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## CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

In the following five chapters, a verse by verse analysis of the translation technique of Chapters 1 to 5 of the Peshitta of Judges will be undertaken. Before doing so some aspects of the history of the study of the translation technique of this ancient Syriac translation of the Old Testament will be reviewed, including recent studies of the translation technique in other books of the Version. The views of several writers on ancient translation technique will also be discussed and the methodology to be followed in this study will be explained. .

Detailed verse by verse study of the Peshitta of the Old Testament in relation to the Masoretic Text and other ancient translations of the Old Testament text is a necessary prerequisite to the effort to understand the nature of its origins, the degree of similarity or dissimilarity between its Vorlage and the MT, the extent to which it may have been influenced by other ancient translations, and the extent to which its translations may have been influenced by other factors that will be classified here as "translation technique," an expression that will be explained in the course of this introduction. In addition to all these possible variables the student has to reckon at many points with the probability that in many places the text available for study differs from the manuscript (or Urtext) of the first translation as a result of change, subtraction, or addition made in the course of the transmission of the text and possibly as a result of comparison with the MT or other versions.

The late Professor M. P. Weitzman wrote:
Quite apart from its own interest, the translation has an important bearing on both earlier and later writings. In relation to the Hebrew text of the Bible, this is the earliest translation of the whole canon into another Semitic language. It is thus potentially an important witness to the Hebrew text, and at the very least shows how the Hebrew text was understood at a particular (if as yet unidentified) time and place. ${ }^{1}$
${ }^{1}$ Michael P. Weitzman, The Syriac Version of the Old Testament (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 2.

Professor Weitzman then mentions its "importance as the basis of the rich literature of Syriac-speaking Christianity," as well as the way in which "the history of its text reflects the history of the constituent churches" of Syriac Christianity.

As the survey below is intended to show, studies of the Peshitta as a translation have often shown greater interest in questions that occupy textual critics and those who are concerned with the setting in which it originated. These are questions about the relation between the text of P and the MT and other ancient versions as that bears on textual criticism and on the origin of P . Notwithstanding this interest (which is the natural interest of, among others, those whose primary concern is in the recovery of a text earlier than the MT that may be closer to a presumed original text) contemporary students of P often conclude that most differences between P and the MT are the result of some translation technique that has changed the translation in a way that cannot be based on the MT or other ancient version. Those who consider the possibility that P is based on an alternative text must weigh that possibility against the possibility that the difference has its origin in the technique of the translator. Obviously, that possibility can range from quite unlikely to highly likely. The consideration as to any verse ought to benefit by a consideration of the translation technique of all the verses of any book of $P$ being studied because of the likelihood that the translator or translators had a particular approach to translation that could be recognized.

Weitzman stated this somewhat differently when he wrote:
[D]iscrepancies appear from time to time between the sense of P and any "plain" sense which modern scholarship, for all its diversity, would attribute to MT. The possible cause identified in the last [previous] chapter can in principle be grouped under three headings. First, the Hebrew Vorlage physically before the translator may have differed from MT. Second, the translator may have changed the sense, whether deliberately (when he "improved" it or chose to follow a different source)
or inadvertently (when he misread or misunderstood the Hebrew text). Third, the text of the Syriac translation may have suffered in transmission. ${ }^{2}$

## DEFINING TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE

Tov
A frequently cited definition and description of translation technique has been formulated by Emanuel Tov. The article in which it appears is more concerned with translation from the Hebrew into Greek, but its definition is a starting point for consideration here:

In the professional literature that term has become a terminus technicus denoting the special techniques used by translators when transferring the message of the source language into the target language. This includes the choice of equivalents, the amount of adherence to the Hebrew text, the equivalence of Greek and Hebrew grammatical categories and etymological exegesis. It also refers to some of the conditions under which the translation was written and about which information is included in the translation itself: cooperation between translators and use of earlier translations. In this definition revisional activity is not mentioned, although that, too, could be included under the heading of translation technique. ${ }^{3}$

This definition by itself does not establish any goal or priority to guide those who study translation technique. Tov goes on to defend "the relevance of this area of research. ${ }^{4} \mathrm{He}$ argues that lexical and grammatical studies as well as comparison of the Greek translation with the Hebrew Vorlage can tell us something about the conditions of the translators' undertaking and the relationships among the various stages of the translation for which we have little or no external evidence. He also argues for the importance of translation technique for text-critical evaluation. He notes the need "to find out whether

[^0]minuses and pluses of the LXX derived from the translator or his Vorlage, and likewise whether differences between the MT and the LXX derived from the translator's exegesis or his Vorlage." ${ }^{5}$ Then he suggests that "a recognition of the translation character" may be "the sole criterion" to decide such questions, "an analysis . . . to be precise" of "the amount of literalness or freedom recognizable in the translation." This would give a privileged importance in deciding specific and significant textual questions to a general conclusion about how literal or free a particular translation may be. More will be said about this below after looking further at the way Tov and others calculate the degree of freedom or literalness in any given translation.

## Aejemelaeus

Anneli Aejmelaeus' article starts from the position that "there ought to be much more talk about what is meant by the term translation technique." ${ }^{\prime 6}$ She observes that "[d]ifferently orientated [sic] scholars seem to attach different connotations to this term." Of greater importance from her perspective are the differences about matters she terms the "inexpressible, viz., the attitude and intention of the translator." Her article is then a vehicle for advancing the view that the translators of the LXX "had no conscious method or philosophy of translation." This is based, for one example, on different approaches to rendering the Hebrew plus infinitive construct into Greek in two chapters of Leviticus. She asserts that the general intention was to produce the meaning of the original. She says that the study of translation technique "cannot be a question of discovering the system used by the translator, because there was none." ${ }^{8}$ Although she says there can be no system for
discerning a translator's technique, she does hold that "[f]ull intentionality can be connected with renderings that involve a clear choice between, for instance, a correct and an incorrect structure in Greek or a Hebraistic and an idiomatic expression." One example she cites is the omission in the Greek of an apodotic conjunction found in the Hebrew. She says this is done because it "aims at avoiding a grammatical error" in the Greek. She also believes that the standard rendering that used $\kappa \alpha$ í for $ו$ in both apodosis and parataxis reflects no special intention, and that this holds true for other "standard" renderings. ${ }^{9}$ (She does not examine the possibility that a native speaker of the target language intending to be literal might have been negligent from time to time or else found some instances in which the literal translation was especially awkward in the target language.) What this comes down to is her adoption of the view that the more literalist translations lack intentionality while the freer ones may be said to show it

Aejemelaeus' thesis is that the Greek translations should be judged according to the "rules of Greek and according to the probable understanding of a native [Greek] speaker." ${ }^{10}$ This excludes interpretation based on the Hebrew original or in the assumed intention of the translator. The intention of the translator is to be sought in the Greek translation itself and not assumed. Standard renderings that result in peculiar expressions and Hebraisms are the result of an "easy technique" of the translator and nothing more.

Aejemelaeus does not raise or comment on other possibilities, such as the possibility that a freer translation could be an easier way out than a more literal one (for example, where the translator was unsure of the Hebrew) or the external evidence discussed below that ancient translators worked within a tradition that distinguished between free and literal translation. It also does not seem justified to use examples where the translator did not

[^1]accurately reproduce the meaning of the Hebrew in the Greek translation to support the argument that the translator's use of a good Greek free translation represents a conscious, disciplined intention of the translator whereas use of Hebraisms and expressions that are peculiar in the target language do not result from any particular intention (especially where the translator is a native speaker of the target language). Nevertheless, even if it is fair to identify these points as flaws in Aejemelaeus' case, her reminder of the need to be cautious about assuming the intention of the translator can be applied as a beneficial warning.

## Brock

In his article on the history of Syriac translation, Brock develops a typology of translation technique in order to distinguish diachronically translations from the fourth through the seventh centuries A. D. Unlike Aejemelaeus, Brock is prepared to evaluate the attitude of the translator based on the character of the translation. He writes:

Depending then on the attitude that the translator takes to his own role as translator and to the text he is translating his basic aim in making the translation will differ. If he adopts a self-effacing, referential attitude toward his source text, then he will probably seek to produce a mirror translation, where every detail of the original is, as far as possible, reproduced in the translation: the focus of attention will be directed entirely to the original rather than on the reader. If on the other hand, the translator sees his own role as an important one in the transference of information from one language to another, then he will aim at a more expositional type of translation, essentially reader-oriented, where he will try to involve the reader emotionally by employing appropriate cultural equivalents. Should the translator, however, go a step further, and seek to impose his own views on the text in what may at times be a partisan way . . ., then he will produce a tendential rendering. ${ }^{11}$

Unlike Aejemelaeus, Brock is dealing with later translations from Greek into Syriac. His discussion also includes the New Testament P , and does not apply specifically to a translation from Hebrew into Syriac. Still his analysis has application to such a translation just as Tov's discussion of translation from Old Testament Hebrew into Greek can be applied to translation from Hebrew into Syriac.

[^2]Brock chooses three criteria to evaluate where a translation should be located in a range that runs from a mirror (or literal) translation to an expositional (or free) translation. The first criterion is "the choice, by the translator of a particular unit of text from which his translation takes its starting point: . . . how does he segment the Greek original?" "The unit may be as large as a paragraph . . . or can be as small as the bound morpheme. . . ." ${ }^{12}$ Here of course the choice of the larger unit is toward the freer end of the spectrum and the smaller in the more literal direction.
"The second criterion concerns the tension between signifiant and signifié, the word employed and the meaning it conveys." In this case the signifiant is associated with literal and the signifié with free or "dynamic" translation. ${ }^{13}$ "A third criterion concerns the general flow of the sentence, the démarche: the translator's attitude toward word order, connecting particles, Greek hypotaxis, etc. ${ }^{14}$ Except for biblical translations, Brock found word order less important than other considerations in all periods. He comments less fully on this third criterion. He notes that there is less correspondence between the Greek particles that have formal equivalents in Syriac and the equivalent Syriac particles used during the periods he associates with a freer translation technique and more correspondence during the period he characterizes as more literal on other grounds as well. Although his aim is to classify these Syriac translations from Greek diachronically, the three criteria of his typology reflect an understanding of translation technique that does not accord with that of Aejemelaeus who was assessing Greek translation of a Hebrew original. The criteria both writers use overlap but their conclusions about the intention of the translators differ. If Brock is right about a pattern of increasing formality or literalism as time passed, then it is less plausible to conclude that there was no specified intention and that the apparent formality resulted from

[^3]an unreflecting use of an "easy" technique, or a following of the path of least resistance. The object of this study of Judges is to apply and understand the criteria or standards used to calculate literalism and freedom in translation rather than to evaluate whether diachronic changes result from subjective motives of the translator.

Additional light is directed on the question of the translator's intention by Brock's earlier article on ancient translation technique. There he accepts the view that in classical antiquity a distinction was made between literary and nonliterary texts, which could also be described as a distinction between free and literal translations. Illustrating his view with quotations from Jerome, Cicero and Horace, he opines that this distinction broke down based on the development of an "ideal of literal biblical translation" with the advent of Christian biblical translations. He concludes that " $[0]$ wing to the prestige of this ideal . . ., it became the norm for virtually all translations from Greek into Latin until the Renaissance. ${ }^{י 15}$ He takes the earliest Greek translation of the Pentateuch as a third century B. C. work, and believes that a "hundred years later there is evidence to show that general opinion had clearly come down on the side of considering the Bible as a legal rather than a literary document. . . ." ${ }^{16}$ Such a view would call for a literal rather than a free translation, and thus follow the approach used for administrative and legal documents and for school texts translated in classical antiquity.

One factor Brock believes more likely to produce a literal translation is the relative prestige of the source and receptor languages stated in the article just discussed:

The earliest versions of the fourth and fifth century Syriac translations from Greek are almost all very free (Basil's homilies, for example, are expanded by about fifty per cent), and significantly the translations adapt the Greek biblical quotations to the wording familiar to their readers from the Syriac Bible; Aramaic was, after all, the original language of mankind. The rapid hellenization of the Syriac church began in the mid-fifth century, and the precise wording of the Greek original now becomes

[^4]all-important, and biblical quotations are translated exactly, even when they diverge from the text of the Syriac Bible. In other words, with the Greek language's new position of prestige, translation techniques changed. ${ }^{17}$

Brock then recounts aspects of this question in Jewish circles in the period before and after the turn of the era, during which there were varying reactions to the problem of how to translate Holy Scripture, including the evasion of the issue by those who held the Greek LXX was inspired as well as those who developed ever more exacting standards of literalism, and those who denied the possibility of translation altogether. ${ }^{18}$ For Christians the question was somewhat different. According to Brock most Christians, like the Alexandrian Jews, were willing to see the LXX as inspired. Therefore they did not accept the method of Aquila, while recognizing the need for a Greek biblical text in agreement with the Greek translations used in Jewish circles. Brock takes the position that " $[t] h e$ result of this particular need was Origen's monumental Hexapla, the inspiration for whose format may possibly have lain in the bilingual Vergil texts. ${ }^{י 19}$ Brock makes the point that an important influence on this approach was the "view, widespread in antiquity, that what can be fully described must in some way be less than the mind that describes it, [and thus] to translate an inspired text sensus de sensu [as opposed to verbum e verbo] would be to imply that the sensus of the impenetrable mysteries of scripture had been fully grasped by the translator. . . . ${ }^{20}$ The translator who pretended to do so would have to be considered an expositor, not an interpres, according to Brock.

He devotes almost half of the article to an overview of some of the techniques used by the verbum e verbo translators. These provide some standards to evaluate free versus

[^5]literal translation techniques. He concentrates on skilled bilingual translation from Hebrew to Greek and Greek to Syriac, most of whose translators had the receptor language as their first language, saying: "this at once indicates that the abuse of syntax consequent upon this method of translation is deliberate and not due to incompetence. ${ }^{י 21}$ He does not attempt to distinguish different styles of literalist translators or the stages of development of literalist translations of the Bible, but explores four areas that illustrate the limits to which literalism could be pressed. These categories are "Word Order and Formal Correspondence," "Lexical Features; Technical Terms," "Regular Lexical Correspondence," and "Analogy." These features would bear some comparison to translation from Hebrew to Syriac, that is, from one Semitic language to another, but Brock limits his consideration to the more challenging translations from a Semitic to an Indo-European language, and vice versa. The standards to evaluate literalism have also been discussed by Emanuel Tov and James Barr.

## Tov

As in his article described above Tov approaches the categories of literal and free from the point of view of one who is interested in them for their application to text-critical analysis. ${ }^{22}$ The units of translation to be evaluated, here translations into Greek, are the starting point. He calls these translation units and does not define them exactly, but his analyses in fact involve what would amount at least to a grammatical clause. He considers units of varying lengths treated as more than one clause or even one sentence, so one can assume that he understands "translation unit" as a flexible notion. The next step is to

[^6]retrovert the Greek (or other target language) into the Hebrew source and then compare the retroversion with the MT. He then develops five criteria for analysis of literal renderings. ${ }^{23}$

The first criterion is consistency by which he means the use of the same word in the receptor language for each occurrence of any given word in the Hebrew original, insofar as that is possible. Following Brock he takes the position that this "probably developed in a school-type milieu . . . and may reflect the belief that the words of the Holy Bible should be rendered consistently in order to remain as faithful as possible to the source language." The approach is "visible also in the Aramaic Targumim." Another term he uses for this practice is "stereotyping" and he notes the use of the phrases: "concordant relationship" by Eugene Nida and "verbal linkage" by C. Rabin. ${ }^{24}$ Tov says that this characteristic can be expressed statistically on the basis of different gradations of consistency.

The second criterion is the "representation of the constituents of Hebrew words by individual Greek equivalents." This means representing the constituents of prefixed and suffixed Hebrew words by consistent Greek equivalents of the constituent parts. An example of this would be the representation of the prefixed preposition ב before an infinitive construct by use of Greek $\varepsilon$ ह́v before the articular infinitive.

The third is "word-order" which Tov says can be expressed statistically as to the MT and LXX.

The fourth is "quantitative representation." This is the matter of using more than one Greek word for a single Hebrew word, and vice versa, and Tov says the more literal translators aimed at a $1: 1$ representation. He also says the quantitative relationship between the MT and LXX can be expressed statistically.

[^7]The fifth is "linguistic adequacy of lexical choices." "Linguistic precision meant that exegetical elements lying beyond the mere understanding of the words were excluded from the translation." ${ }^{25}$ In Tov's view, the translator's intention to produce a literal translation is the subject of inquiry so that the translator's use of an Aramaic meaning for a Hebrew word based on an understanding of the Hebrew meaning different from ours would still show the intent to be literal even though the lexical choice may have been inadequate to express the meaning of the Hebrew word. (That is to say, if the translator misunderstood the meaning, the intent remained even though the effort failed.) This is the only criterion for evaluating the literal versus free nature of translation technique that Tov does not consider subject to statistical expression.

Tov then defines literalism as based in part on the presence of a high percentage of his five criteria (not necessarily expressed always as a percentage). He says: "When the degree of literalness of a particular translation unit does not reach a certain level, that unit must be considered non-literal. ${ }^{, 26}$ However, he does not propose a grading system that would quantify his "certain level." On the other hand he says that "[n]onliteral translation units can be investigated from the view point of the nature and frequency of the exegetical elements included in them." And he adds: "This information cannot be expressed statistically, unless ones take the negative result of the analysis as a positive indication of the existence of exegetical elements. ${ }^{י 27}$ Tov applies his conclusions to a comparison of the translation of 2 Kgs 19:30-32 and its parallel, Is 37:31-33, the translation of the former passage being considered literal and the latter free. That application can be used to evaluate other translations as literal or free by someone who wants to use Tov's approach.

[^8]James Barr has written what is probably the most complete discussion of this matter of literal and free translation techniques. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{He}$ accepts the categories of literal and free, but is concerned about the lack of a standard to measure more precisely the degree to which a translation is free or literal. He also contends that there is a "more complicated scheme of analysis than is provided by the current and traditional distinction with its simple two-term contrast between 'literal' and 'free.' ${ }^{29}$ By this he means that there are different gauges of literal so that any one translation unit may be both literal and free as to one or more of those gauges.

He also thinks the "traditional vocabulary" using these two terms is inadequate because "many ancient translations of the Bible seem not to have had any clear or definite policy for a literal or a free rendering of the text, and this is true particularly of many of the earlier strata of biblical translation, as represented in the earlier books of the LXX." "[T]ranslators often seem to have worked in an ad hoc manner and at any particular point to have opted for a literal or a free rendering, which was worked out according to the character of the original text and its immediate context." Furthermore Barr finds the traditional contrast between free and literal inadequate because "truly 'free' translation, in the sense in which this might be understood by the modern literary public, scarcely existed in the world of the LXX, or indeed in much of ancient biblical translation in general." He says with respect to the LXX that we are not so much "dealing with the contrast between free and literal," but with "variations within a basically literal approach." Furthermore he says that " $[t]$ he 'freer' books had already used the literalist methods in considerable

[^9]measure: what literalism did was to seek to use these methods more consistently." ${ }^{, 30}$ Accordingly Barr makes the aim of his study the understanding of literalism since that is what "the modern reader" needs to have explained. So one of Barr's purposes is to "trace the motives and rationale of the literalist." ${ }^{, 31}$

Barr also relates the consideration of any particular unit of translation selected for study as free or literal to the question of the Vorlage of the translation. Here he concludes, quite cogently, that there is a "general probability that, where there are textual variations, one of which provides a direct and fairly literal path from the original to the translated text, while the other can only be a free, indirect or dubiously related connection, the direct path does result from literal translation. ${ }^{" 32}$ This is an issue similar to the issue raised by Weitzman in discussing the question of whether P translations which differ from the MT result from a different Vorlage or from translation technique. Weitzman characterizes those who find more of the difference based on a different Vorlage as minimalist and those who base more on translation technique as maximalists. ${ }^{33}$

Barr notes that the discovery of new evidence such as the Qumran manuscripts has reduced the number of LXX translations considered free because those manuscripts enable the reconstruction of a Vorlage that provides a semantic path to the Greek that makes it possible to consider the Greek translation literal. However, where there is no way to see a semantic path to any known Hebrew text, one can only "assume either free composition in Greek or (less likely) a totally different and otherwise unevidenced Hebrew text." ${ }^{34}$ Barr also shows how it is possible to trace a clear semantic path between a translation and a Hebrew text that differs from the MT by one or two letters that change the meaning of the

[^10]Hebrew word in which the letter or letters are found. He would classify such renderings as literal even though they cannot be traced to a known manuscript or the Vorlage but can be traced to an easily understandable mistake in reading a known manuscript based, for example, on confusion between similar letters. ${ }^{35}$ Thus either a free translation or a literal one may give an adequate semantic rendering of the original, but a literal rendering may also be one that is not "an adequate indication of the meaning of the original," but one that does "show a close and understandable relation to the form of the original."

Another phenomenon he calls to our attention is the possibility that a deep obscurity in the original may lead translators in opposite directions. "If a text is really difficult and obscure to the translator, he may opt for free translation, making a general estimate of the total meaning, or simply guessing at it, and ignoring the details; but he may also do the opposite, and decide to give a precise impression in Greek of the detailed form of the Hebrew, leaving it to his readers to work out, if they can, what general purport of this may be. ${ }^{36}$ Barr does not mean by this that literalism is limited to the treatment of obscure texts.

He also clarifies the accepted notion that every translation is also an interpretation by distinguishing between two levels of interpretation possible in translation. The first involves "a minimal location and identification of likely semantic values for the Hebrew lexemes." Barr cites as an example the question of whether the unpointed Hebrew letters אכל are the third person feminine singular perfect of first person singular imperfect of כלה, and further defines the first level as the one "which carries the reader from the graphic sequence to a semantic/syntactic intelligibility." The other level of interpretation is one that involves "matters of content, of reference, or of theological exegesis." A translator may put answers to these questions "into his translated text . . ., but

[^11]. . does not have to do so." It is comment and not a necessary part of the translation process. "Commentators and exegetes [would] have to ask these same questions [as to] the Hebrew itself. . . ., ${ }^{37}$ Of course, Barr acknowledges, one Hebrew word may have several meanings covered by different words in the language of translation, but the choice of the right word here is a matter of first level translation, not a question of "the exegetical, legal or theological content of the texts." He believes that "in some ancient translations . . . one of the main motives was . . . to avoid interpreting." In this way the translator did not make exegetical decisions but gave readers "the semantic raw material upon which a decision might later be built." ${ }^{n 8}$ This tendency can be pushed to extremes where the word used in translation covers other senses of the Hebrew word but not the sense in the context of the Hebrew translation unit, or when it may even be misleading when it translates a homonym of the Hebrew word and not the word to be translated.

Barr then proceeds to discuss six "distinguishable modes of difference between a more literal and a less literal rendering of a Hebrew text." They are:

1. The division into elements or segments, and the sequence in which these elements are represented.
2. The quantitative addition or subtraction of elements.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in the rendering, i. e., the degree to which a particular versional term is used for all (or most cases) of a particular term of the original.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic information, especially in cases of metaphor and idiom.
5. Coded "etymological" indication of formal/semantic relationships obtaining in the vocabulary of the original language.
6. Level of text and level of analysis. ${ }^{39}$
[^12]These modes will be described now.

## 1. Division into elements and sequence of those elements.

Barr says that " $[t]$ he following of the Hebrew word order--not strictly but in large measure--is probably to be attributed to habit and the quest for an easy technique rather than to any literalist policy." He has cited as examples of this technique the fact that "[v]erbs come at the beginning of sentences in the Hebrew manner, genitives come after the nouns they qualify; $\pi \hat{\alpha} \varsigma ~ ' a l l ' ~ c o m e s ~ b e f o r e ~ t h e ~ n o u n, ~ a d j e c t i v e s ~ f o l l o w, ~ a n d ~ s o ~ o n . " ~ " T h u s, " ~$ he continues, this "easy technique" "probably quite unconsciously, . . . provided the foundation upon which the later . . . strict[er] literalism might build, for the following of the word order of the original in itself did much to set in the foreground the segmentation of the elements." "For the more extreme literalism, however, segmentation . . . does not stop at the word level: it sometimes goes on to give [semantic] representation in translation . . . to elements that lie below word level, either to parts of words or to morphemes which have only grammatical or word formational function in the original." He cites Aquila as the best known such translator and his translation of the Hebrew particle את that has only a grammatical function by the Greek ov́v that translates the Hebrew preposition that does have a lexical function similar to ov́v. ${ }^{40}$ Barr concludes that "one of the central paradoxes of the whole matter [is]. . . that literalism . . . when it insists on going farther and segmenting below the word level), actually becomes a free mode of translation." ${ }^{41}$
2. The quantitative addition or subtraction of elements.

When a translator adds "considerable amounts of new material," as in the Song of Hannah of Targum Jonathan, 1 Samuel 2, such an expansion makes the version less literal. When "something in the original text . . . is left without representation in the translation, this

[^13]also means that the version is not literal." ${ }^{42}$ Barr explains the principle of literalism in play here as follows:

A literal translation will express only the linguistic elements that are present in the original, and will express all of them. The measure for this is of course semantic: there is no way in which a Greek text can be merely quantitatively equivalent to a Hebrew text except that it expresses meanings that stood for the meanings of each element in the Hebrew. ${ }^{43}$

While the quantitative variations would be somewhat different for the translation into the two dialects of Aramaic subject to analysis in this study, similar considerations will apply.

Barr then makes the point that additional material in a translation may be free, but the portion of that same translation that represents the original text may be quite literal. He also makes the point that where "material is pure free composition, having no base in the original text, we hardly need to concern ourselves with it." "Thus expansions are often not mere additions, they are exegetical provisions of context." ${ }^{34}$ Concluding, he states that "[1]iteralism when measured as against quantitative addition or subtraction of elements, seems to be basically a different thing from literalism defined through the division of the text into segments. ${ }^{.45}$

Although Barr does not say so, "pure free composition having no base in the original text" reveals other facets of the intention, conscious or unconscious, of the translator than are revealed in study of the way the probable original text has been translated. These extended additions may be worthy of study as a feature of ancient translations or a clue to the influences on or beliefs of the translator or later copyist but do not fit into the system that Barr creates in defining the typology of literalism.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in the rendering.

[^14]"It is usually considered . . . a mark of literalism . . . if the same word is used every time a given word in the original appears." ${ }^{" 46}$ And so, "[t]he freer style of translation makes a point of not doing this. ${ }^{,{ }^{47}}$ At the same time Barr notes that a translation can be literal in some respects, such as providing a word-for-word translation, and still not be consistent in its choices of translation words. Furthermore, he holds that "use of vocabulary equivalences is not in itself a sign of literalism." ${ }^{48}$ This may happen simply because the word is the natural one for the translator in the translation language (which is by and large Greek for Barr in this article). On the other hand variations in vocabulary may be a question of style and have very little to do with literalism.

More serious issues could arise where a word was polysemic. The Hebrew word illustrates this for Barr. For three of its meanings, (a) "sole of the foot" (b) "time, occasion" and (c) "anvil," he notes that "even literal translations seem often to yield to the polysemy, at least in major cases." He observes that even Aquila translated פעם as $\pi \mathrm{ov}$, when it means "sole of the foot," although he uses $\kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ o o o o when it means "time" and also when it means "anvil," and thus is less rigid in applying his principles of literalism than might otherwise be expected. ${ }^{49}$

Another problem here is the rendering of homonyms. As to one example of a rendering of one word גאל by a meaning of its homonym, he comments that "[i]t is possible that the rendering derives from a policy of unvarying constancy," but "[m]ore probable . . . that it is a mere mistake., ${ }^{50}$

Barr then surveys four possible positions "on the scale between free and literal in respect of constancy in the use of equivalents." By and large he is classifying Greek

[^15]translations from Hebrew. The first tendency, which he finds in "older strata of the LXX," has "little conscious striving to use constant equivalences, and a fair amount of variation in vocabulary use . . .," he surmises to have resulted from "practical considerations rather than any doctrinaire preference," arising "from the use of a primitive sort of word-list" or from "taking the books earlier translated . . . as a sort of quarry." The second tendency "shows an increasing desire for accuracy . . . through increased regularity in the equivalences used." Consistently followed, this leads to "a high degree of regularity: for a given Hebrew phenomenon, a regular Greek stereotype will be found. ${ }^{251}$ Barr comments further on the extent to which there can be a "one-to-one relationship in both directions" between the language translated and the translation language. He does not cite specific examples of this practice before moving on to discuss a third possibility, "the imitative style of translation . . . relevant above all for Aquila." This is "not so much . . . a statement in Greek of the sense of the Hebrew . . . it is a guide in Greek to the form of the Hebrew. ${ }^{, 52}$ For those who know Hebrew it provides clues to the original. At this point Barr suggests a partial revision of the standard view of Aquila as the most extreme literalist, arguing that Aquila translated the same Hebrew form according to its meaning in different contexts by different Greek words and that "revisers who worked on later strata of the LXX pushed consistency in renderings farther than he did. ${ }^{י 53}$
"The fourth possibility, in relation to constancy, is a positive preference for variety." This, of course, "is a classic aspect of freer translation." ${ }^{54}$ On the other hand Barr calls his readers' attention to the fact that Greek translators sometimes replace stylistic variety in the

[^16]Hebrew original with repetition of the same Greek word to translate the variety of words in the original.

## 4. The accuracy and the level of semantic information.

This can take place in several ways. A term to be translated can be translated as a term with a narrower or wider meaning. (Barr cites $\pi \alpha \rho \theta \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma$ as a translation of עלמה in Is 7:14 as a case where the Greek translation is narrower and more specific than the Hebrew.
 and thus be more literal. ${ }^{55}$ )

Another issue in this category is raised by a metaphorical expression as in Ps 95:1 where is translated as "rock" in the English Versions from AV to NRSV, but as "strength" in the Coverdale Psalms, and in other examples cited by Barr. By examples cited from the Targums Barr illustrates his view of how "non-literal translation" "may offer not the linguistic semantic value of the words but the exegetical-theological value of the reference" or even a "halachic-exegetical" effect. ${ }^{56}$ He proceeds to suggest that this problem may have influenced some translators to render each word more consistently as in his third mode for classifying literalness just above, and this may have promoted more semantic accuracy, but with the following qualification:

Improvement in semantic accuracy was attainable, but was attainable only by a moderate and flexible approach aimed at securing the maximum semantic agreement with the Hebrew text. In particular, the aim of semantic accuracy, important as it may have been in promoting a move towards greater literalism, conflicted with many of the other means which ancient literalism adopted and cherished--its word-forword segmentation, its search for constancy in renderings for any given word, its "etymological" representation and linkages and relations existing within the language of the original text. ${ }^{57}$

[^17]In closing this section of his discussion, Barr remarks (1) that the dissatisfaction with Greek translation from Hebrew of people like Ben Sira in the introduction to Ecclesiasticus led "to the movement for increasing literalism;" and (2) that Aquila's supposed confutation of "certain Christian misunderstandings" left ample room for Christians to defend their understanding of disputed Old Testament passages as for example where Aquila translated בתולה by veâvi̧ in Is 7:14 at the same time he translated same Greek word in Deut 22:28 and used an "etymological translation for עלמה in Gen 24:43, showing little concern for consistent semantic accuracy. ${ }^{58}$
5. Coded "etymological" indication of formal/semantic relationships obtaining in the vocabulary of the original language.

The examples Barr gives are in Greek translation and include not only cases where the translator chose a word with both the "sense" of the Hebrew, but also a "guide to the form . . or a reflection of that form. ${ }^{59} \mathrm{He}$ illustrates the former by several examples such as $\lambda i$ is for ליש and the latter by examples such as $\sigma$ viv for the Hebrew direct object marker. Other applications of the practice are seen in treating a group of homonyms together and using the same Greek word for all the various meanings, possibly based on the dominant use of the term in the Old Testament. He cites the practice of giving all ברר words the sense of ברר meaning "choose" or "select." Nevertheless, he notes that literal translators including Aquila did not apply this method consistently.
6. Level of text and level of analysis.

This mode of translation is one in which vocalization of the MT (or, theoretically, other forms of the Hebrew text) can be ignored and the text analyzed based on the consonants vocalized in a different, but possible way. He gives examples such as treating

[^18] as to the unpointed text but not as to the text as pronounced.

Barr concludes his study by pointing out again that any given text can be both literal and free at the same time, remarking that "[a]ncient biblical translations are seldom pure exponents of either the literal or the free. . . ." He then observes:

It might be possible to devise a scheme by which the various different modes of literality might be formally designated and marked. If this were done one could then go through any particular book in a Greek or other version and give for each version a percentage notation or something similar, quantifying the degree of literality on each of several levels. It might then be possible to produce a more systematic and final assessment of the degree of freedom or literality to be found in a book. . . . ${ }^{60}$

This proposal by Barr is one to be considered further below in a section immediately preceding the "concluding comments" of this introductory chapter.

The last seven paragraphs of Barr's article recapitulate his analysis of the factors that brought about literalism. First, he says, "practical problems of translating" may have "led [early translators] in a literal direction." Reuse of the same equivalence "again and again for any single word in the original" "saves trouble." "[P]rimitive word-lists encourage" it. As practical translators, not sophisticated linguists, "[t]hey were not literalists in any ideological sense," but their "simple means of working . . . were taken over, generalized and made more consequent, by more literalist successors." ${ }^{61}$

Second, the later desire for greater accuracy drove a "movement towards literalism" because of "unaccountable variations and unevenness" in early translation, especially when "the Bible became a battleground . . . between competing religions and sects." Third, "the conception of inspired scripture encouraged a more literalist approach." Fourth, seeing multiple meaning in the text meant that free translations which had to commit to a single meaning could not provide the full meaning, whereas a literal translation seeking "to bring

[^19]the reader to the actual form of the original" could help in the "search for authoritative meanings." Fifth, Jews in the Greek world came to a "deepening conviction that real authority lay in the Hebrew." This led to imitation of "features of the form of the Hebrew original. ${ }^{362}$

All this produced more literalist translation, but what Barr says spoiled it "was its deep failure to give a correct semantic impression of the meaning of the original." "Literal translation, pushed far enough, joined hands with extreme freedom in translating." What saved them "was the fact that they did not press their principles too far" and so could sometimes "correct erroneous meaning and improve the impression of the form of the original." "In the end literalism had no solution to the problem: the solution had to be semantic, in correct representation of meaning, and not formal, in exact following of the formal patterns of the original. ${ }^{, 63}$

## Lane

An article by D. J. Lane will close this selection from the literature on translation technique in ancient translations of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek and Aramaic. The title of the article ${ }^{64}$ is taken from S. T. Coleridge's definition of poetry: the best words in the best order. "The thesis of [Lane's] article is that in the Syriac Leviticus there is a carefully constructed piece of writing." By this he means "that properly to translate is to effect something recognizable as good writing by those who only know the translation." This "cannot be a matter only of nicety of diction but also of a clear judgment of the intention of the original text." This view seems comparable to what Barr means when he writes of semantic accuracy. To support his thesis Lane uses three approaches: (1) "an

[^20]assessment of the variants in the manuscripts of the Syriac Leviticus"; (2) "an examination of [the same translation] in general with respect to matters of style"; and (3) "discussion of some passages which show care and expertise in the choice of equivalents in technical terms. ${ }^{\prime 65}$ To apply approach (1) he assesses forty-seven manuscripts, thirty-four of which he classifies as "Nestorian" or "Mosul," six of which he associates with Takrit in Iraq (but from the Wadi Natrum in Egypt), and seven of which he calls the Western Group, showing "the type of text associated with the editorial activity of the Maronite Renaissance in Rome and Paris in the seventeenth century." His overall impression is that "an unconscious sense of individual Syriac style led copyists to reorder phrases." This was the work "of different individuals in different places. ${ }^{" 66} \mathrm{He}$ concludes as to the differences between the first group and the next two groups that there are forty-seven variants that fall into three categories: the transposition of words, usually only two, the addition or omission of a single word, as well as what he calls "legitimate variants." These last he considers more likely to be "nuancing" and to be deliberate. ${ }^{67}$ He also finds variants within the second Takrit group that, together with the findings described above, "sometimes reflect different opinions as to how particular phrases should be rendered, taking into account a feeling for the text and its significance. ${ }^{" 68}$

He then turns to his second approach saying: "It must be admitted that most variants within the manuscripts do concern stylistic rather than exegetical concern," and contrasts this with "Targums Onkelos and Neofiti, which seem closer to the Hebrew style, but less faithful to Hebrew meaning." After discussing other matters of style, he sets out the "main features of" of what he calls Syriac style that are evidenced in the Syriac Leviticus. With

[^21]some abbreviation for purposes of the discussion in this paper there are eight: (1) use of an emphatic noun where Hebrew does not have an article and use of "one" if an indefinite article is specifically required; (2) avoidance of construct state; (3) preference for the active voice; (4) preference for the finite "tense" over the infinitive or "particle [sic]"; (5) care for the appropriate preposition with verbs of speaking, moving and giving; (6) preference for a direct object before an "indirect or second object"; (7) fondness for chiasmus; and (8) above all, concern for consistency and order within a paragraph. Because of these factors Lane says he uses the term "Syriac Leviticus" to emphasize that the translation uses "the best words in the best order" according to the standards of the Syriac language. ${ }^{69}$

In concluding his application of the third approach, he says that " $[\mathrm{t}]$ he logic of the translator is more thoroughgoing than the original and that has led to the choice of words as well as style." ${ }^{.70}$ Among the examples he cites of the "thoroughgoing" "logic of the translator" are those of Emerton's article "Unclean Birds and the Origin of the Peshitta" ${ }^{71}$ "in which it is shown that the difference between the Syriac list of 15 birds [in Lev 9:14-19] and the Hebrew list of 20 birds can be attributed to the translator's attempts to find the terms best judged to represent what the Hebrew was understood to mean." Lane develops additional examples in which he holds that the important question is not what the word to be translated means, but what the translator thinks it means. The first of several cited is the Hebrew חֵלֶב used three times in Lev 3:6-11, where the cognate Syriac word ul. translates the first and reidi (Lane transliterates tarbeh) the next two. He believes the context meant two different kinds of fat were involved. From all these examples he reaches the conclusion described above about the thoroughgoing "logic of the translator." ${ }^{72}$

[^22]Lane concludes his article with examples of translation that he sees as having their origin in Rabbinic discussions, and aligns himself with those who say "the Syriac rests not on one but upon several Targumic or Rabbinic traditions." ${ }^{" 73}$ Thus, "the Syriac Leviticus is evidence of the kind of approach which rendering and exegesis of the Hebrew necessitated."

Lane ends on a note that he does not develop fully, by responding to J. Perles’ 1859 judgment that differences between Leviticus in the Peshitta and the MT that could not be explained as exegetical were "faulty or cantankerous." Lane contends:
[H]e did not take into account that a Syriac version would require a Syriac style.
Like other writers on the Peshitta [Perles] had mistaken ideas as to what constituted closeness to, or divergence from the Hebrew MT. There is no such objective thing as closeness to, or distance from, that text: closeness and distance are, after all, subjective matters. ${ }^{74}$

Since Lane is not working with a typology of closeness to or distance from a translation text, his conclusion about subjectivity has less value and does not explain his own use of the word "close." As quoted above, he said Targums Onkelos and Neofiti are "closer" to the Hebrew style than the Peshitta but "less faithful" to Hebrew meaning. Nevertheless, if one were developing a typology of freedom in translation, then some of his observations might be helpful in the effort. For example, some of the main features of Syriac style (idiom, usage, or diction) might be useful in categorizing small changes in word order or changes in verb form as well as word choices. Even in such cases, just as with certain types of literalism, the semantic accuracy of the particular category of freedom in translation would still be an issue. After all, a free translation considered free in relation to the translated text may be semantically inaccurate too.

## APPROACH ADOPTED HERE TO EVALUATE THE LITERALNESS OR FREEDOM OF THE PESHITTA

[^23]The goal of this study is to evaluate the first five chapters of the Leiden Peshitta Edition of Judges for literalness and freedom beginning with an evaluation of whether or not each verse is a translation based on the Masoretic Text of the Book of Judges.

The first stage in the process will be to compare the translation with the MT verse by verse. The first step of the first stage will be to determine whether the translation will support a retroversion into the Hebrew of the MT, as suggested by Tov. At this step, the intention will not be to evaluate how literal or free the translation is, but to determine whether there are additions (pluses), subtractions (minuses), or changes in the Syriac that would clearly require additions, subtractions or changes in the Hebrew retroversion that would distinguish the retroversion from the MT. If there are no probable additions, subtractions, or changes, then P will be assumed to be based on the MT. If there are such differences, step two would be to compare the Leiden $P$ and its apparatus with Sperber's edition of Targum Jonathan (TgJ) and with Rahlfs' edition of Alexandrinus and Vaticanus in order to explore the possibility of an alternative Hebrew text or ancient version on which differences could have been based. This may involve going more deeply into the other manuscripts of the LXX and TgJ. That inquiry could lead to a conclusion that the difference or differences arose from an alternative Hebrew text or from some other translation available to the translator of P . In a few cases the text of the Syro-Hexapla will be compared to P and the other versions. To the extent that any of these kinds of differences were present in any verse, then the portion of that verse (up to and including the whole verse) not based on the MT would not be evaluated for the degree to which its translation is literal or free, in other words its translation technique would not be evaluated. Admittedly this approach might miss some small variations between the MT and the Vorlage of the Syriac text where a difference is
attributed to Syriac idiom or to some probable reason other than the Vorlage. In such cases though, unless the difference is easily explainable as a matter of translation, there is no way to know unless an ancient Hebrew manuscript or other ancient witness shows up that reflects the difference in a way that supports a reasoned conclusion that it lies behind P. The goal at stage one is to establish the cases where it is probable that the difference or differences are based on a different Vorlage, and exclude any such differences from the evaluation of the translation technique.

Stage 2 of the analysis will be to evaluate the verses or portions of verses assumed to be based on a Vorlage indistinguishable from the MT for the extent to which they can be classified as literal as well as to consider ways in which they may be said to be free. The standard for classifying literal translation will be Barr's six distinguishable modes of differences between a more or a less literal rendering of a Hebrew text with help in applying those modes taken from the other authorities described above, especially Brock and Tov. In that way each verse can be evaluated for the extent to which it exhibits one or more modes of literal translation as well as the ways in which it is freer. Where some mode of literalness or exercise of freedom resulted in semantic inaccuracy that should be noted too.

Although evaluations such as these are susceptible to subjectivity, they help to focus more clearly on an elusive reality when a careful methodology like that developed by Barr is applied to the problem. This is a reality that we recognize and translators can apply, sometimes deliberately and other times less deliberately, and some of their readers can recognize a translation as more or less literal or free. A methodology like Barr's, Brock's, or Tov's can help give some shape and outline to what is more difficult to express without such a framework.

Applying Barr's methodology for evaluating literalism may allow the student to pursue another goal, that is, to evaluate the translation for what Barr calls "the various factors" that brought about literalism. ${ }^{75}$ Of course, the fifth of those factors, the declining prestige of the Greek versions and the rise of the effort to imitate the form of the Hebrew original would have to be adapted to take account of the difference between Syriac and the Greek translation Barr had in mind in his discussion. The understanding that Barr shows for the motives and rationale of the literalist is balanced against his recognition that it could fail "to give a correct semantic impression of the original." For this reason it seems desirable to try to evaluate the extent to which the translation gives a correct impression of the form of the original as well as the extent to which it failed or succeeded in giving a correct semantic impression.

The ways in which a translation can be treated as free should also be considered. Where a verse or portion of a verse is judged to be based on a text like the MT, but contains what is found in error, as Barr does in the case of the homonyms גאל, I, and , , II, such a variation does not fit into either the literal or free category, although it might be a failed attempt to be literal. At the same time, an exegetical or interpretive change would be classified as free. Further description of the approach to the application of Barr's typology and the statistical analysis of the conclusions will be set out at the beginning of the verse by verse commentary.

What Lane classifies as stylistic changes present a somewhat different problem. Since it seems possible to adapt a target language to the form of the Hebrew in some, perhaps many ways, and preserve semantic accuracy as well, even if the adaptation is an awkward innovation in the receptor language, it seems to be worthy of notice when the target language already has a form closer to the Hebrew form that is avoided in favor of

[^24]another form. An obvious example for this would be the use of a noun in the emphatic state or a noun with a pronominal suffix plus ז $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ in Syriac to represent a noun in the construct state in Hebrew. This might be classified as slightly free (or less literal). On the other hand, if the translator mimicked the Hebrew form even while recognizing some awkwardness in Syriac, that would be an example of literalism. Another example would be the use of the Syriac participle rather than the imperfect to translate a Hebrew imperfect with a future sense where the Syriac imperfect would do the job and reflect the Hebrew form more closely. These examples illustrate the differences between stage one and stage two of the analysis. In stage one the Syriac variations would probably not represent a different Vorlage, and in stage two, the Syriac forms that are not as similar to Hebrew as they theoretically might be would represent a (perhaps small) step away from a literal translation toward a freer translation, and cases that did not do so would evidence literalism.

When a portion of the text of P is not based on the Hebrew Vorlage, the difference will be compared with the other three versions, and a decision will be noted on the issue of whether any of the others has a similar difference from the Vorlage as well as a summary of the extent of the difference. This will allow a comparison of P with the three versions to calculate the degree to which they show similarities with or differences from the translation technique of P . This is to be contrasted with the approach of Craig Morrison, discussed below, who takes a greater interest in the textual question. As each verse is evaluated based on the six characteristics of Barr's typology of literalism, an estimate of the version closest to P in respect to those characteristics will be made and explained. Where TgJ is the closest, then the Greek version that is closer than the other will be identified.

The Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible ("MT") in the BHS edition ${ }^{76}$ is posited as a text close to the Vorlage on which the Urtext of P was based and also as the text on which any corrections were made from Hebrew sources in the Syriac manuscript tradition on which this study is based. This presumption will apply both to the consideration of textual variation and to the consideration of translation technique, but is, of course, rebuttable.

## Leiden Peshitta

The student of the translation of the Peshitta of Judges has the benefit of the extensive work on the text already done by P. B. Dirksen. His monograph on the transmission of the text ${ }^{77}$ and his edition of the text in the Leiden Peshitta series ${ }^{78}$ together with other articles on the text supply a well-developed textual basis for a form of the text according to the rules set by the Leiden Peshitta Institute as further elaborated by Dirksen in his monograph and articles on the text of Judges. What this work makes possible is a definition of the oldest form of the text according to Dirksen's delineation of that standard and his analysis of the available manuscripts now to be described. He identifies a group of the oldest manuscripts designated the "ancient manuscripts," a category that comprises all of the texts through the ninth century except 9 c 1 , based on his conclusion that "[t]he manuscripts 6b7, 6ph11, 7a1, 8a1, 9a1 (and its descendants

[^25]17a7.8.9) represent a text tradition of their own, found also in 18 g 4. ."79 He adds: "It is convenient at this point to note the remarkable fact, that the oldest manuscripts represent a type of text of their own, and that we do not have (so far as Judges is concerned) any representative older than 9 c 1 of the type of text to which the other manuscripts must go back."

Dirksen sets out from there to develop a test for determining when the student of $P$ can consider a reading the oldest extant reading of the text. He concludes that where "the ancient manuscripts agree with the majority of the other manuscripts, there can be no doubt that these manuscripts together represent the older reading." ${ }^{80}$ However the oldest manuscripts available should not always be treated as representing the older reading. Therefore Dirksen says that:

From this it also follows, that where 6 h 7 and other ancient manuscripts differ from the later manuscripts, we cannot single out the superior reading on the basis of manuscript evidence alone. If selecting a reading as superior is at all possible, there must be another basis, such as the possibility of explaining one reading as a corruption of the other. ${ }^{81}$

In the Transmission monograph he decides that where there is such a difference among the ancient manuscripts there are "only . . . a limited number of cases" where one "can be reasonably certain as to which of the two readings is the older." This is true even though "in many places the two readings . . . presuppose the same Hebrew text. ${ }^{, 82}$

Unless otherwise stated then, the P text for consideration in this study will be Dirksen's conclusions about what is the oldest form of the text or probably the oldest

[^26]form. Where Dirksen has not given an opinion, the more literal reading will be accepted since the purpose of this study is not to decide textual questions, especially where, as in this case, so much highly regarded work on the text has already been published by Dirksen. Nevertheless, the significance of textual variations cited in Dirksen's notes may be noted in the discussion of some of the verses and in the concluding chapter of this study.

Starting from that point, the purpose of this study is to follow Dirksen's suggestion for a full treatment of the subject that is not covered by his work on the text. He suggests "two further studies:"

The first would be a study of the technique of the Peshitta as a translation, how it renders the Hebrew, the liberties it takes with the Hebrew or its literalness, etc. The second would be a study of the relationship between the Peshitta and the other ancient versions, especially the LXX, or, as far a Judges is concerned, the two recensions of this version. ${ }^{83}$

As already proposed, this study will also treat the relation between the Peshitta and Targum Jonathan as well as the two "recensions" of the LXX mentioned by Dirksen. And so the textual basis for the evaluation of those relations must now be considered.

## Greek Texts, Especially Alexandrinus and Vaticanus

The student of the Greek text of Judges has the benefit of Walter Bodine's monograph on the $\kappa \alpha \downarrow \gamma \varepsilon$ and other Greek texts of Judges. ${ }^{84}$ His conclusions provide a framework for comparing the P translations to those two versions. He examined the B (or Vaticanus) family of Judges in chapter one of his work and found it to be a genuine member of the $\kappa \alpha \downarrow \gamma \varepsilon$ recension based on an examination of 30 characteristics

[^27]of the recension found in that family. ${ }^{85} \mathrm{He}$ "concluded that the clearest preservation of the Old Greek (OG) of Judges is to be found first in the text of Lucian and then in the Old Latin, and especially in the two . . . when they agree." The revision of Origen in his fifth column, Bodine says, "was found to be based on a form of the OG and to exhibit identifiable каí $\gamma \varepsilon$ influence." He suggests that influence was Aquila. Origen's sixth column of Judges "most likely represents the work of Theodotion of the second century." He opines that "the small ratio of revisions common to the sixth column and the B family may reflect earlier revision which was already present in the Vorlage of both." He concluded that "[t]he Alexandrian [A] family was . . . a full text primarily influenced by the Origenic revision [that is, the fifth column]., ${ }^{86}$ Bodine cites the conclusion of Swete that the Syro-hexaplar is "our chief authority for the text of Origen's revision. ${ }^{78}$

In light of these conclusions where a question arises in discussing the retroversion of each verse to be studied the Greek texts consulted to resolve a question of whether a departure by P from the MT was the result of a different Vorlage from the MT will be those cited in the apparatus of Brooke and McLean. ${ }^{88}$ Where there is a question about the literal or free nature of the translation, only the examples provided by A or B will be noted, and, ordinarily, no other Greek texts will be consulted. In the same way the translation technique applied by A and B similar to or different from that found in P will be noted, but no other Greek texts will be considered to determine whether they are similar or dissimilar. ${ }^{89}$

[^28]An example from Bodine's monograph may serve as an illustration. This is
 or $\dot{\varepsilon} v a v \tau i o v$. According to Bodine the "OG . . . avoided the literal translation of this preposition when the object was יהוה and used it only rarely when the object was a suffix equivalent to יהוה." "On the other hand, when the object was a suffix or noun referring to someone other than יהוה, the literal translation was often [used]. In contrast to this, the $\kappa \alpha \imath \gamma \varepsilon$ recension renders the preposition literally regardless of the object." ${ }^{90}$ In kai ge Samuel-Kings, "the literal rendering is employed by the $\kappa \alpha \downarrow \gamma \varepsilon$ revision for all uses of the Hebrew preposition. In Judges the literal translation does not occur when the object is explicitly יהוה, thus setting off this textual tradition as distinctive within the $\kappa \alpha \downarrow \gamma \varepsilon$ revision." On the other hand, "[i]ts continuity with the recension is demonstrated by the use of the literal translation when the object is a suffix equivalent to יהוה, in contrast to the OG in Judges, as elsewhere." ${ }^{191}$ The verses of Judges where the literal translation with יהוה is not used are 2:11; 3:7, 12a-b; 4:1; $6: 1 ; 10: 6$; and $13: 1$. The literal rendering with a suffix referring to the Lord is used in verses 6:17 and 10:15. In all these cases A, B, P, and Tg. J. follow the same pattern in Judges, putting them in the same relation to the OG and the $\kappa \alpha \downarrow \gamma \varepsilon$ recension in respect of this example exhibiting features of literal and nonliteral translation. This feature can be identified as the same in the two Aramaic dialects considered here as well as the two Greek versions, but it may not always be so easy to show similarities or differences between examples of literal and free translation from Hebrew into Greek and Aramaic.

[^29]Targum Jonathan
The situation as to the text of Targum Jonathan is rather different. As the following discussion will show, the state of the text of Targum Jonathan as it would have been known in the period when it came to be recognized as "our Targum" in the Babylonian Talmud (Qidd. 49a), perhaps the fourth century A. D., is not witnessed by any manuscripts earlier than the eighth century. We cannot rely on a single datable manuscript as we can with Codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus, and do not have a carefully developed theory of the manuscripts that represent the earliest stage of the transmission of an Urtext as we do for P. Nevertheless, the broad outlines of its origin place it in a context appropriate for comparison with P . As just stated, that stage of its development was in the Jewish community in Babylon, probably during the Tannaitic Period after the Bar Kokhba War and then during the Amoraic Period. Philip S. Alexander takes the position that there was an Old Palestinian Targum in existence written in Standard Literary Aramaic by some time shortly before the Bar Kokhba War. In the period after that the Old Palestinian version was taken to Babylon and then subjected to revision and standardization to produce the Babylonian versions of Onkelos and Jonathan. He opines that this involved (1) a shortening to conform the Targum more closely to the Hebrew text, and (2) a revision of the Halakhic aspects to align them with the Halakha of Babylon. At the same time, Alexander opines, the original dialect was "basically" preserved, "a western form of Standard Literary Aramaic." ${ }^{\text {.92 }}$ According to Alexander's scenario, in a separate development the Old Palestinian Targums were recast in Galilean Aramaic after the Bar Kokhba War when Jewish cultural life in Palestine shifted from Judea to Galilee. ${ }^{93}$

[^30]The standard edition for contemporary references to Tg J and the other Babylonian Targumim remains the edition of Alexander Sperber published in 1959-62 and 1968 and now available in English. ${ }^{94}$ This includes Onkelos and Jonathan as well as Chronicles, Ruth, Canticles, Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes. The basis of Sperber's edition of Jonathan for Judges is the British Museum Manuscript Or. 2210. The student of Tg J can supplement Sperber's work with the Babylonian manuscripts for Joshua and Judges by Emiliano Martinez Borobio. ${ }^{95}$ Those manuscripts of Judges are classified as "babilónico antiguo," "babilónico medio," and "babilónico reciente," following the criteria adopted by J. Ribera Florit. ${ }^{96}$

There are two areas of disagreement that are in the background for the student of Tg J or any of the Babylonian Targums. One is the question of the adequacy of Sperber's edition and the other is the question of the dating of the Targums. R. P. Gordon summarizes the criticism of Malachi Martin and J. von Zijl in a 1974 article. ${ }^{97}$ Anthony D. York discusses the other question. ${ }^{98}$

Fr. Martin concluded that the manuscripts relied on by Sperber are too removed from the period in which the Babylonian Targum tradition was still being practiced. Although Sperber used a twelfth century text as his basic text for Targum Onkelos, the basic text for Tg J (Ms. or. 2210) is dated 1469 A. D., and the others are sixteenth or seventeenth century. All of the texts used by Sperber are considered by Martin to be Yemenite. Writing in particular of the manuscripts used for Onkelos he characterizes Sperber's edition as one "of Yemenite Targum texts of an impure

[^31]strain." Thus he says the "supralinear vocalization" "is a mere transcription into Babylonian vowel signs (with Yemenite characteristics) of the Tiberian version." ${ }^{\text {"99 }}$ The Yemenite characterization seems intended to apply to the Former Prophets of Tg J as well.

Gordon also discusses the large number of errors in Sperber's edition, referring in particular to an article by J. van Zijl. Gordon concludes that most of the errors are in the vocalization, "a vocalisation that does not present the authentic Babylonian tradition." ${ }^{100}$ However, he does assert that "Sperber's reproduction of the consonantal text of Ms. or. 2211 [sic] may . . . be regarded as sufficient for most purposes. ${ }^{101} \mathrm{He}$ holds to this position on the consonantal text in an article published in 1994. ${ }^{102}$

The question of dating the period during which Tg J first took shape, as distinguished from the dating of the manuscripts that provide the available evidence for the text, requires the establishment of a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem. This discussion usually assumes a process of recension and thus does not necessarily consider the question of the content of the text at each stage of development.

The most important recent work on Tg J of Judges is that of William F. Smelik. ${ }^{103}$ Smelik summarizes his conclusions about Tg J as follows:

It seems reasonable to assumed the proto-Targum of Judges existed prior to the Bar Kokhba Revolt, underwent at least one revision in the second half of the second century CE, and was perhaps occasionally revised in the Amoraic period so as to bring TJon into agreement with later exegesis. ${ }^{104}$

[^32]He bases this in part on his analysis of certain verses like 5:2, 5:7, and 5:11 that he believes refer to the Hadrianic persecutions. He proposes that 5:10 refers to either the first or the second revolt. The suggestion of the influence from the first revolt is a bit puzzling as a basis for a revision in the second half of the second century, but that puzzle will not be considered further in this discussion.

His views on the textual evidence for Tg J also add material for consideration. He agrees with Malachi Martin's criticism of Sperber's choice of Yemenite manuscripts cited above, pages 38-39, and with the view that Babylonian manuscripts would have been "preferable." ${ }^{105} \mathrm{He}$ says at the same point "that the manuscripts of the Babylonian tradition cannot function as the basic text for the whole Targum Jonathan" because "[t]hey are too fragmentary and vary too much among themselves." He points out in support of this that "[e]ven if . . . MS [L 229 (EMC 105) of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America] is supplied with Cambridge Genizah fragments, more than half of Targum Judges is still wanting," noting that "[o]ften no genuine Babylonian texts were available [for Martinez Borobio's edition], and Eb66, Eb75 or MS or. 1471 had to be substituted." As a consequence of this he concludes: "So Sperber's choice of a well-executed Yemenite MS was not so injudicious after all." ${ }^{106}$ Smelik minimizes his criticism of Sperber's vocalization and believes Martinez Borobio's edition of the Babylonian manuscripts makes up for this part of the defect in Sperber's edition. Sperber used four Yemenite and two Western manuscripts, and Smelik counts five available Yemenite manuscripts and nineteen Western. Thus he believes that the main defect in Sperber's consonantal text is in his failure to use the twelve Western Texts that he, Smelik, collated to find seven errors

[^33]in the main text of Sperber's edition and twelve errors in Sperber's apparatus. (Smelik concedes that his list of errors is not complete.) ${ }^{107}$ In a footnote, Smelik reveals his "plan to publish an edition of the Western Text of Judges in due time." ${ }^{108}$

In Chapter 3, Smelik undertakes "the quest for the literary character and exegetical traditions of T Jon" by "a comparison between the Targums and the Septuagint, Peshitta and Vulgate, as well as Symmachus, Aquila and Theodotion where extant. ${ }^{" 109}$ By Septuagint or LXX he means the same four manuscript families used by Bodine. ${ }^{110}$ He catalogues the following categories of modifications in order to compare the versions under consideration:

1. Pluses in TJon only;
2. Pluses in TJon with an equivalent in another version;
3. TJon $\neq$ MT, version $=$ MT;
4. Both TJon and version $\neq$ MT: similar modification;
5. Both TJon and version $\neq$ MT: divergent modifications;
6. Representation of names;
7. Additional remarks [that is, conclusions].

To summarize his extensive treatment quite briefly, he finds:

1) "LXX and TJon clearly represent two independent translations."
"Whereas LXX is a highly literal translation of the Hebrew into Greek, TJon retains the Hebrew wording as closely as possible yet clarifies the Hebrew at the same time by interspersed comments and substitutions." ${ }^{111}$
2) "Hardly any of the targumic deviations from the Hebrew is to be found in [the] Greek revisions" of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.
3) P and Tg . J. "represent two independent translations of the Hebrew."
"[T]he Syriac translator frequently transposed or omitted Hebrew words whereas the

[^34]targumist almost invariably represents the Hebrew completely and in its proper word order."
4) "Since TJon, Pesh and Vg often display a similar interpretation, the study of parallels between Jerome's works and the Targum should take the exegetical tradition of the Peshitta into account." ${ }^{112}$

Chapter 4 of this volume on Targum Judges, 309 of its 656 pages, is devoted to a translation of and commentary on Targum Jonathan of Judges:

The edition of Targum Jonathan by Alexander Sperber formed the basis for the text and translation in the present chapter. It was revised in light of the corrections given in Chapter Two. ${ }^{113}$ Relevant variant readings of the Western manuscripts which have been described in Chapter Two will be included in the discussion or footnotes.

Smelik undertook his translation in light of his conclusion that "previous research concerning the origin and growth of TJon ha[d] high-lighted the need to examine the translators' consistency in translating and interpreting the Hebrew text before them." He also "found [it] necessary to compare TJon's exegesis with Jewish exegetical traditions as preserved in a variety of sources." A bilingual concordance was prepared as a tool to analyze the Hebrew-Aramaic equivalents and evaluate "deviations from standard translations in . . . light of other Jewish exegetical traditions." ${ }^{114}$ He translated, hoping "that the English translation . . . is literal enough to understand the idiom of the Targum and . . . facilitate the reading of the commentary," "that is, to give a literal rendering using modern English equivalents."
"Occasionally," "concession[s] to this principle [were] unavoidable." ${ }^{115}$
${ }^{112}$ Smelik, Targum of Judges, 322.
${ }^{113}$ See footnote 116 above..
${ }^{114}$ Smelik, Targum of Judges, 323.
${ }^{115} \mathrm{Ibid}$., 325.

One consideration that Smelik emphasizes as a feature is consistency. He considers that consistency can, but need not always be, a feature of a literal translation since a free translation can regularly apply some of the aspects of consistency. He lists eight factors to be taken into account in evaluating the consistency of a translation, of which the first four only apply to literal translations: ${ }^{116}$

1) Stereotyped equations of Hebrew and Aramaic;
2) Hebrew-Aramaic equivalence of grammatical counterparts;
3) The location and rationale of pluses and minuses of elements in the target text; and
4) Correspondence in the sequence of words between both texts. The final four then take account of consistency of non-literal renderings:
5) Exegetical and theological consistency (including aspects of associative and complementary translation, simplification, and so on);
6) Consistency of language;
7) Double translations as possible traces of revision; and
8) The evaluation of the translation of Hebrew doublets. ${ }^{117}$

He does draw a few conclusions based on consistency (and inconsistency) in his fifth and concluding chapter. His discussion of the setting in life of Tg J starts from an assumption that it "combined a literal approach with a midrashic one from the outset." This fits with his view that the setting in life for the middle and late second century A. D. development of the text was in the elementary schools and in the academies for advanced study. ${ }^{118}$ (Smelik envisions an educational system with

[^35]elementary schools and more advanced academies and discusses them as places for the study of the Targum, but does not describe the system in detail. ${ }^{119}$ ) In this regard he comments that "the consistency we observe may well date to this transition period [of development of the text] (assuming the translators were able to consult previous attempts at translation)." This consistency is in places where he sees the influence of rabbinic exegesis, albeit he opines that such exegesis has an "elliptical character" and "can only be appreciated by the reader who is already familiar with the traditional interpretation." ${ }^{120}$ Smelik's other conclusions are rather wide-ranging but beyond the scope of the effort undertaken here to show the relevance of his work to the evaluation of the translation technique of P. Any consideration of Tg. J. of Judges must take account of his work.

## Survey of Some Other Recent Studies of the Peshitta as a Translation

Other studies of the Peshitta text as a translation can be compared to the work undertaken in this study of the Judges text, and they will be reviewed now. This will provide some understanding of the tradition of study of the translation technique of the Syriac version. It will also show how other studies have approached the relation of P's translation technique to that of the other three versions as well as how they evaluate the extent to which P's differences from the MT are a result of reliance on a different Vorlage as opposed to having their origin in factors that should be classified as matters of translation technique.

Heidi M. Szpek. Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job.

[^36]This 1992 work considers translation technique in a different, perhaps complementary, way from that proposed by Barr. Her "model" is based on the premise that the act of translation can be conceptualized as a systematic process involving four interconnected components. Those are "element of translation," "adjustment," "motivation," and "effect on meaning." Starting from the first, element of translation, she means by that phrase a component of the source text that corresponds to a component of the target text. She then explains that each "element" is to be "classified according to its placement in the field of linguistics according to four headings: grammar, syntax, semantics, and style. ${ }^{121}$ She treats grammar as covering the topics of gender, number, person, tense, voice, word class (part of speech), and suffix. ${ }^{122}$ Syntax covers four headings: word, phrase, clause and sentence. Her consideration of semantic adjustments is "noted by one of the following terms: root, word, or phrase." ${ }^{123}$ Style "refers to those elements of choice which an author can impart to a text for aesthetic reasons. ${ }^{124}$ Later, in chapter six, she examines two subtopics in her consideration of style: sentence type and figurative language. ${ }^{125}$

The adjustments considered are "changes that expand the text," that is, "addition," "changes that shorten the text," "omission," and "changes that do not effect [sic] length," "substitution." She considers "deliberate changes" not under "adjustment" but under "motivations for a change." ${ }^{126}$ After summarizing her use of other studies, she concludes:

[^37]Thus no one study has provided the background from which the T[ranslation]T[echnique] Model has emerged, but rather a mixture of concepts, classification and methods drawn from both biblical studies and linguistics have contributed to and resulted in the nascence of this model. Throughout the explanation of the Model, those scholars whose terminology has been borrowed or modified will be indicated in the footnotes. ${ }^{127}$

She assigns twelve different reasons or causes for the adjustment in her discussion of the motivation for the adjustment: language difference (based on differences specific to the "way" the source or target language "has of expressing itself'); linguistic interference (in particular where confusion exists between cognate languages); implicit to explicit exegesis; ideology; ambiguity; redundancy (present in the source text omitted in the target); textual difficulty; intra-verse influence (of any grammatical element on a parallel element); inter-verse influence (like the previous cause but between adjacent verses); parallel verse influence (of a semantic element on a parallel element); versional influence or versional parallels; error (subdivided between aural and visual errors). ${ }^{128}$

The last part of Szpek's translation model is the effect of the adjustment on meaning. She considers two factors as part of this evaluation: meaning relation and perspective. Meaning relation has to do with "the semantic relationship that occurs between the source text and the translated text for each item translated." ${ }^{129}$ The relations are placed under five headings: (1) clarity (meaning clarification in the target text of an ambiguity in the source); (2) confusion (the opposite of the preceding); (3) synonymy (involving a delineation of relations that are not completely and totally synonymous considered at four levels); ${ }^{130}$ (4) antithesis (the translation contradicts or

[^38]is the opposite of the source text); and (5) innovation (completely new meaning in the target text). ${ }^{131}$

The second factor that Szpek considers to have an effect on meaning is perspective, which "refers to the point of view from which an effect on meaning is classified." The three perspectives she considers are the reader/aural recipient of the translated text, the translator, and the evaluator of the translated text. She opines that most people who hear or read a translated text in any language would not be able to read and understand the Hebrew text. For such persons in her opinion there is thus no issue of the effect on meaning of any adjustment made by the translation. She points out that the effect on meaning intended by the translator may not be the effect perceived by the evaluator of the translation. She does not go on to point out that additional evaluators may bring new perceptions, and so on. ${ }^{132}$

The body of her work is devoted to applying her model to numerous selected examples from the Book of Job. Her last chapter stating her conclusions and Appendices A through G show the use to which her Translation Technique Model has been put. Those conclusions are in four parts: Characteristics of the Peshitta in general; Characteristics of P-Job; the Formation and Textual Transmission of P-Job; and Final Comments on the Effectiveness of the TT Model. The first two parts dealing with characteristics of P are each broken down into four parts covering examples of grammatical, syntactical, semantic and stylistic characteristics. ${ }^{133}$ In the third part she speculates on the history of the formation and later transmission of the text based on her conclusions about the source of many errors she found in the text of P-Job, and reaches some conclusions about the ideology of the translator based on

[^39]"translational departures." For example, she posits an initial stage of translation for an unvocalized text in which visual errors arose and versional influences had an effect, and later stages of copying from more than one text type or copying based on oral dictation where aural errors arose, sometimes based on the copyist's familiarity with lectionary readings, and without any corrective consultation of the MT or other version. ${ }^{134}$

She also concludes that there are ideological changes in P that account for some of the translational departures. In her final three paragraphs she comments favorably on the effectiveness of the model she has used ${ }^{135}$ and then adds appendices giving examples of paraphrase, errors, generalization, specification, contextual translation, interpretation, and lexical leveling.

No evaluation of her work is attempted here, only a description of her work in order to show a somewhat different approach to consideration of translation techniques from what is found in the analyses of Barr, Brock, and Tov. It might be possible to use her work as a basis for applying Barr's typology of literalism, but the result would be different from what she has produced. Some of her conclusions might be compared to those Lane suggests in the article discussed above.

One feature of her methodology may be useful for applying Barr's typology. That would be the evaluation of the adjustment in each verse along the lines in her model of translation technique, and then the description of the effect of that adjustment, but to use those features in relation to the question of the degree to which the effect was more or less in the direction of a free or a literal translation. Finally, where there may be an effect on meaning as a result of an adjustment in the direction

[^40]toward freedom or literalness, that could also be noted, together with cases where the probable influence leading to the adjustment was an error made by the translator or a later copyist.

## Richard A. Taylor on Daniel

In his 1994 monograph, Taylor compares "word-by-word or phrase-by-phrase the Syriac text of Daniel to the Hebrew/Aramaic MT, recording in the collation lists any potentially meaningful deviation, with the exception of orthographic variants." He continues:

New categories for this purpose were created as new phenomena surfaced through an inductive exploration of the Syriac text of Daniel. A complete listing of these categories of evidence, together with the abbreviations employed for this purpose throughout the project, appear at the end of this volume as an appendix entitled "Categories of Variations and Abbreviations employed. ${ }^{136}$

The categories are (1) plus, (2) minus, (3) word choice, (4) alteration in words, (5) word order, (6) substitution, (7) asyndeton, and (8) pronominal suffix. Word choice is divided into five categories (essentially parts of speech), verb, substantive, preposition, conjunction, and adjective and adverb. Alteration is broken into twenty categories and involves words in all but one of those categories that have the same meaning in translation with changes in person, number, tense, voice, mood, suffix, conjunction, etc. Taylor's intention as to the category of substitution seems to involve changes in meaning, in a range from smaller to larger in magnitude. He uses asyndeton to cover cases both where P has dropped waw found in the MT or added one not found there. Pronominal suffix means cases where $P$ has added a suffix to the

[^41]translation word where MT has no such suffix. ${ }^{137}$ He first tabulates and then discusses these deviations in each of the chapters of Daniel.

In his conclusion he offers opinions about (1) "the nature and role of the Syriac version of Daniel from a text critical point of view;" (2) "the general characteristics of the Peshitta of Daniel from the standpoint of its translation techniques, summarizing the methodology and philosophy of its translator and the accuracy and integrity of his work;" (3) "the dating of the Peshitta of Daniel;" and (4) "the problem of the community origins of the Syriac version and the identity of the audience for which this translation was originally intended." His comments on translation technique are of interest here.

The discussion of translation technique occupies slightly more than seven pages of his conclusion and considers four areas: (1) a definition of the expression "translation technique"; (2) a brief discussion of the relevance of translation technique to the text critical process; (3) "methodological problems encountered in seeking to determine the cause of textual variation"; and (4) a brief discussion of "prominent translational characteristics of Daniel." He defines translation technique as "the characteristic means of expression adopted by a translator of the biblical text which may differ in significant ways from the syntactical structure and lexical choices . . . in the text" being translated. ${ }^{138}$ Taylor also quotes the definition from Tov's article quoted above. ${ }^{139}$ He notes that the relevance of translation technique to the textcritical process is a matter of distinguishing any difference between the target text and the presumed source text that results from translation characteristics rather than from
${ }^{137}$ Taylor, Peshitta of Daniel, Appendix, 325.
${ }^{138}$ Ibid.,. 314.
${ }^{139}$ See footnote 3 above.
that presumed Vorlage. ${ }^{140}$ He notes too the difficulty of evaluating some of the differences from the source text found in the target text. In this connection he uses as an example "the frequency with which the Syriac translator uses a conjunction when MT has none" to support the conclusion that "it is translation technique which is responsible for some, if not many, of these differences. ${ }^{" 141}$ He mentions too the "possible difference between the two languages in terms of the semantic range of the conjunctions," citing Brock on the difference between waw and каí in Syriac translations of the Greek New Testament. ${ }^{142}$

His "general assessment" is that "the translator" "for the most part understood the biblical text and sought to render it accurately and clearly into the Syriac language." He gives specific examples of translation technique in three paragraphs. First, he believes that the thirty-eight instances of asyndetic translation where MT has a conjunction result from translation preferences because the general preference of Syriac translation for pleonasm noted above would also be more likely to add than subtract the conjunction. Second, he finds that "the Syriac version is often expansionistic, preferring to supply elements which in the MT may be implied but are not specifically indicated." He cites the supplying of an indirect object or addition of a copula as examples, and says "the presence of additional features [may be] due to harmonization with other passages," referring to Dan 5:21. He describes as "[o]ne of the most striking translation techniques in the Peshitta of . . . Daniel" "a tendency toward reversal of word order of matched pairs." Thus MT's "A \& B" becomes "B \& A" in P, and Taylor cites sixteen instances of this phenomenon. ${ }^{143}$
${ }^{140}$ Taylor, Peshitta of Daniel, 315-16.
${ }^{141}$ Ibid., 317.
${ }^{142}$ S. P. Brock, "Limitations of Syriac in Representing Greek," in B. M. Metzger, ed., The Early Versions of the New Testamen: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 83-98, 84.
${ }^{143}$ Taylor, Peshitta of Daniel, 320-21.

## D. J. Lane. The Peshitta of Leviticus

Lane, the author of the article discussed above, is also the editor of the Leiden edition of the Peshitta of Leviticus. He covers a variety of matters in this monograph. ${ }^{144}$ In Part I, he considers the manuscripts, "describ[ing] the character of 7a1 and its place among manuscripts older and younger than itself," "reexamin[ing] the 119 readings of 7a1 which the Leiden Leviticus has altered," and looks at "manuscripts earlier or later than 7a1, in order to suggest those readings which might be considered preferable, or 'more authentically' Peshitta," as well as manuscripts which give evidence of text traditions older than that of 7 a 1 , and questions what such a phrase as "closer to the Hebrew" might mean. ${ }^{145}$

In Part II he discusses generally "the Vorlage which may be presumed, the literary genre into which the Syriac translation may be placed, and the context of the translation," and "gives evidence of the exegesis and translation which suggest this context, showing a concern with syntax as well as lexicography." In Part II he also "discusses the methods and purposes of the editors [of other printed editions of the Peshitta]," "tabulates their differences from the Leiden edition," and "asks questions about the Peshitta as an authoritative text and the circumstances of its acceptance or promotion as such. ${ }^{146}$ Most relevant to the project being undertaken here as to the P version of Judges is chapter five about the literary genre and context of the translation, and chapter six about the concern of the translator with syntax as well as lexicography.

[^42]In particular in chapter five he discusses the use of P to construct a putative Hebrew Vorlage. Lane considers this "a hopelessly subjective enterprise," and cautions against "the hazards of retro-translation." By this he means that a retroversion of some portion of Syriac of P into Hebrew that produces a Hebrew passage different from MT does not necessarily mean that the retroverted Syriac represents a different Vorlage, but may only "give evidence of interpretation or explication." ${ }^{147}$ He discusses examples in twenty-six verses where BHS cites P as evidence for a possibly different Vorlage and explains how all of those may have resulted from the work of the translator rather than from a text different from MT. In six of those verses, $1: 2,8 ; 5: 11,24 ; 6: 20$; and $8: 8$, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX agree with P, but Lane even attributes these to a shared method rather than a different Vorlage. ${ }^{148} \mathrm{He}$ also concludes that these variations arose as an interpretive element in the P translation and not in some intermediary between P and MT. ${ }^{149}$ Returning to the theme of his article "The Best Words in the Best Order," discussed above, pages 24 to 27 , he opines that "[r]ightly . . . oratory or rhetoric is the genre into which translation is to be placed." He quotes H. J. C. Grierson for a definition of rhetoric as
the study of how to express oneself most correctly and effectively, bearing in mind the nature of the language we use, the subject we are speaking or writing about, the kind of audience (often only vaguely definable) we have in view, and the purpose, which last is the main determinant. ${ }^{150}$

He continues by making a distinction between translations that (1) try to make "the basic text . . . the 'real' text" as opposed to those (2) where "the translator's

[^43]purpose is to establish the version as the 'real' text," which is the text where he believes Coleridge's aphorism "the best words in the best order" is to be applied. ${ }^{151}$ This of course is a less systematic approach than Barr's typology, but (1) seems to approximate Barr's literalism while (2) is "freer" even if it corresponds to one or more criteria for literalism in Barr's typology. Lane acknowledges the issues raised by the need for a translation to be an "acceptable rendering, which made use of understanding of a Hebrew text at the time of translation," ${ }^{152}$ and to heed "the warning that a translation may have more nuance than the original." ${ }^{153} \mathrm{He}$ also quotes Mulder's article in the 1985 Leiden Symposium, commenting that "the P translator was continually also alive to the syntactic and idiomatic differences by which the two languages can be told apart. ${ }^{154}$ This surely bears on the need for an acceptable rendering of the original. At the same time he observes that Mulder "speaks of 'a rather literal translation smoothly fitting itself into the syntactic and idiomatic peculiarities of the Syriac language. ${ }^{\prime} 155$ This may create an issue of how far Lane has considered the degree to which his approach (2) above is literal or free, but he does not go into that issue.

In chapter six, "The Translator," Lane moves closer to a systematic consideration of translation technique, in his "study of selected readings." In the heading summarizing the chapter, he writes " that the Peshiṭta is of a piece with other versions in particular LXX and Targums Onqelos and Jonathan." Although in his view "[a]ll approach the Hebrew to show the meaning of the text," "they all have their convergences and divergences" showing that the Peshiṭta antedates the

[^44]Targums. . . ." At the outset of these comments he says the "role of the translator is to find equivalents for the . . . text to be translated." They may be (1) formal [using] cognates, transliterations, and homophones, "where emphasis is on the external resemblance between text and version." Or, they may be (2) dynamic where "more than the single word is taken into account" and "the emphasis is on the inner meaning . . . so that [the] sense [of the text] may be conveyed in the version." "The Peshiṭta inclines to the second kind . . . though both kinds are found. . . . ${ }^{156}$

He illustrates his conclusion by differentiating categories of problems and selects examples to illustrate how the translator of the Peshitta of Leviticus deals with those problems in comparison with the Targums, especially Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, and the "LXX." The categories "idiom and syntax" are broken down into (1) the way Hebrew idioms are reproduced in Syriac, (2) the difference between the length of the clause or phrases in the translation and in the MT, and (3) the difficulty in finding equivalents, including the effect of reproducing Hebrew phrases or clauses by Syriac idioms that have no close counterparts in Hebrew. As to the foregoing matters covered by his discussion, he concludes that the Peshitta is "congruous with known Aramaic versions and the LXX, but that a translator has been working with first principles of exegesis rather than plagiarism." ${ }^{157}$

Lane then turns to three kinds of influences, internal and external, that he believes motivated interpretive translators and chooses examples to illustrate these influences: (1) "Passages where clarification was required"; (2) "passages where other scripture . . . has suggested interpretation"; and (3) "interpretations . . .
grounded in contemporary society . . . which reflect a social rather than a scriptural context."

Next he considers examples of the translation of "technical terms" finding that they fall into three possible areas: (1) those as to which "the translator has knowledge, which the version conveys," (2) those where "the translator is guessing in a way that may be more or less informed;" and (3) those where "the translator is imprecise, and the version reveals the imprecision." ${ }^{158}$

Finally he treats examples of translation of cultic and cultural terms where he says "the logic which . . . influenced the Peshiṭta rendering" is similar to that which he discussed in his article, "The Best Words in the Best Order." 159

In concluding his chapter on "The Translator" he says that his "examples well illustrate the difficulties which faced a translator from Hebrew into Syriac, and give some idea of the way . . . the Syriac translators worked, with some indication of the way . . . some Aramaic and Greek translators" dealt with the same examples. He holds that the "author of the Peshitta of Leviticus was working" "within the pattern of interpretation found within the tradition and method regarded as targumic," "[b]ut [that] the Peshiṭta was made before certain accredited interpretations became as definitive in exegesis as the text was for exegesis." ${ }^{160}$

No evaluation of Lane's judgments either in describing the activity of the translator or in proceeding to the conclusions quoted here will be undertaken. His analysis of the examples he has chosen can be compared to the components of Heidi Szpek's model of translation technique and the components of adjustment, motivation and effect on meaning that she uses to construct and apply that model.

[^45]Some of his examples may offer apt comparisons to conclusions about where to place the translation of particular passages on the continuum between free and literal. The fact that he is comparing Targum Onkelos, in a similar tradition to Tg J which is used for comparison to P of Judges here means that some of his conclusions about those comparisons could offer material for reflection on those issues of literalness, and freedom. It is not clear what witnesses to Targum Onqelos are the basis for his comparison. He lists both Sperber and Grossfeld's translation in his bibliography. Something similar could be said about the comparison he makes with the LXX and the comparison being made here with Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. Presumably his LXX is either Rahlfs or the Göttingen edition, for those are both listed in his bibliography.

## Craig E. Morrison: Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel

As the title of his study states, Morrison analyzes the P of 1 Samuel in order to describe its character and detect any influences on it by the LXX or Tg J as well as any relationship between it and the Hebrew texts discovered at Qumran. At the outset he aligns himself with scholars such as Haar Romney, Dirksen, de Boer, S. R. Driver, and Weitzman who have concluded that the source of P was a Hebrew exemplar with a close affinity to MT. ${ }^{161} \mathrm{He}$ sees the understanding of the character of the translation of 1 Samuel as a necessary prerequisite to its use as a text critical tool in the study of the Hebrew text. Noting the position of text critics such as Würtheim and Brotzman that P was influenced by the LXX, he cautions against accepting their conclusions until there is sufficient research to support such conclusions. ${ }^{162}$ After evaluating the research of others who have studied P , or

[^46]commented on it in the study of other ancient versions or in commentaries on First Samuel, he outlines his project as a consideration of (1) instances where $P$ deviates from the MT, (2) cases where the deviations from the MT are identical with or similar to the OG, the Lucianic text, the Hexaplaric text or Tg. J., not discussing agreements shared with more than one version, but listing them in the Appendix, and (3) organizing divergent readings unique to P "so as to expose the translation techniques, exegesis, and other characteristics of this version." ${ }^{163}$ The largest portion of his study, chapter two, is devoted to this consideration of the unique readings of P . He then evaluates the shared readings in the other important chapter of his study, chapter three. His study is thus the first examination of the translation technique and exegetical character of First Samuel.

The unique readings of chapter two are almost all examples of readings that can be described as free. Morrison describes the range as running from instances where P "makes explicit what is in the MT and proceeding to instances [of] . . . different interpretations." ${ }^{164}$ On that range are "non literal" translation choices of several kinds, including translations that do not mirror the Hebrew text, as well as omissions, errors in translation and in manuscript transmission, including errors in analysis of the vocalization of the Hebrew text. Only in a few instances where Morrison sees P as reproducing the formal character of the Hebrew do we find examples of translations that would fit into Barr's typology of literalism. Thus almost all of Morrison's unique readings could form the basis for illustrating a "typology of free translation" if one were attempted. Morrison, however, does not venture an evaluation of all of the points at which P might be categorized as literal

[^47]since his approach involves analyses of the points at which P offers unique readings that depart from the MT.

In chapter three Morrison considers the instances where P agrees with the LXX or Tg. J. against the MT as well as comparing the divergent reading in P with 4QSam ${ }^{\text {b }}$. His consideration of the LXX agreements is broken down into three parts, the OG, the proto-Lucianic, and Origen's Hexapla (actually a presumed preHexapla). Of the eighty readings shared with the OG, Morrison only suspects one that may have been influenced by the OG. He finds no influence from the ten minor and four significant agreements he detects in the Hexaplaric manuscripts. He also concludes that, in cases where P and the Greek versions grappled with the same difficulties in the MT, they worked independently. In summary he finds it "reasonable to conclude that [P] was not influenced by the LXX at the time of its translation or during its transmission. ${ }^{165}$

Morrison then assesses the relationship between P and Tg J , noting arguments of other scholars for some degree of influence from Jewish sources on P. He notes twenty-seven instances where P agrees with Tg J against the MT and LXX, and finds none "that meet the criteria suggested by Dirksen for determining literary dependence. . . ."166 Those criteria are the need for (1) "'a sizable number' of agreements;" (2) "a few convincing cases of dependence;" and (3) ""linguistically or theologically difficult passages' where one would expect the . . . translator to consult the Targum." Furthermore, Morrison shows conspicuous examples of disagreement between P and Tg J . He cites cases where Tg J is "painfully literal" in translating the MT while P and LXX are not, and difficult translations handled

[^48]differently as well as "many notable characteristics of TJ [that] do not appear" in P, for example, "the targumic treatment of anthropomorphic descriptions for God. . . ." He concludes that there is no case for literary dependence of P on Tg J , but does believe there are a few instances of similar interpretation where the translator of P and Tg J "were acquainted with a common font of interpretation regarding some phrases in 1 Samuel." Before concluding he rejects any finding that P depends on $4 \mathrm{QSam}{ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ in the one instance where there is exclusive agreement between the two. Thus he finds no dependence of P on any other text to which he is comparing it, but only on Hebrew texts similar to the MT. ${ }^{167}$

In a final chapter Morrison reviews his findings about the character of the Syriac version discussed in chapter two, the relation between the Syriac version and LXX as well as between the Syriac version and Tg J and adds three paragraphs on "The Syriac Version and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible." In his summary of the character of the Syriac he seems to assume that his findings based on the analysis of the unique readings of the Syriac apply to the whole text of P of First Samuel. While this may be true, it goes somewhat beyond the evidence he has introduced. The kind of evidence proposed to be developed for this study of Judges would, if properly executed throughout all the chapters of a book, be a sounder basis for the kind of conclusions he reaches here about the whole First Book of Samuel. He finds possible but limited use for P in the textual criticism of the MT, but that use would not be possible where an identified translation technique accounts for the reading and he states that "identified translation techniques can account for most of the nonMasoretic readings unique to" $P$. ${ }^{168}$

[^49]
## Gillian Greenberg: Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah

Starting from Tov's description of translation technique in his article first cited on page 3 above, Greenberg defines that phrase for purposes of her work as incorporating the following three components:
(a) the characteristic approach of the translator to his source text, for instance the choice of lexical equivalents, the degree of adherence to the source text, and the equivalence of source and translated grammatical categories;
(b) co-operation between translators and the rise of earlier translations;
(c) the work of later scribes on the original translation, that is, revisional activity. ${ }^{169}$

Jeremiah is the only book of the Hebrew Bible other than Judges for which no running commentary yet exists for P. Although she recongnizes this, Greenberg has concluded that such a running commentary on Jeremiah is "hardly possible," but proposes that her work which she characterizes as "not only a qualitative, but a quantitative, analysis" "will fill the gap on which Weitzman commented," ${ }^{170}$ by noting the lack of running commentaries on these two books in his Syriac Version. By qualitative she seems to mean her selection of "the most interesting examples" to illustrate "the various features of the translation technique" she discusses. By quantitative she seems to mean a "structured sample" from verses chosen to verify that her qualitative examples were not isolated examples but a regular feature of the Book of Jeremiah. For the structured sample she used verse 10 of all fifty-two

[^50]chapters except chapters forty-five and forty-seven where she used verse 5 and verse 7 , respectively. ${ }^{171}$

After her introductory chapter she discusses thirteen issues of translation in thirteen chapters, analyzing multiple verses in each chapter:

1) Changes in the sense of the Hebrew;
2) Additions;
3) Selection of lexical equivalents;
4) Harmonization;
5) Figurative language and anthropomorphism;
6) Grammatical inconsistency and logical imprecision;
7) Duplicate passages;
8) Causes of minuses;
9) Work of the scribes;
10) Difficult Hebrew: influence from the LXX;
11) Difficult Hebrew: use of guesswork;
12) Difficult Hebrew: influence from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible;
13) Difficult Hebrew: other strategies.

In the final chapter she concludes "that, despite the marked heterogeneity of the Hebrew, the translation is homogeneous." This conclusion is not specifically tied to examples from her thirteen chapters of analysis. The conclusions are asserted quite definitely. Going beyond a simple finding of homogeneity, she says: "On further investigation, however, the evidence that these factors [choice of lexical equivalents, preservation of Hebrew word order, and method of translation of the Hebrew
${ }^{171}$ Ibid., 27.
infinitive] vary seemed unconvincing, and did not support a suggestion that the work of more than one man is discernible. ${ }^{172}$

She also considers the literary "style" of P and states her belief that the P translations of similar passages found in Jeremiah and some other OT book[s] (even in another part of Jeremiah) "both [read] acceptably in their context, with no feeling that either is discordant with the surrounding verses." Without repeating every step of her argument in the concluding chapter of a bit under three pages, a reader can report that she adds other elements to the "intuitive process" on which she bases this conclusion. She notes Weitzman's interest in the comparison of the range of the vocabulary and text length as a style characteristic and of verb frequency as a measure to be demonstrated whether or not a passage is composite. From there she goes on to conclude "in view of his interest, it seems most unlikely that, had his reading made him aware of differences in style in the different books of the Peshitta, he would not have commented on this." Weitzman was the supervisor of Greenberg's dissertation on which this study is based until his death and so it is relevant to note that she is not quoting him but supposing he would have contradicted her conclusion if he had concluded the contrary (as to which we must assume she means whether or not he knew that such a conclusion had been asserted).

She continues by rejecting the notion that the consistency in style which she intuits "could, theoretically, have been produced by . . . an overall 'house style' to which all translators and scribes had to conform." ${ }^{173}$ She even suggests the possibility that "the whole Peshitta of the Old Testament is the work of one man," and then wraps up her conclusion by proposing that " $[a]$ verse by verse analysis of the

[^51]translation technique in the Peshitta to Isaiah and Psalms [that she was planning to undertake], supported if appropriate by the application of statistical techniques, would go some way toward showing exactly how these books do and do not stand apart." Such an approach, she believes, would "elucidate the question of style" she has raised and, her readers may presume, serve to test, and perhaps verify her conclusions about the translation. ${ }^{174}$

## Peter J. Williams: Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings

This treatise will be cited frequently in the analysis of the syntax of the verses to be studied in the following chapters. ${ }^{175}$ As the title indicates Williams' work is not about translation technique in any sense broader than the subject stated in its title. However, the conclusions he reaches about the syntax of that translation respond to questions about the differences between P and any Vorlage considered indistinguishable from MT in other books of P such as Judges. Because it does so it is treated here as a helpful tool for the study of translation technique. In his study Williams does reach conclusions about whether some differences between $P$ and MT should be treated as instances of adaptation to Syriac syntax rather than as the result of differences between the Vorlage of P and MT. Indeed he sometimes treats the two investigations of syntax and translation technique as different aspects of the same activity. For example, in the introductory chapter he wrote that "[ $t$ ]here remains plenty of investigation to perform on Syriac syntax and translation technique., ${ }^{176}$

He devotes ten chapters to ten different topics where Syriac syntactic structures may sometimes be formally similar to those of the presumed Vorlage, but

[^52]also where they differ while still remaining semantically accurate. His conclusions may provide a definition for some matters that Lane calls "style" or the "best words in the best order." Chapter 2 of his study examines the three Syriac constructions that render the sole form of the construct-genitive relationship in Classical Biblical Hebrew Prose. One of those three Syriac constructions is of course formally equivalent to the Hebrew. In fact there are other matters of Syriac syntax covered where there is formal equivalence as well as difference.

Chapter 3 treats the use of $\omega$ while Chapter 4 considers the three main constructions used for direct objects and Chapter 5 "contrasts the way Hebrew and Syriac use the particle waw., ${ }^{177}$ Chapter 6 deals with the verb forms used in Syriac to represent Hebrew verb forms; Chapter 7 examines the use of various forms of to tor tor introduce speech; and Chapter 8 treats the ways in which the infinitive absolute and infinitive construct can be translated in Syriac. Chapter 9 discusses the rendering of several Hebrew prepositions in Syriac, and Chapter 10 analyzes the Syriac demonstrative as a feature of Syriac translation of a Hebrew text. In Chapter 11, the last chapter before his conclusion, Williams describes how Hebrew hnh, "behold," is translated, and how Syriac <m sometimes renders that Hebrew as well as other Hebrew expressions. The following verse by verse analysis will often refer to Williams' conclusions as well as those of other scholars such as Nöldeke and Duval. He opines that "supposed variants" from MT are "produced in translation" and show how translations that are not formally equivalent to the Hebrew, but might have been, result from "the fact that the Peshitta alone of all ancient translations extant over long stretches of text (i.e., discounting Symmachus and Theodotion) follows the protoMasoretic text and yet sets a higher premium on semantic rather than formal

[^53]equivalence." ${ }^{178} \mathrm{He}$ acknowledges at that same point that "we may expect formal equivalence at the syntactic level" "where Hebrew and Syriac syntactic structures coincide in their use." On the other hand where there is divergence, we may "find on a numbers of fronts the translation tends to refrain from formal representation of its Vorlage in preference to a translation consistent with its own idiom."

When his conclusions are used in the following verse-by-verse analysis, most of them will be described there, but the most systematic reference to his conclusions will be made in discussing genitive constructions and direct object constructions. They will be referred to by the designations he uses and therefore those designations are described here. Although he identifies some other forms of genitive construction in Chapter 2, the principle forms found in 1 Kings and Judges are those categorized as genitive constructions $a, b$, and $c$. The first construction comprises a construct noun followed by a genitive noun as in Hebrew. The second comprises a noun followed by another noun prefixed by the Syriac particle $d$. The third construction comprises a noun plus a pronoun suffix that agrees in number and gender with the following genitive noun also prefixed by the $d$ particle. ${ }^{179}$ In Chapter 7, he considers direct object constructions, of which the most important are identified as $d, e$, and $f$. Construction $d$ covers cases where the verb without any object suffix has a direct object without any prefix. Construction $e$ covers constructions where the verb without any object suffix has a direct object prefixed by $l$. Construction $f$ covers constructions where the verb has an object suffix and its direct object is prefixed by $l$. Of course, where the object is third person plural the object pronouns are used.

[^54]Arnold Lazarus: Zur syrischen Übersetzung des Buches der Richter
This 1900 Inaugural Dissertation written under the supervision of Carl Brockelmann and published in seventy-two pages in 1901 catalogues variations among the texts of P in the printed editions known as the London Polyglot of 1657 (including Herbert Thorndike's collection of Ussher's and Pocke's notes), S. Lee's edition of 1823, the Urmia edition of 1852 produced by American Presbyterians, and the Mosul edition of 1887 produced by Dominicans, as well as Ceriani's edition of the Milan Codex. To this he adds a Glossary, which is in fact a glossary of Syriac words in Judges (with some omissions, among which are proper names) showing for each Syriac word the Hebrew words translated by the Syriac word and in some cases showing the corresponding Greek from Lagarde and the Targumic Aramaic from Lagarde. Thus his dissertation might still have some limited value as a concordance. ${ }^{180}$

With the publication of Dirksen's edition of the P text of Judges and his monograph on the transmission of its text, there is no longer any substantial use for Lazarus' comparison among one seventeenth century printed edition of P , three nineteenth century printed editions, and the facsimile of the Milan Codex of the Syriac version.

## Quantifying the Degree of Literality

Something will now be said about the approach to be used in this study to quantify the degree to which modes 1,2 , and 3 (as defined by Barr in his article on "The Typology of Literalism") are literal in order to apply the suggestion of Barr and

[^55]Tov that it is possible to assign a percentage value to those three modes (or four by Tov's reckoning). Barr adds, "or something similar quantifying the degree of literality on each of several levels. ${ }^{181}$ As discussed earlier in this chapter, Tov has made similar suggestions, but has not defined any method by which his suggestion might be applied.

In this study each verse will be divided into segments and the percentage of segments considered literal or non-literal will be the starting point of the evaluation of modes 1 and 2. For mode 3 the percentage of consistent renderings will be the starting point for quantifying the degree of literality for that mode, with some resort to bricolage or tinkering in the case of polysemic terms.

The assignment of a percentage based merely on the number of segments judged non-literal does not take account of the comparative importance of the several segments, literal or not, and suggests a degree of precision that could overstate the accuracy of the calculation. Therefore a grading system has been developed to express the conclusion reached without stating it as an exact percentage of $100 \%$. This is intended to be more helpful in expressing an opinion by means of a grading system rather than by means of such an exact precision. Thus a percentage from $91 \%$ to $100 \%$ is rated 5 ; a percentage of $90 \%$ is rated 4.5 ; a percentage from $81 \%$ to $89 \%$ is rated 4 while one of $80 \%$ is rated 3.5 ; a percentage from $66 \%$ to $89 \%$ is rated 3 and one of from $51 \%$ to $65 \%$ is rated 2 ; and then a percentage of $50 \%$ is rated 1.5 and lower percentages are rated 1 . Where a rating is considered to be subject to dispute so that it might be lower, a minus is added, and where the dispute might be about whether it should be higher, a plus will be added. For ratings from $91 \%$ to $99 \%$ in modes 1 and 2 , a minus is added so that the distinction can be made between places

[^56]where there are no non-literal segments or aspects of that verse bearing on the mode being quantified and places where the number of non-literal factors is negligible as to that mode. In the concluding chapter at the end of this study, when the arithmetic means (or averages) are calculated for each mode a method for quantifying the pluses and minuses is described.

Since this may be the first time a method of quantification like that just described has been used, a description will now be given of three other methods of quantifying conclusions that have to be expressed in numerical terms. That is because these methods are considered comparable to what is being done here. They are methods that are used every day, and, to the extent that one sees that they comparable or similar to what is being done here, they help to see this approach is less novel than it might seem without making the comparisons. The first is in the grading of tests in elementary foreign language courses; the second is in the appraisal of the fair market value of real property; and the third is in the polling of public opinion. The position taken here is that processes such as these are more similar to quantifying the degree to which any of these modes is literal than the process of measuring a given length with a measuring instrument is similar.

In the grading of tests the number of ways to complete the various tasks correctly is limited, and it is comparatively easy to quantify the quality of the work that completes the test correctly. At the same time some incorrect responses show more understanding of the subject than the others, and translations from or to the subject language can be partly right and partly wrong. Unless the test giver decides not to give credit for work in the gray area, a similar problem of quantification arises. Nevertheless it is less complicated than that confronting the person trying to quantify the degree to which these modes are literal because there is more certainty about what
a correct response should be and about the weight to be given the various elements of the test or particular sections of it. That is to say, there are similarities between the two kinds of activities and the fact that the degree of academic success depends on these evaluations tends to corroborate the usefulness of the proposed approach here.

The notion of fair market value has been cited because that phrase is defined for professionals in the field as the "most probable price, as of a specific date, in cash, or on terms equivalent to cash, or on other precisely revealed terms, for which the specified property rights would sell after reasonable exposure in a competitive market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, with the buyer and seller each acting prudently, knowlegeably and for self-interest, and assuming that neither is under undue duress. ${ }^{182}$ This estimate is made based either (1) on the cost approach (land value plus depreciated value of improvements), ${ }^{183}$ (2) the sales comparison approach (sales of similar properties adjusted to account for differences between the property whose sale is considered comparable and the property to be evaluated), ${ }^{184}$ or (3) the income capitalization approach used for income producing property (based on estimated net operating income capitalized at a rate estimated to be expected by typical investors in the relevant market), or some combination of these three approaches. ${ }^{185}$ As one can see all of these approaches depend on estimates of various factors that have to be based on the training and experience of the appraiser. The selling price of any particular property may or may not be the fair market value of that property or evidence of the capitalization rate expected by the typical investor or the net operating income of income producing property. An appraiser must analyze any

[^57]sale, income, capitalization rate, table of replacement value, etc. relied upon to determine whether it is evidence of the market, or adjust it to the market before basing any estimate of value on it. These estimates are relied upon by financial institutions, investors, governments, and ordinary buyers among others. They are referred to here in order to show how far they can be from the simple calculation of an easily determinable percentage and still be the basis for serious academic discussion. When an economist says that real property in such and such a world capital is worth a particular amount, that conclusion is the sum of numerous calculations like this often made in mass and not often based on a careful application of the principles described to individual parcels of real property.

Another activity in which people with serious responsibilities base important decisions is found in the polling of public opinion or in particular defined sectors of the population. There, much needs to be known about what bias may be found in the questions and in the selection of the sample to be polled. Then one has to take into account the haziness of typical possible responses like: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) neither agree nor disagree; (4) disagree; (5) strongly disagree. Other questions encountered in such polls might ask the person queried to indicate agreement on a scale of 1 to 10 in which 10 states the greatest agreement and 1 the least. At the very least one who relies on these has to believe that variations in the way respondents estimate their degree of agreement or disagreement have to cancel each other out.

The purpose of these comparison is not to reject conclusions in these three areas as useless. Rather it is to try to show what is possible realistically and to support the conclusion that the calculations to be made about the degree to which the verses studied are literal or not can shed a bit of light on that question.

## Concluding Comments

The foregoing discussion has been intended to set this study of Judges againstS the background of comparatively recent thinking about translation technique in Late Antiquity and to summarize scholarly opinion about the versions to be studied. In addition some of the more recent monographs that have studied the translation technique of several Old Testament books have been reviewed to show that background as well. This study can be distinguished from those, other than that of Taylor, by its verse by verse approach to the text of Judges in the five chapters analyzed, and by its application of the system of classification proposed by Barr, and applied in light of other thinking that has been discussed, as well as by this author's own effort to adapt that system and thinking for the application now to be undertaken.

## CHAPTER TWO

## CHAPTER ONE OF JUDGES

A discussion of the title of the Book is omitted since it is not part of the Masoretic Text. The verse by verse discussion of chapter one follows.

## ויהי אחרי מות יהושע וישאלו בני ישראל ביהוה לאמֵר מי יעלה לנו אל הכנעני בתחלה להלחם בו . <br>  , <br> RETROVERSION

Every word element of P can be translated back into the Hebrew of MT except brnwn 'bdh dmry'. No word in MT lacks a translation element in P , although the waw before $y \check{s}^{\prime} / l w$ is not prefixed to its Syriac equivalent. The addition of brnwn 'bdh dmry' in P is found only in Greek uncial manuscripts k and m and in the Sahidic mss cited by Brooke and McLean. In Judg 2:8, a phrase equivalent to $b r n w n$ ' $b d h d m r y$ ' is found in MT, $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$ and B. No other ms supports 'bdh dmry'. The same phrase is included in the alteration of verse $5: 18$ by Tg J. The phrase is also found in Josh 23:29. The view adopted here is that the expansion has its origin in the translation or transmission of P, probably influenced by Josh 24:29 and Judg 2:8. The phrase $l m t k t s ̌ w . ~ . ~ . b q r b^{3}$ is treated here as equivalent to lhlḥm. With the exception noted, the Vorlage of the verse will be treated as substantially similar to MT.

## LITERALISM

1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. For convenience in referring to the text the elements are treated as those words with or without prefixes and suffixes separate from other elements by spaces and the segments are treated as those same elements except that elements joined by maqqēph are treated as segments. The point where the athnach is marked in the Hebrew text will be noted in discussing each verse. Prefixes and suffixes may be referred to as elements or sub-elements. To illustrate, the Hebrew of this verse has seventeen elements and fifteen segments, and the athnach is at the ninth element, l'mr. The Syriac segments are then calculated in relation to the Hebrew, and in most cases the Syriac elements-segments can
be lined up with the Hebrew elements and segments. The intention is to describe those relations in an understandable way as necessary in each verse.

In this verse, all fifteen segments are represented in P , plus the phrase $y$ šw' brnwn 'bdh $d m r y^{\prime}$ and the final element $b q r b^{\prime}$ (treated here as based on the Hebrew text). The word order of the segments is exactly the same as the order of MT. Variations in grammar or syntax at the level of the element are discussed in the consideration of mode 4, and additions or subtractions (pluses or minuses) are considered in evaluating mode 2. Since the final element is being treated as a sort of pleonastic addition, this mode can be rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The phrase, "the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord," is an addition, as is the final element in P. Although neither changes the meaning of the verse, both make it less a literal translation. Since only fifteen of nineteen segments in P are literal that is just under $79 \%$ of the segments and rated 3. If $b q r b^{\prime}$ were to be counted as an addition that would reduce the percentage to a fraction under $74 \%$ and still be rated 3 . Other changes that are semantic or syntactical are accounted for under mode 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$b t r$. With the preposition $m n$ this renders the plur. form 'hry in this verse and in 10:1, 3; 11:36 (followed by $d$ rendering 'šr); 12:8, 11, and 13 (seven places in all). ${ }^{1}$ The same Syriac renders the preposition 'hry with an object referring to person or place at $1: 6 ; 2: 12,17,19$; $3: 22,28(2 x) ; 4: 16 ; 5: 14 ; 6: 34,35 ; 7: 23 ; 8: 5,12,27,33 ; 9: 3,4,49 ; 19: 3$; and $20: 45$ (twentyone places). The Hebrew preposition without an auxilliary is rendered by btr alone plus its object where it refers to time at 2:7, 10; and 3:31(3x) (five places). As an adverb 'ḥr meaning something like "afterward" is rendered by hydyn at 1:9 (with btr); 7:11; 15:7; and 19:5 (four

[^58]places). The prepositional form of the Hebrew is rendered by ' $m$ at $4: 14$ and 13:11 (two places). At 16:4 'hry kn refers to time and is rendered by btr kn, but that is not factored into any calculation here. At 18:12 and 20:14 there is a sense of "behind" where the preposition 'h$r r y$ is used and it is rendered by bstr. Used in the sense of "because" or "since" 'ḥry 'šr is rendered by $h k n$ ' $m t l d$ at $19: 23$. (Perhaps this also applies to the use at 11:36.) Here it is reckoned that btr alone could have been used in all these places except 1:9; 7:11; 15:7; 16:4; 19:5; and 19:23 (and possibly 11:36). This means that the seven places where $m n$ is added are inconsistent as are the two places where ' $m$ is used and the two places where $b s t r$ is used. Thus there are twenty-four consistent renderings and eleven inconsistent renderings, but seven of these are unusual because they render by btr plus a consistent addition so that they can be described as only partially inconsistent. Thus all the places where btr alone is used will be rated 4. The two uses of ' $m$ and the two of bstr will be rated 1 and the seven occurrences of $m n b t r$ will be rated 2 .
myt. This is the Peal perfect third masculine singular of $m w t$ translating the construct of the Hebrew noun meaning "death." In 13:7 and 16:30 the suffixed Hebrew noun with the same meaning is translated by the suffixed Syriac mwtw. The words in P rendering this root are consistently based on the same Syriac root. All four examples of $m w t$ in MT of Judges are in the construct state. In this verse, $2: 19$ and 16:30, they are translated by the Peal of the verb $m w t$, but in 13:7 by the active participle. This shows a consistency that is rated 5 , although the identical form of the same root may not be used in every case.
$s_{s} l w$. The Pael of this verb translates the Qal of the same Hebrew root here and in 1:14; 4:20;
$5: 25 ; 8: 14,24,26 ; 13: 6,18 ; 18: 4,15 ; 20: 18,23$ and $27(14 x)$. Thus it is rated 5 for the Book of Judges and this verse.
bny'ysryl. This translates the equivalent Hebrew phrase in this verse and 2:6, 11; 3:2, 5, 7, $8,9(2 x), 12,14,15(2 x), 27 ; 4: 1,3(2 x), 5,23,24 ; 6: 1,2,7,8 ; 8: 28,33,34 ; 10: 6,8(2 x), 11$, 15,$17 ; 11: 27,33 ; 13: 1 ; 19: 30 ; 20: 1,3(2 x), 7,13,14,18,19,23,24,26,27,30,32 ; 21: 5,6$, 18 , and 24 ; fifty-five times in all. The Hebrew phrase is rendered without bny in 2:4 and 20:25, omitted in 6:6 (since a similar phrase accounted for above is in 6:7), and rendered by byt 'ysryl in 19:12 and 20:35. Since there are only two inconsistent renderings here out of the sixty examples studied, this is rated 5.
$m r y$. Here $y h w h$ is the word rendered. Its translation was examined in 115 cases, four of them with the prepositional prefix $b: 1: 1 ; 20: 23,27$; and 21:7. In one place $y h w h$ was not translated, 6:6., but there are textual questions at that point which might bear on that omission. In another place, 16:28, where 'lhym is the qere perpetuum of $y h w h, \mathrm{P}$ has ' $/ h h^{\prime}$, which is as close to literal as one can get unless one attempts in Syriac a stratagem confusing to readers who do not know Biblical Hebrew, like English "Jehovah." In three other cases, $11: 35,36$; and $13: 23$, the translation is ' $/ h^{\prime}$, perhaps because use of the tetragrammaton might shock some readers in those contexts (Jephthah and his daughter, Chap. 11, and Samson's mother, Chap. 13). With only three possible inconsistencies out of 115 , the rendering of this word would rate 5 for consistency wherever it is so rendered in Judges. $n s q$. The Peal of $s l q$ renders the Qal of $\operatorname{ll} h$ here and in $1: 2,3,16,22 ; 2: 1 ; 4: 5,10(2 \mathrm{x}), 12 ; 6: 3$ 21,$35 ; 8: 8,11 ; 9: 48,51 ; 11: 13,16 ; 12: 3 ; 13: 5,20 ; 14: 2,19 ; 15: 6,9,10 ; 16: 5,17,18(2 x)$, $31 ; 18: 9,12,17 ; 19: 25,30 ; 20: 3,18,23(2 x), 26,28,30,31,40(2 x) ; 21: 5(2 x)$ and $8(49 x)$. In 1:4 the Qal is translated by ${ }^{\prime} z l$. One of the occurrences in 6:3 is not translated and the occurrence in 6:5 is also left untranslated. The rendering of the Hiphil of $t h$ is not considered here. Thus the consistency of rendering of the Hebrew source would be rated 5 wherever it is rendered as it is here.
$r y s ̌$. Here and in one of the two other occurrences of thlh in Judg 20:18, the Hebrew is rendered by this same term. The other instance in $20: 18$ is rendered by $q d m y t$. This sample is too small to form the basis for a reliable estimate of consistency, but two-thirds of the cases of an adequate sample would rate 3 even if one-third were inconsistent. $m t k t s ̌ w$. The Niphal of lḥm is translated by the Ethpaal of ktš twenty-eight times: in this verse and $1: 3,5,8,9: 5: 19(1 \mathrm{x}){ }^{2} 8: 1 ; 9: 17,38,39,45,52 ; 10: 9,18 ; 11: 4,5,6,8,9,12,20,25(2 \mathrm{x})$, 27,$32 ; 12: 1,3$, and 4. In $5: 19$, one of the occurrences is rendered by the Ethpeel of $k n s{ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ and in 5:20, the Hebrew verb is translated by 'bdw qrb' in the first half of the verse and gapped in the second half (raising questions about the possibly greater poetic sense of the translator). Since over $90 \%$ of these renderings are consistent, this rendering is rated 5 wherever it occurs in Judges.
${ }^{\text {c }} m h w n$. This renders $b w$. This analysis is not intended to report all the instances of $b$ in Judges, but to report all those with pronominal suffixes as well as others encountered in the verses studied and where they are encountered in the course of study of this preposition and other terms. This instance of Hebrew $b$ is translated twice in this verse by Syriac $b$ as well as in $1: 2,4(2 x), 5(1 x), 8,10,21(1 x), 29(1 x) ; 22(2 x) ; 3: 1,4(2 x) ; 6: 32(1 x), 39(1 x) ; 8: 16(1 x), 21$, 22, 23(3x); 9:2(2x), 4, 9, 19(4x), 26(1x), 38(2x), 45(2x); 10:14(2x); 11:32(1x); 12:3(2x); $15: 11,12(1 x), 15 ; 16: 8,10(2 x), 11(2 x), 12(2 x), 13(2 x), 15(2 x), 16,17,30(4 x) ; 18: 5,25$, $28(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 19: 11,25(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 20: 18,23,27 ; 21,7$ and $23(70 \mathrm{x})$. It is rendered in P by ${ }^{\text {' } m}$ once in this verse and $1: 3(1 \mathrm{x}), 5,9 ; 8: 1 ; 9: 38,39 ; 10: 9,18 ; 11: 4,5,6,8,9,20,25,27,32(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 12: 1$, $3(1 \mathrm{x}), 4$; and 18:20; a total of twenty-two times. Twenty of the twenty-two complement the

[^59]Ethpaal of ktš, and this is the normal preposition for the complement of the person with whom the subject of this verb is in conflict according to JPS. ${ }^{4}$ Moreover, in 18:20, $b$ is part of the compound preposition, $b q r b$, and so more to be associated with $q r b$. When some examples are looked at more closely, difficult questions can be seen. One difficulty would be found in several places where the object of the preposition in MT is pronominal, and thus becomes the pronominal object suffix of the verb in P , as in 6:32; 15:12(1x); 19:4, 7; and 20:12 (for a total of five times). However, according to JPS, $d w n$ in 6:32 should take ${ }^{\text {' } m}$. ${ }^{5}$ In 20:12 the pronominal suffix on the 3rd fem. sing. of $h w$ is unusual but explained in JPS as "often [found] in exclamations. ${ }^{6}$

The preposition under consideration is translated by P as $\urcorner$ in 6:39(2x); 9:26(1x); and 18:6; (4x). It is rendered by $m n$ in 13:16 (partitive sense); and 15:7 (with the Ethpeel. of nqm, the usual way this verb takes its complement according to $\left.\mathrm{JPS}^{7}\right) ;(2 \mathrm{x})$. At $2: 15, b k l{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \check{s} r$ is rendered by $l k r d$, and this is probably truer to the meaning than $\mathrm{Tg}^{8}$ In two places there is no translation of $b: 1: 14$ and 19:25.

While this is not an exhaustive study of the rendering of MT $b$ in Judges, very few of the formal inconsistencies lack an explanation based on Syriac lexicology or syntax. Still, in many of the those cases the formal equivalent would be a possible translation in Syriac, even if awkward. Thus the rendering is not as literal as it might be. Even if all thirty variants are treated as such, the seventy renderings by $b$ would still be $70 \%$ of the renderings studied. Probably at least four of the thirty remaining that are object suffixes should be eliminated

[^60]from consideration, and that would make $b$ the rendering in about $73 \%$ of the cases, giving it a rating of 3 . However, any rating of the consistency of $b$ under these circumstances could be misleading and will not be attempted here.

The rating for this mode is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As noted above in the discussion of the rendering by btr Williams sees the use $m n$ befor $b t r$ as showing that the era of Joshua has definitively ended. Obviously the implication is clear as to someone whose death is being reported.

There is one example of Williams' genitive construction $a$ in the phrase bny 'ysryl and of his genitive construction $c$ in ' $b d h d m r y$ '. The collective noun $k n ' n y$ and the pronoun referring to it are rendered as plural, without changing the meaning of the verse.

Although $h w^{\prime}$ and ' $m r$ are not evaluated for consistency of rendering, the rendering of $l^{\prime} m r$ bears on the question of how literal P is. Unlike $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}$ translates this infinitive in a variety of ways. In $1: 1 ; 10: 10 ; 16: 18 ; 20: 8,23$, and 28 , it is translated as a participle but not in the recitative sense in which a participle of $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ is sometimes used in A and B. In $5: 1 ; 11: 12,17$; and 20:12 it is treated as an infinitive, but, except in $5: 1$, not in a recitative sense as in Tg J . In 6:13, 32; 7:24; 8:15; 9:31; 16:2, 18; 21:1, 10, 18, and 20, it is translated as a perfect while A and B continue to use a recitative participle (although A has $\varepsilon \hat{i} \pi \varepsilon \nu$ in 5:1 and no translation term in 6:32) and Tg J stays with the infinitive. In 7:2 one finds an imperfect and the expected consistency in $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and Tg J . In 7:3 there is an imperative while $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and Tg J continue consistently. In 8:9; 13:6; 15:13;19:22; and 21:5, P has no word for $l^{\prime} m r$, while $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and Tg J are still consistent (except that B has no rendering in $8: 9$ ). The Ethpeel is found in $16: 2$, but the other three versions do not change.

Although the translator of P reflects an understanding of the semantic value of ' mr , there is no understanding of the Hebrew usage here. Rather than adopt a consistent approach where this word is found, as the other versions have, the renderings vary. The variations may have negligible effect on meaning, but do exclude any intention to translate literally. This conclusion is similar to that of Williams about the rendering of l'mr in 1 Kings. He says that it "is frequently translated by finite forms of the verb, participle, dalath, or nothing." He does find ten occasions where it is rendered by $l m^{\prime} m r$, but seven of them are in phrases where it is the word of the Lord that comes to someone and the message is preceded by this construction. In two of the three other cases "it is separated from the verb of communication which it follows by a considerable number of words." And "[i]n one case . . . [it] is used to translate לאמר when placed between the protasis and apodosis in quoted speech."9

## RATING OF THE VERSE

The rating of segmentation and sequencing was 5 (counted twice), that of the additions was 3 and of consistency 5 , so the rating of the verse would be 4.5. This may not adequately reflect some of the less literal features of the verse.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

On the surface, B appears to be closer to P since it renders the collective noun for the Canaanite as plural, and, along with A , it renders $\mathrm{l} m r$ as a participle. While Tg J is similar in other ways, it is also dissimilar in its addition of $m y m r^{\circ}$ before its rendering of LORD. Vaticanus is considered closest to P here.

[^61]```
ויאמר יהוה יהודה יעלה הנה נתתי את־הארץ בידו: 1:2.
```



## RETROVERSION

The verse in MT has eight segments treating the two elements joined by athnach as a single segment, four to the athnach and four following it. With l'r counted as segment 7, there are also eight segments in this verse of P , two to the first punctuation point, two more to the second, and four more to the last punctuation point. Each of the eight segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment in MT.

LITERALISM 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Starting from the four segments to the athnach, the first two segments of MT are represented by the two segments of P to the first punctuation point, then two more to the second point and the last four after that. The segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Additions or subtractions. There is no added or subtracted element. There is one additional sub-element at segment 6 , the 3 rd person feminine pronoun object suffix. This verb does not always have a pronominal suffix anticipating its direct object, but is not treated as an addition under this mode. Rather it is considered a syntactical feature under mode 4 as that mode is defined for purposes of this study and would not reduce the rating for this mode in this verse below 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in the renderings.

$m r y$. This renders $y h w h$ and the rendering was rated 5 in the previous verse.
$n s q$. This renders $y^{c} l h$ and the rendering was rated 5 in the previous verse.
$h^{\prime}$. This renders $h n h$ and the rendering is rated 4 at 4:22.
'šlmth. The Aphel of this root translates Qal forms of $n$th in this verse and in 1:4;2:14, 23; $3: 10,28 ; 4: 7,14 ; 6: 1,13 ; 7: 2,7,9,14,15 ; 8: 3,7 ; 9: 29 ; 11: 9,21,30,32 ; 12: 3 ; 13: 1 ; 15: 12$, $13 ; 16: 23,24 ; 18: 10$; and $20: 28$; a total of thirty times. In all these cases the verb is complemented by $b^{\prime} y d$ (sing. or plur., usually with a pronominal suffix) as well as a direct object and has the sense of "deliver" given to it in the tradition of the English Versions. The renderings of the remaining instances of $n t n$ in Judges are discussed in considering 1:12. The great consistency of the rendering in this context would be rated 5 wherever it is found in the context in Judges.
' $r$ '. In addition to this verse, ' $r$ s is translated by this word in $1: 15,26,27,32,33 ; 2: 1,2,6$, $12 ; 3: 11,25,30 ; 4: 21 ; 5: 4,31 ; 6: 4,5,9,10,37,39,40 ; 8: 28 ; 9: 37 ; 10: 4,8 ; 11: 3,5,12,13$, 15(2x), 17, 18(3x), 19(1x), 21(1x); 12:12, 15; 13:20; 16:24(plur.); 18:2(2x), 7, 9(2x), $10(2 \mathrm{x}), 14,17,30 ; 19: 30 ; 20: 1,21,25 ; 21: 12$ and 21 ; a total of fifty-nine times. One occurrence in 11:21 is not translated. Given the choices open to the translator the consistency is not surprising, and this is rated 5 throughout Judges.
'yd. This word in various forms translates $y d$ of MT here and in $1: 4,6,7,35 ; 2: 14(2 \mathrm{x}), 15$, $16,18,23,3: 4,8,10(2 \mathrm{x}), 15(2 \mathrm{x}), 21,28,30 ; 4: 2,7,9,14,21,24 ; 5: 26 ; 6: 1,2,9(2 \mathrm{x}), 21$, 36,$37 ; 7: 2(2 \mathrm{x}), 6,7,8,9,11,14,15,16 ; 8: 3,6,7,15,22 ; 9: 16,17,24,29,33,48 ; 10: 7(2 \mathrm{x})$, $12 ; 11: 21,30,32: 12: 2,3 ; 13: 1,5 ; 14: 6 ; 15: 12,13,14,15,17,18(2 x) ; 16: 23,24,26 ; 17: 3$, 5,$12 ; 18: 10(2 x), 19 ; 19: 27 ; 20: 16$, and 28 ; eighty-five times in all. In $11: 26$, the
metaphorical use of "hands" is rendered more "literally" by gnb, that is, less metaphorically, but not in literal way at the level of the source text. In 7:19, $20(2 x) ; 8: 34 ; 13: 23$; and 16:18 (a total of six times), there is no rendering by P of the term in the source, because an element clearly based on the source disappears in a free translation. Thus in eighty-five of the eightysix places where $y d$ is rendered by this its Syriac cognate, it is rendered consistently and should be rated 5 where so translated.

This mode is rated 5 for this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The plur. of ' $y d$ renders the sing. of the corresponding word in MT. There is one example of Williams' direct object construction $f$ where MT uses ${ } t$.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
5.

## COMPARISON WITH T J, A, AND B

The two Greek versions are identical except that B adds a definite article not found in A before $\chi \varepsilon 1 \rho i$, and they are as close to the source as P . The Targum adds $y t b y$ before "land." The absence of the definite article in A may make it closer to both P and MT.

```
1:3. ויאמר יהודה לשמעון אחיו עלה אתי בגורלי ונלחמה בכנעני והלכתי גם אני אתך בגורלֵך וילך אתו 
```

שמעון:


## RETROVERSION

When one divides the verse into sixteen segments as described just below and evaluates whether each Syriac term can be retroverted into the corresponding segment of a Hebrew text like MT, there is little doubt that every element of P can be seen as based on a source indistinguishable from MT. There are of course features of Syriac syntax that have to be accounted for in considering mode 4.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. When the two elements joined by maqqēph are counted as one segment 11, there are sixteen segments in MT and the athnach is on the thirteenth. When ' $m k n n n y$ ' and ' $p$ ' $n$ ' are both treated as single segments 9 and 11, there are a similar sixteen segments in $P$, four to the first punctuation point, five more to the second, four more to the third such point, and the final three to the last punctuation point. The segments in P are in the same sequence as those in MT. Both the division of the elements and the sequence are rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. No elements are added or subtracted so that this mode can be rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

'hwhy. This translation of ' $h$ with variations based only on number or pronominal suffix is found here and in :13, 17; 3:9; $8: 19 ; 9: 1,3(2 x), 5,18,24(2 x), 26,31,41,56 ; 11: 3 ; 16: 31$; $18: 8(2 x), 14 ; 19: 23 ; 20: 13,23,28 ; 21: 6$ and 22 ; a total of twenty-seven times. The word is not translated in 9:21, but that omission is part of a reinterpretation of the verse that would be considered as part of the analysis of that verse. In 14:3, the word is translated ' $b w k$, a change from the "daughters of your brothers [family/relatives]" to the "house of your father." This change in P is cited in the BHS apparatus. The larger sense of the phrase is clear, and
does not seem to be the result of inconsistency in translation. Even if we treated these last two as inconsistent, 27 consistent out of 29 would be $93 \%$ consistent, and rate 5 . $s q$. The verb slq was discussed in the analysis of 1:1 and rated 5 there as it is also here. 'my. This preposition with various pronominal suffixes renders ' $t$ three times in this verse and in $1: 16(3 x), 17,19,21 ; 2: 1 ; 4: 13 ; 7: 1,2,4(2 x), 18,19 ; 8: 1(1 x), 4 ; 9: 32,33,35,48(1 x) ;$ 11:27(1x); 12:4; and 17:11; twenty-four times in all. The same Hebrew preposition is translated by $l w t$ in 16:15: 19:2 and $4(3 x)$. It is rendered by ${ }^{l} g n b(2 x)$ in $3: 19$ and $4: 11$, and by $l$ in $8: 7(2 \mathrm{x})$. Once in $1: 14$ the Syriac is $m n$ as also in $1: 16$, it is $l$. The preposition in MT is not translated in 14:11 (where the verse varies from MT in vocabulary but not meaning), in 17:2 (also a freer translation with similar meaning), and 20:20 (a verse missing from P). So ${ }^{\prime} m$ renders ' $t$ twenty-four out of thirty-six times in Judges. If the three places where there is no translation are set aside, that is twenty-four out of thirty-three, or about $73 \%$ of the times on which the calculation is based. In 19:2, the Hebrew is $m^{\prime} t w$ rendered in P by $m n l w t w$ as Tg J renders it by mlwtyh, while rendering by ' $m$ in 16:15 and 19:4. Similarly in 3:19 and 4:11, Tg J renders by ${ }^{\prime} m$, but in $8: 7, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ renders both instances of ${ }^{\prime} t$ as a preposition by ${ }^{\prime} l$, just as P does. This tends to corroborate P 's use of $l w t$ in 19:2 and of $' l$ twice in 8:7. If those three are left out of the calculation, then ' $m$ renders ${ }{ }^{t} t 80 \%$ of the time ( 24 of 30 places). Approaching this calculation cautiously, the rendering is rated 3+ in Judges in cases where as here it is rendered by ' $m$.
$p s t y / k$. This work translates Hebrew $g w r l$ twice in this verse and the one instance of it in 20:9. In this verse it has the sense of a right of possession received by casting of lots and in 20:9 a duty imposed by casting of lots. This seems consistent, but the number of renderings to be considered is too small to attach a rating to the rendering of this word.
${ }^{\prime} m$. This preposition is evaluated in the consideration of its rendering of $b$ in 1:1 and not rated there.
$n t k t s ̌$. The Ethpael.of $k t \check{s}$ translates the Niphal of $l h ̣ m$ here and in the verses cited in the analysis of verse 1 above. It would also be assigned a 5 .
${ }^{\prime} z l$. The Peal of this verb translates the Qa of $h l k$ twice in this verse and in $1: 10,11,16,17$, $26 ; 2: 6,12,17,19 ; 3: 13 ; 4: 6,8(4 x), 9(4 x), 24(1 x) ; 6: 14 ; 7: 4(4 x), 7 ; 8: 1 ; 29 ; 9: 1,4,6,8(2 x)$, $9,11,13,21,49,50,55 ; 10: 14 ; 11: 5,8,11,37(?), 38(2 x), 40 ; 12: 1 ; 13: 11 ; 14: 3,9(1 x) ;$ $15: 4 ; 16: 1 ; 17: 8,9,10 ; 18: 2,5,6(2 x), 7,9,14,17,21,24,26 ; 19: 2,, 3,5(2 x), 7,8,9(2 x)$, $10,14,17,18(2 x), 27,28(2 x) ; 20: 8 ; 21: 10,20$, and 21 (eighty-eight times in all plus one questionable case). It is rendered by the cognate hlk in 2:22; 5:6(2x), 10; 11:16 and 18 (a total of six times). The translation term is ${ }^{\prime} t$ ' in 4:22; 9:10, 12, 14; 11:6; 14:9(1x); 18:19; 19:11, 13(Qēre); and 21:23 (ten times in all). The rendering is by ' ${ }^{\prime} g l z$ in $6: 21$ and by $s l q$ in $9: 7$. There is no translation term once in $4: 24$. The question in $11: 37$ is whether the ${ }^{\prime} z l$ and the following 'hlk are rendering the verbs in the source in the reverse order.

This makes eighty-eight or eighty-nine times that ' $z l$ renders hlk out of the 108 examples considered, or eighty-eight out of 106 if 4:24 and 11:37 are left out of consideration. The issue remaining for evaluation of consistency is whether the examples translated by ' $t$ ' are inconsistent. What they might be showing is that for the translator, the possible meanings of $h l k$ do not overlap exactly with Syriac ' $z l$. The other seven (or eight) variants would seem to have been more open to a strict consistency. If renderings by ' $t$ ' are left out of consideration, then the other eighty-eight out of ninety-six renderings would be almost $92 \%$ of that total and rated 5 but with a minus to reflect the uncertainty expressed here. (If renderings by ' $t$ ' were considered in the calculation, the rating would have been 4.)
${ }^{\prime} p$. This translates $g m$ in this verse and in 1:22; $2: 3,10(2 \mathrm{x}), 17,21 ; 3: 31 ; 5: 4(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 6: 35 ; 7: 18$; 8:9, 22(3x); 9:19; $10: 9 ; 11: 17 ; 17: 2 ; 19: 19(3 x)$; and $20: 48$; twenty-three times in all. The word is not translated in 3:22; 8:31; and 9:49(2x) (a total of four times). It appears to have been rendered by a waw prefix once at 5:4. Thus it is rated 5 in this verse and the Book as a whole.

This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The Canaanite is rendered as a plur. here as earlier. Alexandrinus has render $g m$ by каí $\gamma \varepsilon$. There is no hint of that in P .

## RATING OF THE VERSE 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

All three versions are close to each other. The use of the plural of Canaanite by B is probably the feature that most clearly aligns it with P , and B 's nonuse of $\kappa \alpha i \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ also distinguishes it from A . Therefore B is considered in these minor respects as closer to P .

1:4. ויעל יהודה ויתן יהוה את־הכנעני והפרזי ביָדם ויכום בבזק עשרת אלפים איש:
 \%

## RETROVERSION

If the direct object marker and the object marked are treated as one segment, there are twelve segments in this verse, seven to the athnach and five following it. Twelve
segments can also be identified in P , if we understand that ' $n w n$ together with $w \check{s} l m$ is part of segment 3, a direct object construction, and that mnhwn represents the pronominal suffix of segment 8 and renders that segment together with whrbw. Their occurence in the Syriac verse will not change the meaning of the verse, since they are features of Syriac translation technique. Thus there is no reason to distinguish the Vorlage of the source text from MT. The way in which they are features of translation technique will also be considered below.

## LITERALISM

1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. As mentioned just above, two elements of the verse in P do not have any formal equivalent in MT. The first, 'nwn, is an example of Williams, ${ }^{10}$ direct object construction $f$ where we find verb + pronoun $+l+$ direct object. In this case the subject is placed between the pronoun and the direct object, but that preserves the same sequence in P that is found in MT, apart from these two elements. The prepositional phrase $m n h w n$ would seem to add a partitive sense to the direct object: they slew some 10,000 of (or from) the men. The pronoun would seem to anticipate the object of the preposition: the 10,000 men. This will be considered further as part of mode 4 . Since Barr's model of literalism in division and sequencing is not affected by additions, the P verse can be treated as being divided into the same segments and those segments recognized as following the same sequence as MT, and rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The pronoun 'nwn is not supported in MT, but is of course a pronoun anticipating the direct object of its verb. This is an example of direct object construction $f$ as analyzed by Williams. Among other comment about this construction, he says that "[c]onstruction $f$ may be used rather than construction $d$ or $e$ to express that an

[^62]action is the culmination of previous events, or it may be used because a previous mention of the object is referred back to. ${ }^{, 11}$ Since, as pointed out in the discussion of $1: 2$, there is no consistency in the use of suffixed pronoun direct objects this is treated as a feature of mode 4 , since the third person plur. independent pronoun has a kind of semi-enclitic status in these situations and is otherwise syntactically indistinguishable from suffixed pronoun objects. The addition of $m n h w n$ is more of a problem. In 20:45 where the direct object is also thousands of men, $h r b$ also takes the preposition $m n$, but the preposition is also in $\mathrm{MT}^{12}$ there.

Accordingly this will be treated as an addition since in this verse the same Hebrew verb has only a pronoun object suffix. The effect of this addition on a verse with twelve segments will be calculated as a reduction of $8 \frac{1}{3} \%$. Thus the literal quality of the verse reduced by is a little more than $8 \%$, so this mode will be rated 5 , but with a minus to take account of this addition.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

${ }^{\text {' }} z l$. Out of 64 instances of $c h$ in Judges, this is the only time it is rendered by ${ }^{\text {' } z l \text {. See the }}$ consideration of $n s q$ at $1: 1$. The Targum renders by slq. It is rated 1 .
'šlm. This was analyzed at $1: 2$ and, as there, is rated 5 here.
$m r y$. This was analyzed at $1: 1$ and has the same rating here, 5 .
$h r b w$. This translates the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. Hiphil narrative of $n k h$ and the same Syriac root renders the same Hebrew root in the next verse and in 3:31; 6:16; 20:45: and 21:10 (a total of six times). The same Hebrew verb is rendered by $m h^{\prime}$ in $1: 8,17,25 ; 3: 13 ; 8: 11 ; 11: 33 ; 12: 4 ;$ 15:8; 18:27; 20:37 and 48 (a total of eleven times). Syriac $q t l$ renders the same root in 1:10; 3:29; 9:43, 44; 14:19(?); 15:15, 16; and 20:31 (seven times + ?). The question mark

[^63]represents a less literal translation where another verb is located at the place where $q \underset{l}{ } l$ would be expected, but $q t t l$ is still the verb that provides this meaning "slay" in 14:19. The term used to render the same Hebrew verb in 1:12 is $k b s{ }^{c}$ and in $20: 39, r^{\prime}$. Finally in 11:21 the Syriac rendering is by ' $b d$. By contrast, B and A have $\pi \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ in all but three of the verses ( A : $\pi \alpha i ́ \omega, 14: 19$, and $\tau \dot{\prime} \pi \tau \omega, 21: 31,39$; B: кó $\pi \tau \omega, 1: 4,17$ ). Targum J has $m h h^{\prime}$ in all seven of the verses in chap. 1 where a form of $n k h$ is found in MT, in $3: 13 ; 8: 11 ; 11: 21,33: 12: 4 ; 14: 19$; 15:8; 18:27: 20:37, 45, 48 and 21:10. Targum J also renders by $q t \underline{l}$ in 3:29, 31; and 6:16.

The inconsistency is greater in P than in the other three versions and cannot be accounted for easily on semantic grounds. For example, in similar situations, the inconsistency is found: P has the Canaanites as the direct object of $h r b$ in 1:5 and of $m h^{\prime}$ in 1:17, and the Hebrew verb is the same in both places. In places where the smiting is by the mouth/edge of the sword, P renders $n k h$ by $m h^{\prime}$ in $1: 8,25 ; 18: 27 ; 20: 37$ and 48 , but switches to $h r b$ in 21:10. The greater consistency of the other versions does not necessarily settle the question of whether $P$ is inconsistent, but renderings of a particular term in $P$ that appear inconsistent without external evidence add grounds for finding inconsistent other variations in Prendering the same Hebrew term. This does not mean they are semantically misleading but does mean that they are not as literal as they might be, whether intentionally so or not.

Of the 27 examples given, $m h^{\prime}$ occurs most frequently, and that is 11 of the 27 , not quite $41 \%$ of the time. Thus any of these renderings would rate 1 . gbryn. This translates the sing. of 'yš. The renderings of 148 occurrences of the sing. in the MT of Judges are considered here, but the TLOT counts $155 .{ }^{13}$ There are 44 instances of the

[^64]plur. 'nšym. The singular and plur. of the source term are analyzed separately in this discussion.

In addition to the plur. of $g b r$ that renders the term in this verse, that plur. form for the Hebrew sing. is found in $3: 29(1 \mathrm{x}), 31 ; 4: 6,10,14 ; 7: 6,7(1 \mathrm{x}), 8(1 \mathrm{x}), 16,19 ; 8: 4,10,14$; 9:2(1x), $5,49(1 x) ; 12: 1,2 ; 14: 19 ; 15: 10,11,15,16 ; 16: 27 ; 18: 11,16,17 ; 20: 15(2 x), 17(3 x)$, $21,25,31,34,35,38,39(2 \mathrm{x}), 41(2 \mathrm{x}), 44,45(2 \mathrm{x}), 46,47 ; 21: 1(1 \mathrm{x}), 8,10$, and 12 (a total of fifty-two times). The sing of $g b r$ renders the sing. of ' $y$ ' in $1: 24,25,26 ; 2: 6 ; 3: 15,17$, 29(1x); 4:22; 7:13, 22; 8:21; 9:2(1x), 18, 49(1x); 10:1, 18(1x); 11:39; 13:2, 6(1x), 10(1x), $11(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 16: 5 ; 17: 1,5,8,11 ; 18: 19 ; 19: 7,9,10,16(2 \mathrm{x}), 17(2 \mathrm{x}), 20,22(2 \mathrm{x}), 23(2 \mathrm{x}), 24,25$, 26,$28 ; 20: 8(1 \mathrm{x}), 11(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 21: 1(1 \mathrm{x}), 21$, and 22 (forty-nine times in all). The same sing. in MT is translated by ' $n s ̌$ in $2: 21 ; 3: 28,29(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 4: 20(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 7: 7(1 \mathrm{x}), 8(1 \mathrm{x}), 21 ; 8: 24,25$; 9:55(1x); 10:18(1x); 17:6; 19:15, 18; 20:8(2x), 11(1x); 21:24(2x) and 25 (twenty-one times). The plur. construct bny renders this Hebrew sing. in $9: 8(1 \mathrm{x}), 23 ; 8: 22 ; 9: 55 ; 20: 22,33,36$, 42 and 48 (nine times). The Syriac translates by $b^{c} l$ in $13: 6(1 \mathrm{x}), 9,10(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 14: 15 ; 19: 3$; and 20:4(1x) (six times). The Syriac uses byt for the Hebrew term in 7:24 and 8:1 (twice). In 7:14 P renders by $g \underline{n} b r^{\nu}$, in 16:19, by $g \nu^{\prime}$, and in 19:6, ḥtn (three times in all). The word is not rendered by P in 20:2 (Syriac rglyyn for Hebrew 'yš rgly), 4 (1x, pleonastic), 16, 20 ( 2 x , whole verse missing), and 39 (a total of six times).

Before reporting the 44 rendering of the plur. 'nšym of MT, comments will be made about renderings of the sing. by any other term than the sing. of $g b r$. In this verse, the Hebrew ' $y s s^{\prime}$ is numbered at 10,000 and ' $y s s^{\prime}$ is treated as a collective noun and this is how the plur. can be explained in this verse and another thirty-nine of the fifty-two places where the Hebrew sing. is rendered as the plur. of some form of $g b r$. Of the remaining twelve, nine are gentilics: 12:1; 15:10; 20:17(gentilic-1x and status-profession-1x), 38, 39(1x), 41(2x) and

21(1x). In 12:2, the term seems to be a vocative in MT where the Hebrew sing. form is used although Jephthah is speaking to a group of Ephraimites. In 21:8 the Hebrew is in a context where 'nš might be expected in Syriac, as "one" might be expected in English, but P has a plur. of $g b r$ which is the subject of a verb that is plur. in form. This does not change the meaning but it is a freer translation in this case than the sing. would be. In 21:12, the "man" in Hebrew is any man whom the 400 virgins had not "known." Once again, the plur. does not change the meaning, but it is freer than the choice of the sing. would have been.

According to JPS, 'nš = homo and $g b r=v i r$, but the definition of $g b r$ in that dictionary also states that $g b r$ can mean husband. ${ }^{14}$ Similarly, $b^{\prime} l$ can also mean "husband," as it does in the six places where it is used consistently to translate ' $y s$ s in the sense of "husband." The TLOT states that 'yš in Hebrew can have "the generalized meaning 'person'" and can be used "as a pronoun in the sense of 'any, everyone, anyone,' negated 'none'. . . ."15 All twenty-one of the instances where 'nš renders ' $y s$ š are in contexts where such a translation would be unexceptionable. Perhaps some form of $g b r$ would be possible and the JPS entry allows this, but it probably would not be the first choice. We do not know how stylistically adroit or awkward such a possibility would have been in the linguistic milieu of the translator. We can conclude at least that rendering by 'nš is consistent even if the consistent choice of $g b r$ could have been more literal. Targum J renders by 'nš in 2:21; 3:28;, $29 ; 19: 15,18 ; 20: 8(2 \mathrm{x})$, and 11 , but in all thirteen other places where P renders the same way Tg J varies and renders by a form of $g b r$, and is thus less consistent than P .

The use of bny for gentilic meaning is common in MT and that is rendered by the same consonants in Syriac. The phrase bny yśrl occurs sixty times in MT of Judges. The

[^65]phrase 'yš yśr'l is found thirteen times in MT of Judges and is translated in P by bny ysr'l in eight of those places: $7: 8,23: 8: 22 ; 9: 55 ; 20: 22,33,36$ and 42 . In the missing 20:20 there is, of course, no translation and in 20:11 we see ' $n s^{\prime}$ ' and in 20:41, $g b r^{\prime}$ (plur.). The article in TLOT on this Hebrew word says:
$b \bar{e} n$ in the pl. cs. is combined most frequently with a following ethnic name to indicate members of this people. The expression be nê yiśrā $\bar{e} l$ (about 630x) should be mentioned first; in addition to the rare 'yiśrā́ $\bar{e} l$ ( 50 x ) or 'anšê yiśrāe $\bar{l}(9 \mathrm{x})$. It is the expression that refers to the "Israelites;" a distinction in meaning between the three expressions is difficult to determine.

If the $P$ translator was consciously or unconsciously aware of this, it might have influenced a tendency to use the majority term. The example that would tend to show inconsistency is found by comparing 20:41 with 20:42. In both cases MT has 'yš yśr ${ }^{\prime} l$, but in $\mathrm{P} g b r^{\prime}$ (plur.) is used in 20:41 and bny in 20:42. This suggests a lack of care about consistency.

The translations are $b^{c} l$ are not hard to accept. Both JPS and Costaz allow that word and $g b r$ for husband in their dictionaries (and Costaz adds $g b r w t$ '). Brockelmann defines by equivalent terms in Latin. The most that can be said here is that when 'yš means "husband" in Judges, it is rendered by $b c l$ and one may say this is consistent even if it was less awkward in the translator's world to say $g b r^{\prime}$ instead of $b^{c} l$ than it now would be in English to say "man" for "husband."

The entry for byt' and byt in JPS includes the following alternatives: "metaph. family, hence a nation, race, people." ${ }^{16}$ In Judg 10:9, MT has byt'prym rather than 'yš'prym as it has in 7:24 and 8:1. In P the phrase is rendered by byt'prym in 7:24 and 8:1, but in 10:9 P renders by bny 'prym. This is not consistency.

[^66]In 7:14 the rendering of Hebrew ' $y s{ }^{\prime}$ by $g \underline{n} b r r^{\prime}$ is giving expression to the implication of the Hebrew that the person described is a warrior of heroic proportions, a correct interpretation, but not literal. Similar considerations would apply to $g r^{\prime}$ ' for ' $y s s^{\prime}$ in 16:19 where the man Delilah calls is called to shave Samson's head. Those considerations also apply to the minus in 20:2 where Syriac rglyyn renders Hebrew 'yš rgly. The hatn in 19:6 is also an interpretive variation.

Of the 148 examples of this sing. studied, the 40 places where the Hebrew term is a collective noun for an expressly stated number of "men" and rendered by the plur. of $g b r$ together with the 49 rendering by the singular of $g b r$, the twenty-one by some form of 'nš, and the six by $b l$ are treated as consistent here. There are 116. The others that are translated are treated as inconsistent, and there are twenty-nine of them. Thus, about $80 \%$ are consistent and this rates 3.5 for Judges as a whole, and rated 4 for this verse since the use here is treated as consistent in comparison to what is calculated as the average degree of consistency for ' $y s$ š.

The plur. of 'nšym is rendered by some plur. form of $g b r$ in $6: 27(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 9: 51 ;!6: 27$; 18:2(1x), $7,14,17 ; 19: 22(1 x), 25 ; 20: 10,12,13,44,46$; fourteen times in all. Some form of the plur. of 'nš renders the Hebrew plur. used here in $6: 27(1 \mathrm{x}), 28,30 ; 8: 5,8(2 \mathrm{x}), 9,14$, $15(1 \mathrm{x}), 16,17,18 ; 9: 9,28,36,57 ; 11: 3 ; 12: 4(1 \mathrm{x}), 5 ; 14: 18 ; 19: 16,22(1 \mathrm{x})$; a total of twentytwo times. The plur. form 'nš' renders 'nšym without the Syāmē in 9:4, 13, 49; 12:4(1x) and 18:25. Rubens Duval says that the emphatic form of ' $n s$ š is only singular in the expression $b r$ 'nš', but he also says it is marked by the "ribboni" where plur. ${ }^{17}$ Nevertheless the adjectives modifying the word in 9:4 are plur. as is the following verb of which it is the apparent

[^67]subject. In 9:13 there is no clear indication that P is preserving the plurality in the source, but it would be harder to treat it as sing. than to treat it as plur. even without the Syāmē. In 9:49 ' $n s s^{\prime}$ ' is anticipated by the preceding plur. pronoun suffix of $k l h w n$. The same situation found in 9:49 exists in 12:14. In 18:25 'nš' is modified by the construct plur. mryry followed by $n p s s^{5}$. Therefore, all five are treated in this discussion as plur. and that makes the total rendered by some form of the plur. of 'nš, twenty-seven. In $8: 15$ ' $n s ̌ k$ is rendered by $b d y k$, the men in question being at Gideon's command. In 18:2, the second instance of 'nsym is not rendered in P and in 18:22, it is rendered by the sing. $g b r^{\text {. }}$. That last rendering is peculiar to P and neither $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Vulgate have treated the neighbors of Micah as only one neighbor. This sing. must be a mistake. Targum J renders by the plur. gbry.

Summarizing these findings then, one is dealing with twenty-seven renderings by a plur. of 'nš, fourteen by a plur. of $g b r$, one plur. of ' $b d$, one sing. of $g b r$ and one instance untranslated. Where P has the plur. of 'nš in chaps. $6(3 \mathrm{x})$ and $8(9 \mathrm{x})$; verses $9: 28,49$; 12:4(2x), 5; 19:16 and 22 (nineteen times), Tg J renders by a plur. of the same root. The Targum renders the Hebrew plur. by a plur. form of $g b r$ where P renders by a plur. of ' $n s ̌$ in $9: 4,36,49,57 ; 11: 3$; and $18: 45$ (six times). The rendering of the same Hebrew by Tg J is by rbrby in 9:9 and 13 (twice). These last two are obviously changes in Tg J. Smelik argues in opposition to those who see this as a rejection of any hint of anthropomorphism that it is done in order to "emphasize that honouring rulers for what is essentially a gift of God is improper." ${ }^{18}$ Whatever the reason, these are among the eight of the twenty-seven places where P and Tg J do not translate 'nšym by the same root, 'nš.

Where P has rendered by a plur. form of $g b r \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ does so too in 6:27(1x); 9:51; $16: 27 ; 18:: 2,7,1117 ; 19: 22(1 \mathrm{x}), 25 ; 20: 10,12$ and 13 (twelve times). Thus in twelve of the

[^68]fourteen places where P renders the Hebrew plur. by a plur. form of $g b r, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ does too. The Targum also has the plur. for the root of $g b r$ in $8: 15$ where P has the root ${ }^{\prime} b d$ and in 18:2 at the point where P does not render the plur. of 'nšym.

Thus these comparisons show that in nineteen of the twenty-seven places where a plur. form of ' $n s{ }_{s}$ is used by $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ is in agreement and in twelve of the fourteen places where the plur. of $g b r$ is used by P , the two are in agreement. As a very approximate indication of inconsistency, the 31 agreements out of 41 will be treated as places where $P$ is consistent. The use of ' $b d$ by P in $8: 15$ will also be treated as inconsistent. The mistake of the sing. for the plur. in 18:22 will not be counted nor will the omission of a rendering in 18:2. This means that 31 of 42 will be treated as consistent, just about $74 \%$ or 3 . That will be the rating for those rendering in the book as a whole. In this verse it is not rated, because the rendering is of a sing. form and already rated above.

The rating of the mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The Canaanites, the Perizzites, the hands, and the men are all sing. in MT and plur. in P. The direct object of 'šlm is construction $f$. It is interesting that in MT the direct object of $w y k w m$ is the pronoun object suffix that anticipates the number of those killed. A literal rendering of this in P would be a form of direct object where the verb has a pronoun suffix that anticipates a direct object without the preposition $l$. Williams says there are only three examples of this in 1 Kings and that in all of them the object precedes the verb. ${ }^{19}$ Of course, P has not rendered the syntax in this way but has made the partitive $m n$ the object of the verb. Nöldeke points out that the $m n$

[^69]can also be the object of $l$ in a direct object construction. ${ }^{20}$ The contrast with the construction in 20:45 was pointed out above in the discussion of mode 2 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

Targum J has the addition dbyt not found in P, A or B. Codex B has the plur. of "hands" found also in P and renders the Hebrew form of $n t n$ by $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta i \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{r}$ rather than $\delta i \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{t}$ as used by A. This rendering by B corresponds semantically to P's choice of the Aphel of šlm (rather than $y h b$ ) and Tg J's use of $m s r$ (although the C form of šlm might have been used). Although the differences are slight, B is closer to P than are the other two versions.

1:5. וימצאו את־אדני בזק בבזק וילחמו בַו ויכו את־הכנעני ואת־הפרזי:


## RETROVERSION

The translation of $P$ can easily be retroverted into the Hebrew of MT. When the three pairs of Hebrew elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments 2, 8, and 9, and the other six elements are treated as segments, there are nine segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and threee following it. With lmrh $d$ counted as segment 2, and $l k n^{\prime} n y^{\prime}$ and $l p r z y^{3}$ counted as segments 8 and 9 there are also nine segments in this verse of P , four to the
first punctuation point, and five following it. These can be seen as retroverting to the nine segments in MT. Thus the Vorlage of P cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

## LITERALISM

1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. Although there are features of translation technique and a question about the reading of the consonants that have to be pointed out in mode 4 , this is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT and the division and sequence of the segments of P correspond fully to those in MT and are rated 5. 2. Additions and subtractions. There are none and this mode is rated 5. Changes not treated as additions or subtractions are noted in describing features of mode 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

'škḥwhy. Here the Syriac root translates the Hebrew $m s ̣$. The same term also does so in P in 5:30; 6:17; 15:15; 17:8, 9; 20:48(2x-Niphal); and 21:12 (nine times including lemma). Five other Syriac words each translate the same Hebrew root once: $g d \check{s}$ (6:13); $s p q(9: 33) ; y d^{c}$ (14:12); pšr (14:18); and $m l^{\prime}(21: 14)$. More consistently, škḥ translates Hebrew $y k l$ six out of seven times as will be shown in the discussion of 2:14. Targum J renders $m s^{\prime}$ by $\check{s} k h$ twelve of the fourteen times. By contrast P renders by $\check{s k h} h$ nine out of fourteen times, or about $64 \%$ of the time in Judges. This would rate 2 for the entire Book where the term is consistent with the majority of renderings as it is here and 1 in the other 5 places. $m r h$. Because of its frequent consistent use, $m r y$ has already been considered in the discussion of $1: 1$ in a way that distinguishes it from $m r$. This word with varying pronominal suffixes corresponding to those found on the Hebrew of ' $d[w] n$ translates the Hebrew in this verse and $1: 6,7 ; 3: 25 ; 4: 18 ; 6: 13 ; 19: 11,12,26$ and $27(10 x)$. This should be assigned a 5 for consistency throughout Judges and in every verse of Judges where it is found. In
discussing mode 4 , it will be noted that the Hebrew 'dny is this verse probably should be transliterated rather than translated.
${ }^{\prime} t k t s ̌ w$. The rendering by this term should be rated 5 for the reasons given in the discussion of 1:1 above.

ḩrbw. The conclusion that this should be rated 1 was reached in discussing this term while considering 1:4 above.
$b w$. See the discussion of this preposition in the consideration of $1: 1$. No rating.
The rating of mode 3 for this verse is 3 .
4. Level and accuracy of semantic and syntactical information. Although $m r h$ in the Syriac is translating part of what is treated by most translations as a proper noun, in $P$ it is part of a genitive phrase that Williams would classify as genitive construction $c .{ }^{21}$ Boling comments along the line similar to that taken by Burney ${ }^{22}$ and Moore ${ }^{23}$ that "standard translations have treated [ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ doni-bezeq] as a personal name under the influence of 'Adoni-zedeq, king of Jerusalem' in Josh 10:1, 3." He continues by writing: "But it is not clear that bezeq is a divine appellation, which is needed to make the name conform to a known pattern. More likely it is a title, not a name. ${ }^{י 24}$ If Boling is right, MT, Tg J, B, A, and the Vulgate have all got it wrong and only P has it right. The MT pointing would call for "my Lord," but the pointing could be changed to a plur. construct, the "honorific plural." 25 This question is discussed here as part of the redefined mode 4 , but might be considered under Barr's mode 6 , "Level of text and level of analysis." In any case there is a question here of what the correct

[^70]reading should be, and it is possible that the translator of P understood the correct reading or pronunciation of the letters better. However, the fact that the other versions cited were reading like the MT calls for caution before reaching that conclusion.

The construct chain $m r h d b z q$ would be an example of genitive construction $c$. The three direct objects so marked in MT are all direct object construction $e$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

There is a question of whether $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \beta \beta v$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\beta} \xi \alpha \nu \tau$ o in B are as close in meaning to the Hebrew that they render as are $\varepsilon \dot{\delta} \rho \circ v$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \lambda \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta \sigma \alpha v$ in A. In 1:1, both render the Hebrew verb lhm in the same way A does here. Thus A is treated here as closer to MT than the other three versions, since P and Tg J have the Canaanites and the Perizzites in the plur. As a result, Tg J is closest to P .

1:6.
וינס אדני בזק וירדפו אחרֵיו ויאחזו אתו ויקצצו את־בהנות ידיו ורגליו:


## RETROVERSION

If the pair of elements joined by maqqēph is treated as segment 9 there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and six following it. If whzwhw is counted as segments 6 and 7 and $k r w t t^{t}$ as segment 9 there are also eleven segments in this verse of P ,
three to the first punctuation point, two more to the second, segments 6-7 to the third, and the final four segments to the last punctuation point. All eleven segments can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of a Hebrew verse like that of MT.

LITERALISM 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of a verse like this verse of MT. The elements and segments of P are in exactly the same order in P that they follow in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Additions and subtractions. There are none. There are features of Syriac syntax seen in the presence or absence of some features below the level of what are treated as segments here. These sub-elements call for comment in discussing mode 4 . This mode is rated 5 in this verse.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

${ }^{\prime} r q$. This translates $n w s$ in this verse and 4:15, 17; 6:11(Hiphil); 7:21(qere), 22; 8:12; 9:21, 40, 51;20:32, 45 and 47 (thirteen times in all). It is translated by this Syriac verb in every place, even 7:21. Thus it is rated 5 for consistency in this verse and for the Book of Judges. $m r h$. This is rated 5 in this verse based on the evaluation in discussing 1:5. $r d p$. This verb is also found in $3: 28 ; 4: 16,22 ; 7: 23,25 ; 8: 4,5,12 ; 9: 40$; and 20:43(Hiphil) (11x). It is translated by its Hebrew cognate in nine of those verses, but by ' $t$ ' in 3:28 and by $r h t$ in $8: 4$. The verb is followed by btr except in $8: 4 ; 9: 40$; and $20: 43$. Thus the consistency of the renderings is about $82 \%$ and rated 4 for the Book of Judges when rendered as it is here.
$p s q w$. This verb translates the Piel of $q \subseteq \subseteq \subseteq$ in this verse and the Pual in the following verse. This is considered too small a sample to evaluate for consistency.
$k r w t$. This translates the Hebrew bhnwt in this verse and the next and like psq is not considered to have been rendered often enough in Judges to be evaluated.
${ }^{\prime} y d w h y$. This was considered in evaluating 1:2 and will be rated 5 here as it was there. rglwhy. The noun $r g l$ is also found in the following verse and in $3: 24,4: 10,15,17 ; 5: 15$, $27(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 8: 5$; and 19:21 (a total of eleven times). It is rendered by the Syriac cognate in this verse and $1: 7 ; 4: 15,17 ; 5: 15(1 \mathrm{x}), 27(1 \mathrm{x})$; and 19:21 (seven times). The plur. with the Hiphil participle of $s k k$ is rendered less euphemistically than in the source text by $l p r w t d q^{\prime} n p q$ in 3:24 and that calls for comment in discussing mode 4. In 4:10 and 8:5, brglyw and brgly are rendered by ' $m h$ and ' $m y$. For the other occurrence of $r g l$ there is no translation term. This makes seven out of ten times that the Hebrew is rendered by the Syriac cognate. That would rate 3 for Judges as a whole in each place where it is rendered by the cognate.

The rating for the verse in this mode is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The matter of the translation by $m r h d b z q$ was considered in discussing 1:5, and is an example of genitive construction $c$. The pronoun direct object ${ }^{\prime} t w$ is rendered by P as a pronoun suffix to the verb. This alternative exists in Hebrew too as we see in the wykwm in 1:4. The separated pronoun object may be a possible but less likely choice in Syriac. Nöldeke says that "occasionally" the suffixed pronoun may be "exchanged" for the method "which is contrived by $l$, followed by the Pron. Suff. . . . ."26 The direct object $k r w t^{\circ}$ is rendered by direct object construction $d$, and the following construct chain is genitive construction $b$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE 5.

${ }^{26}$ Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, 227.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

The Syriac version differs from the other three in treating 'dny bzq as a description other than a proper name, and B differs from the other three in adding a second ök $\rho \alpha$. The use of $q \underline{s}{ }^{\prime}$ by the Targum makes it closer to MT than P . It is not easy to decide whether Tg J or A is closer to P apart from the similarities present because of the similarity of the dialects used by P and Tg J .

## 1:7. ויאמר אדני־בזק שבעים מלכים בחנות ידיהם ורגליהם מקצצים היו מלקטים תחת שלחני כאשר עשיתי כן שלם־לי אלהים ויביאהו ירושלם וימת שם:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \div \text {-rd }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments 2 and 16, there are twenty-one segments in this verse of MT, seventeen to the athnach and four following it. With $m r h d b z q$ counted as segment 2 , $p^{\prime} n y$ as segment $16, d m p s q n$ as segment $8, h w y$ as segment $9, k r w t^{\prime}$ as segment 5 , mlqtyn $h w w$ as segment 10 , lhem' (following segment 10) as an addition, $m n$ thyt as segment $11,{ }^{\prime} y k m^{\prime} d$ as segment 13 , there are also twenty-one segments plus the addition in this verse of P . Segments 1 to 4 and 10 to 21 can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. The segments of P that follow the
sequence $8,9,5,6,7$ represent the same-numbered segments of MT, but the addition of the prefix to segment 8 and the subtraction of the prepositional prefix of segment 5 have changed these five segments from a word for word translation into a free translation. That is to say, the fifth through the ninth segments of P are representing the fifth through the eighth segments of MT, but those five segments of P form a relative clause as opposed to the nominative absolute clause formed by the four segments $5,6,7$, and 8 of MT. In the process of this free translation, what is counted here as segment 9 has become part of the relative clause and segment 10 of P has added an enclitic $h w w$ that takes its place.

Targum J, A, and B preserve the word order of MT although Tg J adds $l h m^{\prime}$ just as P does while A and B add $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ before $\dot{v} \pi о \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega$ so that it is the "things" under the table that the seventy kings were gathering. The Vulgate follows an order similar to P by placing amputatis after reges, but adds the direct object (ciborum) reliquias after colligebant sub mensa mea. Brooke and McLean report no variant Greek text at this point. If we see Tg J and P as supporting one approach on this issue of a direct object for the verb rendering mlqtym, A and B another, and the Vulgate a third, we find no agreement as to one particular variant. None of them seem to recognize the possibility that the Hebrew has an intransitive sense like that which would be rendered by "glean." (In Ruth 2, P renders the Hebrew root lqt by the same Aramaic root while LXX uses $\sigma v \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ in most places, but $\sigma v v \alpha ́ \gamma \omega$ in two.) If some translators did not recognize that sense they might have concluded that the verb needed a direct object. ${ }^{27}$ Therefore it seems unlikely that this addition is based on a different Hebrew Vorlage. Since the word order is preserved in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and B , and differs from P in the Vulgate, a Vorlage indistinguishable from MT is treated as the most likely Vorlage of P .

[^71]
## LITERALISM 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. As

 described above, both the Hebrew verse and this verse of P are divisible into twenty-one segments (plus the addition in P ). The use by P of $h w y$ at what is counted as segment 9 and the use of $m n$ will be treated under mode 4 and the addition of $l h m^{\prime}$ under mode 2. All of the elements of MT are thus found in P, but segment 8 (and $h w y$ ) in MT is placed between the segments in P representing segments 4 and 5 of MT and the order of the segments of P representing segments 9 and 10 in MT is reversed. (The explanation of this as a change from a nominative absolute to a relative clause is discussed above and also considered as part of mode 4.) It is difficult to calculate a percentage notation for segmentation here, but it is calculated that about four and one-half of the twenty-one segments are not in fact a word for word translation of segments 5 to 8 of MT and possibly segment 9 (the .5 here). That reduces the literal quality of the segmentation to a fraction under $74 \%$. The sequence here is estimated to have been impaired to approximately the same extent. Accordingly this mode will be rated 3 .2. Additions and subtractions. As already noted, only $l h m^{\prime}$ is being treated as an addition here. It represents at most $5 \%$ of the verse and so the verse will be rated 5 , but with a minus to note the possibility that this is too liberal a notation. There are no subtractions.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
mrh bzq. This is the third of three consecutive verses in which this designation is consistently rendered as a description of the position of the captured king, and not a proper name. The consistency of this rendering by $m r h$ is rated 5 here as in verses 5 and 6. mlkyn. This noun in several forms renders forms of Hebrew $m l k$ in this verse and $3: 8,10,12$, $14,15,17,19 ; 4: 2,17,23,24(2 x) ; 5: 3,19(2 x) ; 8: 5,12,18,26 ; 9: 6,8,15 ; 11: 12,13,14$,
$17(3 x), 19(2 x), 25,28 ; 17: 6 ; 18: 1 ; 19: 1$; and 21:25 (thirty-seven times in all). Not surprisingly it is translated by the Syriac noun from the same root in every case. Thus the consistency is rated 5 here.
$m p s q$. The root of the verb $p s q$ is evaluated in the discussion of 1:6 and also not rated here for the reasons given there.
${ }^{\prime} y d y h w n$. This rendering is considered in the discussion of 1:6 and rated 5 here for the reasons given there.
rglyhwn. This was also evaluated in the discussion of 1:6 and rated 4 here for the reasons given there.
mlqtyn. This verb translates its Hebrew cognate here and in 11:3. The consistent translations in Ruth 2 have also been noted above. Since the matter for consideration is the consistency in Judges this is not rated here because of the small size of the sample.
thyt. This preposition with $m n$ translates Hebrew $t h \underline{t}$ in this verse and without $m n$ in 3:30;
$4: 5 ; 6: 11$ and 19 , a total of five times. The Hebrew mtht is rendered by ltḥt in 7:8. That Hebrew with the same prefix is rendered by P as $\lg w m n$ in $3: 16$; bdwkth in $7: 21$; and $h l p y h$ in 15:2. In none of these three cases does the inconsistency affect meaning except in the most minimal way. Since this is the only one of the five rendering by thyt of its Hebrew cognate that adds $m n$ to the preposition considered here, it will be rated 1 . The other four would be rated 3.5 for consistency and the four renderings of $m t h t$ will not be rated here.
ptwry. This translates šlhny here, and it is the only occurrence of the Hebrew word in MT of Judges. Thus there is not a sufficient number of occurrences to evaluate consistency. The Hebrew word occurs frequently in the later chapters of Exodus and one may note that, in 40:4, 22 and 24, P renders by ptwr . These were the only places consulted in MT outside of Judges.
' $y k m$ ' $d$. This renders Hebrew $k \stackrel{s}{s} r$ here. The Hebrew word is found in this verse of MT and $1: 20 ; 2: 15(2 \mathrm{x}), 22 ; 3: 18 ; 6: 27(2 \mathrm{x}), 36,37 ; 7: 5,17 ; 8: 8,33 ; 9: 33 ; 11: 5,7,36 ; 15: 10,11 ; 16: 9$ and 22 for a total of twenty-two times. Five times, in $3: 18 ; 8: 33 ; 11: 5,7$, and $16: 22, \mathrm{P}$ renders by $k d$, and this seems to be the sense of $k \stackrel{s}{s}$ in those places. Only in 9:33 and 15:11 does P use the same language as in this verse: ' $y k m^{\prime} d$ ( 3 x including this verse). In nine places ' $y k d$ is found: $1: 20 ; 2: 15(2 \mathrm{x}), 22 ; 6: 27(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 7: 5 ; 8: 8 ; 15: 10$ and 16:9. In three verses, 6:36, 37, and 7:17, the target text has 'ykn' $d$, and in 11:36, 'yk mdm $d$. In 6:27(1x) the Hebrew is rendered by $m t l d$. The construction in $15: 11$ is closest to the current verse, "as ('yk m'd) they did to me, so ( $h k n n^{\prime}$ ) have I done to them." In $8: 8$, the $m^{\prime}$ ' is lacking and the order of the protasis and apodosis in MT is reversed in P , but the structure is similar. These variations may be explained as resulting from the translator's understanding of the meaning of $k^{\prime} s s^{r}$ in its Hebrew context in relation to the construction in Hebrew that most faithfully represents that meaning. In this verse $m^{\prime}$ is not in Codex Ambrosianus and that means no more than the fact that the majority of ancient manuscripts have that word. Both Costaz and JPS give similar meanings for ' $y k d$ and ' $y k m m^{\prime} d .{ }^{28}$ The meaning of ' $y k n n^{\prime} d$ is also close to the meaning of those two phrases. Just as the English word "as" may be an adverb, a conjunction, a pronoun or a preposition, these terms may be analyzed as fitting into more than one classification that describes their function in the context of the clause or sentence in which they are found.

One may compare Tg J here, because it represents $k{ }^{\prime} s{ }^{s} r$ by $k m^{\prime} d$ in every verse noted above where the Hebrew word is found except in the verses where P uses $k d$. The Targum

[^72]also uses $k d$ in most of those instances, but not in 16:22 where $b t r d$ is used. This high degree of apparent consistency can be contrasted with A and B.

Where P has $k d$, in 3:18 A and B both have $\omega$, 11:5 and 7, both have $\dot{\eta} v i ́ \kappa \alpha$, and in 16:22, A has $\dot{\eta} v i ́ \kappa \alpha$ and B has каө́́s. In 1:7, 9:33; 11:36
 őv $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o v$, and őv $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o v$. In 1:20, $\mathrm{A}=\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha}$ and $\mathrm{B}=\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma ;$ in 2:15, A and $\mathrm{B}=\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ (twice in both cases); in 2:22, both A and $\mathrm{B}=$ őv $\tau \rho \bar{\pi} \pi \rho v$; in $6: 27, \mathrm{~A}=\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha}$ and $\mathrm{B}=\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$; in 7:5, A and $\mathrm{B}=\dot{\omega} \varsigma \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \dot{\alpha} v$; in 15:10, A and $\mathrm{B}=o ̋ v \tau \rho o ́ \pi o v$; and in $16: 9, \mathrm{~A}=o ̋ v \tau \rho o ́ \pi \rho v$ and $\mathrm{B}=\dot{\omega} \varsigma$ $\varepsilon ̇$ ći. In 6:36 and 37, A has őv $\tau \rho \dot{\pi} \pi \sigma v$ in both verses and B has $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ while in $7: 17$ both A and B have $\dot{\omega} \varsigma \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} v$. It is difficult to find any pattern of consistency either within A or within $B$ and when we note the fact that there is no consistency between the two versions and that there are even places where one will use term X and the other Y for this Hebrew word and then the version that used X will use Y while the other is using X in the corresponding position in the Greek text. Then too, where there are six possible translations in P , there are eight in A and B .

On the score of consistency then, P is somewhere between Tg J with its great consistency, and A and B with greater inconsistency than P . If the five instances of $k d$ are treated as consistent and the nine instances of 'ykd are considered more consistent than the other eight renderings, then this would make almost $64 \%$ of the renderings consistent and rate 2 for the whole book. The nine renderings by ' $y k d$ are just under $53 \%$ on the renderings besides those of $k d$. They would rate a very low 2 . The phrase used in this verse would rate 1. Note here that ms 7 a 1 does not have $m^{2}$.
'bdt. This translates 's'yty here and the same root translates forms of s'sh/y as well in eighty-six other places in Judges. 1:24; 2:2, 7, 10, 11, 17; 3:7, 12(2x), 16; 4:1; 6:1, 2, 17, 19, 20,
$27(3 x), 29(2 x), 40 ; 7: 17(3 x) ; 8: 1,3,27,35(2 x) ; 9: 16(2 x), 19,27,33,48(2 x), 56 ; 10: 6,15 ;$ 11:10, 27, $36(2 x), 37,38,39 ; 13: 1,8,15 ; 14: 6,10(2 x) ; 15: 3,6,7,10(2 x), 11(3 x) ; 16: 11 ;$ $17: 3,4,5,6 ; 18: 3,4,14,18,24,27,31 ; 19: 23,24(2 x) ; 20: 6,9,10(2 x) ; 21: 7,11,15,16,23$ and 25. In one place it is not translated: 13:19 (where there may be some question about the Vorlage). One of the three occurrences in 9:16 is translated by $p r^{\prime}$, the root that translates $\check{s l m}$ in this verse and the Hiphil of $\check{s} w b$ in 9:56. In 13:16, the Syriac phrase $t s q(t)$ renders $\tau h$ $t^{t}$ 's and the Hebrew follows that with lyhwh tinh, and P with $\operatorname{lmr} y^{\prime}$ tsqyh, so the inconsistency is an adaptation to the context. In 17:8, the Hebrew l's'wt drk is rendered by lms'r 'wrhh, cited in JPS ${ }^{29}$ as meaning "make a way." Thus in 87 of the 90 places where it is rendered, Hebrew 'śh is rendered by a form of ' $b d$, almost $97 \%$ of the time, and can be rated 5 in all 87 places.
$h k n{ }^{\prime}$. This translates $k n$ twelve times, here and in $2: 17 ; 5: 31 ; 6: 20,38,40 ; 7: 17(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 11: 10$; $12: 6 ; 14: 10 ; 15: 11$; and $21: 23$. The Hebrew $k n$ is translated by ' $y k$ in $5: 15$, but this might be discounted because of the uncertainty about the Hebrew of that verse. It can thus be seen as the translator's best effort to deal with a difficult verse.

The Hebrew $k y$ ' $l \mathrm{kn}$ is translated by $d$ in 6:22, and thus does not belong properly to any consideration of the consistency of the translation of the single word $k n$ by a single Syriac word. Similar to this is the rendering of $l k n$ by $m t(w) l h n^{\prime}$ in 15:19 and 18:12. A variation in translation is also required by 16:4, where 'hrry $k n$ is translated by btrkn. The $k n$ shown in the BHS footnote to 21:11 has not been considered since it results from a retroversion of the LXX. Accordingly the twelve renderings considered relevant here consistently render kn by $h k n^{\prime}$ and can be rated 5 but with a minus to reflect that there are renderings to the contrary that have not been considered relevant to the evaluation.

[^73]$p r^{c}$. This translates the only instance of $\check{s l m}$ in Judges and will not be rated. The use of the same Syriac verb to translate s'sh/y has been reported above.
${ }^{\prime} / h h^{\prime}$. This renders ' $/$ lhym here and forty-eight other times in the singular in 2:12(1x); 3:7, 20; $4: 6 ; 5: 3,8 ; 6: 8,10(1 \mathrm{x}), 26,31,39,40 ; 7: 14 ; 8: 3,33,34 ; 9: 7,13,23,56,57 ; 10: 10 ; 11: 21$, 23, 24(2x, once of Chemosh); 13:5, 6(2x), 7, 8, 9, 22; 15:19; 16:17, 23(2x, Dagon), 24(2x, Dagon), 28(plus one Qere not counted here); 17:5; 18:5, 10, 24, 31; 20:2, 18; 21:2 and 3. (This is a total of forty-nine times.) In the following places 'lhym is translated seventeen times by the plural of ' $l h$ ' since the reference is to other "gods:" 2:3, 12(2x), 17, 19; 3:7(3:6 in MT) $6: 10(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 9: 9,27 ; 10: 6(5 \mathrm{x}), 13,14$, and 16 . The Hebrew is rendered by $m r y$ five times in $4: 23 ; 6: 20,36 ; 13: 9$; and 20:27. It is translated by $q d y s^{3}$ once in $5: 5$. These differences between the singular and the plural that fit the context will not be treated as inconsistencies, but that leaves six inconsistencies out of seventy-two (or seventy-three if the Qere is counted). This is still over $91 \%$ of the renderings and is rated 5, except in the six places where ' $/ h h^{\prime}$ is not used.
${ }^{x} l w h y$. This Aphel renders the Hiphil of $b w$ in this verse ${ }^{30}$ and in 12:9; 19:3 and 21. P translates the same Hiphil by the Aphel of $t^{\prime}$ ' in $2: 1 ; 7: 25$; and $21: 12$. In $18: 3$ the question is rephrased by P so that the 2 nd masc. sing. pronominal direct object of $b w$ becomes the 2 nd masc. sing. subject of the Peal of ${ }^{\prime} t^{\prime}$. The Targum uses the Aphel of ${ }^{\prime} t^{\prime}$ in $1: 7 ; 7: 25 ; 18: 3$; and 21:12 and the Aphel of $l$ in $2: 1 ; 12: 9 ; 19: 3$ and 21. Thus P and Tg J are more in agreement than not, reversing the two roots used in 1:7 and 2:1, but using the same root in all six other places, even though P has avoided the Aphel in 18:3. The Greek Versions agree with each other in this verse ( $\ddot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$ ), 2:1 ( $\varepsilon \dot{i} \sigma \alpha ́ \gamma \omega$ ), and 7:25 ( $ך \vee \varepsilon \varepsilon \gamma \kappa \alpha v$ ), but disagree in all the other

[^74]verses, B using some form of the aorist of $\varphi \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega$ prefixed by $\varepsilon$ is in 12:9, 19:3 and 21, and A using some form of the aorist of $\alpha \not \gamma \omega$ prefixed by $\varepsilon i \varsigma ̧$ in 12:9 and 19:21, while revising the formal structure of the Hebrew by using $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \rho \varepsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \eta$ in 19:3. (This is similar to P's revision in 18:3.) In the Vulgate we find a form of adduco in 1:7, 18:3, and 21:12, and of introduco in $2: 1,12: 9 ; 19: 3$ and 21. In 7:25 the translation is portantes.

One cannot draw a clear conclusion about these variations. Even if some usage contemporary to the translators might have been preferable for those who set the standard for the target languages, it seems unlikely that somewhat more or somewhat less consistency in the choice between the two main possibilities found in each of the five versions and three languages would have been found impossible. This may suggest a pattern of moderate consistency but not a conscious strategy of strict consistency. This recalls what Barr said about word lists, ${ }^{31}$ and one can imagine a list with two possibilities for translating the Hiphil of $b w$ available to the several translators in their respective languages. Since P , like Tg J can be seen as being $50 \%$ consistent, this would rate the lowest possible 2 .
$m y t$. This Peal perf. of $m w t$ renders the Qal narrative tense of Hebrew $m w t$ in this verse. The rendering of the noun $m w t$ was analyzed at $1: 1$. In addition to this rendering of the Qal, some form of the Qal is rendered twenty-eight other times in Judges by some form of the Peal. These renderings are found in $2: 8,21 ; 3: 11,25 ; 4: 1,21,22 ; 6: 23,30 ; 8: 32,33 ; 9: 49,54,55$; $10: 2,5 ; 12: 7,10,12,15 ; 13: 22(2 x) ; 15: 18 ; 16: 16,30(2 x) ; 20: 5$; and 21:5. The Qal of the Hebrew is rendered by the Syriac substantive at $5: 18$. Thus, as the rendering of the noun was rated 5 at $1: 1$, the rendering of the verb is rated 5 here.

[^75]tmn. This translates $\check{s} m$. Only instances of the use of $\check{s} m$ in MT without any affixes have been reviewed. The Syriac word renders $\check{s} m$ twenty-one times in this verse and 2:5; 5:11, 27; $6: 24 ; 7: 4 ; 8: 27 ;(; 21 ; 14: 10 ; 16: 1 ; 17: 7 ; 18: 2 ; 19: 2,4,7,15,20 ; 20: 26 ; 21: 2,4$ and 9 . In 18:3 and 21:10 tmn has the inseparable prepositional prefix $l$, and $\check{s} m$ is not translated in 18:10 and 20:22, although implied in the translation. Thus it is consistently rendered twentyone of the twenty-three times where it is represented in P and the other two renderings cannot be considered clearly inconsistent. It is rated 5 in all twenty-one places.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The comments made about mrh bzq in discussing 1:5 would apply here too. The way that the nominative absolute phrase, bhnwt ydyhm wrglyhm mqsṣym, is rendered by P as a dependent relative clause is an interesting feature of the adaptation of the syntax by P and explains the alteration of word order and the addition of hwy. Not surprisingly, Tg J mirrors the Hebrew absolute and the Vulgate uses the ablative absolute. The Greek Versions provide a good example of how Septuagint Greek exhibits literalism by using the nominative absolute which is otherwise foreign to Greek. Conybeare and Stock comment that such a construction can only be described by this phrase. ${ }^{32}$ Commenting on Num 22:24, they write: "As this construction arises out of a literal following of the Hebrew, it would be superfluous to adduce Greek parallels." In this verse of P , there is no such literalism. An example of genitive construction $c$ is also present in this verse in segment 2, and an example of genitive construction $b$ is found
${ }^{32}$ F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, A Grammar of Septuagint Greek (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980 Reprint of Selections from the 1905 Edition) § 51.
at segment 5 with two genitive members at segments 6 and 7. The addition of $l h m^{\prime}$ is an example of direct object construction $d$, but it is not rendering the Hebrew text.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
3.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

None of the other three versions have changed the word order as P has. Interestingly some of the inconsistencies in rendering discussed above are similar, but not identical, in all four versions. The addition of $l h m^{\prime}$ by Tg J makes it closer to P than the two Greek Versions. Small differences in B, like the repetition of öк $\rho \alpha$ and the use of the historic present, $\alpha \gamma \gamma \sigma \sigma \omega$, make B more dissimilar to P and Tg J than A .

1:8. וילחמו בני־יהודה בירושלם וילכדו אותה ויכוה לפי־חרב ואת־העיר שלחו באש:
a.n

## *

## RETROVERSION

This verse can be retroverted into the corresponding verse of the MT, but some differences need to be noted. If the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments 2,7 , and 8 , then there are ten segments in the MT verse. With segment 2 of MT represented by bny yhwd in P, segments 4 and 5 by the single element $w k b s ̌ w h$, segment 7 by $\mathrm{bpwm}{ }^{\prime}$ dhrb', and segment 8 by wlqwryh, there are also ten segments in this verse of P . The Syriac plural in segment 8 is treated as an interpretation by P and not as based on a

Vorlage different from segment 7 of the verse in MT. Accordingly, no textual basis different from MT needs to be considered in evaluating the literal quality of this verse.

LITERALISM 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The elements of P represent the elements of MT in a word for word translation where there is no difference not based on Syriac syntax, except for the plural qwry. Segment 8 is considered a free translation and that aspect of this mode is reduced by $10 \%$ for a rating of 4.5 . That difference and other considered aspects of mode 4 will be discussed as part of that mode. The elements and segments are in the same sequence in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5-. 2. Additions and subtractions. There are no additions or subtractions. This mode is rated 5 . 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$w^{\top} t k t s ̌ w$. The root of his verb translating forms based on the Hebrew root $l h m$ was analyzed in the discussion of 1:1 and is also rated 5 as to this mode in this verse.
$k b s ̌ w$. The 3rd per. Peal perf. of this verb translates the Qal narrative of the Hebrew verb lkd in this verse and $1: 13,18$; and $9: 45 .{ }^{33}$ In all four places a city is being captured. (It renders $n k h$ in 1:12 and is treated as an inconsistency there, but because of doubts about the order of the verbs in 1:12, that inconsistency is not factored into the calculation of consistency in other verses. If the verbs are out of order, then it is a consistent rendering.) In nine other places the Hebrew verb is rendered by the Peal of 'h$d: 3: 28 ; 7: 24(2 x$, one Qal imper.), 25; $8: 12,14 ; 9: 50 ; 12: 5$; and 15:4. Targum J uses the same two roots in the same places except for 9:50 where it uses $k b s ̌$ instead of 'ḥd. That involves the capture of a city as do the other instances where both P and Tg J use $k b \check{s}$. Where ' $h ̣ d$ is used, except in 9:50 in P , the capture

[^76]is of a person, an animal, or a strategic location like a ford. Thus Tg J seems to be consistent in matching its verb with its object, and $P$ is consistent except at $9: 50$, but that is in $20 \%$ of the places where this rendering is expected (or under $17 \%$ if we adjust for the reversed order in $1: 12$ ). Treating the inconsistency at $20 \%$ for this verse, its rendering is rated 3.5 . Because ' $h(d$ is used consistently except at $9: 50$, or just under $89 \%$ of the time it would be expected, it would rate 4 in P .
$p w m^{\prime}$. This word renders $p h$, that is, its construct, $p y$, in this verse and seven other times in $1: 25 ; 4: 15,16 ; 18: 27 ; 20: 37,48$; and $21: 10$. In all eight instances, it is followed by $d h r b^{\prime}$. In six other instances $(7: 6 ; 9: 38 ; 11: 35,36-2 x$; and $18: 19)$ it renders the word as it is used in its normal anatomical sense and not in the same figurative sense of the eight instances like this verse. It is assigned a 5 in this verse and elsewhere in Judges.
$h r b^{\prime}$. This term translates the Hebrew noun $h r r b$ in this verse and ten other times in 1:25; $4: 15,16 ; 7: 14,20,22 ; 18: 27 ; 20: 37,48$; and $21: 10$. In eight of those it is in the phrase "mouth [edge] of the sword," but in three (7:14, 20 and 22), it is "sword of Gideon," "sword for the Lord and for Gideon," and "sword of each, or every, man." In twelve places the same term is rendered by Syriac, syp': 3:16, 21, 22; $8: 10,20 ; 9: 54 ; 20: 2,15,17,25,35$ and 46 . In chapter 3, the three cases involve Ehud's weapon which seems to have been shorter than the usual sword. The other nine places refer to those who "drew" (Syriac šmt for Hebrew šlp) the sword. By comparison Tg J has $h \mathrm{hrb}$ or $\mathrm{h} r b^{\prime}$ in all eleven places that P does and adds the three places in chapter 3. In the remaining nine, Tg J also renders by syp $^{\prime}$. In every place where P has $h r^{\prime} b^{\prime}$, A and B have $\dot{\rho}$ o $\mu \varphi \alpha^{\prime} \alpha$, except that A has $\mu \alpha \alpha^{\chi} \alpha \iota \rho \alpha$ in 7:22. In chapter 3, A and B have $\mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \chi \alpha 1 \rho \alpha$ in all three verses: 16, 21 and 22. In the nine places where both P and Tg J render by syp', B has $\dot{\rho}$ o $\mu \varphi$ 人í (thus rendering by that term 20 out of 23 times). Codex A is not as consistent as B but does have $\dot{\rho}$ o $\mu \varphi \alpha i ́ \alpha$ in seven of the nine places, rendering by
$\mu \alpha ́ \chi \alpha l \rho \alpha$ in 8:20 and 9:54 (so that A consistently translates Hebrew herb by $\dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mu \varphi \alpha i ́ \alpha$ seventeen out of 23 times). Thus B uses the same translation term for almost $87 \%$ of the occurrences and P uses $h r b^{\prime}$ for about $48 \%$ and $s y p^{\prime}$ for about $52 \%$. To a great extent in P it seems that these are stock phrases so that when the translator thinks of the "edge of the sword," the word is $h r b$ ', but when it is a question of those who "draw the sword," the word is $s y p^{\prime}$. This does not account for all of the cases, and it is a bit odd that the sword that is part of the standard equipment for a soldier is the sword used by Ehud here as a concealed weapon. If this speculation has any weight at all, it would weigh in favor of the view that consistency was not foremost in the mind of the translator rather than in favor of the view that there were compelling (as opposed to conventional) lexical reasons for the inconsistency. Therefore rendering by $h r b^{\prime}$ will be rated 1 and by $s y p^{\prime}, 2$.
qwryh. The Syriac noun in its broken plur. form translates Hebrew ' $y r$ in this verse and in 11:39 and 20:48 ( 3 x in all), and it renders the plur. of the Hebrew word six times in 10:4; 11:26; 20:14, 15, 48; and 21:23. The singular form qryt translates ' $y r$ forty-six times in 1:16, $17,23,24(2 \mathrm{x}), 25(2 \mathrm{x}), 26 ; 3: 13 ; 6: 27,28,30 ; 8: 16,17,27 ; 9: 30,31,33,35,43,44,45(3 \mathrm{x})$, $51(2 x) ; 14: 18 ; 16: 2,3 ; 17: 8 ; 18: 27,28,29(2 x) ; 19: 11,12,15,17,22 ; 20: 11,31,32,37,38$, and $40(2 \mathrm{x})$. In 12:7, the sing. form renders the plur. of $y r$, as is also the case in A and B, probably in recognition of the problem of how Jephthah could have been buried in more than one city of Gilead. There is no rendering of the plur. in 20:42. Thus in all fifty-five places where $y r$ is rendered, it is rendered by the plur. or sing. of the same root. ${ }^{34}$ Thus every occurrence is rated 5 . There remain questions about why this rendering is plur. that will be treated in the discussion of mode 4.

[^77]'wqdw. The Aphel of $y q d$ translates the Piel of $\check{s} l h ̣$ in this verse and 20:48. In ten other places the Piel is rendered by five other Syriac verbs, two times each: šbq (1:25 and 15:5); $\check{s} d r$ (2:6 and 5:15, Pual); $\check{s} r^{\nu}$ (3:18 and 7:8); $n p q$ (12:9 and 19:25); and $\check{s} d^{\prime}$ (19:29 and 20:6). In this verse and 20:48, the complement of this verb is the prepositional phrase $b n w r^{\text {. T The }}$ analysis of the object of that prepositional phrase immediately follows this. In the six places where that phrase complements two other Hebrew verbs in MT where the sense of the verb has to do with some subject about setting or starting a fire, the Syriac translates one of those Hebrew verbs, śrp, (five times: $9: 52 ; 12: 1 ; 14: 15 ; 15: 6$; and 18:27) by the Aphel of $y q d$ as it also translates the other Hebrew verb, $y s(t$, in 9:49. Thus there is a peculiar kind of consistency here. This verb is not consistently rendering šlh but it is consistently rendering by a single Syriac verb the Hebrew verbs used in connection with the same prepositional phrase as a complement. Targum J also uses the Aphel of $y q d$ in seven of the eight places where P does, but has the Aphel of $d l q$ in 9:49. This further illustrates Barr's point about how the same translation can be literal in some ways and free in others. The rendering of the Piel or Pual of $\check{s} l h$ would rate 1 in every place where it is rendered in P of Judges, but the rendering of the phrase of which it is a part here would have to be rated 5 if that were being rated. It is deemed more appropriate to note this rendering of the phrase as part of the redefined mode 4 developed for this paper and to evaluate its consistency in mode 3 by the rating of 1 . $b n w r^{2}$. This translates $b$ ' $\check{s}$ eight times, in this verse and in $9: 49,52 ; 12 ; 1 ; 14: 15 ; 15: 618: 27$ and 20:48. It also translates ' $\check{s}$ seven times in $6: 21 ; 9: 15,20(2 x) ; 15: 5,14$; and 16:9. The fact that the Hebrew verbs complemented by the prepositional phrase are all rendered by the same Syriac verb has been noted just above. Here of course the issue is the consistency of the rendering of 'š, and since there is no inconsistency at all, it is rated 5 wherever it occurs. This mode is rated 3 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The phrase bny yhwd is an example of genitive construction $a$., and the phrase $p w m^{\prime} d h r b^{\prime}$ is an example of genitive construction $b$. In lqwryh there is an example of direct object construction $e$.

The most interesting feature of the verse is the rendering of $h^{\prime} y r$ by the Syriac plur. with a 3rd sing. fem. pronoun suffix. The semantic information is inaccurate, but the translator's interpretive intentions seem clear. Here it is understood to be an interpretation in response to the apparent contradiction between the assertion in this verse that the Judahites took the city and the assertion in Jos 15:63 that the Jebusites remained there, as well as the mention in Judg 1:21 that the Jebusites continue to dwell with the Benjamites. However P's translation can be harmonized easily with what Josephus reports. ${ }^{35}$ Thackery translates: "Then they [Simeon and Judah] overran the district, taking the towns, and after capturing very many of them laid siege to Jerusalem. The lower town they mastered in time and slew all the inhabitants; but the upper town proved too difficult to carry through the solidity of its walls and the nature of the site." The translator of P apparently knew about such interpretations and accepted them as explaining any contradiction between this verse and 1:21 in the Vorlage being translated. This is not necessarily what Josephus meant, because what he said could be understood as meaning it was the lower city that was burned while the upper escaped the conflagration. At the same time one can see that someone trying to explain the two statements could have thought that the burning of the dependent villages of a larger city would have been like burning the city itself, or part of the city (not that much different from the lower city in Josephus' history). Similar issues arise in 1:19.

[^78]The consistent use of the Aphel of $y q d$ with the complement $b n w r^{2}$ is an element of translation technique，whether or not applied consciously，that would have to be studied in more detail in order to support a conclusion that there are many such standard formulas that are consistently used．The use of $\check{s} m t \underline{t}$ with $s y p^{\prime}$ considered in the discussion of this verse might be another instance of this phenomenon．

## RATING OF THE VERSE．

## COMPARISON WITH TG J，A AND B

The elements of all three versions can be segmented and sequenced in the same order as P and MT．Because of the similarity of Syriac and OJA，we find constructions such as $m h^{\top}$ wh in P that is very similar to $m h w^{3}$ in Tg J ，and which cannot be duplicated in Greek．On the other hand，the rendering of $l h m$ by $g w h$ plus $q r b^{\prime}$ is not so similar to the other three as the one word renderings of P ， A and B are to each other．Neither is the rendering by Tg J of $p w m^{\prime}$ by ptgm as literal as $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{A}$ and B ，and this makes A and B more comparable to P ．The use by B of the imperfect of $\pi 0 \lambda \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ might be seen as a feature that distinguishes it from A ． These are small differences，but A would seem closest to MT．Although A also seems closer to P ，when the differences are so small，a decision that one version is closer than another has to be so tentative that it will add little or nothing to understanding the translation technique．

ואחר ירדו בני יהודה להלחם בכנעגֵּ יושב ההר והנגב והשפלה：．1：9

## RETROVERSION

There are ten segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and four following it. With btr $h y d y n$ counted as segment 1 and ' $m k n^{\prime} n y$ ' counted as segment 6 there are also ten segments in this verse of P . The segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of this verse of MT. As will be discussed below, wbtr hydyn is translating 'h$r$. The translation of $n g b$ as a common rather than a proper noun is no basis for suspecting the text of MT. As is characteristic of P , gentilics expressed as sing. in MT expressed as plur. in P like the one at segment 6 are not ordinarily considered as arising from a Vorlage different from MT. There is no basis here for finding evidence of a Vorlage different from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word rendering by P of this verse of MT with a literal segmentation and sequencing. The use of hydyn is a feature of Syriac semantics or syntax that is not consistently used, but that does not affect its status as representing the Hebrew 'hrr. This mode will be rated 5 as to both segmentation and sequencing.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The Syriac neither adds nor subtracts from the ten segments as those segments have already been described. Changes not considered in connection with this mode but as examples of Syriac syntax under mode 4 are discussed there. This mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

btr hydyn. This translates 'h$r$ where it is used as an adverb, whereas the preposition 'ḥry was the term considered in $1: 1$. In this verse it is translated by the preposition $b$ tr plus the adverb hydyn, and the prepositional phrase is adverbial. In 7:11; 15:7; and 19:5 $h r$ is also used as an
adverb and rendered simply by the adverb hydyn. In Tg J , the translation is btr kn (kyn in 15:7) in all four places. Both A and B have $\mu \varepsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ in this verse and $\mu \varepsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau$ o in 19:5, A using the former in 7:11 and B the latter. In 15:7, both adopt different free strategies resulting in the lack of any word representing 'ḥr in A and the use of हैб $\sigma \alpha \tau 0 v$ ("finally" or "last") adverbially in B. The Vulgate uses postea in this verse, tunc in 7:11 and 15:7, and sic in 19:5. In Syriac and OJA the adverb in MT is translated by a preposition plus object even when the object is an adverb that might otherwise stand on its own, at least in Syriac. Based on these four examples and bearing in mind the discussion of the rendering of btr at $1: 1$, the consistency in this verse is treated as a $25 \%$ and rated 1 . The consistency would be rated 3 in the other 4 places.
$n h t w$. This translates $y r d w$ here and the same and other forms of that Hebrew verb twentyfive times in all: in this verse and $1: 34 ; 3: 27,28 ; 4: 14,15 ; 5: 11 ; 7: 4,5,9,10(2 x), 11(1 x), 24$; $9: 36,37 ; 14: 1,5,7,10,19 ; 15: 11,12 ; 16: 21$ and 31 . Aside from the other instance in 7:11 where it is not translated, $y r d$ is rendered by Syriac $n p q$ in 5:14, by ${ }^{\text {' } z l}$ in 11:37 and 15:8, and by $r k n$ in 19:11. In twenty-eight of these thirty cases (including the instance in 7:11 not translated by P ), Tg J renders by a form of $n h \underline{t}$ but renders by $n g d$ in 11:37 and $m^{\prime} k$ in 19:11. Smelik remarks as to 11:37: "To 'descend' on the mountains (MT) is odd. . . "36 and "[t]o 'descend' upon the mountains is unusual idiom; ${ }^{37}$ and repeats almost the same comment as to the Vulgate choice of circumeo. ${ }^{38}$ As to 19:11 he says: "'Day' is often a metaphor for 'sun'. . . . For that reason yrd did not receive the standard translation of nht.."39 He notes but does not explain the variation in P in 5:14 and 15:8. ${ }^{40}$ The consistency of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ as a
${ }^{36}$ Smelik, Targum of Judges, 219.
${ }^{37}$ Ibid., 276.
${ }^{38}$ Ibid., 305.
${ }^{39}$ Ibid., 610.
${ }^{40}$ Ibid., 245, 350.
translation of $h l k$ is discussed in connection with 1:3 above and the use of $n p q$ to render $y s^{\prime}$ will be taken up in the analysis of 1:24.

Setting aside the untranslated form in 7:11, that leaves four out of twenty-nine places where P does not render $y r d$ by $n h t$, two of which are exceptions even in Tg J that renders more consistently by $n h t$, although P and Tg J are not in agreement as to the roots by which they stray from consistent rendering at 11:37 and 19:11. Thus P has rendered $y r d$ by $n h t t$ in about $86 \%$ of the places where the word is translated and $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J} \mathrm{93} \mathrm{\%} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{the} \mathrm{time}$. the consistency of P's rendering will be rated 4 for Judges as a whole and 1 in the places where the rendering is inconsistent. It is rated 4 in this verse.
$m t k t s ̌ w$. This is analyzed in the discussion of 1:1. It is also rated 5 for this verse. $y t b y$. This plur. act. Peal participle of the verb $y t b$ in the construct state renders the sing. act Qal participle of the Hebrew verb yšb in the construct state in this verb. Some form of the same verb in P renders a form of the Qal of the same verb in MT in 69 other places: 1:10, 11, 16(Aphel), 17, 19, 21(2x), 27(4x), 29(2x), 30(3x), 31(2x), 32(2x), 33(5x), 35; 2:2; 3:3, 5, 20; 4:2, 5: 5:10, 16, 17, 23; 6:10, 11, 18; 8:29; 9:21, 41; 10:1, 18; 11:3, 8, 17, 21, 26; 13:9; $15: 8 ; 16: 9,12 ; 17: 10,11 ; 18: 1,7,28 ; 19: 4,6,15 ; 20: 15,26,47 ; 21: 2,9,10,12$ and 23 . In 11:21, one instance of $y s s^{b} b$ is not translated. This is consistent in all 70 places where the Hebrew root in this verse is translated and can be rated 5 in all of those places. $t \nmid w r r^{\text {. This }}$ translates $h r$ in this verse and thirty-four other times in 1:19, 34, 35; 2:9(2x); 3:3(2x), 27(2x); 4:5, 6, 12, 14; 5:5; 6:2; 7:3, 24; 9:7, 25, 36(2x), 48; 10:1; 11:37, 38; 12:15; $16: 3 ; 17: 1,8 ; 18: 2,13 ; 19: 1,16$ and 18 . This means the rendering is invariably consistent and rated 5 in every place where it occurs.
tymn'. This renders $n g b$ here and in $1: 15,16$; and 21:19. It is rated 5 in every place in Judges where it is found.
$p q^{\prime} t$. This translates šplh which is a hapax legomenon in Judges and not rated for that reason.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information.

The translation of the adverb ' $h r$ by a prepositional phrase has been noted above. The phrase bny yhwd and ytby twr are examples of genitive construction $a$. The rendering of the singular of kn'ny by a plur. gentilic in P is another example of the rendering of a singular collective gentilic proper noun in Hebrew by a plur. Although bqrb ${ }^{\text {c }}$ complemented the verb from the root $k t t^{5}$ in 1:1, there is no such complement of the same verb in this verse.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B.

As is often the case, after accounting for the differences in language and dialect, the versions are quite close. By using the plur. of the gentilic, P distinguishes itself from the other three. The Targum uses two terms to tender the Niphal of $l h m$, but it is consistent in doing so. The Greek Codices differ from each other only in the choice of preposition to complement
 without any preposition, so it is hard to say whether it or A is closer to or farther from a more literal representation of MT. The more literal representation of the infinitive may make Tg J closer to P than the Greek Versions, and A's use of $\varepsilon$ v may make it slightly closer than B is to the ${ }^{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{m} \mathrm{P}$.

# 1:10. <br> וילך יהודה אל־הכנעני היושב בחברון ושם־חברון לפנים קרית ארבַע ויכו את־ששי ואת־אחימן <br> ואת־תלמי: 

##  <br> لr.

## RETROVERSION.

Setting aside for the moment the last two words of the verse of P in the construct phrase bny $g n b r^{3}$, there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT if five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as a single segments $3,6,11,12$, and 13 , nine segments to the athnach and four following it. If ' $l k n ' n y$ ' is counted as segment 3 of P , šmh dḥbrwn as segment 6 , lšyšy as segment 11 , wl'hymn as segment 12 , and wltwlmy as segment 13 , there are also thirteen segments plus two added segments after segment 13 in this verse of P . These thirteen numbered segments can all be located in P in the same sequence in which they are found in MT and can be retroverted to a Hebrew text that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT. The addition is probably based on Jos 15:14 and is similar to Judg 1:20: bny $h^{\prime} n q$. The addition is found in A and B , but not in Tg J or the Vulgate. Dirksen in the Leiden Edition, from which the text being considered here is taken, reports the absence of the addition in 9a1. Brooke and McLean report two Greek cursives that do not have the addition and also its omission by OL. This could be taken as an influence of the LXX on P, but, if so, it is possible, even probable, that the LXX Versions that make the addition have done so under the influence of Jos 15:14.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Aside from the addition already noted, the thirteen segments already identified in MT are translated word for word by P and in exactly the same order as in MT so that this mode may be rated 5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Since two segments are added to the thirteen segments in the verse of P are additions and that is slightly more than $15 \%$ of the segments in the verse of MT, this mode is rated 4 as to this verse. Other differences based on Syriac syntax or found below the level of the segment are considered in discussing mode 4 below.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

'zl. The consistency of the rendering of this term was analyzed in the discussion of 1:3 and is rated 5- here for the reasons stated there.
ytbyn. The discussion under 1:9 considers this rendering and rates it 5 .
$\check{s} m h$. This translates $\check{s} m$ here and eighteen other times in 1:11, 17, 23, 26(2x); 2:5; 8:31;
$13: 2,6,17,18,24 ; 15: 19 ; 16: 4 ; 17: 1 ; 18: 29(3 x)$. Thus it will be rated 5 in all of these places in Judges.
$m n$ qdym. This renders lpnym in this verse and in 1:11 and 23. In 3:2 it is rendered by $q d m y$. Since this is consistent $75 \%$ of the time, it will be rated 3 where the three consistent translations are found, and 1 where it occurs in 3:2. The renderings of lpny as a preposition are analyzed at $2: 14$.
$q t l w$. This renders the 3rd plur. Hiphil narrative tense and the translation of that Hebrew verb is discussed as part of the analysis of 1:4. and rated 1 here for the reasons given there.

This mode is rated 3 for this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of the collective gentilic kn'ny by a plur. form in Syriac in this and other verses has been noted already. The use of the conjunction $d$ as a prefix of the fourth segment of P results in
rendering the attributive participle as a dependent adjective clause and is seen often in translations of adjectival participles from Hebrew to Syriac. The construct chain in segment 6 is rendered by genitive construction $c$. The construct chain of segments 8 and 9 is rendered as genitive construction $a$. The genitive construction in the addition is not considered. The three direct objects of $q t l w$ are rendered by direct object construction $e$. Issues of translation technique bearing on the phrase that is an addition in this verse will be considered as part of this mode in the discussion of 1:20.

## RATING OF THE VERSE

The verse is rated 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

Targum J has added the relative $d$ and byt before Judah and rendered the verb of which this phrase is the subject as a plur. even though it keeps the Canaanite as a sing. This change makes it farther from the MT than the other three versions at this point. Both A and B have added $\kappa \alpha i ̀ \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \varepsilon v \mathrm{X} \varepsilon \beta \rho \omega v \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \dot{\varepsilon} v \alpha v \tau i \alpha \rho$ and that puts them in opposition to $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$, and MT. Although the orthography is somewhat different, both A and B have expanded the former name of Hebron by adding the sēperr that is the second part of the former name of Debir in the next verse. On the other hand A and B have the same addition found in P . In spite of this important similarity P shares with A and B , there are too many differences to be able to say they are more similar to P than is Tg J .
nen

## RETROVERSION

Treating elements joined by maqqēph as single segments 3 , 5 , and 7 , there are seven segments in the MT verse, four to the athnach and three following it. With mn tmn counted as segment 2, 'l ytby as segment 3 , wšmh ddbyr as segment 5, mn qdym as segment 6 , and qwryt spr as segment 7, there are also seven segments in P . The first four are represented in P up to the first punctuation point and the next three segments (each having two elements) follow that punctuation point. The rendering of P can be retroverted word for word in the same order and yield a text identical to MT except for the plur. form of $w^{3} z l w$. That may be an influence from the last clause of the previous verse, and given the many cases of such renderings in the plur. by P where the subject in the MT is in fact more than one person, this difference can be attributed to translation technique. Therefore no text that can be distinguished from that of MT will be proposed for this verse.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of a Hebrew Vorlage like this verse of MT and the segments are in the same order as the segments and elements of MT so that this mode may be rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$w^{*} z l w$. This verb renders hlk in 1:3 and the other 88 or 89 places discussed there. Here the 3rd person plur. translates a 3rd person sing. As was stated above, this is attributed to
another feature of translation technique and is not treated as an inconsistent rendering. For the reasons developed in the discussion of 1:3, it is rated 5- here.
tmn. This translates šām in this verse. The adverb first occurred in 1:7 and was translated there by this word. Instances of its occurrence without any prefix are analyzed there. Here instances of $m s ̌ m$ and wmšm have also been analyzed and are translated as in this verse in $1: 20 ; 8: 8 ; 18: 13 ; 19: 18$; and $21: 24$. Thus all six of these prefixed occurrences would be rated 5 where they occur and that evaluation gains additional weight from the conclusion reached as to $t m n$ in 1:7.
ytby. This renders Hebrew $y w s ̌ b y$ and is rated 5 as it first was rated in the discussion of 1:9. $\check{s m h}$. This is one of the occurrences of $\check{s} m^{\prime}$ translating the Hebrew $\check{s} \bar{e} m$ cited as a part of the analysis of that occurrence in 1:10. The conclusion reached there that it should be rated 5 applies equally here.
$m n$ qdym. The conclusions reached in 1:10 as to this rendering apply here as well so that it is rated 3.

This mode in this verse is rated 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information.

There are two examples of genitive construction $a$ : $y w t b y d b y r$ and $q w r y t s p r$. There is one example of genitive construction $c$ : šmh ddbyr.

## RATING OF THE VERSE 5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
Both A and B have rendered $y l k$ by plur. forms as P has done. In this verse Tg J holds to the sing. P is faithful to the name of the city as it is given in MT, as A is also, but B's rendering
by a proper noun is followed by an appositive that renders the two elements of the proper noun by their Greek equivalents. Targum J , according to Smelik, is reflecting the prominent position of scribes in Israelite society and renders 'rky as "magistrates." ${ }^{41}$ Thus A is treated here as less distant from P than the other two versions.

1:12.
ויאמר כלב אשר־יכה את־קרית־ספר ולכזֵה ונתתי לו את־עכסה בתי לאשה:


## RETROVERSION

Once again treating the elements joined by maqqēph as single segments 3 , 4 , and 8 (meaning in this verse that the fourth segment comprises three elements), this verse of MT has 10 segments, five up to the athnach and five following it. The same first five segments are found in P up to the first punctuation point, and the remaining five follow it. Although it is arguable that this verse can be retroverted to the MT, it would be less awkward if $k b s s^{\text {rendered }} l k d$ and $h r b$ rendered $n k h$. Perhaps the order has been influenced by the order of the same verbs in 1:8. The consistency of the rendering of the verbs in question would then be more evident and the sense of the verbs that rendered the Hebrew would probably be closer to the meaning in the source text. Still, it is clear that the translator or a later editor thought this was correct since the objects of the two verbs are in the correct order in P . A proposal that P correctly represents the verbs in the Hebrew text used for translation in a reverse order from MT has to be rejected based on Tg J using verbs which support the order in MT ( $\mathrm{m} h^{\prime}$ first, followed

[^79]by $k b \check{s})$. The same support for MT in this respect is given by A and B. In the next verse, $1: 13$, as at $1: 8$, even P renders $l k d$ by $k b \check{s}$. Accordingly the Vorlage will be considered to be indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Except for the question raised about the order of the verbs $k b s ̌$ and $h r b$ in P , this is plausible as a word for word translation of this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 subject to the qualification about the order of these verbs. In light of the renderings in verses $1: 8$ and $1: 13$, this is not considered a case of a free translation but of some mistake either at the time of translation or at some point during the transmission of the text. Accepting that order here does bear on the question of the consistency or non-consistency of the rendering of the Hebrew verbs that these two verbs translate. Since this is an analysis of the translation technique of Dirksen's text, mode 3 is the mode of translation technique that applies to the existence of these questionable renderings in that text.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5 in this verse.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$n k b s y y$. The rendering of the Hiphil imperf. of $n k h$ by this Syriac verb is found only in this verse. A survey of the twenty-eight other renderings of $n k h$ was made in the discussion of $1: 4$. Its rating here is 1 . The problem involved here has already been discussed in the foregoing consideration of this verse. The more likely rendering of Hebrew lkd in the following verse $1: 13$ is notable.
nhrbyh. This renders $l k d$ only in this verse. Other renderings are reviewed in the discussion of $1: 8$. It is rated 1 here.
${ }^{\prime} t l$. This translates the converted perf. of $n t n$ here. The consistency of translating forms of ntn by 'šlm is discussed in considering verse 1:2 where forms rendered by that Aphel form are evaluated. Thirty renderings are considered there. Forms of $n$th are rendered by this verb or $y h b$ thirty times (not counting the failure to render in $8: 25$ ), in this verse and $1: 13,15(3 \mathrm{x}), 20$; $3: 6 ; 6: 9 ; 8: 5,6,15,24,25$ (1x plus one time not rendered); $9: 4 ; 14: 9,12,13,19 ; 15: 2,6,18$; $17: 4 ; 20: 13,36 ; 21: 1,7,14,18(2 x)$ and 22 . In three places the rendering is by $\check{s} b q: 1: 34$; 3:28(1x); and 15:1. In 7:16, the Hebrew is rendered by Aphel of 'h. This last might have been translated consistently by $y h b$ as Tg J has done. In $1: 34 ; 3: 28$; and $15: 1, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ renders by $\check{s} b q$ where P does also. In JPS, "allow" is one possible sense of $y h b$, and that seems to be the sense in these three verses. ${ }^{42}$ If the thirty renderings by the Aphel of šlm are treated as consistent and the thirty renderings by $y h b$ or $n t l$ are also so treated, then reckoning these four renderings as inconsistent would still leave a fraction under $87 \%$ of the renderings as consistent and be rated 4 in those places.
$b r t y$. This translates the sing. of $b t$ with the 1st person pronominal suffix in MT. The sing. of $b t$ with or without such suffixes is translated eight times by brt here and in 1:13; 11:34(2x), 35, 40(1x); 19:24; and 21:1. Plural forms will be discussed separately. Not surprisingly all these are consistent so the translation of $b t$ will be rated 5 in all these places. 'ntt'. The plur. forms of the Hebrew of this term will be discussed separately. This term in P translates 'sh fifty-two times (plus two renderings of the sing. by plur.), once in this verse in the sense of "wife" and in the sense of "wife" or "woman" in 1:13; 4:4(2x), 9, 17, 21; 5:24; 9:49(plur. rendering sing.), 53,$54 ; 11: 1,2(3 x) ; 13: 2,3,6,9,10,11(2 x), 13,19,20,21(1 x$ plus one addition), 21, 22, 23, 24; 14:1, 2(2x), $3(2 \mathrm{x}), 7,9,10,15,16,20 ; 15: 1(2 \mathrm{x}), 6 ; 16: 1$,

[^80]4,$27 ; 19: 1,26 ; 21: 1,11,16$ (plur. rendering sing.), 18, 21, and 22. One instance of the word in 19:27 is not translated. None of these renderings is inconsistent. In about twenty-five places the sense is "wife," but that is not treated here as inconsistent. Thus in every place where 'sh is translated, it will be rated 5 , but in the places it is rendered by plur., comment would be necessary.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. If the doubts already expressed about the reversed order of the renderings of $n k h$ and $l k d$ lead to the conclusion that the order is reversed, then P would be giving a slightly different picture of what Caleb was requiring as a condition of his unilateral offer. It seems unlikely that Caleb could have welshed on his promise if the order of the actions described was reversed by someone who performed both conditions. The verse of P exhibits one instance of direct object construction $f$ in $n k b s ̌ y h ~ l q w r y t ~ s p r ~ a n d ~ o n e ~ e x a m p l e ~ o f ~ d i r e c t ~ o b j e c t ~ c o n s t r u c t i o n ~ e ~ i n ~ l k s s ' . ~ S e g m e n t ~ 10, ~$ 'ntt' renders a prepositional phrase in MT by an appositive. The omission of the waw before ${ }^{\prime} t l$ is a feature of the difference between the way Biblical Hebrew renders a protasis and apodosis. Here we have a situation where the identity of the pronoun that is the indirect object of the apodosis is extraposed in the protasis and Syriac in this case does not separate the relative clause from the main clause by a waw. This is similar to the situation where Hebrew renders a protasis and apodosis as two apparently independent clauses, and Syriac renders them as a complex sentence with a main clause and a subordinate clause. ${ }^{43}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

[^81]
## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Only P renders the name of the city in a way that can be described as literal and it is hard to say that any differences in the other three versions on this point would make one of them more comparable to P than the other two. One small point makes Tg J less comparable to P than are the two Greek versions and that is the rendering of 'šh by 'ittu, meaning "wifehood" or "marriage" and not by the closely related term that means "woman" or "wife." Any differences between A and B are more minor than this and quite difficult to apply as a ground for saying one of them is closer to P than the other. They both seem to have transposed the second and third letters of A $\sigma \chi \alpha$.

```
1:13.
    וילכדה עתניאל בן־קנז אחי כלב הקטן ממֵנו ויתן־לו את־עכסה בתו לאשה:
```



## RETROVERSION

Treating the elements joined by maqqēph as individual segments 3,8 and 9 , there are eleven elements in MT, seven to the athnach, and four following it. Treating br qnz as single segment 3, there are seven segments in P to the first punctuation point, and treating wyhb lh as single segment 8 and $l k s^{\prime}$ as segment 9 , there are four segments in P from the first punctuation point to the second and final such point. The only possible question that could be raised against the conclusion that P represents a text indistinguishable from MT is the inconsistency between P's translation of $l k d$ in this verse and $1: 12$. The other three versions are consistent, so it is either a case of P's having reversed the order of the verbs in 1:12, a
possibility suggested in the discussion of that verse, or it is a quite striking example in 1:12 of inconsistent rendering of the Hebrew verbs $n k h$ and $l k d$. The Hebrew Vorlage of this verse cannot be distinguished from MT based on an inconsistent rendering by P or on any other available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT. Each segment in P represents the corresponding segment in MT in the same sequence as that of MT. This mode is rated 5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is no addition or subtraction of elements, so this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$k b s \check{s}$. See the analysis of this verb in the discussion of $1: 8$ and note the discussion in $1: 12$ just above. For the reasons given in the discussion of $1: 8$, it is rated 3 here.
$b r$. The construct of this noun translates the construct of $b n$ here and this or other forms of the sing. for a total of forty-nine times in $2: 8 ; 3: 9,11,15,31 ; 4: 6,12 ; 5: 1,6,12 ; 6: 11,29$, $30 ; 7: 14 ; 8: 13,22(3 x), 29,31,32 ; 9: 1,5,18,26,28(2 x), 30,31,35,57 ; 10: 1(2 x) ; 11: 1,2$, 25,$34 ; 12: 13,15 ; 13: 3,5,7,24 ; 17: 2,3 ; 18: 30(2 x)$; and 20:28(2x). All of these are translated by a sing. form of $b r$. This is rated 5 . $z^{c} w r$. This renders the masculine form of $q t n$ in this verse, $3: 9$ and $9: 5$. The feminine form of this Syriac word renders the feminine form of the Hebrew in 15:2. Although this is a small sample, it is rated 5 . $y h b$, brty, and 'ntt'. These three terms are discussed as translations in the consideration of the previous verse, $1: 12$. The first was rated 4 and the second and third are rated 5 here for the reasons given there.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4.5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Segment 3 in $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{br} q n z$, is an example of genitive construction $a$, and the following construct phrase, of genitive construction $c$. In MT, "Othniel" is followed by three phrases in apposition, the first to Othniel, and the second and third to Kenaz, but only the first two are appositive in P. The third is a verbless relative clause. While it is not certain, this would seem to support the view that Othniel was the son of Kenaz and Kenaz was the brother of Caleb and Caleb was younger than Kenaz. The phrase $l k s h$ in P is an example of direct object construction $e$. As in the previous verse, P renders the final prepositional phrase of MT as an appositive, ' ${ }^{\prime} t{ }^{\prime}$ '.

RATING OF THE VERSE . 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

Codex B by using the genitive of "brother" seems to be stating that Kenaz was the brother of Caleb as do P and Tg J by the use of the adjective clause. However, A's construction is open to the interpretation that Othniel was the younger brother of Caleb, creating problems of a prohibited degree of consanguinity for marriage under Lev 18:6-18. Codex $B$ has added the name of Caleb specifically to state what was already clear, namely, that Caleb gave Achsah to Othniel as wife. This addition does create a difference between B and P , but B also makes Othniel Caleb's nephew. That would make B more similar to P than A if the interpretation of the relative clause made here is correct. That interpretation would have P make Kenaz the younger brother of Caleb. ${ }^{44}$ Targum J continues to use the term for "marriage" or "wifehood" rather than the term for "wife." That is also a difference. Aside from that

[^82]difference, Tg J is syntactically so close to P that it is the closest of the three in this case. The Greek Versions are also close with minor differences between them and no decision on which is the closer will be made for this verse.
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1:14. ויהי בבואה ותסיתהו לשאול מאת־אביה השדה ותצנח מעל החמֵור ויאמר־לה כלב מה־לך: } \\
& \text { חح: حس } \\
& \text { لص, حض, }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

## RETROVERSION

This verse of MT is divided into twelve segments here treating the elements joined by each of the three maqqēphs as single segments 5,10 , and 12 , with nine segments up to the Athnach and three following it. If $m n^{\prime} b w h$ is counted as segment 5 , ' $m r l h$ as segment 10 , and $m^{\prime}$ lky as segment 12, the verse in P can be divided along similar lines with six segments to the first punctuation point, three to the second punctuation point, and the final three, together with the addition of brty at the end of this verse of P , before the third punctuation point.

There are three important elements and one minor one to be considered in the retroversion of this verse in order to evaluate whether its source differs from MT. The minor element is wkd which clearly seems based on the first element in MT (wyhy) and the prepositional prefix (b) of the second element of the verse. The first of the more important issue would be how to retrovert the Ethpalpal of rgg since this verse and the very similar verse in Jos 15:18 are the only places in P where the Hiphil of swt is translated by this verb. Elsewhere in the OT of P , it is rendered by $g r^{\prime}$ and $g r g$, as well as by $t^{c}$, and then by the Shaphel $\check{s} w z b$, the Saphel of $r h b$ and by $m l k$ (as it is here in Tg J). Given the lack of the
pronominal suffix (the second of the three important problems) or other textual basis in P to support the notion that Achsah desired that Othniel ask her father, this has to be seen as a change in meaning similar to that found in A and B, where it is Othniel who "persuades" Achsah to make the request. Only here it may mean that Achsah herself originated the idea of asking him. This has suggested an alternative Vorlage to some commentators, especially because it is hard to say why Achsah first persuaded Othniel to ask for the field, and then did the asking herself, but not for a field. Two considerations at least weigh against emending MT at this point. The first is that if an earlier form of the Hebrew text lies behind $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{A}$, and B, it becomes necessary to explain how it could have changed into the text we now know. The second is that the close similarity of the language of MT of this verse and Josh 15:18 is not followed by P, A, and B. The three versions differ from the Hebrew of Josh 15:18 in a similar way to their differences in this verse, but it is expressed with different language in each of the verses and this would be consistent with translators or copyists who were dissatisfied with the MT in both places without coordinating the changes. One cannot exclude the possibility that this is an error and that the Ethpaal of grg was intended. In that case it might be rendered, "she was coaxed," and be closer to the Greek Versions. Targum J does render the verse in a way that can be retroverted to the verse in MT with some, but less, difficulty.

The final difference in P is the brty. Some early mss., 7 g 1 and 9 a 1 fam, do not include this word. Here there is no support from the other three versions. Accordingly this verse will be discussed treating the differences from MT as arising from the translation and not on a Hebrew source differing from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The biggest difference arises from the different meaning of segment 3 in P and from its lack of an object, whether as a suffix or otherwise, but still an object to be identified with Othniel as we find in MT. Nevertheless this segment does stand in the place of segment 3 in MT and all eleven other segments are represented in the same sequence they are found in MT. This may be either an interpretive emendation or a garbled emendation that transposes the letters in a Syriac verb more similar in meaning to the verb in a Vorlage like MT. This impairs the literal nature of the segmentation by a fraction over $8 \%$ and that aspect of this mode is rated 5 -. The addition does not interfere with the evalulation of this mode. The segments follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT and so the sequencing of this verse can be rated 5. The rating for this mode is $5-$, noting that the meaning of the verse has been changed in part even while the verse remains literal to a considerable degree.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The last element in the verse, brty, is an addition, but it has no effect on meaning since we already know Achsah is Caleb's daughter. On the other hand, 'trgrgt is not treated as an addition or subtraction even though it is semantically inaccurate. This addition is reckoned at $8.33 \%$ so the mode is still rated 5 , but with a minus to reflect that this is not a perfect score.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$w k d$. This conjunction usually followed by a subject and predicate (not necessarily in that order and perhaps with the subject implied in the verb) translates wyhy followed by a prepositional phrase beginning with $b$ followed by an infinitive construct in this verse and (the same verb followed by the preposition $b$ or $k$ ) in eight other places: $2: 4,19$ (without a waw prefix at the beginning of the following MT apodosis); 3:27;7:15; 11:35; 13:20; 14:11;

15:17. The conjunction renders wyhy ky at 16:16 and 25 and renders $k s{ }^{s} r$ followed by a finite
verb three times in $3: 18 ; 8: 33$; and $11: 35$. All of these in translation are temporal subordinate clauses.

The first nine translate the Hebrew clauses described above as part of an independent clause where the sense of the dependent clause is rendered by the prepositional phrase formally dependent on wyhy, but in fact on the following independent clause beginning with waw. The Peshitta makes no effort to give a formal equivalent to the Hebrew syntax and therefore expresses no equivalent to wyhy, as Tg J does ( $w h w h$ ) and as A and B do ( $\kappa \alpha i ̀+$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} v \varepsilon \tau 0, \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon v \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$, or $\hat{\eta} v$, followed by an independent clause). Furthermore, Tg J and the Greek Versions use a prepositional phrase where indicated in the following places: this verse ( Tg J and A --using an articular infinitive as the object of the preposition while B uses a noun); 3:27 (Tg J); 13:20 (Tg J, A, and B); and 14:11 (A). In all other places in these nine verses the Hebrew preposition is rendered by $(w) k d$ in P and Tg J and $\dot{\omega} \varsigma$, ö ó $\varepsilon$, or $\dot{\eta} v i ́ \kappa \alpha$ in A and B. In the three cases where wkd in P renders wyhy $k{ }^{\prime} s{ }^{\prime} r$ plus a finite verb the dependent clause in MT is formally dependent only on wyhy, but semantically it is dependent in relation to the following independent clause. Any formal representation of waw before the following independent clause is omitted by P . The Targum does not omit the waw, and A and B render it by каí.

The element wkd renders wyhy ky in 1:28; 16:16 and 25. The translation by P uses the same technique already described for $k^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} r$. Targum J, A and B use the same approach described above for $k^{\prime} s s^{r}$ in all three verses. In all cases where there is a temporal clause based on $b$ or $k$ plus infinitive construct or by the conjunctions $k y$ or $k \stackrel{s}{s}, \mathrm{P}$ translates by wkd and omits the waw before the following clause so that what is formally an independent clause in Hebrew becomes formally a dependent clause in Syriac without any effect on the meaning of the clauses. Thus this use of $w k d$ will be rated 5 for consistency in this verse and in any
place where it is found. (See the rendering of $b+$ infinitive absolute at 5:4 and $k+$ infinitive absolute at 5:31.)
'trgrgt. This purports to render the Hiphil of swt. This is the only instance of that Hebrew verb in Judges and the rendering cannot be rated for consistency.
's'. This Peal feminine sing. active participle translates the Qal inf. construct of $b w$. The Aphel of the same verb is used to translate the Hiphil of the same Hebrew root in 1:7. In that discussion it was noted that the Hebrew Hiphil was translated four times by this same Aphel and three times by the Aphel of ' $t$ '. In this verse one has to deal with the inf. construct which can function like a verb as well as a gerund.

The Qal inf. construct that is rendered by the Peal active participle here is rendered by the Peal infinitive of $l$ in $15: 1$ and $18: 9$, and is not translated in 19:15. Infinitive constructs of $b w^{\prime}$ are translated by the noun $m^{\prime} l n^{\prime}\left(\right.$ from the root $\left.{ }^{c}\right)$ in $3: 3 ; 6: 4 ; 11: 33$; and 18:10. Forms of ${ }^{\prime} t$ ' render this infinitive construct in $3: 27 ; 5: 28 ; 6: 18$; and $9: 24$. A finite form of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ translates the infinitive of $b w^{w}$ in 20:10. Targum J uses the same roots in most places, including the related noun form $m^{\prime} l n^{\prime}$ in $3: 3 ; 6: 4$; and 11:33, but not in 18:10 where Tg J has the Aphel infinitive of ' $t$ ', and not in 20:10 where the same form of ' $t$ ' is used. Targum J also leaves the Qal infinitive of $b w^{w}$ untranslated in19:15. In the Greek Versions both A and B use $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \varepsilon \hat{\imath} v$ in $6: 4 ; 18$ and $11: 33$ while $A$ alone use that word in $18: 9$ and $B$ alone uses it in 20:10. Both versions use $\varepsilon i \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon i \hat{v}$ in 15:1 and 19:15; B uses that term in 18:9 and $A$ uses it in 19:15. In 3:27 both versions have $\hat{j} \lambda \theta \varepsilon v$. In 9:24 both versions render by $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \hat{v} v$. In this verse A has $\varepsilon i \sigma \pi \circ \rho \varepsilon v ́ \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ and $\mathrm{B}, \varepsilon i \sigma o \delta \omega$. In 3:3, both versions render the infinitive as part of a



Thus all four versions show a great deal of variety while guarding some consistency in the choice of the roots of the verbs. The fact that P and Tg J vary in the same way to some extent might suggest that they were both subject to similar linguistic restraints, but it could also reflect a similar lack of concern for consistency in rendering these terms. If one considers only renderings of the infinitive it is difficult to construct a theory based on which P shows a consistency of greater than $50 \%$, so the consistency of the rendering of this term would be rated 1 .
$m s^{\prime} l$. This infinitive of $\breve{s}^{\prime} l$ was evaluated in the discussion of $1: 1$ and rated 5 here for the reasons given there.
${ }^{\prime} b w h$. Not surprisingly the following 54 instances of ${ }^{\prime} b$ (sing. and plur., with and without suffixes) are all translated by Syriac ' $b$ : this verse; $2: 1,10,12,17,19,20,22 ; 3: 4 ; 6: 11,13$, $15,25(2 x), 27 ; 8: 32 ; 9: 1,5,17,18,28,56 ; 11: 2,7,36,37,39 ; 14: 2,3(2 x), 4,5,6,9,10,15$, 16,$19 ; 15: 1,2,6 ; 16: 31(2 x) ; 17: 10 ; 18: 19,29 ; 19: 2,3(2 x), 4,5,6,8,9$; and 21:22. This rendering is rated 5 in every place where it is found.
hql'. This translates hśdh seven times, in this verse and 5:4(plur.), 18; 13:9; 19:16;
20:6(plur.); and 20:31. In four places it is rendered by $d b r^{\circ} ; 9: 27,32,42$, and 43 ; and in 9:44 by $m d b r$. Targum J translates by $h q l^{\prime}$ in 9:27, 32, 42, 43, 44; 13:9; 19:16; and 20:31 (with the last three being the only instances where P and Tg J use the same root). The Targum has 'ḥsnt' in 1:14 and 'ḥsnt in 20:6, thwwy in 5:4 and 'r( ) in 5:18. Codex Vaticanus translates by $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \gamma \rho o ́ \varsigma$ in every place except 20:6 where őpıov is found. Alexandrinus agrees with B in 20:6 and in every other verse but 9:42 ( $\pi \varepsilon \delta i ́ v v$ ) and $43(\alpha \dot{v} \tau \varphi)^{45}$ Since $P$ has only $58 \%$ of the occurrences of $\dot{s} d h$ consistently rendered by use of $h q l^{\prime}$, it will be rated 2 in Judges wherever it is so translated, but 1 in the other five verses.

[^83]'trknt. This translates $t s ̣ n h$ here, but in 4:21 t $b^{\text {c }}$ renders the same Hebrew verb, and the only other instance of $s \operatorname{sh} h$ in the OT is in Josh 15:15, a duplicate of this verse where P also renders by the Ethpeel of $r k n$. Targum J renders by the Gt of $r k n$ in this verse and by $n s ̣ s$ in 5:21. The sample is too small for the consistency of this rendering to be evaluated.
$m n$. See the discussion of this rendering of Hebrew $m^{c} l$ in the discussion of mode 4. $h m r{ }^{\circ}$. This renders $h h \not h w r$ ten times, in this verse and 6:4; 15:15, $16(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 19: 3,10,19,21$ and 28 , without exception as we might expect, so that the consistency is rated 5 wherever it occurs in Judges.

The rating of this mode for this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As has already been noted the opening clause is formally independent in MT but dependent here. In these circumstances, it is expected that the waw of the apodosis in MT will be omitted, as it is here. The omission of the waw before ' $m r$ is different. Williams ${ }^{46}$ considers that the waw that introduces an apodosis in MT will be omitted in P. Here the Hebrew seems to be describing a succession of events: "and she got off the donkey and Caleb said to her. . . ." If we read into the first waw of the Syriac, "And as (even after) she got off the donkey, Caleb said to her. . .," we can understand the Syriac translator treating this not as a succession of events, but as a dependent clause followed by the independent clause on which it depends.

Segment 6 appears to be an instance of direct object construction $d$.
The rendering of $m l$ by $m n$ here is treated as a feature of this mode rather than of consistency of rendering. In every place where the double preposition occurs in Judges, it is rendered by Syriac $m n$ : this verse; $3: 20,21 ; 4: 15 ; 13: 20 ; 15: 14$; and 16:12. The difference seems comparable to English where one may say "from" or "off" rather than "from upon."

[^84]The use of the participle in the predicate of the opening circumstantial clause is noted here for comparison with other uses of the participle.

## RATING OF THE VERSE 5-.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

While A and B share with P a different understanding of whether it was Achsah or Othniel who was first influenced to make the request to Caleb, the large additions in A and B make it quite different from either P or Tg J which is judged more comparable to P here. By using عioó $\omega$ at segment 2 rather than a verb form, B may be more unlike P and Tg J than A .

```
1:15.
    ותאמר לו הבה־לי ברכה כי ארץ הנגב נתתני ונתתה לי גלת מֵים ויתן־לה כלב את גלת עלית ואת גלת תחתית:
```




## RETROVERSION

For purpose of reference, the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as segments 3 and 13, and the two direct object markers including the objects marked by each of them are treated as elements of segments 15 and 17, respectively. By this reckoning in this verse of MT there are twelve segments to the athnach and six (segments 13-18) following the athnach. With $h b l y$ counted as segment 3 , wyhb $l h$ as segment 13 , byt šqy as segment 15 and wbyt šqy as segment 17, all of these elements are represented in P , the first two to the
first punctuation point, the next two to the second point, the next four to the third point, the next four to the fourth punctuation point, and the six remaining following it to the final punctuation point. The waw of segment 1 is lacking, the ky of segment 5 of MT is represented by the $d$ prefix of $\tau$, with $d$ representing segment 5 of MT. That $\urcorner$ to which it is prefixed has no expressed equivalent in Hebrew (since it gives effect to the adverbial use of Hebrew ' $r s ̣$ ) and the three instances of byt are examples of genitive construction $a$ and part of the segments that represent the three occurrences of $g l t$. The Targum does have the initial waw and A and B have кaí. Williams notes that a waw is rarely represented before the participle of ' $m r$, and the exceptions he cites would not apply here. ${ }^{47}$ For this reason it would be unjustified to assume that the Vorlage of P lacked a waw. Like P all three versions have a preposition before the word translating 'rṣ and, since "the land" cannot be a direct or indirect object here, it is likely that either a $h \bar{e}$ directive on segment 6 of MT has been assimilated to the following definite article of segment 7 or the word is to be treated as an adverbial accusative. This adverbial sense is supplied by the preposition $\%$. (The Vulgate treats the pronoun suffix of segment 8 as an indirect object and terram as the direct object, which is hard to explain except as a misunderstanding of Hebrew grammar.)

Whether any of the versions considered here correctly understand glt might be questioned, but it seems probable that efforts at translation (byt šqy ${ }^{\nu}$ in P and Tg J , and $\lambda \dot{\prime} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \imath v$ in A and B) represent an effort to translate $g l t .^{48}$ Accordingly this verse is treated as based on a Vorlage that cannot be distinguished from MT based on available evidence.

[^85]LITERALISM 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. As described above in the discussion of the Vorlage, all of the elements of this verse are represented in P as a word for word translation, and they are in the order which they follow in MT. Therefore this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is no addition or subtraction of elements although there are adaptations to the syntax of Syriac, such as the addition of the sub-element $l$, that call for comment under mode 4 . This mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$h b$. This renders $h b h$ once in this verse and other forms of $y h b$ render forms of $n t n$ three times in the verse. Rendering of $n$th has been discussed in the analysis of 1:2 and 1:12. The discussion in 1:12 has particular application here and supports a rating of 4 for these renderings.
$b w r k t$. This translates $b r k h$, a term that occurs only here in Judges and thus cannot be evaluated for consistency of rendering.
' $r^{\wedge}$. This rendering of the same Hebrew word was evaluated at 1:2 and rated 5 here as it was there.
d. This renders $k y$ as a conjunction in a causal sense in this verse and eighteen other times in Judges at 1:19(1x); 6:22, 30; 8:6, 15, 20(1x), 22, 24(1x); 9:28, 38; 11:12; 14:3(1x), 4(1x); 16:18(1x), 20; 17:13(1x); 18:23; and 21:22(1x). The Hebrew is rendered in a causal sense by $m t l d$ forty-nine times at $1: 19(1 \mathrm{x}), 32,34 ; 2: 17 ; 3: 22,28 ; 4: 3,9,14,17,19 ; 5: 23 ; 6: 5 ; 7: 9$, $15 ; 8: 5,20(1 x), 24(1 x), 30 ; 9: 5,18 ; 11: 2,13,16,18 ; 12: 4 ; 13: 5(2 x), 7,16(1 x) ; 14: 3(1 x), 17 ;$ $15: 3 ; 16: 17,18,24 ; 18: 1,9,10(1 \mathrm{x}), 28 ; 20: 28,36(1 \mathrm{x}), 39,41(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 21: 5,15,16,18$, and 22(1x). The causal sense is also rendered by ' $l d$ at $6: 31,32 ; 15: 6$; and $20: 6$. Renderings of $k y$ with other uses such as with a noun clause or a temporal clause are not reported here.

With seventy-two examples of the causal use here the forty-nine (68\%) rendered by $m t l d$ will be rated 3 , and those rendered otherwise here will be rated 1 . Thus this rendering is rated 1 . tymn'. Translation of $n g b$ by this term was reviewed as part of the discussion in 1:9, and it is rated 5 here as it was there.
byt šqy (3x). This renders the word pointed in MT as gullōt. Moore argues that the Hebrew is a mistake in MT for what was a Canaanite proper name and is followed by Burney. ${ }^{49}$ The word only occurs here in Judges and is not considered an appropriate subject of evaluation for consistency.
$m y^{3}$. This renders Hebrew mym in this verse and at $4: 19 ; 5: 4,19,25 ; 6: 38 ; 7: 4,5(2 \mathrm{x}), 6$, $24(2 \mathrm{x})$; and 15:19. Therefore the rendering is rated 5 for consistency. 'lyt and thtyt. These adjectives only appear once in Judges and are not evaluated in this mode.

This mode is rated 4 for this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The omission of the initial waw has already been noted in discussing retroversion as has the presence of the preposition \%. The preposition is the means by which Syriac makes explicit what is implicit in the Hebrew, namely, that the "land" was the place where Achsah was put. The three occurrences of the stock phrase byt $\check{s} q y^{\prime}$ are examples of genitive construction $a$. In 'r $r^{\prime}$ dtymn' and $\check{s} q y^{\prime}$ $d m y^{\prime}$ there are two examples of genitive construction $b$. The three instances of byt šqy are all examples of direct object construction $d$. The difficulty with $g l t$ is not a feature of Syriac translation technique, although the approach adopted shows how the translator dealt with a difficult problem..

[^86]
## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The Peshitta is closer to MT than the other three. The Targum has rendered brkh by 'ḥsnt' and added 'tr. It is otherwise closer to P. The Greek Versions have added A $\sigma \chi \alpha$, rendered $g l t$ by $\lambda v ́ \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota v$ (perhaps reading a text with a form of $g^{\prime} l$ ) and added $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ v ~ \kappa \alpha \rho \delta i ́ \alpha v ~$ placing them farther not only from P but from MT as well.

## ובני קיני חתן משה עלו מעיר התמרים את־בני יהודה מדבר יהודה אשר בנגב ערֵד וילך וישב את־העם: .1:16  זהּזוֹ.

## RETROVERSION

If each of the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph is treated as single segments 8 and 17, then there are seventeen segments in this verse of MT, fourteen to the athnach and three following it. With ' $m$ bny counted as segment $8, \mathrm{l}$ 'm' as segment 17 , mn qryt' counted as segment $6, l m d b r$ as segment 10 , and the $d$ prefix of $b t y m n^{\prime}$ as segment 12 , all seventeen segments are represented in P in the same order as they occur in MT. The only question raised by the text of P is ' $d r$ for ${ }^{\text {' } r d}$ at segment 14 where P alone among the versions consulted here displays this variation. While one cannot rule out the possibility of metathesis in a Hebrew manuscript, it seems more likely that the variant resulted from metathesis in P itself (involving only a reverse of the position of the points on the two letters) or from
confusion with the Addar of Josh 15:3, located on maps as Hazar-addar just northwest of Kadesh-barnea at some distance from the Negeb where Arad was probably located. Thus it seems unlikely that $P$ was relying on a text that can be distinguished from MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. As has already been stated, seventeen segments can be counted in $P$ that line up with the seventeen into which the MT verse has been divided here for the purpose of this discussion. Those segments in P follow the same order as the elements identified in MT. Below the level of the elements there are differences in $P$ that can be accounted for as features of Syriac syntax that will be discussed when considering mode 4 . It needs to be noted too that the use of Addar rather than Arad does change the meaning of the verse, but this probably resulted from error or confusion and not translation technique. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$h ̣ m w h$. This term renders Hebrew hātēn five times, in this verse and in $4: 11 ; 19: 4,7$ and 9. As we have already seen with other terms of kinship, there is consistency in this case and this is rated 5 in every place where it occurs in Judges.
slqw. This was examined as a translation of the Hebrew ' $/ \mathrm{h}$ in the discussion of $1: 1$ and is rated 5 here for the reasons stated there.
qryt'. This was discussed as the translation of Hebrew 'yr and is rated 5 here for the reasons given there. $d q l^{\prime}$. This renders $t \bar{a} m \bar{a} r$ here and in 3:13 and tōmer in 4:5. This is consistent, but the number of renderings is too small to be rated.
$m d b r{ }^{\circ}$. This translates Hebrew $m d b r$ nine times in this verse and in $8: 7,16 ; 11: 16,18,22$; $20: 42,45$ and 47 . It is rated 5 in every place where it is so translated. tymn'. The consistency of this translation of $n g b$ was considered in the discussion of 1:9 and is rated 5 here as it was there.
wzlw. This renders hlk and that rendering was analyzed in the discussion of 1:3 and it is rated 5- here for the reasons stated there.
$w^{\omega} w t b w$. This Aphel translates the Qal of wysb as the same Syriac verb translates the same Hebrew verb in $1: 9$ where it is rated 5 in all the places where it occurs.
' $m$ '. This translates ' $m$ sixty times here and in $2: 4,6,7,12$ (plur.); $3: 18 ; 4: 13 ; 5: 2,9,11,18$; $7: 1,2,3(2 \mathrm{x}), 4,5,6,7,8 ; 8: 5 ; 9: 29,32,33,34,35,36(2 \mathrm{x}), 37,38,42,43(2 \mathrm{x}), 45,48(2 \mathrm{x})$; $10: 18 ; 11: 20,21,23 ; 12: 2 ; 14: 3,16,17 ; 16: 30 ; 18: 7,10,20,27 ; 20: 2(2 x), 8,10,16,26$, $31(2 x) ; 21: 4,9$ and 15 . It is not rendered in $5: 13,14 ; 9: 49 ; 11: 11 ; 16: 24 ; 20: 22$; and 21:2. Thus there is no question about consistency and it is rated 5 .

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As stated above ' $d r$ does not reflect accurately the meaning of $' r d$. In the first and second segments as well as the eighth and ninth there are two instances of genitive construction $a$, and in the third and fourth segments, genitive construction $c$. In the sixth and seventh segments there is an example of genitive construction $b$, with another genitive construction b in the tenth and eleventh. In the verse of MT, the first inflected verb is plur. and the next two are sing., but in P all three are plur. The use of the Aphel of $y t b$ is puzzling. Perhaps an initial alep yod evolved into an alep waw. Even if the preposition $l$ resulted from a misunderstanding of ${ }^{\prime} t$ as the direct object marker and not the preposition, the use of Syriac $b$ instead of $l$ would not make the Aphel easier to understand.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Codex A is closer to $P$ than $B$ because $\pi \varepsilon v \theta \varepsilon \rho o \hat{v}$ seems more specific than $\gamma \alpha \mu \beta \rho o v ̂$ at segment 3 and because where it has reworked the text at the point of MT segments 12 and 13 it has added much less than $B$ and also represents segment 15 where $B$ has a minus. The Targum has made the "Kenite" the "Shalmaite" and identified the city of palms as Jericho. In spite of these differences, it has not made the addition at segment 12 and thus is closer to P than is A .

וילך יהודה את־שמעון אחיו ויכו את־הכנעני יושב צפֵת ויחרימו אותה ויקרא את־שם העיר חרמה: 1:17.



## RETROVERSION

The Masoretic Text has fourteen segments when the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments 3,6 , and 12 , eight to the athnach and six following it. With 'm yhwd' counted as segment 3, lkn'ny' as segment 6, whrmwh as segments 9 and 10, and $\check{s} m h$ as segment 12 , those elements are accurately represented in P except that the order of Judah and Simeon is reversed and segments $1,6,7$, and 11 are sing. in MT and plur. in P. The reversal of the order of Judah and Simeon is not unlike other cases where P reverses the order of the terms in a pair of words. There might also be influence from the final clause of
$1: 3$ where Simeon goes with his brother (meaning Judah in the context of the verse). The change is not made by $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Vulgate. Renderings of the sing. by the plur. have already been encountered where it is clear from the context that there is a plurality of persons that are being referred to in the singular constructions. Thus the Vorlage here is considered to be indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Based on the foregoing discussion, the division of P into elements and segments is faithful to MT, but the sequence of the segments is not. The order of Judah and Simeon is reversed. Thus the division into segments can be rated 5 , but since two of the fourteen elements are out of order, the sequencing will be rated 4 , resulting in a rating of 4.5 for this verse.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$w^{3} z l w$. This renders a form of hlk here and was first evaluated in the discussion of 1:3 where it was rated 5-as it is also here.
'ḥwhy. For the reasons given in the consideration of this word translating 'hyw in 1:3 and $1: 13$, this rendering is rated 5 here.
$m h w$. Although this term is used more frequently to translate $n k h$ than any other in P , it is still used less than $50 \%$ of the time as shown in the discussion of 1:4 and is rated 1 here for the reasons given there.
ytbyn. This renders $y s ̌ w b$ here and the same root translates the same Hebrew root in 1:9 and sixty-eight other places cited in the discussion of that verse where it is rated 5 as it also is here. Aspects of the contrast between the form used by P and that of MT will be discussed under mode 4.
'ḥrmwh. The Aphel of this root translates the Hiphil of the same Hebrew root here and in 21:11 P renders by a form of the Syriac root $h r b$. The use of $h r b$ to translate $n k h$ was discussed in considering 1:4. There one could see the inconsistency in P's rendering of the various instances of $n k h$. The examples here are too few to evaluate, but this inconsistency adds weight to the conclusion about the inconsistent use of $h r b$ already discussed. qrw. This translates [w]yqr in twenty-five places, here and in 1:26; $2: 5 ; 4: 6 ; 6: 24,32 ; 7: 3$, $20 ; 8: 1 ; 9: 54 ; 10: 4 ; 12: 1 ; 13: 24 ; 15: 17,18,19 ; 16: 18,19,25(2 \mathrm{x}), 28 ; 18: 12,23,29$; and 21:13. The same Hebrew root is not rendered in the Syriac of $9: 7$ and $14: 15$. Every time this Hebrew root is rendered, this same Syriac root does so and thus this rendering is rated 5 for consistency.
$\check{s} m h$. This translates the equivalent Hebrew root in this verse and the other verses listed at $1: 10$ where it is rated 5 for all nineteen times it is translated, including this one.
$q r y t$. The rendering of $y r$ by this root in P was analyzed in discussing 1:8 and rated 5 here for the reasons stated there.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of the verb 'zl as $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. differs from MT in this verse and with the last clause of 1:3 where Simeon was the subject of the 3rd sing. of the same verb. In the next verse, P preserves Judah's status as the subject of the opening verb in line with MT. This is a puzzle to be solved. One recognizes as an English-speaker that a collective takes a sing. verb when viewed as a whole and a plur. where the individual members are the real subject of the verb. When the plur. is to be preferred in more traditional English, then pronouns related to the collective noun have to be plur., and 'hwhy has a singular pronoun. (The team plays its game well. The team make sure their uniforms are ready for the game.) The reversal of the proper names Judah
and Simeon should be noted. Is this because the P translator wants to make sure that Simeon is going as one called into service by Judah as the last clause of 1:3 states that Simeon went with Judah? If so it would be an intentional interpretation (perhaps intended by the translator to clarify for the reader) and not a feature of syntax or the result of negligence.

The rendering of the gentilic $k n^{\prime} n y^{\prime}$ is consistent with what is found in earlier verses. This makes more explicit in P what is implicit in MT. Once this change has been made, then the participle ytbyn has to be plur. too. The use of the relativizer after the participle is not consistent with verse 1:9 where the Hebrew $y w s ̌ b h h r$ is rendered by $y t b y ~ t ̣ w r$. Instead this verse follows the pattern in 1:10 where the Hebrew hywšb bḥbrwn is rendered by Syriac dytbyn bḥbrwn even though the underlying Hebrew in this verse follows the pattern of 1:9. This inconsistency is hard to explain.

There are also examples of direct object constructions: construction $e$ in $m h \neq l k n n^{\prime} n y^{\prime}$; and construction $d$ is found in qrw šmh where MT has a direct object marker. Although MT has separated the pronominal direct object from the verb $h \mathrm{rm}$ at segment 9 , P renders it by a suffix.

The phrase $\check{s} m h ~ d q r y t t^{\prime}$ is an instance of genitive construction c .

## RATING FOR THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B.

The Targum is closer to MT than P and most of the differences noted above are not found there. The Hebrew root $h \mathrm{rm}$ is rendered by $g m r$ in Tg J even though Tg J renders by the Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew verb in other books (for example 1 Sam 15:21.) Codex A renders the same Hebrew verb by two verbs and makes the second verb the basis for the
name of the city, but B renders only by the second verb used by A and records the name of the city based on the first verb used by A. As a result the city has a different name in each version. Here Tg J is considered closer to P than the Greek Versions, but it is considered that B is closer than A .

1:18.
וילכד יהודה את־עזה ואת־גבולה ואת־אשקלון ואת־גבולֵה ואת־עקרון ואת־גבולה:


## RETROVERSION

In this verse there are six segments in which the direct object marker and the direct object it marks are joined by maqqēph and two single elements which precede the six for a total of eight segments. In P there are eight simple segments. The only feature of P that differs from MT is that MT has the "territory," segments 4,6 , and 8 , of each of the three cities in the sing. and P has the possessions of each city in the plur. form. Neither Tg J , nor A , nor B have this plur. form. This probably should not be understood as a deviation from MT even in the way that other examples of rendering of the sing. by the plur. in P are formal deviations resulting from translation technique without any intended change of meaning. Here, if Costaz is correct, the plur. form found in P has the sing. sense of "territory" (somewhat like "environs" in English) and not the plur. sense. ${ }^{50}$ Accordingly the source for this verse of P is taken as a text that cannot now be distinguished from MT.

[^87]LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of the elements. The verse in P divides into eight segments as close to those of MT as is reasonably possible and they are in exactly the same order as MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$k b s ̌$. This renders the narrative tense of $l k d$ in this verse, in 1:8 and the other verses cited there. For the reasons given there it is rated 4.
thwmyh. This renders the sing. noun gbwl with its 3 rd person sing. pronoun suffix three times in this verse and seven other times in 1:36; 2:9;11:18(2x), 20, 22; and 19:29. Without any inconsistent translations this is rated 5 .

This mode is rated 4.5. in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The six direct objects marked by ' $t$ in MT are all rendered by direct object construction $e$. It should be noted that $t h \mathrm{hwm}^{\prime}$ in the sing. may have a somewhat different sense from its sense in the plur.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The Targum is very close to P here, differing only in the rendering of $t h w m^{\prime}$ by the sing. form. Both A and B are quite different and change the meaning of the Hebrew verse, leading some to speculate that there is influence from Josh $15: 63$ or $17: 12$. It would seem useless to try to calculate some possibly artificial way in which one or the other is closer to P and Tg J .

```
1:19. ויהי יהוה את־יהודה וירש את־ההר כי לא להוריש את־ישבי העמק כי־רכב ברזל להם: 
```



```
nol dur< R|ion
```


## RETROVERSION

The verse of P shown above differs slightly from the verse of the Leiden Peshitta Edition. It is shown here as corrected by the editor after the publication of the edition. ${ }^{51}$ If the four pairs of elements are joined by maqqēph are treated as segments $3,5,9$ and 11 , then there are thirteen segments in this verse in MT, five up to the athnach, and eight following it. If ' $m$ $y h w d^{\prime}$ is counted as segment $3, t w r^{\prime}$ as segment $5, m t t d$ as segment $6, l y t b y$ as segment 9, $d m r k b t$ ' as segment 11 , and the syntactic ' $y t$ along with $l h w n$ as segment 13 , the verse in P can also be divided into thirteen segments. (Both Nöldeke ${ }^{52}$ and JPS ${ }^{53}$ cite as normal in Syriac the use of 'yt before $l$ followed by a noun or pronoun designating who or what is the possessor in the phrase in question.) The verb hrbw can be treated as segment 8 rendering lhwryš. There are then five segments to the first punctuation point, five to the next, and three to the final punctuation point. Many commentators find the verse fraught with difficulties because of the phrase ky l' lhwryš and because of the sense in which those who have difficulties may understand ' $m q$. Some of these solve the problem they see by inserting the modal $y k l$ between $l^{\prime}$ and $h w r y s ̌$. However, if we read the first $k y$ as concessive (BDB, 473,

[^88]col. 2) and translate the preposition $l$ as "by," ${ }^{54}$ the phrase, along with the following phrase, can be translated: "though not by destroying the inhabitants of the [coastal] plain, because [or, since] they had chariots of iron." Alternatively ky could be taken causally and $l$ modally ${ }^{55}$ and translated: "because [or since] not able to destroy the inhabitants of the plain, because they had chariots of iron." The modal translation of the Hebrew would support the approaches of $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$ and B , and thus does not have to be regarded as implying a different Vorlage from that of MT. The approach of P is consistent with taking the Hebrew as meaning: "because of not destroying the inhabitants of the plain, etc." If this is the case, then neither $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, or B support a retroversion of P different from MT. Translating this way would be reading P as saying Judah only took possession of the territories belonging to Gaza, Ashkelon and Ekron in the hill country, but not the territories in the coastal plain because the military superiority belonged to the Philistines in the coastal plain due to the iron chariots that were ineffective in the hills. Accordingly the source text is treated as one that cannot be distinguished from MT. ${ }^{56}$

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of a source text like MT and the elements and segments are in the same order in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 as to both division and sequence.

[^89]2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The translations $h r b w,{ }^{\prime} y t$, and the plur. $m r k b t^{\prime}$ are not treated as additions and do not change the meaning. They are instances of different modes of translation technique. Thus this mode is rated 5. ${ }^{57}$
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$m r y$. This was evaluated at $1: 1$ and is rated 5 here based on that discussion.
' $t$. This was evaluated at 1:3 and is rated 5 here for the reasons given there.
'yrtw. This Qal translates the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ only here in Judges. The other occurrence of the Hiphil in this verse is rendered by the Peal of $h r b w$ and that same root translates the Hiphil of this Hebrew verb in 1:27. Other occurrences of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ in Judges are translated by the Aphel of ' $b d$ in 1:20 (the verb $q t!$ is an addition), $1: 21,28(2 \mathrm{x}), 29,30,31,32,33 ; 2: 21$, 23; 11:23 (where there is also a Qal of $y r s$ translated by the Peal of $y r t$ ), and 24(1x) (plus two instances of the Qal of $y r s ̌$ rendered by the Peal of $y r t$ ). One instance of the Hiphil of $y r \check{s}$ is rendered by the Aphel of $y r t$ in 11:24. This amounts to seventeen instances of the Hiphil, one meaning "take possession" and translated by the Peal of $y r t$, two meaning "dispossess" or "destroy" translated by hrb, one meaning "cause to possess" and translated by the Hiphil of $y r t$ and thirteen meaning something in the range of "dispossess" or "destroy" rendered by the Aphel of 'bd Since this verse is the only place where the Hiphil has the sense of the Qal, the translation of that by the Peal of $y r t$ has too few examples to evaluate, but one can see that the Qal of $y r s ̌$ is rendered by the Peal of $y r t$ in 11:24. The consistency of this translation will be taken up as part of the consideration of 2:6. The consistency of the translation where the Hiphil means something in the range of "dispossess" or "destroy" will be considered in analyzing $h$ rrbw below.

[^90]$t \underset{\sim}{ } r^{2}$. The consistency of this rendering of $h r$ by this noun was studied in analyzing 1:9 and is rated 5 here for the reasons stated there.
$m t l d$. This renders $k y$ here and the rendering was analyzed at $1: 15$ where this rendering was rated 3.
hrrbw. The Peal of this verb renders the Hiphil of $y r \check{s} .^{58}$ As shown above in the discussion of 'yrtw, this verb is used to translate the Hiphil in two of the fifteen places where it has the sense of dispossess or destroy. This means that $h r b$ is only used in $13.33 \%$ of the occurrences, or under $12 \%$ if the seventeen examples are counted. This would rate rendering by $h r b$ at 1 , but the consistency of the rendering by the Aphel of $y r t$ would rate 4 whether the total number is calculated at fifteen or seventeen. That would also be the rating for the rendering of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ in every place where it is rendered by the Aphel of $y r t$. $y t b y$. This renders $y$ šby here and the rendering was rated 5 for consistency at 1:9. ${ }^{\prime} w m q$. This translates $h^{\prime} m q$ seven times, here and with various affixes in $1: 34 ; 6: 33 ; 7: 1,8$, 12 ; and $18: 28$. In $5: 15$, the rendering is considered as based on some mistake in the source, and it is concluded that P is probably not rendering this word there. Accordingly the other seven consistent renderings will be rated 5 in all seven places.
$m r k b t^{\prime}$. This renders $r k b$ eight times, here and in 4:3, 7, 13(2x), 15, 16; and 5:28. In 9:53, where $r k b$ means millstone, it is rendered by $r k b$. Thus as a translation of the Hebrew rendered here it is rated 5 wherever it means "chariot" in Judges.
$p r z l^{\prime}$. This translates $b r z l$ here and in 4:3 and 13, where it is also found with $r k b / m r k b t^{\prime}$. This sample is considered too small to provide a basis for rating.

This mode in this verse is rated 4.

[^91]4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The construct phrase in segments 9 and 10 of this verse of P is an example of genitive construction $a$, and the phrase $m r k b t^{\prime} d p r z l^{\prime}$ in segments 11 and 12 is an example of genitive construction b . The direct object $t w r^{\circ}$ in segment 5 , the source of which is marked by the direct object marker in MT, is rendered by direct object construction $d$. Segment 9 of P is an example of direct object construction $e$. The use of the particle 'yt in possessive clauses like that in segments 11-13 has been noted above.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The three other versions have major differences from MT and P . The Targum has added a number of elements that add some information but do not materially alter the meaning of the verse. Versions A and B have not rendered the last three segments of MT, but have
 the common noun $r k b$, and the dative pronoun on lhm .) One might say that Tg J has added more and that A and B have made a bigger change in meaning, but it is probably not useful to compare them with P as to translation technique in this verse.

ויתנו לכלב את־חברון כאשר דבר משֻׁה ויורש משם את־שלשה בני הענק:


## RETROVERSION

If the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments 3 and 9 , there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and five following it. With ḥbrwn counted as segment $3, y k d$ as segment 4 , wqt $l$ following the first punctuation point treated as an addition, $m n$ tmn as segment 8 , and $t l t^{\prime}$ as segment 9 , there are also eleven segments in this verse of $P$, six to the first punctuation point, and the addition plus the five segments 7 to 11 following it to the final strong punctuation points. There are two elements of P which stand in the way of a clean retroversion to the text of MT. The first is the addition of wqttl and the second is the rendering of $h^{\prime} n q$ by $g n b r$. This second is the equivalent of Tg J rendering by $g b r y^{\mathrm{J}}$. As to the first, since there is no support outside P for this addition to be found in Tg J , LXX, or the Vulgate. The wqtl is somewhat confusing because it has no direct object. The three sons are driven out, so it is not clear who was killed. As it stands it is similar to a pleonastic flourish since it does not actually reinterpret or add any clearly alternative meaning as do many other additions.

As to the second, Moore comments: "The article categorically prohibits taking ענק as a proper noun. ${ }^{59}$ This view is supported by P and Tg J. The principal tradition of English translation, KJV, ASV, RSV, and NRSV, continues to render the word as a proper noun, probably still under the influence of LXX and the Vulgate. Accordingly the verse will be treated as based on a Hebrew text that cannot be distinguished from MT with one addition comparable to pleonasm.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT as explained just above, The eleven

[^92]segments of P without the addition are in the same order as the eleven of MT. Therefore both the segmentation and sequencing are rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The addition of $w q t \underline{l}$ as a pleonasm has already been discussed and described as without effect on the meaning of the verse. This addition is just over $9 \%$ of the verse, so this mode will be rated 5 , with a minus to indicate that the verse is not perfectly free of additions or subtractions.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$y h b w$. This rendering of wytnw is analyzed in discussing 1:12 above where it is rated 5 as it also is here.
'ykd. This was analyzed in the discussion of 1:7, and is a difficult rendering to rate. In the discussion at $1: 7$, the nine places where $k^{\prime} s^{\prime} r$ is rendered by ' $y k d$ were rated 2 and thus this is rated 2.
'mr. Although forms of this Syriac root rendering Hebrew ' $m r$ are not being evaluated, this form rendering the Piel perf. of $d b r$ will be considered. Some form or other of the Piel is rendered by ' $m r$ fifteen times, in this verse and in $2: 4,15: 6: 27,36,37 ; 8: 3 ; 9: 1,2,3 ; 11: 11$; $16: 10,13 ; 20: 3$ and 21:13. The Syriac translation term is some form of $m l l$ nine times in $5: 12 ; 6: 17,39 ; 7: 11 ; 12: 16 ; 13: 11 ; 14: 7 ; 15: 17$; and 19:30. Twice there is no translation of the word: in 8:8 and 9:37. Finally it is rendered by $m l^{\prime}$ in 19:3 where the Syriac $m l^{\prime}$ blb has the meaning of "persuade" or "console," and accurately represents $d b r{ }^{c} l l b .{ }^{60}$ Thus the question is whether there is something in the meaning of ' $m r$ and $m l l$ in Syriac that would make a consistent rendering by the former of its Hebrew cognate and a consistent rendering of the Hebrew rendered here by $m l l$ ungrammatical or highly awkward. The correspondence

[^93]between the translation and source terms in the other versions is much closer. In Tg J , some form of $m l l$ renders $d b r$ in twenty-five of these twenty-seven places, but by $s d r$ in 11:11 and $s^{\prime} y l$ in 14:7 (in contrast to $\lambda \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ in A and B, and loquor in the Vulgate, and even to P where $m l l$ is used). Both A and B have a form of $\lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$ in all twenty-seven places. ${ }^{61}$ By way of comparison, in the fifteen places where P has ' $m r$, the ASV has a form of "speak" in eleven of them, "tell" in 16:10, 13, and 20:3, and "said" in 8:3. The RSV has a form of "speak" in 2:4; 9:3 and 11:11; "said" in this verse and 6:36, 37, 8:3, 9:1, and 2 ; "tell" in 6:27, 16:10, 13, and 20:3; "warned" in 2:15; and "sent word" in 21:13. Thus, although P has ' $m r$ in just under $56 \%$ of the places and is rated 2 , the possibility of legitimate room for variation remains and so a plus is added to the 2 .
$w^{*} w b d$. This renders the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ here and in thirteen of the sixteen other places where the Hiphil occurs in Judges. This rendering is discussed in the analysis of 1:19 and rated 4 there where it renders the source term as it is does here.
$g n b r$. This is the only instance of $h^{\wedge} n q$ in Judges, so it cannot be evaluated here, but there are points for consideration that indicate that it is a literal translation aside from its use of the plur. for the sing. in the source. The first is that in this verse, Tg J translates by gnbry, also plur., and the second is that in Josh 15:13 and 14, $h^{\wedge} n q$ is rendered in P by $g n b r^{2}$, and in Josh 21:20, $h^{\wedge} n w q$ is so rendered.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There is one example of genitive construction $a$ in segments 10 and 11 and two examples of direct object construction

[^94]$d$ in segment 3 and segments 9 to 11. In both cases, MT has the direct object marker. The first direct object is in a clause that can be seen as a pseudo-passive impersonal construction. The rendering of $h^{\prime} n q$ is considered literal here.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is closest to P although it is closer to MT since, among other features, it does not make the addition found in P and translates $d b r$ more consistently. While A and B do not make the addition in P , they have other additions. B adds $\pi$ ó $\lambda \varepsilon 1 \varsigma$ and makes the sons those of Evak rather than "giants," as P and Tg J have made them. A adds $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \varepsilon ̇ \xi そ ̂ \rho \varepsilon v ~ \varepsilon ̇ \kappa \varepsilon i ̂ \theta \varepsilon v ~$ and treats Evak as B did. So B might be considered closer to P than A .

ואת־היבוסי ישב ירושלם לא הורישו בני בנימֵן וישב היבוסי את־בני בנימן בירושלם עד היום הזה: 1.21



## RETROVERSION

When the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments 1 and 10 there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and eight following it. If $w l y b w s y^{\prime}$ is counted as segment 1 and ' $m$ bny as a single segment 10 , this verse of P can also be seen as translating fifteen segments by means of seven to the punctuation point and seven following it. That depends on understanding segment 14 in P, lywmn $^{\prime}$ as the equivalent of
segments 14 and 15 in MT. (This is supported by the analysis of the P rendering in the discussion of mode 3 below.) Although there are differences in the Syriac grammar of the kind discussed under mode 4 , when those are accounted for, this verse of P can be retroverted to the verse of MT, and thus no Vorlage of this verse that differs from this verse of MT will be assumed.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. As the division into segments just delineated shows, segments 1 to 13 of P represent segments 1 to 13 of MT, and segment 14 of P represents segments 14 and 15 of MT as a word for word translation. The segments of P are all in the same sequence as those in MT, and the meaning of the verse in P is the same as that in MT. Differences below the level of the segments can be accounted for as features of the Syriac language and will be discussed as such below. Therefore both division and sequencing are rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As the foregoing discussion already makes clear there are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$y t b y n$ and 'ytbw. The consistency of these renderings of the Hebrew yšb is analyzed in the discussion of $1: 9$ where it is rated 5 and that conclusion applies here as well. ${ }^{\prime} w b d w$. This is rated 4 on the basis of the discussion of the rendering of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ by $h r b$ in 1:19. A similar translation to the one in this verse is seen in the discussion of 'wbd in 1:20.
bny bnymyn. This has not been evaluated here. For the evaluation of the rendering of bny $y s r^{\prime} l$, see the discussion at $1: 1$ above.
' $d m$ ' $l$. This phrase renders the Hebrew preposition ' $d$, functioning as a preposition itself fifty times in Judges in this verse and in 1:26; 3:3; 4:11, 16(1x); 6:4, 24, 31; 7:13, 22(2x), 24(2x);

9:40, 52(2x); 10:4; 11:13(2x), 16, 19, 22(2x), 33(2x); 13:7; 14:5; 15:5(2x), 14, 19; 16:3; $17: 8 ; 18: 1,2,12,13,30 ; 19: 12,18(2 x), 25,30 ; 20: 1,23,26,45,48(2 x)$; and 21:2(an additional ' $d m$ ' $l$ in this verse is not in MT). In five places the Hebrew term used as a conjunction is rendered by ' $d m$ ' $d: 4: 24 ; 5: 7 ; 6: 18(2 \mathrm{x})$ and 19:26. In two cases there is no translation term to render ' $d: 3: 25$ and 20:20. In 3:26 and 19:8, it is rendered by ' $d$ alone in P, but in 3:26 it seems to have the sense of the conjunction meaning "while," a sense of ' $d$ given by Costaz. ${ }^{62}$ In 19:8 it is probably also a conjunction. In 19:10 and 20:43, the Hebrew is the compound preposition ' $d n k h$ and thus not appropriate to consider for consistency. Thus in every place where ' $d$ is a preposition the rendering by P is consistent with the rendering by the Syriac used in this verse and rated 5 here and in those places. Where the Hebrew is a conjunction, the rating will probably be different.
$y w m n$. In all seven places where the Hebrew hywm hzh is the object of the Hebrew preposition rendered by ' $d m$ ' $l$, that Hebrew object is rendered by this Syriac term: this verse; 1:26; $6: 24 ; 10: 4 ; 15: 19 ; 18: 12$ and 19:30. The same Hebrew hywm hzh also occurs in 9:19; 10:15; and 12:3, where it is also translated by this term. In 9:18; 11:27; 21:3 and 6 Hebrew hywm is rendered by this term. The last syllable of the term is in effect an enclitic involving a contraction of $h n^{\prime}$ added to $y w m$. This explains why segment 14 of P faithfully represents segments 14 and 15 of MT. The occurrences in $9: 18 ; 11: 27 ; 21: 3$ and 6 are not made a part of the rating here, and this rating is rated 5 in all of the ten other places cited here.

This mode is rated 5 for this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In discussing 1:17, it was noted that the Hebrew phrase hkn'ny ywšb ṣpt was similar in structure to the Hebrew phrase

[^95]in 1:9, bkn'ny ywšb hhr, but that the Syriac rendering the phrase in 1:17 did not follow the pattern of the rendering in 1:9, but that of the rendering of the Hebrew phrase in 1:10: hkn'ny hywšb bḥbrwn. The Hebrew phrase in this verse, hybwsy yšb yrwšlm, is also similar to 1:9, but rendered by a Syriac phrase structured like the rendering of the phrase in $1: 10$. Direct object construction $e$ renders the direct object in segments 1 and 2 of MT where the direct object marker is used. The two occurrences of $b n y$ are examples of genitive construction $a$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Codex A has no elements representing "in Jerusalem," but Tg J and B do. The Targum renders the first occurrence of "Jebusite" in the plur. and the second in the sing., but B renders both as sing., and thus Tg J is slightly closer to P than is B .

1:22.
ויעלו בית־יוסף גם־הם בית־אֵל ויהוה עמם:


## RETROVERSION

The three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are again treated as single segments 2, 3, and 4 making six segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and two following it. With dbyt ywsp counted as segment $2,{ }^{\prime} p h n w n$ as segment 3 , and $l b y t ' l$ as segment 4 , this verse of P can be divided into six segments that can be retroverted to the Hebrew, the first four to the first punctuation point and the last two following it. The second segment of P does have a $d$
which, if expressed in the retroversion, would add an element or segment to MT. This may be the way P can mirror the plur. form of $y^{c} l w$. The same is true for Tg J , but both Greek versions have oi vioí rather than ó oîkos, and it seems less likely that bny would have been changed to byt in an earlier Hebrew text than that it would have been changed in the other direction. The Greek versions may be rendering by the plur. of "sons" in order to accommodate the plur. verb in a way similar to what may be likely in the case of the $d$. The other sub-element that creates an element or sub-element in the Hebrew is the prepositional suffix $l$ in segment 4. This is the same in Tg J and reflected in A and B by cic. These are merely approaches to rendering the adverbial accusative of the MT into the languages of the versions and would not have to be reflected in a retroversion. Accordingly, the Vorlage is treated as one that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. In the discussion of retroversion above, the six segments of the Hebrew verse are identified and aligned with six corresponding segments in $P$. The sub-elements of segments 2 and 4 are explained so as to show that they are not additions but features of Syriac syntax. Thus this is a word-for-word translation of this verse of MT. The six segments of P are in the same order so that both division and sequencing are rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The conclusion that there are no additions or subtractions is supported by the foregoing discussion of this verse and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

slqw. This renders the narrative tense of $l h$. This rendering is discussed at $1: 1$, and for the reasons stated there it is rated 5 here.
byt. This renders the construct of Hebrew byt as part of a gentilic name in segment 2 and as part of a place name in segment 4. The purpose of this analysis is to study the Hebrew lemma here when it is not part of a place name. Of the fifty examples of the class of Hebrew words defined by that condition, forty-eight are translated by byt (some with pronominal suffixes), one by bny (10:9), and one not translated (19:26). In twenty-three of the fortyeight places, the word refers to a building: $8: 20 ; 11: 31,34 ; 12: 1 ; 17: 4,8,12 ; 18: 2,3,13$, $15(2 \mathrm{x}), 18,19,22(2 \mathrm{x}), 26 ; 19: 2,3,21,23,29$; and $20: 8$. For some of the foregoing, there is ambiguity so that they could mean the designation is of a household or family. In fifteen cases it probably does refer to a household, family, or some larger extension of the family (as in this verse): this verse; $1: 23,35 ; 4: 17 ; 6: 15,27 ; 8: 27,35 ; 9: 1,16,18,19 ; 11: 2 ; 16: 31$; and 18:25. In two places there is more ambiguity about whether it is a physical dwelling or a family grouping: 9:5 and 11:7. In two places it is a prison: 16:21 and 25 . In one place it refers to the captivity in Egypt ("House of Bondage"): $6: 8$. In one place it is not clear what the reference is: 19:18 (byt yhwh, thought by many to be a scribal error for byty). Even though some of these forty-eight occurrences are metaphorical rather than literal, they are all consistent renderings of the same Hebrew word and are rated 5 wherever they occur. 'mhwn. The translation of 't by this Hebrew preposition is discussed in the consideration of 1:3. In this verse Syriac ' $m$ renders Hebrew ' $m$. The same rendering occurs forty-six times, including this verse and $1: 24 ; 2: 18 ; 3: 27 ; 4: 6,8(2 x), 9(2 x), 10 ; 5: 15,20 ; 6: 12,13,16,17$; $7: 4 ; 8: 10,35(2 x) ; 9: 16(2 x), 19(2 x), 34,44,48 ; 11: 3,4,5,8,11,20,25 ; 12: 1 ; 15: 3 ; 16: 30 ;$ $18: 7,19,28 ; 19: 3,10(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 20: 14,18$, and 23 . The preposition is rendered by ' $g n b$ three times in 9:6; 18:22; and 19:11. The Syriac lwt renders the Hebrew preposition twice in 13:9 and $18: 25$. The term $l$ is used twice in $20: 28$ and 38 . In $9: 37$ Hebrew $m^{\prime} m$ is rendered by Syriac $m n$ in 9:37. In 16:13, Syriac $b$ may be rendering Hebrew ' $m$, but one must suspect the
text at this point. In Tg J , the phrase ' $m$ ' $k s n^{\prime}$ ' bmštyt' renders MT ' $m$ hmskt. In P this is represented by bmštyt?. There is no translation of the Hebrew preposition four times in 16:3; 18:3; 19:19; and 20:20. Thus P renders Hebrew ' $m$ by ' $m$ forty-six of the fifty-five times it is translated, almost $84 \%$ of the time, or forty-six out of fifty-three times if we exclude from consideration the rendering by $m n$ in 9:37 and the $b$ in 16:13. In the three places where $l$ gnb is used, the sense of the Hebrew is something in the range of "beside," "alongside," or "near." Costaz gives "alongside" as one sense of ${ }^{c} m$. ${ }^{63}$ In 13:9 where P has $l w t$, it does seem that ' $m$ would have served. Even if the range of meaning of Syriac ' $m$ would not fit in every place where there is a variant, it would have fit in some of them. To the extent that inconsistency would have been merely awkward to a translator, it would still have been an inconsistency. Accordingly the consistency of this rendering will be rated 4 here and in other places it is found.
' $p$. This is rated 5 for the reasons given in the discussion of 1:3.
This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In segment 2 , there is the addition of the relativizer $d$ that accommodates the subject to the plur. verb. Genitive construction $a$ is also present in that segment. In segment 4, the preposition $l$ provides the adverbial effect to the place name that is implicit in the Hebrew. By way of comment on what is not present in the Syriac, one may note that A and B have rendered $g m$ by каi $\gamma \varepsilon$. There is no hint of any influence of that on P .

RATING OF THE VERSE.
${ }^{63}$ L. Costaz, Dictionnaire Syiaque-Français, 255, col. 1.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The first four segments of Tg J are almost identical to those of P , but the fifth adds $m y m r^{\nu} d$, a characteristic feature of this Targum, and the sixth adds $s^{c} d$ into the prepositional phrase, also characteristic in this context. Both A and B have substituted "sons" for "house" in segment 2 and A has rendered segment 5 by Iovסac. This would make Tg J closest to P , and B closer than A. P is closest to MT.

1:23.

```
ויתירו בית־יוסף בבית־אֵל ושם־העיר לפנים לוז:
```



## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 2,3 , and 4 , there are six segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach and three following it. With byt ywsp counted as segment 2 , bbyt 'yl as segment 3 , and wšmh dqryt' as segment 4 , this verse of P can be divided into six segments corresponding to those segments, three to the first punctuation point and three following it. If one takes account of the way Hebrew is rendered into Syriac, one can retrovert the second through the sixth of those segments of P into the second through the fifth of the Hebrew segments. The first segment of P cannot be retroverted, but it can be explained as a mistake that supports the position that it is based on the first segment of MT. What is most likely to have happened is that the translator of P has mistaken the consonants of the verb for the Hiphil of $y$ tr rather than the Hiphil of $t w r$ which is a hapax legomenon in Judges. In B, ка兀єбкє́ $\psi \alpha v \tau o$ reads the Hebrew $t w r$. In Tg J , there is a
verb and direct object meaning "sent spies." Thus it is unlikely that there is evidence in these versions for a text different from that of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The division into six segments has already been shown in the discussion of retroversion. Except for the semantic inaccuracy of the first segment, all six segments of P can be seen as meant to render the six segments of MT, and the last five do. Even the first can be explained as resulting from the first segment of MT, and is not based on any intention to be either hyperliteral or free. Therefore, even though the meaning is changed, the division of the segments and the sequencing can be rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. It might be said that there is a substitution of an element as a result of an unintentional error, but there are no additions or subtractions in the sense that would affect literalism as to this mode, and it is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$p s \check{w}$. This mistaken translation by $p w s ̌$ has already been discussed. This is the only instance of $t w r$ in MT of Judges. The Hiphil of $y t r$ is not found in Judges, but the Niphal is. It is rendered in P by the Eshtaphel of ' $h r$ in 8:10 and 9:5, and by the Ethpeel of $s{ }_{s} b q$ in 21:7 and 16. This is inconsistent but gives no basis to evaluate this rendering and it is not rated here. $\check{s} m h$. This rendering of MT šem is analyzed in the discussion of 1:10 and rated 5 here for the reasons given there.
$m n$ qdym. This renders lpnym which rendering is also analyzed at 1:10 and rated 4 here for the reasons given there.

The two terms rated here yield a 4.5 for this mode in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The inaccuracy of the rendering of the verb in this verse that must result from reading an unvocalized text has features that make it similar to Barr's mode 6 . Thus it is clearly a departure from what would be literal here..

The genitive construction of segment 2 is an example of genitive construction $a$ and the construction of segment 4 is an example of genitive construction $c$. Here as in 1:22, the particle $d$ is a relativizer that makes it possible to treat that segment as a plur. subject of the verb.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5. (This is qualified by the departure from literalism in mode 1 at segment 1.)

## COMPARISON OF TG J, A, AND B

Codex B does not translate byt ywsp and A renders by oîkoç Iбpaŋ $\lambda$. Except for segment 1, Tg J is closest to P. Since there are several other differences between A and B, the effort to calculate which is closer to P is not considered susceptible of any clear conclusion.

ויראו השמרים איש יוצא מן־העֵיר ויאמרו לו הראנו נא את־מבוא העיר ועשינו עמך חסד:
חשם هw
Rusura

## RETROVERSION

If the division into segments is made here as in previous verses by treating the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph as segments 5 and 10, there are fourteen segments in the verse of MT, five to the athnach, and nine following it. With $m n q r y t^{\prime}$ counted as segment $5,{ }^{\prime} y n^{\prime}$ $h w$ counted as an addition at the point where segment 9 of MT occurs, the absence of any rendering of segment 9 of MT counted as a subtraction, and $m^{\prime} l n^{\prime}$ as segment 10 , thirteen of these fourteen segments can be retroverted to thirteen of MT in light of what we can understand about the way P renders Hebrew, but the ninth segment of P presents a problem for retroversion. At this point, P has ' $y n$ ' $h w$, and that most probably cannot be retroverted to $n^{\prime}$, segment 9 of MT. Twenty-nine other places where $n^{\prime}$ occurs in MT have been examined (and cited below in the discussion of mode 3), and none of them appear to have been rendered by P. (Possible suggestions are noted there below.) The Targum renders this particle by $k^{n} n$, but A and B do not render it here. Thus one need not suspect that the Hebrew Vorlage was lacking this particle or had some other element for which there is now no textual evidence. Rather one suspects that this is a case of free translation: "Show us which is the entrance." Although there is no evidence in the textual notes, another possibility would be ' $y k$ ', where is. Accordingly, this will be treated as both an addition and a subtraction in $\mathrm{P},{ }^{64}$ and the Vorlage will be treated as one that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The thirteen elements already discussed are divided and sequenced in a way that could be rated as a 5. However this is not like a situation where all of the elements or segments in MT are

[^96]represented and one is added. The use of 'yn' $h w$ is not seen as intended, even mistakenly, to render $n^{\prime}$ and this would mean that segment 9 of the MT verse is not represented and that P is making an addition that adds to the explicit meaning of the verse, however slightly. Since it is only $7 \%$ of the verse, it would have little effect on the rating, but in order to show that this aspect of this mode is not as literal in its division into elements as are most verses rated 5 in this mode, it will be rated 5-. The sequence of the segments of P follows the same sequence as the segments of MT and that aspect of this mode is rated 5. The mode in this verse is rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The conclusion that the elements of $P$ that stand in the place of segment 9 in MT should be treated as one subtraction and one addition has been stated just above. This will be considered two-fourteenths of the verse making the literal portion of the verse just under $86 \%$ of the verse and rating this mode at 4 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$h z w$. The Qal of $r h$ is rendered thirty-four times by this root: in this verse and 2:7; 3:24; 6:22(2x); 7:17; 9:36(2x), 43, 48, 55; 11:35; 12:3; 13:19, 20, 22; 14:1, 2, 8, 11; 16:1, 5, 18, 24,$27 ; 18: 7,9,26 ; 19: 3,17,30(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 20: 36,41$; and $21: 21$. The Niphal is rendered six times by some form of this root in $5: 8 ; 6: 12 ; 13: 3,10,21$; and 19:30(1x). The Hiphil of $r h$ is rendered four times by the Pael of $h w^{\prime}$, in this verse and $1: 25 ; 4: 22$; and 13:23. All of these renderings would rate 5 in every place in which they are found in Judges. $n t \not w r$. This renders šmrym in this verse and some form of the same root four other times in 2:22(2x); 7:19; and 13:14. The two occurrences of the Niphal of $\check{s} m r$ are rendered by the Ethpeel of $z h r$ in 13:4 and 13. The Niphal is usually translated reflexively. ${ }^{65}$ The entries in

JPS and Costaz support a conclusion that a passive or reflexive form of ntr would not reflect the sense of the Niphal of $\check{s} m r$ and that the Ethpeel of $z h r$ does. ${ }^{66}$ The Targum renders by $n t \underset{r}{ }$ where P does and by the Ithpael of $s m r$ in 13:4 and 13. Based on this, the renderings of the Niphal will not be treated as inconsistent with the renderings of the Qal, but will not be rated because of the small size of the sample. The renderings of the Qal by this root will be rated 5 wherever they occur.
$g b r$. This renders the sing. of Hebrew 'yš here. In the analysis of 1:4, the renderings of this Hebrew noun are analyzed. In that analysis there are forty-nine instances where the sing. of the Hebrew is rendered by this Syriac sing. See that discussion for the other renderings. Here this rendering will be rated 4 for the reasons given there.
$n p q$. This translates the Qal participle $y w s^{\prime}$ here and by various forms of the Qal of that root, forty two other times, in $2: 15 ; 3: 10,22,23,24 ; 4: 14,18,22 ; 5: 4,31 ; 8: 30 ; 9: 15,20(2 x), 27$, $29,33,35,38,39,42,43 ; 11: 3,31(1 x), 34,36 ; 13: 14 ; 14: 14(2 x) ; 15: 19 ; 16: 20 ; 19: 23,27$; $20: 1,14,21,25,28,31 ; 21: 21(2 x)$ and 24 . In $3: 19$ it is rendered by a form of $p r q$ and it is not represented in one of its two occurrences in 11:31 or in 20:20 (the missing verse). Thus in forty-three of forty-four places where it is translated it is rendered by this Syriac verb, almost $98 \%$ of those places and rated 5 in all the places where it is so rendered.. $q r y t$. This translates $y r$ twice in this verse and in the forty-six other places in Judges where the sing. is found. See the analysis at $1: 8$ where this is rated 5 in all places where it is found in Judges.
$h ̣ w n$. See the analysis of $h z w$ above. This rendering will not be rated separately in this verse.

[^97]$m^{\wedge} l n^{\prime}$. This translates $m b w^{\nu}$ here and in the next verse and so there is not an adequate sample to evaluate consistency. In $1: 14$, the rendering of the Qal infinitive of this root is rated at 1 and this means that the analysis there would provide little guidance here.
$n^{2}$. This is the Hebrew particle that has been determined to be not represented in the Syriac of this verse. Thirty instances of this Hebrew in Judges were studied and none of them were found to have been rendered. They will be cited here with a question mark following the citation where there might be some argument that they are represented in P , but no such argument has been accepted here. Thus Hebrew $n^{\prime}$ has been found in this verse of MT and in $4: 19 ; 6: 17,39(1 \mathrm{x}, 1 ?) ; 7: 3 ; 8: 5 ; 9: 2,38(?) ; 10: 15 ; 11: 17,19 ; 12: 6 ; 13: 3,4,8,15 ; 14: 12$; $15: 2 ; 16: 6,10,28: 18: 5(?) ; 19: 6,8,9(2 x), 11,23$, and 24 . It is not rated here even though it might be seen as a novel example of consistency. This does however provide support for the conclusion that the Syriacin this verse is not rendering that particle.
$n^{\prime} b d$. This renders 's'h here and is rated 5 in the discussion of its rendering in 1:7. Based on that reasoning, it is rated 5 here.
${ }^{\prime} m k$. This preposition was considered as a rendering of $b$ in the discussion of 1:1 and of the preposition ' $t$ in the discussion of $1: 3$. Here it renders Hebrew ' $m$ and that use was discussed in considering 1:22 where it was rated 4 for every place where it is so rendered.
$\check{s l m}$ '. This translates $h \underset{s}{ } d$ only here and in 8:35 of Judges. That Hebrew noun is rendered by tybwt in 8:35. Perhaps this term should not be expected to be used very often in Judges. In any case there are too few examples to rate it here.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The substitution of another phrase for $n^{\prime}$ has already been discussed. Here it might be pointed out that Tg J translates in all these places except 12:6 and once in 16:28, and does so invariably by $k^{c} n$. Even in places
where Tg J is rendering instances in MT where both $n$ ' and 'th are found, the rendering is $k^{\prime} n$ as in $7: 3 ; 13: 4$; and 16:10.

In each of the segments 3,10 , and 14 there is an instance of direct object construction d. Only the second one of these instances has the direct object marker in MT. In segment 4 of MT the participle is related adjectivally to segment 3 without any preposition or conjunction, but in P , the participle is put into a relative clause that is adjectival, by the addition of the $d$ prefix. In segments 10 and 11 , there is an instance of genitive construction b.

Williams has concluded that it is rare to find waw plus a participle of ' $m r$, although he finds an exception for renderings of the narrative tense or the infinitive following a verb that has something to do with speech. Here there is a narrative tense, but no preceding verb involving speech, but the waw is preserved before the participle anyway. ${ }^{67}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is quite close to P , differing mainly in being closer to MT , not adding the $d$ of segment 4 and rendering the particle $n^{\prime}$. Both A and B add каi č $\lambda \alpha \beta o v \alpha v ̇ \tau o ̀ v ~ a n d ~ B ~ a l s o ~$ adds i$i \delta o v i . ~ O f ~ t h e ~ t w o ~ t h e n, ~ A ~ i s ~ c l o s e r ~ t o ~ P . ~$

1:25.

[^98]

## RETROVERSION

If the four pairs of elements joined by maqqeph are treated again as single segments $2,5,6$, and 7 , and the set of three elements joined by two maqqēphs treated as segment 8 , there are nine segments in this verse of MT, six segments to the athnach and three following it. With $m^{\prime} l n^{\prime}$ counted as segment 2 , lqryt $t^{\prime}$ as segment $5, b p w m^{\prime} d h r b^{\prime}$ as segment 6 , and $w l g b r^{\prime}$ as segment 8 , this verse of P can be divided into nine segments plus an added $h w$ after segment 8, three to the first punctuation point, three more to the second point, and three more plus the addition to the final point. The first six segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the samenumbered segments of MT, taking account of the characteristic syntactical differences between translation Syriac and Biblical Hebrew. If the $h w$ is set aside for the moment, the final three segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT, treating $w l k l h s ̌ r b t h$ as segment 8 . While the added $h w$ can be treated as a device to make clear that $g b r^{\prime}$ is definite and thus considered part of the retroversion to ' $t-h h^{\prime} y s{ }^{\prime}$, here it will be considered an addition, and not based on a Vorlage in which Hebrew $h h w$ was present at that point. Accordingly, no Vorlage that is alternative to MT is assumed here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The division into segments proposed in the discussion of the retroversion produces nine segments in MT as it also does in P if the addition of $h w$ between segments 7 and 8 is set aside. Thus this verse of P , apart from the addition is a word for word translation of this verse of MT. They are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT and this mode is rated 5 for both division and sequencing.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The addition of $h w$ has been noted and will be treated as $11 \%$ of the verse while recognizing it adds only a small element and does not change the meaning of the verse. This mode is therefore rated 4. The addition is also considered in the discussion of mode 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$h w y$. This was analyzed in the discussion of the rendering of $r^{\prime} h$ by $h z^{\prime}$ at 1:24 and is rated 5 here for the reasons stated there.
$m^{\prime} l n^{\prime}$. This was analyzed in the discussion of 1:24 and is not rated either here or there.
qryt'. The rendering by this word of Hebrew ' $y r$ is analyzed at $1: 8$ and rated 5 based on that consideration.
$m h w$. The rendering of the Hiphil of $n k h$ by this verb is first found in 1:8 and the consistency of the rendering of that Hebrew is analyzed in the discussion of $1: 4$ where it is rated 1 as it will also be rated here.
$p w m^{\prime}$. This renders the construct of $p h$ here, and the same rendering is analyzed as part of the discussion of $1: 8$ where it was rated 5 for reasons that support the same rating here. $h r b^{\prime}$. This translates Hebrew $h r b$ and that translation is analyzed at $1: 8$ where it is rated 1 as it will be here based on that analysis.
$g b r^{\prime}$. This renders the sing. of ' $y s s^{\prime}$ analyzed in the discussion of 1:4. It is rated 4 here for the reasons stated there.
$\check{s r} r$ th. This translates mšpḥtw seven times: in this verse and in $9: 1 ; 13: 2 ; 18: 2,11,19$; and 21:24. The same Hebrew word is not translated where it occurs in 17:7. This degree of consistency rates 5 in every place where it is translated.
$\check{s} b q w h y$. This renders the Piel of $\check{s} l h$ in this verse and in 15:5. In 1:8 and 20:48 the Aphel of $y q d$ renders the Piel of $\check{s} l h ̣$ as $\check{s} d r$ does in 2:6 and 5:15 (here only the Pual of $\check{s l h}$ ). The Piel is
rendered by $\check{s} r$ in $3: 18$ and 7:8 and by the Aphel of $n p q$ in 12:9 and 19:25. The same Hebrew verb is translated by $\check{s} d^{\prime}$ in 19:29 and 20:6. Out of eleven instances of the Piel and one of the Pual, six different Syriac verbs each render this form only twice. Thus as at $1: 8$ for the rendering by the Aphel of $y q d$, this rendering will be rated 1.

The rating for this mode for this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Williams discusses the addition of a demonstrative in P in situations like the one that we find in this verse where $h w$ is added. He says:
"Sometimes it is clear that this is necessary because of the lack of a definite article in Syriac. As we have seen definiteness can be marked by a genitive construction, with suffixed $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, by an object construction, and of course by the use of possessive suffixes on words. However, in some situations these ways of marking cannot be used. In these cases the demonstrative pronoun must be used to mark definiteness.

He cites examples from $1 \mathrm{Kgs} 3: 22$ and 3:26 in particular, but also from 1:41, 3:10, 8:44, and 10:37. ${ }^{68}$ This addition in this verse of Judges is another example.

There are two examples of genitive construction $b$, one in segments 2 and 3 and one in segment 6. There is also an example of $k l$ with a masculine sing. pronominal suffix preceding a noun in segment 8 . Finally, there is one direct object construction $d$ in segments 2 and 3 and three examples of direct object construction $e$, one in segment 5 , and two in segments 7 and 8 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
${ }^{68}$ P. J. Williams, Syntax of Peshitta of 1 Kgs, 177.

In this verse, Tg J is farthest from P , because it renders py by ptgm (trading one metaphor for another), and also, perhaps, because it renders $\check{s} l h ̣$ by $\check{s} y z b$ (apparently not capturing the sense of "let go" or "spare" that could belong here, and certainly not "send away" if that is the sense). Versions A and B are closer to P with $\sigma \tau o ́ \mu \alpha$ and $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \in \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha$ as well as with $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \alpha \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$, assuming that is an indication that $\check{s} b q$ should be treated as meaning "send away" which would be closer to the Piel of šlh. The points at which A and B differ do not bear on their comparability to P and so they will be deemed similarly comparable.

וילך האיש ארץ החתֵים ויבן עיר ויקרא שמה לוז הוא שמה עד היום הזה:

$\therefore$ rusad

## RETROVERSION

Here there are no maqqēphs in MT and so there are fourteen elements and fourteen segments, four to the athnach and ten following it. All fourteen are represented in P, but the thirteenth and fourteenth of the Hebrew are represented by a single segment: lywmn'. Between the eleventh segment of P , representing the eleventh segment of MT and the segment of P representing the twelfth segment of $\mathrm{MT}, \mathrm{P}$ has added dqryt, not numbered as a segment in discussion of this verse, but referred to as an addition.. The thirteen segments of Prepresenting the fourteen of MT can be retroverted into the verse of MT. Neither Tg J, A, B or the Vulgate show this repetition of $y r$ where it is added by P and it is omitted by some Syriac manuscripts. Thus it is treated here as an addition. As was seen in 1:21, Hebrew hywm hzh, segments 13 and 14 of MT, can be rendered by $y w m n^{\prime}$ in Syriac. The contraction
of $h w h w$ into $h w y w$ as the representation of the tenth segment is a feature of Syriac translation technique. The Vorlage of P is treated as indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. As the discussion of the retroversion shows, $P$ represents the fourteen segments of MT in thirteen segments. As in $1: 21$, the fact that $y w m n^{\prime}$ is a single element is not treated here as failure to divide the verse literally since the phrase hywm hzh in MT is in effect just as much a single unit as the Syriac and especially so since the Syriac term is a compound of the two elements in MT. Therefore this verse of P can be seen as a word for word translation of this verse of MT. The elements are in the same sequence in P as in MT and the addition is ignored as a factor for rating this mode, so it is rated 5 both for division and sequence.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The second $q r y t$ in P is an addition. Since this is only a little over $7 \%$ of the existing verse, it does not reduce the rating below 5 , but a minus will be attached to reflect this circumstance.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

${ }^{\prime} z l$. This translates hlk here and in eighty-eight other places cited in the discussion of 1:3 where it was rated 5- as to all those places.
$g b r^{\prime}$. As in 1:24 and 1:25, this rendering of ' $y s$ s is rated 4.
${ }^{\prime} r^{\prime}$ '. This renders 'rṣ in P in the fifty-seven of sixty places where it occurs in MT of Judges. The other three places have no translation in P. See 1:2 for a discussion of these details. It is rated 5 in every place where it translates the Hebrew translated here.
$b n^{\prime}$. This renders $b n h$ here and in $6: 24,26,28 ; 18: 28 ; 21: 4$ and 23 . It is rated 5 here and in all six other places where it is so rendered.
qryt'. See the discussion at 1:8 where the analysis supports the rating of this rendering at 5 .
$q r^{r}$. The rendering of the Hebrew cognate by this Syriac term is discussed at $1: 17$ where it is rated 5 in every place where this rendering occurs.
$\check{s m h}$. This translates Hebrew šmh twice here as this Syriac term in various forms renders its Hebrew cognate in the seventeen other places where it is found in MT. See the analysis made at $1: 10$ where it is rated 5 as to all nineteen of these places.
${ }^{\prime} d m$ ' $l$. See the discussion at $1: 21$ where this rendering of Hebrew ' $d$ is rated 5 as to every place where it is rendered in P as it is here.
$y w m n$. Based on the consideration given to the rendering by this word in 1:21, this is rated 5 here.

The rating of this mode for this verse is 5 . 4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The adverbial accusative ' $r \underline{s}$ is rendered by the prepositional phrase $l^{\prime} r^{\prime}$. In ' $r^{\prime}$ ' dhty $t y^{\prime}$ there is an example of genitive construction $b$, and in $\check{s ̌ m h}$ dqryt, genitive construction $c$, but of course the latter is not a rendering of a phrase of MT, but of the word šmh to which P has added $d q r y t^{\circ}$ already understood in the pronominal suffix. There are two examples of direct object construction $d$, one in qryt' of segment 6, and the other in the šmh of segment 8. The rendering of Hebrew $h w$ by $h w y w$ has already been noted and is an example of the Syriac penchant for enclitic personal pronouns as copulas, but it makes the translation less literal even if it does not affect the meaning of the verse. As earlier discussion has already noted, $y w m n^{\prime}$ can be treated as a close equivalent of hywm hzh.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5 (noting that the addition adds a minus to the rating of mode 2).

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The Targum is closest to P of the three, but closer to MT. A and B are also quite similar, but both add $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \varepsilon i ̂$. They both render $h w^{j} \check{s} m h$ as verbless clauses without a copula, in contrast to P, making them closer to Tg J and MT. The differences between A and B offer little to differentiate them in comparison with P .

1:27. ולא־הוריש מנשה את־בית־שאן ואת־בנותיה ואת־תענך ואת־בנתיה ואת־ישב דור ואת־בנותיה ואת־יושבי יבלעם ואת־בנתיה ואת־יושבי מגדו ואת־בנותיה ויואל הכנעני לשבת בארץ הזאת: a -di.. ,

## RETROVERSION

When the ten pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments $1,4,5,6,7$, $9,10,12,13$, and 15 , and the set of three elements joined by two maqqēphs is counted as segment 3 , there are twenty segments in this verse, fifteen to the athnach and five following it. The Qere is in segment seven and is ישבי. With the question of segment 16 yet to be discussed (where Syriac $w l^{\prime}$ 'št $t b d$ represents MT $w y w^{\prime} l$ ), the other nineteen segments line up with their source in MT, with segment 7, for example, wlytby, representing the Qere of segment 7 of MT, and with segments $4,6,9,12$, and 15 of P representing wt bnwtyh (segments 6 and 12 of the Hebrew having the holem defectively written) by wlkprwnyh. The rendering by P of the place name in segment 11 by $^{\text {' }}$ byn'm is difficult to explain since it seems to be the name of Barak's father in 4:6 and Barak's family is from Kedesh in Naphtali at
some distance from Ibleam. Some confusion between lamad and nun in the Syriac text might possibly be behind this rendering. It will be considered a mistake here without deciding whether it arose in translation or in transmission of the text. Segment 20, hy for $h z^{\prime} t$ is taken as a feature of the use of demonstratives in Syriac and not of an underlying $h y^{\prime}$ in the source, noting that A and B have $\tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta$ and Tg J has $h d^{\prime}$. The rendering of bnwt by kprwn' is a feature of the translation and not a different source. Smelik comments about the same choice by Tg J: "The metaphor בת for territories is equated to כפרא. The same translation is to be found for in 10:4." ${ }^{69}$ The Vulgate has viculis.

Segment 16 in P , understood here as meaning (with segments 17 to 20): "but the Canaanite was not restrained from living/staying in that/this land." The RSV renders MT: "but the Canaanites persisted in dwelling in that land." This is accurate if one accepts the rendering of the collective gentilic by a plur. Smelik, possibly influenced by A and B, renders Tg J wšry $k n^{\prime} n^{\prime} h l m t b b^{\prime} r^{(s)} h d^{\prime}$ as "so the Canaanite began to settle in that land." ${ }^{70}$ Although the D stem of šry can be read "begin," it might be better here to read "be pleased/willing," even "consented/decided." ${ }^{71}$ The renderings of $y w / l$ by $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg}$ J, A and B are all treated here as paraphrases rather than based on a source that differs from MT. Those of A and B as well as of Tg J , if its rendering is treated as "begin," are all inaccurate. The rendering of P and the rendering of Tg J suggested here are not literal but do not substantially change the understanding of the Hebrew of MT. The slant given by P is probably theologically based, implying that they were the beneficiaries of tolerance rather than those who protected themselves against expulsion.
${ }^{69}$ Smelik, Targum of Judges, 346n 146.
${ }^{70}$ Ibid., 346.
${ }^{71}$ D. M. Gropp, Dictionary to Targums Onqelos and Jonathan (Privately circulated: 2004), 295.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Once the issues about the relation between P and MT are resolved, the division into twenty segments follows for all the segments except the eleventh and the sixteenth. Segment 11 of P is treated as an error intended to render segment 11 of MT. Segment 16 represents a slightly different problem from the one involving $n^{\prime}$ in 1:24. There the failure to render the Hebrew and the insertion of a new element (however much in harmony with the sense of the verse) could not be treated as representing anything more than a holding of a place in the text. Here P's segment 16 provides the information provided by the Hebrew it represents, albeit with a slightly different slant. Thus it is more in the nature of a feature of mode 4 and will be treated as such here. However, it is arguable that this could be considered a case of free translation and therefore a minus will be shown for the segmentation aspect of this mode. In that case P's segment 16 is taken as representing the same segment in MT. The sequence of the segments of P is the same as the sequence of the same-numbered segments of MT and rated 5. This mode is rated 5- both as to division and sequence.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Although there may be features of translation to be discussed under mode 4 , there are no additions or subtractions in this verse of P , and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$h r b$. This renders the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ here and in $1: 19$. There this rendering was rated 1 as it is here for the reasons given there.
$k p r w n y h$. This instance of the plur. of $k p r w n^{\prime}$ with the 3 rd feminine sing. suffix renders the plur. of $b t$ with the corresponding suffix five times in this verse. The translation of the sing. is analyzed in the discussion of $1: 12$. The same rendering of the plur. of $b t$ used in this verse is
also found twice in 11:26. In eleven places where it is rendering a reference to human daughters, it is rendered by bnn or $\operatorname{bnt}\left({ }^{\prime}\right): 3: 6(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 11: 40 ; 12: 9(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 14: 1,2,3 ; 21: 18$, and $21(2 x)$. In 21:7 of $P$ there is no rendering of an instance of the plur. Thus in seven places where there is a references to villages as dependent on a more important town, the rendering is by this word. In eleven of the places that are translated and where the reference is to human daughters, the rendering is by a plur. form of brt. Either translation would be consistent in its context and is rated 5.
$y t b y$. This translates $y(w) s \check{s} b y$ three times in this verse and the participle of the same root is also translated by the same Syriac root. As shown in the discussion of 1:9 all the occurrences of this Hebrew verb are translated by the same Syriac verb and thus rated 5.
'št'bd. This Syriac appears meant to render the Hiphil of $y l l$ in this verse. In 1:35 that Hebrew verb is rendered by the Ethpeel of pys, as it also is in 17:11. In 19:11 it is rendered by $s b^{\prime}$. These are considered inconsistent and rated 1. Furthermore, in this verse the rendering is semantically inaccurate even though the inaccuracy only slightly affects the meaning of the verse.
' $r{ }^{\prime}$. This was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:2 and the conclusions reached there apply here.
This mode in this verse is rated 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In the rendering of bnwt by $k p r w n$ " there is a good example of this mode as intended by Barr where "literal translations preserves the metaphor, free translation renders the further significance of the metaphor, but destroys the actual metaphor itself., ${ }^{\text {,72 }}$

Setting aside the proper name Beth-shean, there are three examples of genitive construction $a$ where P renders by $y t b y$. There are ten examples of direct object construction

[^99]$e$ and all are found in P where the Hebrew direct object marker is used by MT. The exclusive use of these two constructions by P gives the verse a more formal similarity to the source than is typically seen where there are construct chains and direct objects so marked as such.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The Targum is closer to P , although it has added $d b y t$ before $m n s ̌ h$. If $\check{s} r y$ is rendered as suggested above rather than in accord with A and B as Smelik has done, Tg J would be paraphrasing segment 16 in a way somewhat closer to P . Versions A and B render $y w^{\circ} l$ by $\eta \mathrm{\eta} \rho \xi \alpha \tau$, but make several major additions as well, B more than A, so B is farthest from P.

1:28. ויהי כי־חזק ישראל וישם את־הכנעני למֵס והוריש לא הורישו:


## RETROVERSION

If the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as segments 2 and 5, then there are nine segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and three following it. If the first two segments of P are counted as representing the first two of MT in a way similar to 1:14 and if $l k n^{\prime} n y^{\prime}$ is counted as segment 5 , then all nine segments of this verse of MT are also represented in P . As in the first two segments of $1: 14$, the result is that the temporal clause is no longer part of a clause that is dependent on a verb in segment 1 and thus formally independent of the apodosis, but part of a clause dependent on the following apodosis, the
main clause in what is now a single complex sentence. That main clause in P does not begin as in MT with a waw suffix to segment 4. Instead segment 4 begins the main clause in a complex sentence to which the clause in the first three segments is now subordinate. If those features of Syriac translation technique are applied, the verse can be retroverted to the verse of MT if segments 4 to 6 of $P$ can be retroverted to the corresponding segments 4 to 6 of MT. According to TDOT, $m s$, segment 6 in this verse, 1:33 and 35 refers "to groups among the Canaanite population who were subjected to compulsory service after the conquest of their areas." ${ }^{" 73}$ In JPS, $k b s s^{\prime} n w n ~ b m d t$ ' is defined as "he compelled them to pay tribute, reduced them to the condition of tributaries." ${ }^{.74}$ Costaz specifies that $m d^{\prime} t$ ' includes "corvée or statute-labour., ${ }^{75}$ Although Brockelmann does not cite this verse,, he renders this term as tributum. ${ }^{76}$ Accordingly this verse of P can be retroverted to the verse of MT and its source will be considered indistinguishable from the MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Although the division of segments 1 and 2 in P does not line up exactly with a verse like this, the segments are as close as they might be considering the modification of the syntax. It could be argued that wkd corresponds to wyhy ky and 'thyl to hazq. As at 1:14 this is treated as a word for word translation and the departure from strict literalism is considered a factor that affects the modes of literalism covered by mode 4 . As will be seen at 5:4 and 31 , similar usages can be rendered more literally by P , but since those are in a poetic passage they may be unique

[^100]there and are not considered a model for other chapters of Judges. All of the elements are in the same order in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 both as to division and sequence.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none in this verse, but there are features that need to be identified in the discussion of mode 4 . This mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$k d$. The rendering of various uses of Hebrew $k y$ was considered in the discussion of 1:19. All of the places considered there where $k d$ rendered $k y$ were in contexts where $k y$ was used as a temporal conjunction. It is not rated here.
'thyl. The Ethpaal of this root renders the Qal of $h z q$ here and at $7: 11$. This will not be rated here, but will be considered further when the rendering of the Piel of $h z q$ is analyzed at 3:12. $k b s ̌$. This translates the Qal narrative tense of śsm only here. The Hebrew is rendered by its Syriac cognate swm a total of ten times in Judges: in 6:19(1x); 7:22; 8:31; 9:24, 48, 49; 12:3; 16:3; 18:19 and 31. The Hebrew verb is rendered three times by the verb kmn: twice in the Aphel in 9:25 and 20:29; and once in the Ethpeel in 20:36. The same Hebrew is rendered by 'ḥd in 4:21; by the Aphel of $r m$ ' in 6:19(1x); by šmy in $8: 31$; by $q w m$ in 11:11; by 'sr in 15:4; and by the Ethpeel of $r^{(r)}$ in 19:30. It is not translated in 18:21. Out of the twenty times it is translated, it is translated at most ten times by a form of śwm. Thus its consistency in Judges is rated 1 as it certainly must be here.
$m d^{\prime} t$. This renders $m s$ here and in $1: 30,33$, and 35 . This would give it a rating of 5 . $m w b d w$ and ' $w b d h$. The Aphel of ' $b d$ renders the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ twice in this verse. The rendering of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ is discussed at $1: 19$ and the rendering by this root is rated 4 there as it is here for the same reasons.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. This verse converts the two opening independent clauses of the MT into a complex sentence in P with the subordinate clause first, which is then followed by the main clause without the waw that joined the two clauses in MT. A similar approach by P to a similar construction in MT was discussed at 1:14. The contrast with the Syriac syntax at 5:4 and 31 was noted in discussing mode 1. In segments 4 and 5 of P there is an example of direct object construction $f$. Both Israel and Canaanite are render as sing. and thus in a way that is more strictly literal than is usual in the case of gentilic nouns.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is not as close to P in this verse as are A and B , because it has added $l m s q y$ and made the final finite verb and its pronominal suffix plur. The two Greek versions have no additions or subtractions and only differ in how they render swm. This difference does not give an adequate basis to find one of them closer to P than the other.

1:29.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ואפרים לא הוריש את־הכנעני היושב בגגזר וישב הכנעני בקרבו בגזר: }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 4 this verse of MT has ten segments, six segments to the athnach and four following it If $l k n^{\prime} n y$ is counted as segment

4 of P , there are also ten segments in this verse of P , six to the first punctuation point and four to the second. The first six segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the first six of MT and the last four of $P$ to the last four of MT. The plur. forms of segments 7 to 9 of $P$ follow a pattern familiar from earlier verses already studied where gentilic nouns in the sing. in MT are often rendered in P by the plur. Targum J has plur. forms throughout this verse, but A and B have sing. Its variation between sing. and plur. distinguishes P here, but does not support an emendation of the source text when consideration is given to the inconsistency of P in this respect as well as to the inconsistency in this respect found in the other versions in this verse. An important consideration is the fact that the plur. forms do not change the meaning of those segments in a verse like this. Thus the source relied on by the P translator cannot be distinguished from the text of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as in MT. The Peshitta is literal as to both aspects of this mode and will be rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
'wbd. See the discussion of this rendering of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ by the Aphel of ' $b d$ in the previous verse and $1: 19$. As there, it is rated 4 here.
$y t b$ and ' $y t b w$. See the discussion at 1:9 and 1:27 of the rendering by this verb of its Hebrew cognate. It is also rated 5 here.
bynthwn. This renders bqrbw here and (with variations as to suffix) in 1:32; 3.5; and 10:16. To this should be added the byt of 1:33 which is merely the contraction of bynt. In 1:30 and

18:20, it is rendered by ' $m$, and in 18:7 by bgw plus suffix. Possibly the translator saw some varying nuance of meaning, but that possibility can hardly exist as to the variation in the next verse. Accordingly, with five of eight renderings like the one in this verse, the consistency of this rendering is calculated at $62.5 \%$ and rated 2 in all five of those places and 1 in the other three places.

This mode in this verse is rated 3.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of segments 4 to 6 of MT by lkn'ny dytb bgzr, unlike renderings of similar phrases in 1:17 and 1:21 follows the pattern of the rendering of the Hebrew in Syriac at 1:10 except that the sing. of MT is guarded by P in this verse. In segment 4, P shows an example of direct object construction $e$ where the Hebrew has the direct object marker.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
All four versions are similar but Tg J has added dbyt before segment 1 and thereby turned the sing. subject into the plur. Both A and B are without additions and have kept the sing. form. They differ only as to the tense of катонќ่ (A imperf. and B aorist). Thus they will be treated as similarly comparable and somewhat closer to P than Tg J .

1:30.
זבולן לא הוריש את־יושבי קטרון ואת־יושבי נהלֵל וישב הכנעני בקרבו ויהיו למס: חוحחת ,

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 4 and 6, there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and five following it. With lytby counted as segment 4 and wlytby as segment 6 , there are also twelve segments in this verse of P, seven to the first punctuation point and five more to the last, strong punctuation point. Segment 1 of P has an added waw, segment 7 begins with a yod rather than a nun as in MT, segments 8,9 , and 11 are plur. rather than sing. as in MT, segment 10 of $P$ has a different preposition from the preposition that renders the identical Hebrew in 1:29, and segment 11 of P uses the verb with the same root as that in 1:28 while the Hebrew verb that was a form of śwm has become a form of hyh.

The initial waw can be explained by noting what Williams has observed about P of 1 Kings. Where Hebrew prose has non-sequential clauses not introduced by waw, the tendency is for P to add one at the beginning of the clause. ${ }^{77}$ This would explain the first issue and is then consistent with retroverting the segment into Hebrew without a waw. It might be added here that this can be understood along with the phenomenon already noted about the omission of waw when P renders two independent clauses as a complex sentence without placing waw between the subordinate and main clauses when it recasts the first clause into a subordinate clause. Here there is a contrasting situation where P is showing that a nonsequential clause is nevertheless an independent clause.

The yod-nun confusion in proper names is common in P , whether by intention or otherwise, and need not prevent the retroversion of segment 7. The plur. forms like those at segments 4,6 , and 9 are all found in this verse in Tg J , and it is not unusual to find such

[^101]inconsistencies in P , so that phenomenon should not stand in the way of retroverting segments 8,9 , and 11 of P into the corresponding segments of MT. The use of the preposition ' $m$ to render the same Hebrew preposition that was rendered by bynt in the previous verse is puzzling as a mode 3 issue, but it is still a preposition that can be retroverted to the Hebrew. In the final clause of segments 11 to 12 it is the tributaries who are the subjects rather than the objects of the verb as in 1:28. The verb in P has become the Ethpeel of the root that was in the Peal in 1:28. This can explain its relation to the Hebrew that it is rendering and allow for a retroversion even though P's rendering may not be considered literal. Accordingly, the source of P will be assumed to be a text that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse in P has 12 identifiable elements or segments that line up with the segments identified for MT. Segments 1 to 10 are considered a word for word translation here, but segments 11 and 12 are considered a free translation since they go beyond the limits set by the translation of segments 4 and 5 at $1: 28$. Therefore the literal quality of the segmentation aspect of this mode is reduced to a fraction over $85 \%$ and rated 4 . The segments of P are in the same sequence as those of MT, so this aspect of this mode are rated 5, and the mode itself is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
${ }^{\prime} w b d$. This rendering of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ is discussed in the previous two verses and in 1:19 and is rated 4 here as it was in those places.
$y t b y$ and ' $y t b w$. The consistency of this rendering of forms of Hebrew $y \check{s} b$ was first considered in the discussion of 1:9 and has recurred many times since. Here as in all those places it is rated 5 .
$' m h$. This has been considered as a rendering of Hebrew $b$, of ${ }^{\prime} t$, and ${ } \quad m$. Here it renders bqrb. The rendering of that Hebrew was discussed in considering the previous verse 1:29 and this rendering was rated 1 there.
'tkbšw and $m d^{\prime} t{ }^{\prime}$. Both these terms were analyzed in the discussion of $1: 28$. The verb $k b s ̌$ as a rendering of $l k d$ is considered at $1: 8$. It will be rated 1 as a rendering of $h y h$ and $m d^{\prime} t^{\prime}$ will be rated 5 .

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The addition of the initial waw to introduce the non-sequential independent clause was noted in the discussion of retroversion as was the nun-yod confusion in the place name. The discrepancy between the preservations of the sing. in the first seven segments and the switch to the plur. in the last five should be noted. In segments 4 and 6 there are two examples of direct object construction $e$ where the Hebrew rendered has the direct object marker. In those two segments and the segment following each of them there is an example of genitive construction $a$. Both of these constructions are the most literal ways to render the source in Syriac.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Here as in 1:28 Tg J has added lmsqy and as in 1:29 added dbyt and rendered the sing. forms by the plur. making it less similar to P . Both A and B add $\kappa \alpha i$ at the beginning of the verse as
$P$ does, but $A$ is otherwise closer to $P$ than $B$ since $B$ renders the sing. pronominal suffix by a


## אשר לא הוריש את־ישבי עכו ואת־יושבי צידֵון ואת־אחלב ואת־אכזיב ואת־חלבה ואת־אפיק ואת־רחב: . 1:31 <br> 

## RETROVERSION

The initial waw was explained in the discussion of the previous verse. With the seven pairs of segments joined by maqqēph counted as segments $4,6,8,9,10,11$, and 13 , there are twelve segments in this verse of P , seven to the athnach and five segments that follow it. With lytby, wlytby, wlhbl, wl'yzbl, wlhlb', wl'pq, and wlrḥwb counted as segments $4,6,8,9,10,11$, and 13, there are also twelve segments in this verse of P , five to the first, two to the second, and five to the third punctuation point. The segments of P can be retroverted to those of MT, but there is some question about whether some of the place names in P can be retroverted to those in MT. Segment 8 in P might be explained by the assimilation of the alep present in Hebrew and metathesis of the bet and the lamad in the translation, but segment 9 is more difficult with its rendering of ' $k z y b$ by ' ${ }^{\prime} y z b l$, if that Syriac is meant to represent the Hebrew. The renderings by Tg J , A, and the Vulgate can reasonably be related to the Hebrew. The rendering by $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{A} \sigma \chi \alpha \zeta_{1}$, is also difficult, but perhaps not so great a corruption of the Hebrew as the rendering of P . Nevertheless, that may be the best clue to understanding $P$ at this point as a corruption that developed from a Hebrew text that was the same as or similar to MT. It is more probable that it developed in the transmission of P than that it arose directly from a Hebrew source, but here it will simply be called a corruption that cannot be retroverted at the
same time it is not evidence for a text alternative to MT. No source for this verse of P different from this verse of MT is proposed here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The twelve segments already identified in MT can also be identified in P and follow the same sequence. Some of the place names, particularly those in segments 8 and 9 seem to have been corrupted. This may not change the meaning, but it does make it more difficult to match the name to a name that is otherwise known. One is then thrown back on MT or more accurate translations to see what stands at this point in those texts in order to specify the name. However, this is not a question of dividing or sequencing, and anyone making that search is helped by the fact that the elements and segments are so clearly divided and segmented that this mode can be rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The corruptions in the place names are not treated as additions or subtraction, but as errors, probably either as a result of negligence or ignorance. This mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering. The terms to be considered here are 'wbd and the two instances of $y t b y$. The first was rated 4 and the second 5 in the consideration of this mode in earlier verses referred to in the previous verse 1:30 and are so rated here. The rating for this mode in this verse is 4.5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The addition of the initial waw has already been mentioned. The corruptions in the renderings of place names by P already mentioned, especially in segments 8 and 9 of the verse make those place names less literal renderings and make the whole verse less literal. Segments $4,6,8,9,10,11$, and 12 of P are all examples of direct object construction $e$ rendering direct objects marked by ${ }^{\prime} t$ in the
source text. Segments 4 and 5 and segments 6 and 7 each form a single example of genitive construction $a$. As mentioned in the consideration of earlier verses, these constructions are the most literal renderings of the particular form of the Hebrew in this verse.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Both A and B have added nine words after $А \kappa \chi \omega$ and B has inaccurate renderings of several place names different from those of P . Targum J has added dbyt and rendered the verb as plur. in line with that addition. Other than those differences and its more accurate rendering of some place names, it is closer to P than the other two versions, even adding the opening waw (which is also represented in A and B ).

1:32.
וישב האשרי בקרב הכנעני ישבי האגרץ כי לא הורישו:


## RETROVERSION

There are nine elements or segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and three following it. If 'wbd 'nwn is counted as segment 9 , there are also nine segments in this verse of P , six to the first punctuation point and three following it. All nine segments of P can be retroverted to the Hebrew of MT. The seventh in MT is represented by $m t l d$, which spans segments 7 and 8 of P , and the ninth in MT is represented by the verb and its pronominal object. This semi-enclitic pronoun together with the verb of which it is the direct object is
considered as segment 9 of P . P has rendered the Canaanites as plur. and thus the pronoun has to be plur. too, but these can be retroverted to MT in consideration of the observed inconsistency of P in rendering collective nouns, especially here in light of the fact that MT has treated the participle $y s s^{b} y$ as plur. The source of this verse of P is therefore treated as based on a source that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The nine segments of MT identified above and the nine segments of P also identified are divided in P as closely as they might reasonably be divided, noting that the conjunction that spans segments 7 and 8 and the semi-enclitic pronoun is part of segment 9 . These segments are in the same sequence in P as in MT and this mode can be rated 5 in respect both of division and of sequence.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering. The terms 'wbd, 'ytb, and ytby have been considered many times. The first was considered the first time in the discussion of 1:19 and rated 4 there as it is here. The second and third were first rated 5 in the discussion of 1:9 as they are here.
bynt. This was considered first in the discussion of 1:29 and rated 3 when used to render $b q r b$ as it does here.
${ }^{\prime} r^{\prime}$. This was evaluated in the discussion of 1:2 and rated 5 wherever it translates its Hebrew cognate as it does here.
$m t l l$. In the discussion of $1: 19$ this was rated 4 as a translation of $k y$ used as a causal conjunction. As such it is rated 4 here.

This mode in this verse is rated 4.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There is one example of genitive construction $a$ in segments 5 and 6. The anomalous plur. participle in segment 5 of MT is rendered as plur. by P, but P has rendered "Canaanite" and the related pronoun object as plur. in harmony with the participle.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The Greeks version have both rendered hwryš modally and conformed the participle to the sing. of "Canaanite." Targum J has added $d b y t$ and rendered both finite verbs as plur. The addition of modality is considered more significant here because it does affect the meaning to some degree and therefore Tg J is considered closer to P . A distinction will not be made here between $A$ and $B$ even though there are very small differences between the two.

```
1:33. נפתלי לא־הוריש את`ישבי בית־שמש ואת־ישבי בית־ענת וישב בקרב הכנעני ישבי הארץ וישבי
בית־שמש ובית ענת היו להם למס:
```




## RETROVERSION

When the six pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments $2,3,4,5,6$, and 13 there are eighteen segments in this verse of MT, eleven to the athnach and seven
following it. With $l^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} w b d$ counted as segment 2 , (w)ytby as segments 3 and 5, byt šmš as segments 4 and 13, byt' ' $n$ t as segment 6 and 13-14, and wytby following segment 13 as an addition, the segments of P representing those eighteen segments of MT can be identified, four to the first punctuation point, two more to the second punctuation point, nine plus the addition to the third punctuation point, and the final three segments to the last punctuation point. Thus there is no punctuation point at the place where the athnach is found. This is not usual. Twenty-nine of the preceding thirty-two verses of $P$ have a punctuation point after the element or word where the athnach is found in MT. (Verses 1:9 and 18 have no punctuation point in P except the final point.) Verse 1:17 places the punctuation point after the word in P that represents the word in MT so marked. Verses 1:34 and 36 have no punctuation points except the final ones.) After the thirteenth segment of P just before the third punctuation point, the next segment following that punctuation point in P and preceding the five segments that represent the last five segments of MT is an additional segment: $y$ tby. The last seven segments of the text of MT can be intelligibly rendered: "And the inhabitants of Bethshemesh and Beth-anath became forced labor for them [that is, the tribe of Naphtali]." However it is not clear in Dirksen's emended text whether the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh and the inhabitants of Beth-anath are objects of the preposition byt along with the Canaanites or subjects of the final clause involving forced labor as those inhabitants of Beth-Shemesh and Beth Anath are in MT. This is not comparable to other situations where P adds waw. If the inhabitants of those two cities are the subjects of the final clause of the verse, it would be quite unusual for the two subjects of a verb to be in a clause like this: and subject A and subject B and verb (of which A and B are the subjects) followed by complements to that verb. If they are the subjects the clause would be rendered: And the inhabitants of Bethshemesh and the inhabitants of Beth-anath and they were subjected to forced labor for/by
them. Without comparing the mss on which Dirksen relies it is difficult to reach a firm conclusion, but it is unlikely that, in the text as it stands in the Leiden edition, the two groups of inhabitants are the subjects of the last clause of $P$, the last three segments of the verse in this case. Neither Tg J, ${ }^{78}$ nor A, nor B reflect a construction like the Leiden text, but rather one like MT where the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh and Beth-anath are subjects of the verb in the last clause without any waw suffixing that verb of which they are the subjects. Accordingly, the evidence of the other three versions will be accepted as a basis for concluding that those three versions had no source that can be distinguished from MT on these points. The conclusion is problematic, but in analyzing the verse according to the model being applied in this consideration of literalism, it will be assumed that they are objects of the preposition byt at segment 8 , because that is how the text of the Leiden Peshitta is understood, not because that is the sense of MT or harmonious with the other verses.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Up to the eleventh segment, the segments in P are a word for word translation of those in MT with allowance made for the differences based on Syriac syntax. On a superficial level the segments of P line up with MT for four of the next five segments in P, the fourth of those, wytby, being an addition, however the verse might be analyzed. The last three segments represent the last three segments of MT albeit by a less than literal rendering of the terminology as well as with the more important difference of the waw on the first of those three, $w^{\nu} t k b s ̌ w$, the one that stands in the place of segment 16 of MT, hyw. The question is whether the verse is divided by P as it is in MT, if the inhabitants of the two cities are the

[^102]objects of the preposition rather than the subjects of the following verb. This is a situation not contemplated by Barr in his essay on "The Typology of Literalism." The problem would be solved if the verb had no waw prefix, but it has one. Thus in a quite unusual sense one could say that the subjects of the verb are not represented in P and that the two new objects of the preposition are additions. Segment 16 is not part of a word-for-word translation of the corresponding segment of MT. Thus five of eighteen segments (12 to 16) are not divided correctly, and the segmentation should be rated 3. The sequence of the elements in P follows the sequence of those elements in MT and is rated 5 . The rating for this mode is 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is at least one addition here between segments 13 and 14 and an added waw prefix at segment 16 that is not a feature of translation technique based on Syriac syntax. This is evaluated as an addition of one and one-half segments and reduces the literal quality of this verse to a fraction under $92 \%$. Therefore this mode is rated 5-.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

All of the words considered for consistency have already been evaluated, four of them in discussing the previous verse. There ' $w b d$, ' $y t b$ (equivalent for this evaluation to $y t b w$ ), $y t b y$, and ' $r$ '' were rated, the first at 4 and the remaining terms at 5 . In that verse too bynt was rated 3 and byt in this verse is considered equivalent. In 1:28 kbš was rated 1 and $m d^{\prime} t t^{\prime}$ was rated 5. The Ethpeel of the verb was rated 1 in 1:30.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As already noted there is a question about the syntax of the verse. If, as may be the case, the inhabitants of Bethshemesh and Beth-anath are joined with the Canaanites, then the last clause would refer to all three groups as being subjected to forced labor. In MT, it seems that the inhabitants of those
two cities are two sub-groups of the larger group of Canaanites and that only the two subgroups are being subjected to forced labor. If this proposal that they are objects of the preposition is a misreading, then the waw prefix of ${ }^{\prime} t k b s s^{s}$ is an unexplained anomaly. The addition of the initial waw follows the pattern already seen in verses $1: 30$ and 31. Other syntactical features to be noted are the two examples of direct object construction $e$ in segments 3 and 5 of P and the examples of genitive construction $a$ in segments 3-4, 5-6, 1011, 12-13, and in the addition together with segment 14.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J adds wdbyt at the beginning of the verse and makes the verbs that are affected by that addition plur. It also adds lmsqy. Both A and B add the opening conjunction, and A adds a specification of $\operatorname{I\sigma \rho } \alpha \eta \lambda$ as the subject who lived among the Canaanites, while B has $N \varepsilon \varphi \theta \alpha \lambda 1$, which is what one might have expected anyway. None of the three show a sign of the problem in P considered here, and accordingly it does not seem helpful to single out one of them as more like P than the other two.

1:34.
וילחצו האמרי את־בני־דן ההרה כי־לא נתנו לרדת לעמק:


## RETROVERSION

Unless l'mwry' bny dn in P is emended to 'mwry' lbny $d n$ this verse cannot be retroverted to that of MT. If the three elements of MT joined by 2 maqqēphs are counted as segment 3, and the pair of elements joined by maqqēph is counted as segment 5 there are eight segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and four following. If we transfer the $l$ prefix of 'mwry' to bny, then the verse of P can be divided into eight segments (considering ' $n w n$ especially as a syntactic addition). Dirksen cites 9 a 1 fam for the alternative reading that renders segments 2 and 3 in this way so that they can be retroverted to MT, but he does not comment on the alternative in his article or monograph. ${ }^{79}$ The variant in the Leiden text is not supported by $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, or B and it has to be treated either as a mistake or as a revision to avoid the idea that the Amorites ever got the better of the Danites. With the change suggested just above the verse of P could be retroverted to the verse of MT, taking account of typical features of Syriac syntax. This verse of P is not reckoned to give any support for a Vorlage different from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Here we will discuss how literal the verse would be if the text of the Leiden Peshitta were being evaluated as a translation of this verse of MT. For this purpose, segments 2 and 3 will be reckoned as free translations that change the meaning of the verse and that affects $25 \%$ of the segments that would call for a rating of no more than 3 for the segmentation. (Of course, the import of the other segments is changed but in most ways they have the same role in the altered verse as they would have in a literal translation. The sequence of the elements

[^103]remains unchanged so that aspect of the mode is rated 5 and the rating of the mode becomes 4.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The prefix of $l^{\prime} m w r y$ is an addition and if the same direct object construction were applied to bny $d n$ such a direct object would have to be seen as having been subtracted there (and these differences can be seen in ms 9a1). This is evaluated as one-half of two of the eight segments and thus equivalent to one segment. Based on that approach this mode would be rated 4.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
'rḥqw. The Aphel of $r h ̣ q$ renders $l h ̣ s$ here. The same Hebrew root is rendered by a form of ${ }^{\prime} / s$ in P in 2:18; 6:9 and 10:12. It is translated by the Shaphel of ${ }^{\prime} b d$ in $4: 3$. Where rendered by a form of ' $l s$ it will be rated 2 in Judges. Here, it would be rated 1.
$t{ }^{2} r^{\circ}$. This was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:9 and is so rated here.
$m t l d$. This was rated 4 in the discussion of 1:19 and is rated the same here.
$\check{s} b q w$. This translates $n t n$ here. In only three out of some sixty-four places where $n t n$ is rendered is it rendered by this root. Those are discussed at $1: 2$ and $1: 12$. This translation may be accurate, but it is not consistent and rated 1 .
$m h t$. This rendering of $r d t$ was rated 4 for consistency at 1:9.
' $w m q$ '. This is one of seven places where ' $m q$ is rendered by this term. The rendering is discussed at $1: 19$. In $5: 15$, the rendering is uncertain. It is rated 5 .

The rating of this mode for this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The verse according to the Leiden Edition of $P$ has the opposite meaning from the meaning of the verse of MT. If the translation accurately reflected the meaning of the MT verse as it does in ms. 9a1, modes 1 and 2 would be rated 5. In either case there is an example of genitive construction $a$ in bny
$d n$ and an example of direct object construction $f$, but that is ' $m w r y$ ' according to the Leiden Edition and $d n$ according to 9 al fam. The hē directive in MT is rendered by the prefixed preposition $l$ of $t w r^{\circ}$ in P . Although MT refers to the plur. bny by the sing. suffix of $n t n, \mathrm{P}$ has rendered by the plur. ' $n w n$ after $\check{s} b q w$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. Although this verse is unusual, as analyzed somewhat artificially here, it is rated 3 .

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The verse of ms 9 a 1 is quite similar to all three of the versions, but $A$ and $B$ have rendered $l h s ̣ w$ by a sing. and B has rendered $n t n$ by a plur. So Tg J is most similar and B more similar than A. No attempt has been made here to compare the verse of the Leiden Edition to these versions.


## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 4 and 9 MT has eleven segments, six to the athnach and five following it. With $b^{\prime} r^{\circ} b h ̣ d s$ counted as holding the place of segment 4 of MT and the $b t \underset{w r}{ }{ }^{\circ}$ that follows that segment counted as an addition that has to be evaluated in connection with segment 4 , and dbyt ywsp as segment 9 , there are
also eleven segments in this verse of P , four plus the addition up to the first punctuation point, segments 5 and 6 up to the second point, segments 7,8 , and 9 to the third point, and the final segments 10 and 11 leading to the last punctuation point. The first three segments of P represent the first three of MT as do the last seven that follow the first punctuation point and end at the fourth such point. In the segments of $\mathrm{P}, b^{\prime} r^{()} d h d s b t \underset{w}{ } r^{\nu}$ that occupy the position between the third and fifth segments, the first element is added, the second suffers from dalat-resh confusion, and the third is standing in the place where it ought not be. As a result, the reader cannot discern any proper name like Har-heres. The other proper names in P can be taken as rendering the proper names of the MT verse. None of the other versions make the phrase into a proper name ${ }^{80}$ although Tg J recognizes that "Heres" is a proper name, as the Vulgate does too. Some of the renderings and additions in $A$ and $B$ are quite fanciful, but can be seen as based on reading Hebrew ḥrś or $h \underset{r}{ } \check{s}$ rather than $h r s$, and reading $\check{s}$ llbym as a zoological rather than a geographical description. The basic elements for the place names are in P and Tg J , even in the Vulgate. Without any clear direction given by these variations, the text will be considered with caution as one that cannot be distinguished from MT. These variations might be influenced by a tendency to reconcile this verse with the changes discussed in the previous verse.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The eleven elements of MT have already been described as also has the representation of the first three and the last seven by P . As the segments are divided, the fourth in $\mathrm{P}, b^{3} r^{(s)} d h d s$ does not represent the fourth in MT and does not show that Har-heres is treated as a proper name.

[^104]With the $b t \underset{w r}{ }{ }^{\prime}$ that follows, this portion of P could be rendered, "in the land of Hedes, in the hill country." This is an odd example of an addition and makes it necessary to ask which prepositional phrase is the addition, the one that is in MT but now moved in P , or the one that occupies the position corresponding to the fourth segment in MT. Without any precedent to rely on this is going to be treated as both a failure to segment the verse properly at one of the eleven segments and also as a failure to maintain the sequence of MT at the point in the sequence where $b t \underline{w r}$ follows hads. Based on this conclusion, "in the land" would be the addition as part of a free translation that includes $b^{\prime} r^{\prime \prime}$. This reduces the degree to which the verse is literal to just under $82 \%$ for both the segmentation and the sequencing, and so this mode is rated 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The prepositional phrase $b^{3} r^{\circ}$ is reckoned an addition and that is only one of eleven segments or less than $10 \%$, but in light of the fact that the verse would have to be emended in some other way after removing the addition, that effect will be calculated at an additional $5 \%$ and this mode will be rated 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

'ttpysw. This Ethpeel of pys renders $y w w^{\prime} l$ the rendering of which by 'št'bd was evaluated at 1:27 where the various renderings, including this, were rated 1 . This rendering may be more accurate than the others considered there. In the discussion of 1:27 it was noted that $\check{s r y}$ in Tg J might yield a more accurate translation. Although Smelik rendered that verb in English by "began" as the Greek Versions should be translated, senses of the Aramaic of Tg J include "consent," "determine" or "decide," and those terms would give a meaning closer to the Hebrew. $m t b$. This renders the infinitive of $y s s^{b}$ that was evaluated in all forms of its occurrences in Judges at 1:9 and rated 5 in all those places.
${ }^{\prime} r^{\prime}$. This renders nothing in this verse and is not rated here. It was last rated at 1:33. $t w r^{2}$. The position adopted for this verse is that this renders $h r$. This rendering was last discussed in considering 1:34 and rated 5 here for the same reason it has been so rated in all other places where it is found.
'Šnt. This form of the root $\check{S} n$ renders the 3 rd feminine narrative Qal of $k b d$ here and at 20:34. There are not a sufficient number of occurrences to evaluate the consistency of this rendering.
${ }^{\prime} y d$ '. This renders $y d$, first evaluated at 1:2 and rated 5 wherever rendered in a context like this.
'štkbšw and $m d^{\prime} t t^{\prime}$. These two renderings were last evaluated at 1:34 where the first was rated 1 and the second, 5 .

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The additions and changes in the treatment of the segments and the sequencing of the place name already discussed do not adequately represent the Hebrew. There is an example of genitive construction $b$ in segments 8 and 9 of P , and of genitive construction $a$ at segment 9 . In ' $r^{\circ} d h d s$ there is a semantically inaccurate rendering by a genitive construction $b$ that may have its origin in a genitive construction like segment 4 of this verse of MT.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The greater misunderstanding of the Hebrew of this verse by A and B put them at greater distance from P than is Tg J .

וגבול האמרי ממעלה עקרבים מהסלע ומעלה:
$\therefore$ D.

## RETROVERSION

There are six segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and three following it. With $m n m s q n^{\prime}$ counted as segment 3 and $m n \check{s} q y p^{\prime}$ as segment 5 , there are also six segments in this verse of $P$. Five of the six segments of this verse of $P$ can certainly be retroverted to the corresponding segments 1 to 3 and 5 to 6 of MT. The different orthography of segment 4 in $P$ raises a question about whether it is based on MT. The other three versions represent the $b$. The conclusion proposed here is that this is the result of confusion at some point in translation or transmission of the Syriac text. Such dubious renderings of place names are not unusual in P . Therefore it is considered that there is not adequate evidence of any text on which $P$ is based which can be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Each segment of P matches the corresponding segment in MT and those segments follow the same sequence as the segments of MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$t h w{ }^{\prime}$. This rendering of $g b w l$ was evaluated in the discussion of 1:18 and rated 5 there as to every place where the same rendering occurs in Judges.
$m s q n$ '. This translates the construct of ma'ăleh once in this verse and in 8:13. This sample is not large enough to be the basis for an evaluation of the consistency of its rendering in Judges.
$\check{s} q y p p^{\prime}$. This renders $s l^{c}$ in this verse and in $15: 8,11,13 ; 20: 45,47(2 \mathrm{x})$, and $21: 13$, that is, eight times. The same Hebrew is rendered by $k^{\prime} p^{\prime}$ in 6:20. Thus the rendering in this verse takes place in almost $89 \%$ of the places where $s l^{k}$ occurs in Judges and is rated 4 in all those places. If $s l^{\prime}$ in MT is a proper name, then the consistency of the rendering would not be rated.
lc. This renders $m \bar{a} l \hat{l}$ in this verse and 1:10. This shows that P correctly understands the vocalization of this verse, but does not provide an adequate sample for an opinion about consistency of rendering.

This mode in this verse is rated 4.5.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There are two examples of genitive construction $b$ in segments 1 to 2 and 3 to 4 . The Amorites are plur. in this verse of P. Segment 5 of $\mathrm{P}, \check{s} q y p^{\prime}$, apparently renders $h s l^{\prime}$ as a common noun rather than as a place name.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Alexandrinus differs from the other three versions being considered here. Both Tg J and B render "Amorite" as singular and have more likely renderings of the Hebrew 'qrbym than does P . They are otherwise similar to P , but are so similar to each other that no meaningful distinction can be made between them in comparison with P.

## CHAPTER TWO OF JUDGES

## 2:1. ויעל מלאך־יהוה מן־הגלגל אל־הבכָים ויאמר אעלה אתכם ממצרים ואביא אתכם אל־הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבתיכם ואמר לא־אפר בריתי אתכם לעולם:   

## RETROVERSION

There are nineteen segments in MT if each of the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments $2,3,4,11$, and 16 , four to the athnach, and fifteen following it. With $m l^{\prime} k h d m r y^{\prime}$ counted as segment $2, m n g l g l^{\prime}$ as segment 3 , $l b k y n$ as segment $4, w^{\prime} m r$ as segment 5 (and the following lbny 'ysryl hkn' 'mr mry' as additions), ' $n$ ' 'sqtkwn as segments 6 and 7 , mn msryn as segment 8 (with ' $r$ ' $d$ between the two elements of segment 8 being an addition), $w^{\prime} y t y t k w n$ as segments 9 and $10, l^{\prime} r^{o}$ as segment 11 , the $d$ prefix of 'ymyt as segment 12 prefixed to segment $13, l^{\prime} b t t l$ (the $d$ prefix being an addition as is the $d$ prefix of segment $18,{ }^{\prime} m k w n$ ), all nineteen of these segments can be seen in P , four to the first punctuation point. The fifth segment follows the first point together with additions to the second point, with segments 6 to 8 plus an addition to the third point, segments 9 to 14 to the fourth point in P up to the second punctuation point are additions. With 'sqtkwn treated as the sixth and seventh segments, the sixth to the eighth segments of MT as rendered in P are
between the second and third punctuation points, with an addition, namely ' $r^{\circ} d$, between $m n$ and mṣryn, which two elements represent the eighth segment. The ninth through the fourteenth segments are represented in P by the segments between the third and fourth punctuation points, and the fifteenth to the nineteenth are between the fourth and fifth points. Those numbered segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the nineteen segments of MT (with the exception of the tense of segment 6-7, 'sqtkwn, of P ) if one takes account of the observed patterns of Syriac translation. The five elements between the fifth and sixth segments (lbny 'ysryl hkn' 'mr mry') and the elements of P that fall between the elements representing the eighth segment ( $r^{\circ} r^{\circ} d$ ) cannot be retroverted. The perfect tense in segment 6 of $P$ cannot be retroverted to the imperfect tense of segment 6 of MT.

Targum J has also rendered ${ }^{x} / h$ by a perfect, while both A and B have the aorist (A inflecting it as 3rd person sing.). The Vulgate has the perfect. This might represent a Vorlage different from MT. For example, BHS proposes a prefixed waw that would make this a long form of the narrative tense. This might call for some other modification since $w y^{\prime} m r w^{c} l h$ would be unusual. Nevertheless, one cannot rule out the possibility that P and other versions cited here were wrestling with the same problem that now confronts the reader of MT, and that they simply treated this as the narrative tense because that is the most likely way to make sense of the text.

The additions are different. Both A and B add two prepositional phrases at the point between the rendering of segments 4 and 5 of MT. Targum J makes changes and additions at the point where segment 2 of MT would be represented. P, as stated above, adds material between segments 5 and 6 , and into the middle of segment 8 . These additions are similar to the text of 6:8 of P that is based on MT (although ' $r^{\circ} d$ is also added there ${ }^{1}$ ) In the second

[^105]part of the verse beginning at its representation of segment 5 , A turns the 1st person sing. subject into a 3rd person sing. subject. Such variations probably discredit others since one would have to propose a variety of source texts to account for each difference as based on a Hebrew source each is accurately rendering, rather than on a single difficult Hebrew source like MT. That is to say, this verse of MT raises questions of interpretation that would have invited some degree of freedom on the part of a translator or transmitter of a translated text. One can note similarities between these additions in P and 6:8 of MT. If that same verse in P is compared with this verse, the possibility of influence can be seen. Accordingly, although one cannot rule out a source with a different reading from ${ }^{x} l h$, there is insufficient evidence to support a textual basis for the additions in P identified here, and the Vorlage of this verse of P will be assumed to be indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. If the additions that are features covered by mode 4 are set aside, all the segments of the verse in MT can be matched by the segments of P. Even the perf. tense of slq can be treated as an intended representation of ${ }^{x} l h$, or, if not, of a source that more clearly supports the perf. tense. Thus even if this is less accurate than it might be, this is a word-for-word translation. Thus there is no reason to conclude that the free features of this verse fall within the purview of this mode, and it is rated 5 both as to segmentation and sequence.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The five elements between segments 5 and 6 and the insertion of ' $r^{\circ} d$ within segment 8 are treated as a six-nineteenth addition to the verse, or a little less than a $32 \%$ addition with the result that this mode is rated 3 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$s l q$ and 'sqtkwn. The rendering of the Qal of 'lh by the Peal of $s l q$ was first evaluated at $1: 1$ and is rated 5 here for the reasons given there. This is the first place in this study where the Aphel of $s l q$ renders the Hiphil of $l h$. That Hebrew Hiphil occurs thirteen times in Judges and is rendered by the Aphel of this verb in all but one of those places. Those twelve are found in this verse, $6: 8,26 ; 11: 31 ; 13: 16 ; 15: 13 ; 16: 3,8,18 ; 20: 26,38$; and $21: 4$. It is rendered by the Aphel of $n p q$ at $6: 13$. This is consistent in over $92 \%$ of the cases and rated 5.
$m l^{\prime} k h$. With the added pronominal suffix this renders Hebrew $m l^{\prime} k$. In twenty-two places where it is the angel of the Lord (or of God), this Hebrew word is rendered by its cognate as here in this verse and in $2: 4 ; 5: 23 ; 6: 11,12,20,21(2 x), 22(2 x) ; 13: 3,6,9,13,15,16(2 x)$, $17,18,20$, and $21(2 \mathrm{x})$. In nine places the plur. of $m l^{\prime} k$ is rendered by the plur. of ${ }^{\prime} y z g d^{\prime}$ and the messengers are human agents of other humans: $6: 35(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 7: 24 ; 9: 31 ; 11: 12,13,14,17$ and 19. The rendering here is rated 5 , but a minus is added to account for the possibility that a more consciously literal translator might have used the Syriac cognate of the Hebrew in every place.
$m r y$. This rendering of the divine name was analyzed at $1: 1$ and rated 5 there.
bny 'ysryl. This is an addition and is not rated here. It was analyzed at 1:1.
'ytytkwn. This Aphel of ' $t$ ' and its suffix are rendering the Hiphil of $b w$ and its object ' $t k w n$ here. Only the verb is considered for consistency, and this was done in the analysis of 1:7 where the Aphel of ' $/ h$ was rendering this Hiphil. That was rated 2, but it more consistently renders the Hebrew than does this Syriac verb, so this rendering (in less than $50 \%$ of the places where the Hebrew is rendered) is rated 1.
'ymyt. This Peal of $y m$ ' renders the Niphal of $\breve{s} b^{\text {c six }}$ times in Judges, in this verse and 2:15;
15:12; 21:1, 7 , and 18 . The rendering is rated 5 .
'bhykwn. This rendering of Hebrew 'btykm was analyzed along with the other renderings of the sing. and plur. of ' $b$ in Judges at 1:14 and rated 5 there.
'bṭl. This rendering of the Hiphil of prr is a hapax legomenon in Judges and thus not rated. here.
qym'. This renders bryt in this verse and in 2:2 and 20. In 20:27, the phrase 'rwn bryt is rendered by $q^{\prime} b w t^{\prime}$. This last, though accurate, is not a consistent rendering and therefore this rendering is rated 3 .
${ }^{\text {'mhwn. This renders }}$ 'tkm and the rendering by this Syriac preposition of that Hebrew preposition was rated 3 in considering 1:3.
${ }^{\prime} l m$. This renders Hebrew ' $w l m$ which is a hapax legomenon in Judges and thus not rated.
This mode is rated 4 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The additions are not considered here, except for the comments about ' $n$ ' made below. In segment 2 of P there is a genitive construction $c$. At segment 17 of P there is an example of direct object construction d. In segment 18 , the attributive prepositional phrase is part of a verbless relative clause introduced by $d$. Both segments 7 and 18 of MT are pronominal direct objects suffixed to the direct object marker, and are rendered by P as suffixes to the preceding verb of which they are the direct object.

The addition of ' $n$ ' at segment 6 may be influenced by $6: 8$ where MT expresses the pronoun in a similar context at the beginning of a divine address. In any case wherever MT has 'nky, P renders by this pronoun, except at 5:3 where only one of the two occurrences is rendered. It is rendered at $6: 8,15,18,37 ; 7: 17,18 ; 8: 5 ; 11: 9,27,35,37 ; 17: 9(2 x$ rendered $3 \mathrm{x}), 10$; and 19:18.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

$B$ is closest to $P$ in this verse. All three other versions make additions in rendering the first four segments to the athnach, and those additions are not found in P . Those additions of A and $B$ are similar and might have been intended to provide understandable geographical information like that in an annotated Bible. Those of Tg J involve a rewriting of the verse, perhaps theologically motivated. The changes made by A in the second portion of the verse from 1st to 2nd person sing. may be the result of an effort to deal with the difficult text, but the other three versions do not do so. Where P adds after w'mr, lbny 'ysryl hkn' 'mr mry', B is the only version with a similar addition after $\kappa \alpha i ̀ \varepsilon i ̂ \pi \varepsilon v$. By its addition of the words $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ $\alpha v ̉ \tau \circ u ́ \varsigma ~ T \alpha ́ \delta \varepsilon ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \iota ~ к и ́ \rho ı о \varsigma, ~ B ~ i s ~ m a d e ~ c l o s e s t ~ t o ~ P . ~ . ~$

ואתם לא־תכרתו ברית ליושבי הארץ הזאת מזבחותיהם תתצֵון ולא־שמעתם בקלי מה־זאת עשיתם: 2:2.
n


## RETROVERSION

With the elements joined by maqqēph each treated as single segments 2,9 , and 12 , there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, eight segments up to the athnach and four following it. In P with $l^{\prime}$ tqymwn counted as segment 2 , wl' šm'twn as segment 9 , and $l m n^{\prime} h k n '$ as segment 11, this verse of P can also be divided into twelve segments, six to the first punctuation point, two more to the second punctuation point, and four following it to the fourth punctuation point. Each of the segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT. At segment 11, lmn' $h k n^{\prime}$, where the corresponding direct object, $m h$, is unmarked, P has direct object construction $e$. Accordingly, the source will be treated as indistinguishable from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of segments. The segments of P divide segment by segment into the corresponding twelve segments into which MT is divided and those segments of $P$ follow the same sequence. Therefore this verse is rated 5 as to both aspects of this mode.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$w^{3} n t w n$. This renders $w^{2} t m$ in this and fourteen other places: 6:10, $31(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 7: 18 ; 9: 15,18$; $10: 13 ; 11: 7,9 ; 14: 13 ; 15: 12 ; 18: 9,18$; and $21: 22$. It is not rendered at $18: 8$ and the occurrence at $12: 4$ of MT is freely translated so that the 2 nd person plur. is lost. Wherever it is rendered as it is here, it is rated 5.
tqymwn. This renders $t k r t w$, the Qal of $k r t$. Elsewhere in Judges the sense of the Hebrew is of an actual severing of something into parts by some instrument of cutting, not related to an agreement between or among persons. In these places the Hebrew is rendered by $p s q: 6: 25$, 26, 30; 9:48, 49; and 6:28 (Pual of $k r t$ ). The Hiphil of $k r t$ is rendered by $q t \underline{l}$ at $4: 24$. Since this is the only place in Judges where $q y m^{\prime}$ is the direct object of this verb, it will not be rated. Smelik says: "T Jon uses גזר mainly for קצץ me context of a covenant and קרת me." qym ${ }^{2}$. This rendering of bryt was rated 3 in the discussion of the previous verse, 2:1. $y t b y$. This rendering of $y w s ̌ b y$ was rated 5 in the discussion or 1:9.
${ }^{2} r{ }^{\prime}$. This rendering of ' $r$ s was first rated 5 in the discussion of 1:2.
$m d b h ̣ y h w n$. This renders $m z b h ̣$ eleven times, including this verse, $6: 24,25,26,28(2 \mathrm{x}), 30$, 31,$32 ; 13: 20(1 \mathrm{x})$; and $21: 4$. Once at $13: 20$, the Hebrew is rendered by $k^{\prime} p^{\prime}$. This is consistent in almost $92 \%$ of the occurrences and rated 5 .

[^106]${ }^{\prime} q r$. The Peal of this verb renders the Qal of $n t s ̣$ seven times, in this verse and 6:30, 31, 32; $8: 9 ; 17$; and $9: 45$. The same verb renders the Pual of the same Hebrew verb at $6: 28$. The rendering is rated 5 .
$\breve{s} m^{\prime} t w n$. The Peal of this verb renders the Qal of $\breve{s} m^{c}$ twenty-two times, in this verse and 2:17(2x), 20; 3:4; 5:3, 16; 6:10; 7:11, 15; 9:7(2x), 30, 46; 11:10, 17, 28; 13:9; 14:13; 19:25; 20:3 and 13. The Aphel of the same Syriac root renders the Hiphil of the same Hebrew root at $13: 23$ and $18: 25$. Accordingly, the rendering is rated 5 .
$q l y$. Syriac $q l$ renders Hebrew $q w l$ ten times, including this verse and $2: 4,20 ; 6: 10 ; 9: 7 ; 13: 9$; $18: 3,25 ; 20: 13$; and $21: 2$. It is translated by $m l^{\prime}$ at $5: 11$. Thus it is in almost $91 \%$ of the occurrences and rated 5 wherever it is translated as it is here.
$l m n^{\prime} h k n$ ' 'bdtwn. This phrase renders $m h-z^{\prime} t$ 's'ytm and is not rated, but there is a similar rendering at 15:11. There the Hebrew wmh-z't 's't lnw is rendered $m n^{\prime}$ 'bdt ln hkn'.
'bdtwn. The rendering of 'śh by this Syriac verb was considered at $1: 7$ and the consistency of this rendering was rated 5 there.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In segments 4 and 5 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$. Segments 3 and 7 are each instances of direct object construction $d$, even though the direct object at segment 7 is fronted there is no direct object marker in MT. In segment 8 of which segment 7 is the direct object an imperative renders the imperf. of MT. This is in line with Syriac syntax that does not use the imperf. for a positive command. Nöldeke comments: "Without $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ however the 2 nd person of the Impf. is but seldom used with imperative force; the Impt. is the proper mode for this." ${ }^{3}$ The preposition $l$ of segment 10 of P differs from the $b$ of MT and this is surprising since in the

[^107]other places in MT where $q w l$ complements $\breve{s} m^{c}$ using the preposition $b, \mathrm{P}$ follows suit: 2:20; 6:10; 13:9; and 20:13. The similarity of the rendering by P of $m h-z^{\prime} t$ 's'yt in $15: 11$ has already been pointed out. The JPS entry says that $h k n /$ ' may be rendered as "this" after a preposition. ${ }^{4}$ Costaz says it may be rendered as "this, that" without qualification. ${ }^{5}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B.

Targum J represents the same twelve segments as P , albeit with some different choices of vocabulary that give a different slant to the verse. For example, note the use of 'ygwryhwn for $m z b h \not w t y h m$ and mymry for $q l y$. The use of $q b l$ for MT $\breve{s} m$ c where "hear" or "listen" has the metaphorical sense of "heed" or "obey" is standard in Tg J. ${ }^{6}$ On the other hand, both A and B add material in similar ways between segments 6 and 7 (thirteen words in A and eleven in B ) and those additions prohibit worshipping the gods of the inhabitants of the land and enjoins the smashing of their carved things. This makes $\operatorname{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ closer to P and A and B more different from it in a similar way.

2:3.
וגם אמרתי לא־אגרש אותם מפניכָם והיו לכם לצדים ואלהיהם יהיו לכם למוקש:

${ }^{4}$ J. Payne Smith, Syriac Dictionary, 103, col. 2.
${ }^{5}$ L. Costaz, Dictionaire Syriaque-Français, 77, col. 1.
${ }^{6}$ See Willem F. Smelik, Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets, Vol. 2, Judges (Leiden: E. J. Brill), 395.

## RETROVERSION

There are twelve segments in MT (treating $l^{\prime}$ ' $g r \check{s}$ as segment 3), five to the athnach and seven following it. If ' $n{ }^{\prime} h k n^{\prime}$ is counted as an addition and $d l^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} w b d$ counted as segment 3 , there are also twelve segments in P , two segments to the first and three more to the second punctuation point, three to the third, and four to the fourth such point. The initial waw prefix is missing in P and the words ' $n$ ' $h k n$ ' are additions. Smelik treats 'wbd as not equal to MT 'grš, but treats Tg J 'tryk as equal. He notes that the rendering of ṣdym as ṣrym (accepted by RSV and NRSV) is supported only by hostes in the Vulgate. ${ }^{7}$ Both A and B render by бvvoхás.

The omission of the initial waw here is not expected. In eight places where wgm is found in MT of Judges, it is rendered six times by $w p$ in $2: 10(2 \mathrm{x}), 17 ; 11: 17 ; 17: 2$; and 19:19(1x). Only in this verse and once in 19:19 is the waw omitted before 'p. On the other hand, Tg J preserves the waw, and A and B show a каí (к $\gamma \gamma \dot{\omega}$ in B), but have no $\gamma \varepsilon$. These considerations are taken here as support for the Hebrew source as having an initial waw, noting as well that ms 9 al of P does have the waw.

The ' $n$ ' $h k n$ ' is treated as an addition and it is similar to part of the addition in 2:1: $h k n$ ' 'mr mry'. The translator appears to be trying to emphasize that it is not the angel's, but the Lord's words that are being quoted and there is no other support for the approach taken in P toward this end in the versions considered here. The $d$ prefix of segment 3 is considered to have been understood as recitative.

The Aphel of ' $b d$ also renders the Hiphil of $y r s$ in fourteen of the seventeen places where it is found in Judges as was shown in discussing 1:19. Smelik observes as to this verse

[^108]in Tg J: "MT גרש גרך is equated to the standard translation for MT הוריש in harmony with his conclusion noted above that the ' $b d$ of P at this point does not equal MT while the $t r k$ of Tg J does (although Tg J does render $g r \check{s}$ more consistently than P ).

The rendering of șdym by sryqut' might be the result of dālath-rēsh confusion with sdyqwt being closer to the solution proposed by the English Versions and the Vulgate. Whichever was intended, this seems to be an effort to solve the problem of the meaning of s.dym that still vexes text critics and commentators.

Accordingly, no basis for distinguishing the source of this verse from the MT has been found here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. As the Syriac segments are described above without the additions identified, there are twelve segments that can be lined up word for word with the twelve segments of the MT in the same sequence as they are found in MT. Thus this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Two elements, ' $n^{\prime} h k n^{\prime}$, have been added and reduce the rating of the literal character of the verse by almost $17 \%$. The subtracted waw prefix of segment 1 is considered here to be a subtraction of an element that results in an additional reduction of slightly more than $4 \%$ and that would mean that this mode is rated 3 . The added $d$ recitative is considered a recitative feature that is covered by mode 4 , but, if it is, the reduction would be another $4 \%$ and the rating would still be 3 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering

' $p$. The rendering of $g m$ by this Syriac term was considered at 1:3 and rated 5 .

[^109]'wbd. This Aphel renders the Piel of grš twice, once in this verse and once at 6:9. That Hebrew verb is rendered by $t r d$ three times, in $9: 41 ; 11: 2$ and 7 . Therefore it is rated 1 here and 2 where rendered by trd.
$m n$ qdmykwn. This renders mpnykm here and, mpny, the preposition, with other suffixes or noun objects thirteen times, in this verse and $2: 18,21 ; 5: 5(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 6: 2,6,9,11 ; 9: 21,40 ; 11: 3$, 23 and 24. It is rendered by $q d m$ without $m n$ twice, in $5: 15(1 \mathrm{x})$ and 11:33. This is consistent almost $87 \%$ of the time and rated 4 .
sryqut'. Whether this is rendering ṣd or $s ̧ r$, this is a hapax legomenon as to the first, and would be only the second occurrence of the other. Thus it is not rated. $t w q l t$. This renders $m w q s ̌$ here and in $8: 27$, and thus there are too few examples to rate the rendering for consistency.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The omission of the initial waw prefix does not appear to be based on a consistent feature of Syriac syntax. The addition of ' $n$ ' $h k n$ ', as already mentioned, may be an addition intended to make clear that it is the Lord who is being quoted by his angel, not the angel speaking for himself.

The semi-enclitic pronoun direct object at segment 4 renders the Hebrew direct object marker with a pronominal suffix. This might be seen as an example of direct object construction d, but it probably should be classified with pronominal object suffixes of the kind that are rendered in places like segment 7 of 2:1.
$t w q l t$ ' is probably influenced by $\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ v \delta \alpha \lambda o v$ in LXX, which can mean either "trap" or "stumbling block" among other possibilities, but P has chosen a term that may be limited to a cause of stumbling (whether literally or figuratively) and, if so, may not yield so readily the more likely sense of $m w q s ̌$ as "trap" or "snare."

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A \& B

Both B and Tg J are close to MT and to P except for P's additions. Because Tg J renders 'Ihyhm by t'wthwn, it is less similar to P than B . The addition of several words by A makes it the least comparable to P of the three versions being compared here.

ויהי כדבר מלאך יהוה את־הדברים האלה אל־כל־בני ישראֵל וישאו העם את־קולם ויבכו:


## RETROVERSION

There are twelve segments in this verse of MT with all three sets of elements joined by maqqēph each treated as a segment (that is, segments 5, 7 and 11) and there are eight segments to the athnach at $y^{\prime} s^{\prime} l$, and four following it. Twelve segments in P can also be identified that represent the twelve segments of MT, with the exception of segment 7 of P that can only be said to represent segment 7 of MT, if at all, in the loosest possible way. Moreover, a segment, $k l h$, is added to P between the segments of P , 'rymw and ' $m$ ', representing segments 9 and 10 of MT. There are eight segments of P to the first punctuation point, and four following it, setting aside the added segment between segments 9 and 10 .

If one accepts $w k d^{\prime} m r$ as retroverting to wyhy $b d b r$, as was done at 1:14, then the first 6 segments of P can be retroverted. The seventh segment of $\mathrm{P}, k l h w n$, cannot be
retroverted. One might speculate that this had a starting point in the source since $k l$ is one element of segment 7 of MT and the prepositional prefix $l$ of segment 8 in $P$ can be taken as retroverting to the ' $l$ of the phrase, 'l-kl-bny, segment 7 of MT, missing from Dirksen's text. Thus at this point in Dirksen's text the translation is rather free, but the notes to that text suggest that this may be a point at which there are problems that arose in the transmission of the text. Several early manuscripts omit this term, and some are cited as transposing $k l h$ ' $m$ '. The exact form of the transposition is not shown, but if at this point, following segment $6, \mathrm{P}$ read $l \mathrm{klh}$ ' $m$ ' $d$ ' $y s r y l$ (or something similar but more likely), then it would be easier to see this as a word-for-word translation of segments 7 and 8 of MT, especially if the ' $m$ ' of segment 10 remains and the $k l h$ preceding it in Dirksen's text is part of the transposition and no longer posed before segment 10. In the verse of Dirksen's text, the function of klhwn seems to be in apposition to what precedes it, namely "these words." The $k l h$ before ' $m$ ' can be seen as either an addition or as a transposition of the $k l$ before bny ys' $r^{\prime} l$ that is placed where it is found in P after the subtraction of $b n y$ before $y s^{\prime} r^{\nu} l$. Here it is treated as a plus. ${ }^{9}$ In summary, these additions and subtractions have no support in the three versions regularly compared here or in the Vulgate and the conflicts in the early mss of $P$ discredit their reliability.

If the $k l h$ after segment 9 and before ' $m$ ' is set aside and excluded from consideration for purposes of this analysis, then segment 9 (with qualification for the absence of a prefixed waw discussed as part of mode 4) and segments 10 to 12 can also be retroverted. In conclusion, the pluses and minuses do not support an argument for a Hebrew source that can be distinguished from MT.

[^110]LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The additions after segments 6 and 9 are overlooked for the purpose of evaluating the segmentation and sequencing in the same way that has been done in earlier verses since this departure from literalism is rated under mode 2. Here however the subtraction of the elements kl-bny does have an effect on the word-for-word segmentation since it creates a new segment l'ysryl that fills the place occupied by segments 7 and 8 of MT. Then the express comprehension of "all" the "children of Israel" is omitted in this segment and added before segment 10 of P . This seems to fall outside the standards articulated in Chapter One of this study for evaluation of literalism as word for word translation. In an effort to place an adjustment value on the segmentation, this will be treated as affecting the segmentation of one and one-half of the twelve segments. Even though $k l h$ is also considered an addition, it will be treated as a confusion of the sequence of the elements in this verse since, if it is an addition, it is also a subtraction of an element of segment 7 of MT. This reduces the rating for both aspects of this mode below $90 \%$ and therefore the mode will be rated 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Although $k l h$ has been treated here as an addition, it has also been viewed as a transposition, and the missing phrase of which it could be a part is treated as a subtraction. With klhwn, it is one of two additions, and in relation to the Hebrew phrase 'l-kl-bny, it is treated as subtraction of one segment. Thus three out of twelve segments are considered features that reduce the literal nature of this mode in this verse and the mode is rated 3 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
${ }^{\prime} m r$. This Peal perf. of ${ }^{\prime} m r$ renders the Piel infinitive construct of $d b r$ here. This rendering was analyzed at 1:20 and rated $2+$ there.
$m l^{\prime} k h$. This rendering was analyzed in discussing $2: 1$ and is rated 5 based on that consideration.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ is rated 5 as explained in the discussion of $1: 1$.
$m l$ '. This plur. translates $d b r y m$ in this verse and some form of the same Syriac noun renders some form of dābār eleven times, including this verse and 3:19, 20; 9:3, 30;11:10, 11, 28; 16:16; 18:7(1x), and 28. The Hebrew word is rendered four times by ptgm' at $8: 3 ; 13: 12,17$; and 20:7. The Syriac rendering is $h k n$ ' three times in $8: 1 ; 20: 9$; and $21: 11$. The Hebrew is rendered by 'bydt' twice in 6:29, and by $m d m$ twice in 18:10 and 19:19. There is no rendering twice, in 11:37 and 19:24; perhaps the Hebrew can be taken as rendered by lyt $d$ at 18:7, but that might also be taken as a failure to translate the word itself. The most frequently occurring rendering as in this verse is only found in eleven of twenty-five places, thus the consistency is rated 1 .
'ysryl. The phrase bny 'ysryl was analyzed at 1:1 and this is one of the few inconsistent renderings of that Hebrew phrase. Since bny is treated here as a minus, this rendering is not calculated as an inconsistency.
'rymw. This Aphel of $r w m$ translates the Qal narrative tense of $n s$ ' five times, including this verse; $8: 28 ; 9: 7 ; 19: 17$; and 21:2. The same Hebrew verb is rendered three times by $\check{s} q l$ in 3:18; 9:48 and 54. The rendering is by $n s b$ once in 21:23 and there is no rendering at 16:31. Targum J uses the same root to render the same Hebrew four times, in this verse; 8:28; 9:7; and 21:2. In 3:18; 9:48, 54; and 16:31, Tg J renders by the root $n t t l$. In 19:17, Tg J renders by $z q p$ and in $21: 23$ by $n s b$ as P has also done. There does not seem to be a distinction here between lifting up eyes or voices and lifting or bearing a physical object. Clearly as well, rwm or sql/ntll would not be used for the "taking" or a wife as in 21:23. Codex B uses some form of $\alpha \hat{i} \rho \omega$ or $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \hat{i} \rho \omega$ for eight of the ten occurrences of $n s^{\prime}$, but A only for six. Thus the consistency of P is only slightly less than A and five of the nine places where P translates, it does so by an Aphel of rwm, that is in over $55 \%$ of the places. Therefore this rendering will be rated 2, with the qualification that some of the inconsistencies may not have been optional.
' $m$ '. This was analyzed in considering $1: 16$ where it was found to render Hebrew ' $m$ in all the places where that Hebrew is translated in Judges and rated 5 in all these places.
$q l h w n$. Syriac $q l$ as a rendering of Hebrew $q w l$ was analyzed at 2:2 and rated 5 there as it is here.
$b k w$. This renders the $3^{\text {rd }}$ person plur. Qal narrative of $b k h$ here. The proper name $b k y m$ is rendered by bkyn at $2: 1$ and $2: 15$, and not part of the consideration here. The eight places where this verb is found that are considered here are in this verse and $11: 37,38 ; 14: 16,17$; 20:23, 26; and 21:2. They are all rendered by this Syriac verb of the same root and rated 5 .

This mode is rated 3 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The way in which Syriac recasts the independent temporal protasis of MT was discussed at 1:14. A similar construction is found here where wyhy $k d b r$ is rendered by $w k d$ ' $m r$ and the waw of wys' $w$ is omitted in the rendering of 'rymw. This explains how segment 9 of P without the prefixed conjunction can be retroverted to segment 9 of MT with such a prefix.

The genitive relation between segments 2 and 3 of MT does not exist in $P$ and the genitive relation between segments 3 and 4 is rendered by genitive construction $c$. There are two direct object constructions $d$, one at segment 5 and one at segment 11. In both cases the direct object marker is present in MT.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

None of the other three versions reconstructed the protasis as P does although all three have rendered $d b r$ by a finite verb. Targum J renders $m l^{\prime} k$ by $n b y$. None of the three have the
additions made by P and identified in the foregoing discussion of the verse. Neither Tg J nor B has the subtraction. One of the elements subtracted in P is also absent in A and that is a rendering of bny where Tg J has bny and B has vioùs. Based on this small detail, A is deemed more similar to P than the other two, and based on its rendering of $m l^{\prime} k \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ is considered less similar to P than B .

2:5.
ויקראו שם־המקום ההוא בכָים ויזבחו שם ליהוה:


## RETROVERSION

With the elements joined by maqqēph treated as segment 2 , there are seven segments in MT, four to the athnach and three following it. With šmh ditr counted as segment 2 and the addition of ' $m$ ' set aside for the purpose of this analysis, there are four segments in P to the first punctuation point, and three following it. Although the $3^{\text {rd }}$ person sing of $q r^{r}$ cannot be retroverted to the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. of the cognate Hebrew verb, it can be retroverted to the sing. that fits the verse of P once the addition has been introduced. Both Tg J and B preserve the plur. Alexandrinus has rendered by a sing. passive of which tò ővo $\mu \alpha$ is the subject. (Dirksen's note shows that ms 9al fam preserves the plur.) The plur. in MT is of course a pseudopassive and those who render it as plur. are preserving that sense in a more literal way. Here P has used a construction with which we are familiar in English where a pseudo-passive is created by saying "people" do such and such, when the sense is that such and such is done. However, in this verse, A takes the more straightforward approach and turns it into a true passive.

Setting aside the addition all six other segments can be retroverted to MT and even the addition can be seen as an approach to rendering the pseudo-passive of the MT. Accordingly the source is treated as one that is indistinguishable from MT.

## LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.

 Although, ' $m$ ' is in many ways like an addition, it can also be seen as a free rendering of the first segment with the result that it becomes a different approach to the pseudo-passive of MT. It does not change the meaning, but does depart from a strictly word-for-word rendering at this point. This would change one of seven segments and reduce the rating for segmentation to 4 . The sequence of the elements is not considered to have been changed by this addition, so the rating for this mode is 4.5 .2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The addition of ${ }^{\prime} m$ ' is calculated as reducing the literal quality of the verse as to this mode to just under $86 \%$ of the degree to which the verse would be literal without the addition and this gives a rating of 4 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$q r^{r}$. This renders the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. narrative tense of Hebrew $q r^{r}$. The rendering of this Hebrew root by this Syriac root was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:17.
$\check{s} m h$. This Syriac with the pronominal suffix renders Hebrew šēm without any suffix. A similar rendering was evaluated at 1:10 and the rendering of the Hebrew word by some form of Syriac $\check{s} m$ was rated 5 wherever it occurs.
'tr'. This Syriac renders Hebrew $m q w m$ ten times, in this verse and 2:5; 7:7; 9:55; 15:17;
$18: 12 ; 19: 13,16,28$; and 20:36. The Hebrew word is rendered by $d w k t$ in $20: 22$ and $33(2 \mathrm{x})$.

It is rendered by ${ }^{\prime} r^{\prime \prime}$ at $11: 19$ and not rendered at $18: 10$. In these last five places, it is rendered by ${ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{tr}^{\prime}$ in Tg J . Thus in ten of the fourteen places where it is rendered in P , it is rendered by 'tr', over $71 \%$ of the renderings, and will be rated 3 .
$d b h ̣ w$. This renders the verb $z b h$ twice in Judges, in this verse and 16:23. This means there are too few examples to rate the consistency of the rendering. However, based on the consistent rendering of $m z b h$ by $m d b h^{3}$ discussed at $2: 2$, there is little reason to expect inconsistency.
tmn. This rendering of $\check{s} m$ was considered in the discussion of 1:7 and rated 5 at every place where the same rendering is found in Judges. $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. at segment 1, a pseudo-passive by a different approach to the pseudo-passive in P has already been noted. It was not noted that there is a difference between the use of ' $m$ ' with a sing. form of the verb in this verse and its use with a plur. form in the preceding verse. This would tend to show that ' $m$ ' can be viewed either as a collective noun or as a sing.

In segment 2 there is a genitive construction $c$ as well as a direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Alexandrinus has omitted a rendering of the initial waw and added $\delta$ ờ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0$ at the beginning of the verse. Vaticanus renders the seven segments in the same sequence as MT without
addition or subtraction (rendering $q r^{\circ}$ by $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \circ$ vo $\mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$ rather than $\left.\kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega\right)$ ). Targum J adds $n k s t$ $q d s ̌ y n$. Thus neither A nor Tg J deviates from a literal approach in the same way that P does. Since P only differs from B in the same way it differs from MT, in an unusual way, it could be said to be closer to B than it is to A and Tg J .

2:6.
וישלח יהושע את־הצֵם וילכו בני־ישראל איש לנחלתו לרשת את־הארץ:


## RETROVERSION

With the elements of MT joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 3,5 , and 9 , there are nine segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach, and six following it. With the phrase $l^{\prime} m$ ' counted as segment 3 , the phrase bny 'ysryl counted as single segment 5 , and 'r $r^{\circ}$ counted as segment 9 , there are nine segments in $P$, three to the first punctuation point, and six following it. Each segment of $P$ can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT and so there is no reason to propose any source that is different from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The segments of P can be matched with the corresponding segments of MT as a word-for-word translation and follow the same sequence as the segments of MT. This mode is rated 5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions, and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

$\check{s} d r$. This translates the Piel of $\check{s} l \underline{h}$ twice, once in this verse and once at $5: 15$. The consistency of the various translations of šlh in P was considered in discussing 1:8 and rated 1 there as it is here.
' $m$ '. This rendering of the Hebrew cognate was analyzed in the discussion of 1:16 and the rendering throughout Judges is rated 5 in all the places where it occurs. ${ }^{\prime} z l w$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of hlk here and the rendering of the Qal of hlk was discussed at 1:3 and rated 5 - there when it is rendered as it is here.
bny 'ysryl. This rendering of bny yśr ${ }^{\prime} l$ was rated 5 at $1: 1$.
$g b r$. This renders the sing. of ' $y s{ }^{\prime}$ and is one of the forty-nine times in Judges where the Hebrew is so rendered as shown in the discussion of 1:4 where the rendering in those 49 places was rated 4 as it is also here.
yrtwth. This renders nhltw six times, in this verse and 2:9; 18:1(1x); 20:6; 21:23 and 24. The Hebrew is rendered once in 18:1 by Syriac plgwt'. In Tg J, it is rendered by 'hsnt' in all seven places. The consistency in P is in almost $87 \%$ of the cases, so it is rated 4 . $m^{\prime} r t$. The Peal infinitive of $y r t$ renders the Qal infinitive of $y r s ̌$ here. The rendering of the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$ was considered in discussing 1:19. The Peal of $y r t$ translates the Qal of $y r \check{s}$ eight times, as in this verse and $3: 13 ; 11: 22,23,24(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 14: 15$; and 18:9. The Qal is rendered by the Aphel of ' $b d$ in 11:21 and is not rendered in 18:7 (where the MT is suspect). The rendering by the Aphel at 11:21 is treated as an inconsistency leaving about $89 \% \mathrm{pf}$ the renderings consistent so that the consistent renderings are rated 4.
' $r^{\prime}$. This renders ' $r s ̣$ and was first studied at 1:1. The rendering is rated 5 thoughout Judges.
This mode is rated 4 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There is a direct object construction $e$ at segment 3 and a direct object construction $d$ at segment 9 . There is a genitive construction $a$ in segment 5 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum $J$ is not different from $P$ as to the characteristics considered under modes 1 and 2 and it is semantically and syntactically similar to P . Although yrwtt', the OJA cognate of Syriac
 any rendering of bny yśr $r^{\prime} l$ and makes the rendering of wylkw sing. Thus Tg J is most similar to P and, if an addition is treated as less a difference than a subtraction, A would be closer to $P$ than $B$.

2:7. ויעבדו העם את־יהוה כל ימי יהושֵע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושוע אשר ראו את כל־מעשה יהוה הגדול אשר עשה לישראל:



## RETROVERSION

With 't-yhwh and 't kl-m's'h treated as segments 3 and 17 , respectively, there are twenty-two segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and sixteen following it. With lmry counted as segment 3 , $d^{\prime} g r w$ as segments 10 and 11 (and probably segment $12^{10}$ ), the waw prefix of $h z w$ counted as occupying the place of segment 15 of MT and hazw as segment 16, with ${ }^{\prime} b d w h y$ in the place of segment 17 (without either a direct object marker or $k l$ ), with wrwrbt'

[^111]in the place of segment 19 (prefixed by an added waw), and $d^{c} b d$ counted as segments 20 and 21, there are also twenty-two segments in this verse of P . The first six segments of P proceed to the first punctuation point retrovert without difficulty to the first six segments of MT. The next seven segments of $P$ can also be retroverted to segments 7 to 14 of MT, with the $d$ prefix of ' $g r w$ retroverting to segment 10 of MT and ' $g r w$ itself retroverting to segments 11 and 12. The next two segments of P retrovert to segments 13 and 14 of MT. After that the only element or sub-element of P that can be seen as occupying the position taken by segment 15 of MT is the prefixed waw of whzw. Here one can see that the 'šr of segment 15 , like that of segment 10 of MT refers back to segment 9 , the elders, or that it refers to both Joshua and the elders. The prefixed waw of segment 15 of P then might be seen as turning the relative pronoun of segment 10 into the subject of both segment 11 and segment 16 rather than stating a separate relative pronoun for both clauses. This would not change the meaning. (On the other hand, with this change it is possible to read the Syriac verse as altered so that the people are both those who serve and those who saw all the great things. This reading would either clarify the verse or change its meaning.)

There is no element in Dirksen's text of P that can be retroverted to the $k l$ of segment 17 of MT. (Dirksen notes that mss 9al fam, 10c1, 11c1, and 12al fam do have such a term: $k l h w n$.) Otherwise 'bdwhy dmry' can be retroverted to segments 17 (or the plur. of the word $m(s h)$ and 18 of MT. However the plur. rwrbt' cannot be retroverted to segment 19, because of the waw, but especially because of the entry in JPS saying that "the shorter forms of pl. [of $\left.r w r b^{\prime}\right]$ are chiefly used as adj., the longer (older) forms only as subst." The entry also includes the conclusion that the "[f]em emph. pl. [means] mighty works, great deeds or words." ${ }^{11}$ Finally $d^{c} b d$ l'ysryl can be retroverted to segments 20 to 22 of MT. There is a

[^112]slight possibility that this could be seen as ambiguous since the 'bdwhy are not necessarily an antecedent of the relative $d$, while the $r w r b t{ }^{\prime}$ certainly are. Nothing in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$ or B gives any support to a conclusion that the differences in P are based on a Hebrew source different from MT. Both A and B have $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ where MT has $r^{\prime} w$, but that term is not in doubt in P and the Greek can be treated as retroverting to the MT verb. Accordingly the source text is treated here as indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Here two segments of P , whzw and the plur. of $w r w r b t^{\prime}$ are considered failures to segment literally. The first probably has little or no effect on meaning (if, as judged here it was the elders who "saw," but it would if the people are treated as part of the subject). But it does make a syntactic difference in the clause by making it more independent of the previous clause. The waw prefix of $r w r b t^{\prime}$ is also taken here as a departure from the segmentation of MT since it creates a second direct object of $h z w$ as well as some ambiguity about whether the relative clause describes only the latter and not both direct objects.

Since the elements of this verse of P that represent the elements of the presumed source are in the same sequence as those of MT, the literal nature of the sequence is not affected, although it is interrupted by gaps and additions.

The effect of the departure from segmentation is difficult to quantify. While only two of twenty-two segments of MT are treated as not literally divided, that would still mean that over $90 \%$ of the segmentation is literal, but since the number of elements in P has been reduced from the number in MT (the missing $y w m t t^{\prime}$, $\check{s} r$, and $k l$ ) this reduced number is the base on which the segmentation is calculated, and that would make the rating for segmentation 4 and for this mode, 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. This verse has three subtractions, an expected plur. of $y w m t$ ' after ' $g r w$, a term representing the 'šr of segment 15 , and an expected $k l$ or $k l h w n$ before 'bdwhy. It also has two sub-elements that are not features of Syriac syntax like those considered part of mode 4. These are the waw prefixes of $h z w$ and $r w r b t t^{\circ}$. These will be treated as subtracting three elements and adding two sub-elements (each considered half of an element). This yields a total of four variations from a literal rendering as to this mode. This is about $82 \%$ of the elements of this verse and thus the mode is rated 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$p l h w$. The Peal of this verb renders the Qal of ' $b d$ seventeen times in Judges, in this verse and $2: 11,13,19 ; 3: 6,7,8,14 ; 9: 28(3 x), 38 ; 10: 6(2 x), 10,13$, and 16 . Its rendering is rated 5 . ' $m$ '. This rendering of Hebrew ' $m$ was evaluated at $1: 16$ and rated 5 in all sixty places where it is so rendered in Judges.
$m r y^{3}$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
$y w m t^{\prime} / h$. This renders $y m y$ twice in this verse and does not render $y m y m$ once. The ten times where hywm hzh is rendered by ywmn' are rated at 1:21 and the other four verses where hywm is rendered by ywmn' are also reported there. In addition, forms of this Hebrew root are rendered by this Syriac term fifty-two times, including this verse (2x) and 2:18; 4:14, 23; 5:1, 6(2x); 6:32; 8:28; 9:45; 11:4, 40(1x); 13:7, 10; 14:8, 12, 14, 15, 17(2x), 18; 15:20; $16: 16 ; 17: 6,10 ; 18: 1(3 x), 30,31 ; 19: 1,2,4,5,8(2 x), 9(2 x), 11 ; 20: 15,21,22,24,25,26$, $27,28,30,35,46$; and $21: 25$. It is rendered by ' $d n$ four times, twice at $11: 40$ and twice at 21:19. It is rendered by $z b n^{\prime}$ twice, once at $3: 30$ and once at $15: 1$. It is not rendered once in this verse and once at 19:9. The only places considered inconsistent here are the four renderings by ' $d n$ (noting the possibility that "days" in these places might have been awkward
in Syriac) and the two by $z b n^{\prime}$. This consistency is found in more than $88 \%$ of the places where this Hebrew term is rendered and it is rated 4.
$q s ̌ y s ̌$. This plur. renders hzqnym here and seven other times in Judges: $8: 14 ; 11: 5,7,8,9$, 10, and 11. The same Hebrew word is rendered by some form of $s b^{\prime}$ six times: $8: 16 ; 19: 16$, 17, 20, 22; and 21:16. There might have been some distinction in the translator's mind between $q s y^{y} s^{\prime}$ as a term of respect and $s b^{\prime}$ as attributing chronological age, but, if so, it is not consistently applied since at $8: 16$ the reference is to "elders of the city" and at 21:16 it is the "elders of the congregation." Accordingly, with only about $57 \%$ of the renderings, this one and others like it are rated 2. The renderings by $s b^{\prime}$ would rate 1 . 'grw. This Aphel of $n g r$ renders the Hiphil of 'rk only here in Judges so that it cannot be rated.
btr. This renders 'ḥry here and did so first at $1: 1$ where it is evaluated and rated 4 as it will be here.
$h z w$. This Peal of hazw renders the Qal of $r h$ here and thirty-three other times discussed at $1: 24$ where this rendering is rated 5 .
' $b d w h y$. This renders $m$ 's'h here and in $2: 10 ; 13: 12$; and $19: 16$ so that it is rated 5. $r w r b t$. This may be meant to render $h g d w l$ here although it seems to be a substantive. The same Hebrew root is rendered as a plur. adjective by this Syriac root at 5:15 and 16. Forms of the related $r b^{\prime}$ in the sing. render the Hebrew sing. adjective in $11: 33\left(r b t^{\prime}\right) ; 15: 8,18 ; 16: 5$, $6,15,23$; and 21:2. At 21:5 the "oath" in P is $m w m t$ ' with a seyame and the modifier is $r b t$ ', not a form of $r w r b^{3}$. At best there are only three places where $r w r b t^{\prime}$ consistently renders $g d w l$ and, as for the one in this verse, if it is rendering any element of MT, it is rendering a sing. adjective. In 21:5 where the plur. form of the adjective might be expected, one finds the sing. Furthermore, the subject of this analysis is the consistency of the rendering in this verse
with other comparable renderings and not the consistency of the renderings in the eight places where a sing. is rendering a sing. Accordingly this rendering is not rated because of the lack of renderings with which to compare it and because of the uncertainty of the translation term in relation to its Hebrew source.
${ }^{\prime} b d$. The rendering of Hebrew 's'h by this Syriac verb was analyzed in the discussion of 1:7 and rated 5 there.

The rating of this mode for this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As already discussed, the substitution of a waw for a dalat prefixed to haw does not accurately represent the syntax of the MT, and thus represents some freedom in translation rather than expressing a feature of Syriac syntax. Similar comments would apply to wrwrbt .

In segment 3 of P there is a direct object construction $e$ and in the truncated segment 17 a direct object construction $d$. (As the Syriac stands, segment 19, $r w r b t^{\prime}$, is also a direct object construction d.) Segments 5 to 6 provide an example of genitive construction $c$ and segments 8 and 9 an example of genitive construction $b$.

Williams notes "that suffixed $\boldsymbol{\text { ح }}$ is used when the word 'days' stands on its own, or is suffixed. ${ }^{112}$ Segments 7, 8, and 9 are an example of the first, and segments 4, 5 and 6 an example of the second.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

[^113]Targum J follows MT quite closely and makes neither of the changes (the substitution of the $w$ for $d$ and the addition of the $w$ prefix at segment 19) made by P . The Targum does add the characteristic $q d m$ before $y w y$. The two Greek Versions are almost identical here, but they do differ in that A renders 'ḥry yhwšw' by $\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ v$ and B by $\mu \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ 'I $\eta \sigma 0 \hat{\text { v }}$. Although the differences between Tg J and A and B are slight, A and B do render hrykw ymym by a verb alone, $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \alpha \kappa \rho о \eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon ́ v \sigma \alpha \nu$ rather than by two terms in the somewhat more literal way of Tg J by hrykw ywmym. This reed is even thinner than it might otherwise be of course, because the Greek verb is a literal rendering by one term of the Hebrew phrase it is rendering, as is also the case for the Aphel of $n g r$ used in P. Based on this quite slight difference A and B are judged closer to P than Tg J , and A closer than B because of B 's use of the genitive with $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ́$.

2:8

## RETROVERSION

With the elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 3 and 6, there are eight segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and three following it. With the phrase brnwn counted as segment 3 and $b r m^{\prime \prime}$ counted as single segment 6 , there are also eight segments in this verse of P , five to the first punctuation point, and three following it. Each segment of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT and there is no basis in P to conclude that P's source was distinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The division of the segments is the same in P as in MT and the sequence is also the same, so that this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no elements added or subtracted and this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering

$m y t$. This Peal of $m w t$ renders the Qal of $m w t$ here. This was analyzed for consistency at 1:7 and rated 5 there.
$b r$. This renders $b n$ twice in this verse, once as part of a proper name and once as part of an idiom for stating a person's age. This rendering of the sing. was analyzed at $1: 13$ where this verse was treated as having only one rendering of $b n$. All forty-eight renderings of $b n$ outside this verse were consistent and rated 5 as are the renderings in this verse.
${ }^{\prime} b d h$. This renders Hebrew ' $b d$ and a form of this Syriac noun renders a form of the Hebrew noun five times in Judges, in this verse and in $3: 24 ; 6: 27 ; 15: 18$; and 19:19. At $6: 8$ the Hebrew plur. is rendered by ' $b d w t$ ', an accurate translation, but not a completely consistent one. Thus this rendering is consistent about $83 \%$ of the time and rated 4 . $m^{\prime \prime} w s r$. This renders $m^{\prime} h w^{\prime \prime} r$. The term $m^{\prime} h$ is rendered thirty times by $m^{\prime \prime}$ and not rendered one time. Either ' $s r$ or ' $s r$ ' renders the corresponding Hebrew twelve times. These are not rated since there is little room for the translator to be inconsistent in rendering. šnyn. This renders the plur. šnym twenty-two times in Judges and the sing. šnyt ${ }^{\text {p }}$ renders the Hebrew sing. twice. The places where those and other renderings of šnh occur in Judges are shown in the discussion of $3: 11$. Here it is rated 5 .

This mode is rated 5 for this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The proper name brnwn has its origin in a genitive construction, but it is not cited as a genitive construction here. It can be contrasted with $m r h d b z q$ at 1:5 and 6. In segments 4 and 5 there is a genitive construction $c$ and in segment $6, b r m^{\prime \prime}$, an example of genitive construction $a$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Like P all the other three are quite literal in this verse and cannot be distinguished meaningfully by applying any of the modes of literalism considered here. Because of the similarity of the Aramaic of P and Tg J , the vocabulary of the two versions is closer than usual in this verse.

2:9.
ויקברו אותו בגבול נחלתו בתמנת־חרס בהר אפרִים מצפון להר געש:


## RETROVERSION

With the elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 5 and 9 there are nine segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and three following it. With wqbrwhy of P lined up with segments 1 and 2 of MT, btmnt srh lined up with segment 5 of MT, btmnt$h r s, m n g r b y$ lined up with segment $8, m s p w n$, and $d t \not t w r^{\circ} d g c^{c ̌}$ lined up with segment $9, l h r$ $g \check{s}$, there are also nine identifiable segments in the verse of P. Each can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT, taking account of Syriac syntax and with explanations in the
case of segments 1 and 9 and explanation and qualification in the case of segment 5 . In the case of segment 1 , wqbrwhy, it is clear that expressing the pronominal direct object either as a suffix or as a separated direct object is an option that is open in either language, although rather less likely in Syriac. The Syriac as it stands here could be retroverted either into the MT as it stands or into a form where the verb has a pronominal object. At segment 9 there is a $d$ prefix in P where MT has a prefixed preposition $l$. The sense of $d$ here in P is that of a preposition. In the two other similar places in Judges where MT has a similar construction with mspwn l, P has the same construction it has here with mn grby d: 7:1 and 21:19. Similar examples are found at Josh 8:11 and 24:30.

The use by P of srh for $h r r s$ at segment 5 is not supported by $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and Tg J . It is supported by the Vulgate, and by some mss of Tg J. Smelik comments: "Whether the present variant reading is a genuine reflection of a different Vorlage, or a correction under the influence of Josh [19:50 and 24:20] can hardly be decided." ${ }^{13}$ Here too the question of whether the translator or a copyist of P based this reading, srh, on a Hebrew source then available (or even on something so speculative as negligence in reading the letters backwards) will not be decided, but the rest of the verse is considered to be one based on a Hebrew source indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The conclusion that this verse in P can be divided into the segments of MT shows that the segments as translated in P are divided as they are divided in MT. The undecided $s r h / h r s$ question does not compromise this conclusion since its position in segment 5 remains the same whatever may be the reason for the difference. The $d$ prefix of segment 7 , creating a

[^114]small subordinate clause where there is an attributive preposition in MT presents the only deviation from a word-for-word translation, and that is a small one treated under mode 4. The elements of P are in the same sequence so that both aspects of this mode are rated 5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none. There are sub-elements that remain to be explained as features of mode 4. It is assumed for the purpose of this discussion only that the $h r s / s r h$ issue does not involve addition or subtraction, and so this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

$q b r w h y$. This Peal renders the Qal narrative of $q b r$ here and in 16:31. The Ethpeel of the same verb renders the Niphal of the same Hebrew verb in $8: 22 ; 10: 2,5: 12: 7,10,12$, and 15. Thus the nine renderings in Judges are consistent and should be rated 5. $t h w m^{2}$. This rendering of $g b w l$ was analyzed at $1: 18$ and rated 5 there. yrtwth. This rendering of nhltw was analyzed in the discussion of 2:6 and rated 4 there as it will be here.
$t \not t r r^{2}$. This rendering of $h r$ was considered at 1:9 and rated 5 as to all places where it is rendered as it is here.
grby. This renders $s p w n$ here and at $7: 1 ; 12: 1$; and $21: 19$, four times in all, and is rated 5 in all these places.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. While the accuracy of srh as a rendering of $h r s$ has to be questioned here, the cause has not been explained. In the phrases of segments 3 to 4 , segments 6 to 7 , and in segment 9 , there are three examples of genitive construction $b$. In segment 6 there is another example of the rendering of an attributive (here a prepositional phrase) by a verbless relative clause. In the element $d t w r^{\circ}$ of segment 9 of this verse and the other verses cited in the discussion of retroversion, there are examples of the
use of prepositional $d$ where the preposition $l$ is used in similar contexts by classical Biblical Hebrew prose.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A \& B

Targum J adds the phrase dbyt between segments 6 and 7 and renders $h r s$ by the same consonants. Both A and B render tmnt-hrs by $\Theta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$ and are otherwise identical without additions or subtractions dividing the elements as closely as reasonably possible to MT and in the same sequence. Thus based on the very small addition in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$ and B are similarly closer to P than is Tg J .

וגם כל־הדור ההוא נאספו אל־אבותיו ויקם דור אחר אחריהם אשר לא־ידעו את־יהוה וגם את־המעשה . 2:10
אשר עשה לישראל:

ח

## RETROVERSION

With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as five single segments $2,5,11,12$, and 14 , there are seventeen segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach, and twelve following it. In $\mathrm{P}, k l h d r^{\prime}$ corresponds to segment 2 of MT, lwt 'bhyhwn to segment 5, the prefix portion of $d l^{\prime}$ to segment 10 , the following $l^{\prime} y d^{\prime} w$ to segment 11 , lmry' to segment 12 , $l^{\prime} b d w h y$ to segment 14 , the prefix of $d^{\prime} b d$ to segment 15 and ' $b d$ itself to segment 16 . The $l$
between segments 13 and 14 is an addition. Segments 1 to 5 occur before the first punctuation point, 6 to 9 before the second such point, 10 to 12 before the third, and 13 to 17 up to the fourth and last punctuation point. Each of these seventeen segments of P as they are described here, corresponding to the seventeen segments in this verse of MT, can be retroverted to that corresponding segment. The $l^{\prime}$ cannot be retroverted, but it may be possible to understand it as a feature of Syriac translation technique in discussing mode 4. Accordingly the source of this verse of P is treated as a source that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. In discussing the retroversion, the segments that were identified in MT and then matched by those in P support the conclusion that (except for the added $l$ ') the segments of P are divided, mutatis mutandis according to Syriac syntax, so as to reflect the division of the segments of MT. They are also in the same sequence so that both aspects of this mode should be rated 5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one addition, the $l$ already identified, and there are no subtractions. The addition will be discussed further in considering mode 4. This addition is only about $6 \%$ of the verse which will still be rated 5 , but with a minus to reflect the fact of the addition. The reader should note that Smelik does not report this addition in his list of pluses. ${ }^{14}$

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering

' $p$. This renders Hebrew $g m$ twice in this verse. This rendering was discussed at $1: 3$ where it was rated 5 when rendered as it is here.

[^115]$d r^{2}$. This renders Hebrew $d w r$ twice in this verse and once at $3: 2$, and so there are not enough examples to evaluate the consistency of this translation term in Judges.
'tknšw. This Ethpeel (or Ethpaal) renders the Niphal of 'sp here and in 6:33; 9:6;10:17: 16:23; 20:11 and 14. At $10: 17$, the Niphal of $s^{\prime} q$ is also rendered by the same form of this Syriac verb. This rendering is consistent in the seven places where the Niphal of 'sp is found in Judges and rated 5. The three instances of the Qal of the same Hebrew verb and the two of the Piel were not considered here, but will be considered in discussing 3:13.
'bhyhwn. This renders Hebrew 'bwtyw here. All the renderings of 'b in Judges, sing. and plur., with or without suffixes, were studied at $1: 14$ and all were rated 5 .
$q m$. This renders the Qal narrative tene of Hebrew $q$ wm and other forms of the Qal at 3:20; $4: 9,14 ; 5: 7,12 ; 7: 9,15 ; 8: 20,21(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 9: 18,32,34,35,43 ; 10: 1,3 ; 13: 11 ; 16: 3 ; 18: 9 ; 19: 3$, $7,9,10,27,28(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 20: 5,8,18,19$ and 33 . This is a total of thirty-three times. There is no rendering of the Hebrew at 19:5. Wherever rendered, this rendering of the Qal of qwm is consistent in Judges and rated 5.
' $h r r n$ '. This renders ' $h r$ here and plur. forms render plur. forms of the Hebrew at 2:12; 17, 19; and $10: 13$. The fem. sing. ' $h r t^{\prime}$ ' renders the fem sing of the Hebrew at $11: 2$. Therefore these six renderings are rated 5 in all these places.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{c} w$. This Peal renders the Qal of $y d^{\prime} w$ seventeen times, here and in 3:1, 2(2x), 4; 6:37; $13: 16,21 ; 14: 4 ; 15: 11 ; 16: 20 ; 17: 13 ; 18: 5,14(2 x) ;$ 19:22; and 20:34. It is rendered by $h k m$ in four places where it means carnal knowledge: 11:39; 19:25; 21:11 and 12. Targum J renders by $y d^{c}$ in all four places where P is inconsistent and the Hebrew refers to carnal knowledge. This could mean that there is a bright-line distinction in Syriac between the two senses of $y d^{\star}$ in Hebrew, but the case of 19:22 might cast doubt on that. Is this rendering by Syriac $y d^{\prime}$ in that verse an inconsistency or does it reflect the translator's interpretation that
the demand from the mob was made in innocent language but with the malicious intent that the old man described as hnblh (MT) or $s^{c} r^{\prime}(\mathrm{P})$ ? This consideration reduces the likelihood that there is any bright line distinction between the two words. Although neither JPS or Costaz report "carnally knowing" as a sense of $y d^{\prime}$, they do treat that meaning as one available for $h \mathrm{~km}$. Brockelmann gives coivit as one meaning of $y d^{c}$ and cites $1 \mathrm{Kgs} 1: 4$ where the reader is told that David had no carnal knowledge of Abishag the Shunammite. ${ }^{15}$ On the assumption then that "to know carnally" is a possible meaning of Syriac $y d^{\prime}$, these four renderings would not be as literal as theoretically possible. Even if these four renderings are taken as inconsistent with respect to the other seventeen, the other seventeen would still be about $81 \%$ of the renderings and rated 4 . That is the conclusion reached here.
mry. This was rated 5 at 1:1.
'bdwhy. This was rated 5 at 2:7.
'bd. This was rated 5 at 1:7.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The addition of $l^{\prime}$ by P between segments 13 and 14 calls for some attempt at explanation. According to JPS either $l^{\prime} \ldots l^{\prime}, w^{\prime} \ldots l^{\prime}$, or $l^{\prime} \ldots{ }^{\prime} p^{\prime}$ ' can mean "neither. . . nor." ${ }^{16}$ Here one finds $l^{\prime} \ldots w^{\prime} p l^{\prime}$, and
基; this is rendered by the translator of Nöldeke's Grammar as "neither did he feel sorry for me nor did he think of me (otherwise)." ${ }^{17}$ This suggests that Syriac syntax may be more likely to call for an express negation of every clause that is the object of a verb that

[^116]is negated. If this is the case a translator or even a copyist might be more likely to add a second $l$ in situations like the one that had to be dealt with here.

While the $h w$ by which P makes clear that $d r^{\nu}$ is definite accurately renders segment 3 of MT, the suffix of $k l h$ is a feature of Syriac syntax. As already noted Williams has concluded that in 1 Kings, " $[t]$ he most outstanding feature of all the examples above [of kl with a sing. masc. or fem. suffix] is that they are probably all definite." ${ }^{18}$

The renderings of segments 12 and 14 are both examples of direct object construction e.

The Hebrew is somewhat inconsistent about whether it treats an element as sing. or plur. Although $h d w r$ is sing., $n^{\prime} s p w$ of which it is the subject is plur., but then the suffix of ${ }^{\prime} b w t y w$ is sing. Then wyqm is sing. and its subject, $d w r$, is sing. at the same time the suffix of 'hryhm is plur., and $y d^{\prime} w$ whose subject is ultimately $d w r$ is plur. In all but one of these cases, P renders these variations in MT faithfully, but it renders the suffix of segment 5 as a plur., 'bhyhwn. As in 2:7 the sing. of $m$ 's'h is rendered by a plur. in P .

The pronominal suffix of this last plur., ' $b d w h y$, may have been added as a means of marking it as definite.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for the fact that A renders both occurrence of $w g m$ by каi and B by каi $\gamma \varepsilon$, and A renders segment 10 by ő oot and B by őt, the two versions are identical. Targum J would be closest to MT if it had not added $l m d h ̣ l m n q d m$. Both A and B are similar to P in using the

[^117]plur. pronoun $\alpha$ v̉ $\tau \hat{v} v$ with "fathers," but they do not follow P in making plur. the "work" which the Lord did. It is not easy to assess whether $\kappa \alpha i \gamma \varepsilon$ is closer to $w p$ than $\kappa \alpha i ́$ alone. Something more than каi may be called for as to the second $w g m$, segment 13. If that is the case, B would be closer to P than A .

2:11.

```
ויעשו בני־ישראל את־הרע בעיני יהו\ה ויעבדו את־הבעלים:
```



## RETROVERSION

With each set of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 2,3 , and 7 , there are seven segments in MT, five up to the athnach and two following it. With bny 'ysryl as segment 2 , $d b y s ̌$ as segment 3 and $l b c^{\prime}$ as segment 7 , there are also seven segments in P , five to the first punctuation point and two following it. Each of those segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT with the exception of segment 7 which is sing. in P. Since Tg J, A, B, and the Vulgate all have the Baals in the plur. and since P often differs from MT in rendering by sing. or plur., the use of a Hebrew text by $P$ that differed from MT in this respect is unlikely.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of segments. As the discussion of retroversion shows, the translation of this verse is on an element by element or segment by segment basis and the elements are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. Accordingly this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions although there may be features of the translation that need to be noted as part of mode 4.

Accordingly, this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

${ }^{\prime} b d w$. As stated in considering this mode in the previous verse, the rendering of 's'h by this verb was evaluated at 1:7 and rated 5 wherever so rendered in Judges.
bny 'ysryl. The translation by this phrase of the equivalent phrase in MT was analyzed at 1:1 and rated 5 wherever it occurs in Judges.
$d b y s ̌$. The rendering of $h r^{c}$ by this phrase occurs eight times in Judges, in this verse and in 3:7, 12(2x); 4:1; 6:1; 10:6; and 13:1. The rendering of $r^{c h}$ or $h r^{r} h$ by byšt will be seen eleven times in Judges, beginning at $2: 15$ and then in $9: 23,56,57 ; 11: 27 ; 15: 3 ; 20: 3,12,13,34$, and 41. These feminine forms are often substantives. Wherever the nineteen rendering recorded here occur, they will be rated 5 .
$q d m$. This translates byny in all eight places cited in the previous entry where $h r^{\prime}$ is rendered by $d b y s \check{c}$ and the eyes are those of the Lord and the prepositional phrase means "before," or "in the presence of the Lord." In seven other places in P the phrase bynyn (with various pronominal suffixes) renders the equivalent phrase in MT. In 6:17, it is the eyes of the angel of the Lord and in 10:15, the eyes of the Lord. In $14: 3,7 ; 17: 6 ; 19: 24$; and 21:25, it is human eyes. In 6:17, it is not what is evil in the eyes of the beholder, it is finding favor in the eyes of the Lord or his angel, and in 10:15, it is a question of what is good in the eyes of the Lord. Thus it is clear that in eight places the rendering is incontestably consistent and in two places, 6:17 and 10:15, the rendering is inconsistent with those eight renderings. In the five place where the eyes are human, there is, arguably, a basis for a distinction. If those five places are not part of the calculation of consistency, the consistency of the eight renderings
would be rated 4 , but if the five are treated as inconsistent, the rating for the eight is 2 . Here the rating will be 4 with a minus to indicate the uncertainty.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was evaluated at $1: 1$ and rated 5 wherever so rendered in Judges.
plhw. This rendering of ${ }^{\prime} b d$ was evaluated at 2:7 and rated 5 .
$b^{c}$ ? . This sing. form in P renders the plur. of the Hebrew cognate six times and the sing. five times as follows: this verse (plur.); 2:13 (plur.); $3: 7$ (plur.); 6:25, 28, 30, 31 , and 32 (all five sing.); 8:33 (plur.); 10:6 and 10 (both plur.). Thus these renderings can all be rated 5, but this pattern is another example of the anomalous pattern of consistency and inconsistency found in $P$.

This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The construction dbyš as a direct object is an example of a construction discussed by Williams as a direct object: He says, "This is especially used for 'doing bad' or 'doing good.' It is a form of relative clause.
 t.ar.. ${ }^{19}$ It is an object clause here. Syriac idiom may be shy about treating some sing. adjectives as substantives. Someone may have said: the rich are different from you and me. However, the speaker would not be understood who said: the rich is different from you and me. Rather, to express the sing. in English, it would be necessary to say something like: one who is rich is different from you and me. (In English this is, at least partly, because adjectives do not have sing. and plur. forms.) In the same way, speakers of standard English do not say: he did the admirable. They say: he did what is admirable; or they say something equivalent, or throw in the word "thing." This suggests something similar about Syriac syntax.

[^118]As noted in considering the consistency of the rendering of $b^{c} y n y$ by $q d m$, the more literal rendering by Syriac byny is not awkward for the translator and the use of $q d m$ in the context of this verse where the "eyes" are those of the Lord is similar to Tg J. In this verse Tg J also renders by $q d m$ at the same time both P and Tg J render by $b^{c} y n y$ at $14: 3$, for example, where the eyes are those of Samson. This is an example of one way of realizing mode 4 as defined by Barr when he writes of cases where there are "two levels to be considered, the literal meaning of the word as a normal linguistic unit, and the more ultimate significance, the quality or reality that is actually being spoken about. ${ }^{, 20}$

The rendering of $h b^{c} l y m$ by the sing. $b c l$ is puzzling and is in contrast to rendering $m$ 's'h by the plur. of ' $b d$ in the previous verse.

In segment 2 of P there is an instance of genitive construction $a$ and in segment 7 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

In this verse, Tg J is as similar to P as could be expected. Only in rendering $b^{c} l$ as plur. does it differ, but there it is following MT as A and B also do. Both A and B are similar, not
 the imperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \varepsilon v o v$, but B does so by the aorist $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \varepsilon v \sigma \alpha v$, and the aorist seems more fitted to rendering the narrative tense. Thus B can be seen as closer than A to P.

[^119]
## 2:12. ויעזבו את־יהוה אלהי אבותם המוציא אותם מארץ מצרים וילכו אחרי אלהים אחרים מאלהי העמים אשר סביבותיהם וישתחוו להֵם ויכעסו את־יהוה: <br>  

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 2 and 20 there are twenty segments in MT, eighteen to the athnach and two following it. In P there are nineteen segments with $l m r y^{\prime}$ treated as segment 2, with $m n^{\prime} r^{\circ}$ as the seventh segment, with ' $h r n^{\prime}$ ' as the twelfth segment, without a segment 13 , with $d^{\prime} m m^{\prime}$ treated as segment 14 , with the $d$ prefix of $d b h d r y h w n$ treated as segment 15 and the rest of that element treated as segment 16. There are eight segments in P representing segments 1 to 8 of MT to the first punctuation point, nine to the second point (numbered 9 to 18 without any segment 13), and finally two segments numbered 19 and 20 (the eighteenth and nineteenth segments of P ) to the third punctuation point. Segments 1 to 12 of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT as can segments 14 to 20 .

There is no support in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Vulgate for the omission of an element representing $m^{\prime} l h y$ of MT. The Targum is less literal with $m t^{\prime} w t$ representing segment 13 . Accordingly the source of P will be assumed to be one that cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The nineteen segments identified in $P$ are word-for-word renderings of nineteen of the twenty segments of MT with some features of Syriac syntax that formally differentiate them from the

MT, like the prefixed relative pronouns of segments 5 and 15 (and thus features of mode 4), but not considered here as a failure to segment literally. The missing rendering of segment 13 is treated as a subtraction with no substantial effect on meaning. Those segments are in the same sequence as they are in MT, so this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. One of the twenty segments of MT as they are divided and identified above is not rendered by $\mathrm{P}, m^{\prime} l h y$, segment 13 . Since that is only $5 \%$ of the segments, the mode is rated 5 , but with a minus to reflect that departure from literalism. This minus is not reported by Smelik.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering

$\check{s} b q w$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of ${ }^{\prime} z b$ six times in Judges, in this verse and 2:13, $21 ; 10: 6,10$, and 13. It was discussed as a rendering of $n t n$ at $1: 34$. Here it is rated 5 where rendered as in this verse. $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
' $l h h^{\prime}$. This renders 'lhym as the God of Israel here once and 'lhym as the other "gods" once, and a third occurrence of ${ }^{\prime} l h^{\prime}$ which also refers to those other gods is not rendered at all. As sing. in meaning translating the "God" of Israel, it was rated 5 at 1:7. In the discussion of 1:7, the places where the word refers to other "gods" were accounted for and in twenty-one of the twenty-two places, it is rendered by the plur. of ' $/ h^{\prime}$. The fact that it is not rendered once in this verse was reported there. Here the fact that it is rendered by the plur of ${ }^{\prime} l h^{\prime}$ in all twenty-one places where it is translated is the basis for also rating the plur. rendering 5.
'bhyhwn. This renders 'bwtm of MT and the rendering by P of all forms of ' $b$, plur., sing., and with or without suffixes was considered at $1: 14$ where those renderings are rated 5 . ${ }^{\prime} p q$. This Aphel of $n p q$ translates the Hiphil of $y s^{\prime}$ here and seven other times at $6: 8,18,19$, $30 ; 19: 22,24$ and 25 . It is rated 5.
' $r$ '. This rendition of ' $r \underset{~}{\text { s }}$ was considered at $1: 2$ where it was rated 5 wherever rendered as it is here.
${ }^{\prime} z l w$. This rendering by the Peal of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ of the Qa of $h l k$ was rated 5- in the discussion of 1:3. ' $h \mathrm{rn}$ '. This renders the plur. of 'hrym. The rendering was evaluated at $2: 10$ above and rated 5 there.
${ }^{\prime} m m$ '. This renders the plur. of ${ }^{\prime} m$ here. The renderings of $' m$ were considered at 1:16 and rated 5 there.
$b h ̣ d r y h w n$. This prepositional phrase renders sbybyhm here and construct forms of $h d r$ render forms of $s b y b$ six more times at $2: 12,14 ; 7: 18,21 ; 8: 34$; and $20: 29$. The consistency of these seven renderings is rated 5 .
$s g d w$. This Peal renders what is usually treated as the Hithpael of šḥh (or šhwh) here and at $2: 17,19$; and $7: 15$. Thus it is rated 5 .
${ }^{\prime} r g z w$. This Aphel of $r g z$ renders the Hiphil of $k ' s$ only here in Judges and no other form of the Hebrew verb occurs in Judges. Thus it cannot be rated.

This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There are three examples of direct object construction $e$ at segments 2,18 , and 20. Genitive construction $b$ is seen at segments 3 to 4,7 to 8 , and 12 to 14 (where there is no segment 13 and the governing word is at segment 11). ${ }^{21}$

The rendering of the participle $m w s y^{3}$ in the determined state in Hebrew by a relative clause with a finite verb, $d^{p} p q$, is comparable to the rendering of the attributive adjective in the determined state by a verbless relative clause with the adjective in the absolute state that was seen in the previous verse in the rendering of $h r^{c}$. Another similar phenomenon is the

[^120]rendering of the determined participle in Hebrew by a relative clause in Syriac where the predicate is a participle. This was seen in the rendering of hyšb at $1: 10$ and hywšb at 1:29.

The omission of the prepositional phrase $m^{\prime} l h y$ can be seen as a departure from a word-for-word rendering as well as a case of a subtraction of an element. There is no change of meaning, but the effect of the the omission could be seen as an indication that the phrase is not necessary to the understanding of the verse and thus be an assertion of freedom from the constraint of literalism under such circumstances.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has added $p l h n^{\prime} d$ at segment 2 and rendered segment 9 by $t^{t} w$ and segment 11 by $t^{\prime}$ 'wt, and placed 'mmy' at the position of segment 12 of in MT without rendering 'ḥrym. In addition, Tg J renders $m^{\prime} l h y$, segment 13, by $m t^{t} w t$ and at segment 20 has rendered or substituted for the direct object marker the preposition $q d m$. Thus it is more unlike both MT and $P$ than are $A$ and $B$. Those last two versions are quite similar, but A renders segment 3 as $\theta \varepsilon o ̀ v$ without the definite article and B has one. At segment 14 A renders by $\lambda \alpha \hat{\rho} v$ and B by $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta v \hat{\varrho} v$, the only place in Judges where B renders ' $m$ by another term than $\lambda \alpha o ́ s$. Thus A is more similar to P than is B .

2:13.
ויעזבו את־יהוה ויעבדו לבעל ולעשתרות:


## RETROVERSION

With 't-yhwh treated as a single segment 2 there are five segments in MT, two to the athnach and three after it. With lmry as segment 2 there are also five segments in P , two to the first punctuation point and three following it. Each segment of P can be retroverted to each segment of MT and there is no evidence of any difference between the source of P and the text of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of the elements and segments of MT and the sequence of the elements is the same in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition of subtraction of elements. There is no addition or subtraction of elements, and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

Segment $1, s \check{s} b q w$, first rendered the Qal of ${ }^{\prime} z b$ in the previous verse and was rated 5 there. The direct object at segment 2, mry', was first considered at 1:1 and rated 5. Segment 3, $p l h w$, first rendered ' $b d$ at $2: 7$ and was rated 5 where so rendered. At $2: 11, b^{c} l^{\prime}$ rendered the plur. of $b c l$ in MT and was rated 5 as a rendering of both the sing. and plur.
'strt'. This plur. noun renders Hebrew 'štrwt here and at 10:6. The sing. of 'str' renders 'šrh at $6: 25,26,28$, and 30 . The plur. of 'str' renders 'šrwt at $3: 7$. While this evidence is insufficient to rate the rendering of this term in Judges, the evidence of the sing. and plur. of this word and the similar term might point to consistency.

This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. The rendering of this verse in P is notably literal. There are three direct objects rendered according to construction $e$, and the last two are formally equivalent to MT. The entry for $l$ in BDB specifies that this preposition
can denote the object of a verb, especially with particular verbs, of which 'bd is one. ${ }^{22}$ Of interest in this respect is that the MT is not consistent so that the similar construction in 2:11 above "serving the Baals" uses the direct object marker ' $t$ while the same construction in this verse uses $l$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Here again Tg J has added $p l h n^{\prime} d$ at segment 2. As between A and B , A renders segment 2 by кúpıov and B by dủtóv, and A also has the article $\tau \hat{1}$ with Baal while B has $\tau \hat{̣}$. The first and more important difference makes A closer to P than B The second does little to affect the conclusion because TDNT explains $\tau \hat{1}$ with Baal as based on " $\alpha i \sigma \chi$ ט́vך instead of B $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda$, as with the OT בשֶׁת for בַׁבַ verse.

ויחר־אף יהוה בישראל ויתנם ביד־שסים וישסו אותחם וימכרם ביד אויביהם מסביב ולא־יכלו עוד לעמד . 2:14 לפני אויביהם:



## RETROVERSION

${ }^{22}$ Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon, 512a.
${ }^{23}$ TDNT, Vol. I, 606 n 5.

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph considered as segments 1,5 and 12 , there are sixteen segments in MT, seven to the athnach and nine following it. With wthmt considered segment $1, ~ ' l ' y s r y l$ considered segment 3 , with the first occurrence of w'slm 'nwn considered as segment 4 and the second as segment 8 , with $b^{\prime} y d^{\prime} d b z w z^{\prime}$ as segment 5 , and $w l^{\prime}$ 'škḥw as segment 12, there are also sixteen segments in P , three to the first punctuation point, four more to the second punctuation point, four more to the third point, and five more following it all the way to the fourth point. Segments 2 to 16 of P can be retroverted to MT. The retroversion of segment 1 of P to MT does not include the ' $p$ element of that segment of MT. As will be shown below, $h r h^{\prime} p$ is rendered four other times in Judges where MT has ' $p$ with a pronominal suffix and in two other places where it is in a genitive construction with $y h w h$ and in all six of those places $y h r$ is rendered by 'thmt as it is in this verse. In this verse, 2:20 and 3:8 where $y h w h$ is the genitive it is the subject of the verb and in the four other places the subject of the verb is $r w g z^{\prime}$ with a pronominal suffix. While the meaning may not be changed, the omission of a rendering of ' $p$ means that the translation is not word for word to this limited extent. At this point in the discussion of this verse, the question is whether P is relying on a source without ' $p$. One does find $r g z z^{\prime}$ in Tg J , and both A and B render by $\kappa \alpha i ̀$ $\dot{\omega} \rho \gamma \dot{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \quad \theta \nu \mu \varrho ̣$ ки́ $\rho ı \varsigma$. This appears to be a form of the cognate dative described by Conybeare and Stock as follows: "From the foregoing instances [where the verb and substantive in the dative are cognate] it is an easy step to others in which the substantive is of a kindred meaning, though not of a kindred derivation with the verb. ${ }^{, 24}$ Based on this understanding it can be seen that A and B show a translation rendering both wyhr and 'p even though the grammatical structure does not duplicate that of MT. With no clear evidence that

[^121]P's source differs from MT in this respect this difference will be considered a feature of the translation and no source different from MT will be assumed in evaluating this verse. ${ }^{25}$

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements of segments, and sequence of elements. Although the absence of a translation term for ' $p$ does not change the meaning of the clause of which the segment is a part it does change the segmentation because $m r y$ is now the subject of the verb and not the subjective genitive modifying the subject of the verb. A comparison with 10:7 shows that this is unlike the various ways with which Syriac syntax may render the elements with what has been referred to in this study as an additon or subtraction of subelements. (Examples are waw and dalat prefixes, variations in construction of the genitive or direct object, etc.) Therefore this will be treated as a failure to segment literally $5 \%$ of the verse. This does not reduce the rating below 5 but will be marked with a minus to reflect the presence of a slight deviation from literalism in this mode in this verse. The sequence of the remaining elements is in accord with the sequence of the elements in MT. Thus this mode is rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions and there is one subtraction already described. The subtraction is evaluated as a $5 \%$ reduction in the literal nature of this mode, so the rating remains 5 with a minus. Smelik does not note the difference from MT. ${ }^{26}$

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

${ }^{\text {'thlumt. This renders forms of the Qal of herh here and six other times in Judges: 2:20; 3:8; }}$
$6: 39 ; 9: 30 ; 10: 7$; and $14: 19$. The rendering is rated 5 .

[^122]$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
'šlm. This Aphel renders the Qal narrative of $n t n$ once in this verse and the Qal narrative of $m k r$ once as well. The same rendering of the $n t n$ was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:2. The same Aphel renders the Qal of $m k r$ five times, once in this verse and in 3:8; 4:2, 9; and 10:7. This is a consistent rendering of $m k r$ and can be rated 5. The Targum renders the two different Hebrew verbs by the same Aramaic verb, msr. The Greek versions use $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta i \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{t}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta \dot{\delta} \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{l}$ and are thus more faithful to the distinction between the Hebrew verbs. ${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This renders Hebrew $y d$ twice in this verse and the rendering was considered and rated 5 at 1:2.
$b z w z^{\prime}$ and $b z w$. The first of these renders the Qal participle of $\check{s} s h$ and the second the Qal narrative tense of the similar Hebrew verb, $\check{s s s}$. The same participle is similarly rendered at $2: 16$. These are the only examples of these two Hebrew verbs in Judges and so they are not rated here. See the renderings of Hebrew šll by bzt' and bzwz' at 5:30.
$b^{c} l d b b y h w n$. This renders MT ${ }^{\prime}(w) y b$ twice in this verse and seven other times if Judges: 2:8;
$3: 28: 5: 31 ; 8: 34 ; 11: 36 ; 16: 23$ and 24 . The rendering is rated 5.
$h d r h w n$. The rendering of sbyb by this term was considered at $2: 12$ and rated 5 there.
'škhw. This renders $y k l$ three times, in this verse; $8: 3$; and $14: 14$ and thus the occurrences are too few to be rated.
$t w b$. This renders ' $w d$ eight times in Judges, which includes this verse; $7: 4 ; 11: 14 ; 13: 8,9$, $21 ; 18: 24 ; 20: 25$ and 28 . The Hebrew is not rendered at $9: 20$. At $6: 24$ and $8: 20$ where the Hebrew has a pronominal suffix (' $w d n w$ ) the rendering is by ' $d k y l$. Thus in $80 \%$ of the cases where it is rendered, it is consistently rendered and will be rated 3.5. $m q m$. This Peal infinitive renders the Qal infinitive of ' $m d$ and the Peal of the same Syriac verb renders the Qal of ${ }^{\prime} m d$ nine times, and that includes this verse and 3:19; 4:20; 6:31; 7:21;

9:7, 35, 44; and 20:28. The Aphel of $q w m$ renders the Hiphil of ' $m$ ' once at $16: 25$. Thus all these renderings would be rated 5 .
$q d m$. This renders lpny here, the preposition formation from $l$ and the construct of pnym. The adverbial form lpnym was analyzed at 1:10. This prepositional form is rendered by $q d m$ twenty-three times, which renderings include this verse and $2: 14 ; 3: 27 ; 4: 14,15,23 ; 6: 18$; $8: 28 ; 9: 39 ; 11: 9,11 ; 13: 15 ; 16: 25 ; 18: 21 ; 20: 23,26(2 x), 28,32,35,39,42$; and $21: 2$. This consistency is somewhat besmirched by the addition of $m n$ before $q d m$ in 20:32, 35 and 42 . Nevertheless this rendering is rated 5 for consistency.

This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The subtraction treated as a failure to segment should be noted here too. Moreover, there are two examples of genitive construction $b$ at segment 5 and at segments 9 and 10. At segment 11 , the prepositional phrase of MT is rendered in P by a prepositional phrase plus a $d$ suffix, making it into a relative clause.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J renders ' $p$ by $r g z$ ', but like P renders both wytnm and wymkrm by the same verb ( $m s r$ rather than $\check{s l m}$ ) as well as rendering by the root $b z z$ where P does too. The rendering by Tg J of 'wyb by bcly $d b b$ is similar to but slightly different from P. Neither A nor B is more similar to P than Tg J by their renderings of $w y h r-{ }^{-} p$. Although they are closer to MT by rendering wytnm by one verb and wymkrm by another, they differ from both P and Tg J in that respect. Both also employ a slightly more literal turn of phrase than P and Tg J by
rendering lpny $l$ by $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi o v$. Thus they are both farther from P than is Tg J , but A is closer to P than B in one small respect since B renders $\chi \varepsilon$ qi by the plur.

בכל אשר יצאו יד־יהוה היתה־בם לרעה כאשר דבר יהוה וכאשר נשבע יהוה להֵם ויצר להם מאד: 2:15.


## RETROVERSION

With the elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 4 and 5 there are sixteen segments in MT, thirteen to the athnach, and three following it. The verse of P can be divided so as to match those segments if the prefix of dnpqyn is lined up with segment 2 , npqyn and $h w w$ with segment $3,^{\prime} y d^{\prime} d m r y$ ' with segment $4, h w y^{\prime} h w t ~ ' l y h w n$ with segment 5, 'yk $d$ with segment $7, ' m r$ with segment $8, w y k d$ with segment 10 , and ' $y m$ ' with segment 11 . The order of the segments of P corresponding to segments 12 and 13 is reversed. The final three segments of $\mathrm{P}, 14,15$, and 16 following the third punctuation point can be seen without difficulty to line up with the final three of MT. In $P$ there are three segments to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, three more to the third, four more to the fourth, and the final three segments to the fourth punctuation point.

Except for the inverse order of segments 12 and 13, the segments of P can be retroverted to those of MT. The first segment, wlkr, has an added waw prefix, renders the preposition $b$ by $l$ and renders $k l$ by $k r$. The added prefix can be explained as another instance of the addition by P of a conjunction before a non-sequential clause that is not
preceded by a conjunction in the Hebrew of MT. ${ }^{27}$ The two other sub-elements of segment 1 of P can be retroverted to the first segment of MT. BDB holds that Hebrew $b k l$ ' $s ̌ r$ can be rendered as "wheresoever." ${ }^{28}$ JPS says that $l k r$ can be rendered as "thither, where." ${ }^{29}$ Costaz states that $k r d$ can be rendered "where." ${ }^{30}$

At segment 3, the Hebrew perf. is rendered by the participle plus hww. Nöldeke says that this is "a form expressing continuance or repetition in past time." ${ }^{31}$ Since this renders the Hebrew perf., it may be the sense of which Joüon writes: "Parfois l'action, posée dans le passé, est censée continuer d'une certaine façon jusqu'au moment présent." ${ }^{32}$ Since both A and $B$ render by the imperf., this rendering seems unexceptionable. The same explanation would also apply to rendering the $3^{\text {rd }}$ feminine perf. of hyth of segment 5 by hwy plus hwt.

In discussing 1:7, it was shown that 'yk $d$ was the most frequent rendering of Hebrew $k^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} r r$ where the word has the meaning it has here. At 1:20, it was shown that ' $m r$ renders the Piel of $d b r$ more often than does $m l l$.

Finally the $3^{\text {rd }}$ sing. perf. of ${ }^{\prime} q t$ followed by $l h w n t t b$ must be considered as a rendering of segments 14 to 16 of MT. The entry in JPS for the Peal of ${ }^{\text {' }}$ wq would allow segments 14 to 16 to be rendered: "they were exceedingly distressed." ${ }^{33}$ Accordingly the source of this verse of P cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.
${ }^{27}$ See Williams, Syntax of Peshitta of 1 Kgs, 85-93.
${ }^{28}$ Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon, 82, col. 2; also 481, col. 2.
${ }^{29}$ J. Payne Smith, Syriac Dictionary, 223, col. 2.
${ }^{30}$ Costaz, Dictionnaire Syriaque-Français, 161, col. 1.
${ }^{31}$ Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, 216, § 277.
${ }^{32}$ Joüon, Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique, 297, 112e.
${ }^{33}$ J. Payne Smith, Syriac Dictionary, 406, col. 2.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation of a text like MT, but it is not in the same sequence as MT at segments 12 and 13. This is judged to impair the literalism of the sequence by $12.5 \%$ and rated 4. Since the segmentation is rated 5 , the rating for this mode will be 4.5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are neither additions nor subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$k r$. This is part of the phrase $l k r d$ that renders Hebrew $k l$ ' $\check{s} r$ and this is the only occurrence of that phrase in MT of Judges. Thus it is not rated.
$n p q$. This rendering of the Qal of $y s^{\prime}$ is analyzed at $1: 24$ and rated 5 there.
'ydh. This renders the construct of $y d$ here and the rendering of $y d$ by forms of ' $y d$ ' was considered at 1:2 and rated 5 .
$m r y^{\prime}$. Again, this renders $y h w h$ and was rated 5 for consistency in the discussion of 1:1.
byšt ${ }^{2}$. This renders Hebrew $r^{\kappa} h$. This rendering and the rendering of the adjective $r^{\kappa}$ by byš were considered at $2: 11$ and rated 5 there.
${ }^{\prime} y k d$. As noted in considering the retroversion of this verse, the rendering of $k{ }^{\prime} s r$ by this phrase was considered at 1:7 and rated 2 there. It renders $k \stackrel{s}{r} r$ in the plurality of cases in Judges.
${ }^{\prime} m r$. This renders the Piel of $d b r$ and this rendering was analyzed at 1:20 and rated 2 there. 'ym'. This Peal of $y m{ }^{\prime} /{ }^{\prime} y m$ ' renders the Niphal of $\check{s} b^{c}$ six times in Judges, including this verse. The rendering was analyzed at $2: 1$ and rated 5 .
'qt. This renders the Qal narrative of s'rr here and at 10:9 and the Qal perf. at 11:7. Both in the Syriac and the Hebrew there is an impersonal construction. Although these renderings are consistent, the number of them is too small to form a base for rating consistency.
$t b$. This renders $m^{\prime} d$ in this verse and nine other times at $3: 17 ; 6: 6 ; 10: 9 ; 11: 33 ; 12: 2 ; 13: 6$;
15:18; $18: 9$; and 19:11. The Hebrew is not rendered at $12: 2$. Accordingly this rendering is rated 5.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Level and accuracy of semantic and syntactical information. Several of the syntactical issues were discussed when considering the retroversion: the initial waw prefix, the use of the participle of $n p q$ plus the perf. of $h w$ (or $h w w$ in this verse). At segment 4 there is an example of genitive construction $c$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has ${ }^{\prime} t r$ where ' $\check{s} r$ is found in MT at segment 2 . It is followed by the $d$ prefix of $n p q$. Smelik treats this as a place where $\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{MT}$ and Tg J does not. ${ }^{34}$ The Targum also differs from P by substituting $m h^{\prime} m n q d m$ for $y d$.

Both A and B have $\dot{\varepsilon} v \pi \alpha \hat{\alpha} \tau v$, oîc for $b k l$ ' $\check{s} r$. Just as Syriac $l k r$ can refer to time or place, the Greek here can do so too. ${ }^{35}$ Perhaps it might refer to "peoples," but there is no reason to construe it inconsistently with the Hebrew, at least as to B. In A, the verb غ̇ $\pi$ ó $\rho v \varepsilon$ vov seems to be a mistake, but it may be interpreting the Israelite ventures as spiritual
 remainder of B is also closer to both P and MT than the other two versions, except that B is even more accurate than P in having the correct word order at segments 12 and 13.

[^123]${ }^{35}$ Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Greek-English Lexicon (New York: Harper \& Brothers, 1883 Seventh edition), 469a .

## RETROVERSION

There are six segments in MT, three to the athnach and three following it. With wprqw'nwn treated as segment 4 of P and $m n^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$ as segment 5, there are eight segments in P with two segments, byt and 'sryl, being additions to the rendition of any source with the same number of segments as MT. Those two segments will be referred to as segment $x$ and segment $y$. Neither Tg J, A, B, nor the Vulgate support the additions. They have the character of a small and unnecessary explanation. The six other segments of P can be retroverted to the six segments of MT without difficulty. Accordingly the Vorlage of P will be considered as indistinguishable from MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. If the additions are set aside for the purpose of evaluating this mode, the verse is a word-for-word translation of a verse indistinguishable from the verse of the MT and the elements are all in the same sequence as those of MT. Therefore this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are two additions that do not change the meaning of the verse, but which might be said to make clear beyond even an unreasonable doubt whose judges were raised up. This is treated as a one-third reduction of the literal nature of the revision giving rise to a rating of 3 for the verse.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
'qym. The Aphel of qwm renders the Hiphil of qwm here. The rendering of the Qal of the same Hebrew verb by the Peal of this verb was considered and rated 5 at 2:10. In addition to the rendering in this verse, the Aphel of this same verb renders the Hiphil of the same Hebrew verb six other times at $2: 18 ; 3: 9,15 ; 7: 19(2 x)$; and $18: 30$. This rendering is also rated 5 . $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 when it was considered at $1: 1$.
$d y n^{\prime}$. This plur. substantive renders the Qal participle, šptym three times in Judges (this verse, $2: 17$ and 18 ) and the sing. four times, in $2: 18(2 x), 19$; and $11: 27$. In $4: 4$ of MT the feminine participle is used as a predicate and is rendered in Syriac by the feminine participle of $d w n$. This is not considered an inconsistency. Thus this rendering is rated 5 . prqw. This renders the Hiphil narrative tense of $y s^{c}$ here and sixteen other times in Judges at $2: 18 ; 3: 9(1 \mathrm{x}), 31 ; 6: 14,15,36,37 ; 7: 7 ; 8: 22 ; 10: 1,12,14 ; 12: 2,3 ; 13: 1$ and 5 . The Hiphil participle used substantively is rendered twice by $p r w q^{\prime}$ at $3: 9$ and 15 and this is not treated as inconsistent. At 6:31 the Hebrew is rendered by $p s^{\prime}$ and in 7:2 by $z k$. If the two renderings by the substantive $p r w q^{\prime}$ are left out of consideration, this would be two inconsistencies out of nineteen occurrences, $89 \%$ consistency, and if they are included, the percentage would be slightly over $90 \%$. The first would rate 4 and the second 5 , but since this is either a very low 5 or very high 4 , it will be rated 4.5 .
${ }^{\prime} y d$. The rendering of $y d$ by ' $y d$ ' was rated 5 at 1:2.
bzwzyhwn. This rendering of the Qal participle of šsh was considered at 2:14 and not rated because there were not enough examples to show consistency or inconsistency.

This mode is rated 5 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There is an example of genitive construction $b$ at segments 5 and 6 . Segment 3 is an example of direct object construction $d$. Segment 4 contains an example of a semi-enclitic pronoun object rendering a pronoun suffix in the Hebrew. The additions are not evaluated.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B.

Targum J has rendered šptym by ngwdyn, but is otherwise similar to P . Both A and B have rendered wywšy'wm by каì ह̈б $\omega \sigma \varepsilon v$ av̉兀ov́s with B expressing the sing. subject кúpıo̧ a second time. The question is then whether the change of the expressed subjects of the saving action from human beings, plur., to the "Lord," sing., is a more significant change than turning "judges" into the more general category of "leaders." The changes made by A and B are judged here to be more significant in relation both to P and to MT and this judgment would mean that Tg J is closer to P than the Greek Versions. The comparatively trivial addition of B makes it slightly less similar to P than is A .
וגם אל־שפטיהם לא שמעו כי זנו אחרי אלהים אחרים וישתחוו להֵם סרו מהר מן־הדרך אשר הלכו . 2:17 אבותם לשמע מצות־יהוה לא־עשו כן:





## RETROVERSION

With the elements of MT joined by maqqēph treated as single segments $2,14,19$, and 20 there are 21 segments in MT, eleven to the athnach and ten following it. With ldynyhwn counted at segment 2 , and $m t \not t w l d$ treated as segment 5 , there are eleven segments in P up to $l h w n$. With $m n$ 'wrh' treated as segment 14 , the following $d$ prefix as $15,{ }^{\prime} z l w$ as segment 16 ,
'bhyhwn as segment 17, pwqdnwhy dmry' as segment 19 , wl' ' $b d w$ as segment 20 , and excluding at this stage for purposes of analysis $b h$ betwen segments 16 and 17 , there are ten segments in P from wstw to $h k n$. There are four segments of P to the first punctuation point, thirteen more plus $b h$ to the second, two more to the third, and two more to the fourth punctuation point.

Segments 1 to 5 of Pretrovert to segments 1 to 5 of MT, but segment 6 does not. Since A, B, and the Vulgate render znw more closely to its lexical sense of fornication and harlotry, this may possibly reflect a bit of prudery on the part of the translator in which Tg J joins P. This reticence or some similar motive is more likely to explain the semantic inaccuracy than is a conjectured difference in the Vorlage of both P and Tg J . On the other hand, the agreement of both P and Tg J at this point could be evidence either of a common source or of some link between the translators. The segments of $P$ from 7 to 16 can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT. What looks superficially like an addition between segments 16 and $17, b h$, is most probably a feature of Syriac syntax where 'zl $b^{\prime} w r h^{\prime}$ is standard idiom for "journey, travel, go in the direction of" according to JPS and "walk" would fit equally well as the translation verb of motion. ${ }^{36}$ Here the Syriac verb takes its complement with the preposition $b$ and thus the relativizer has to have a resumptive pronoun with that preposition. Smelik treats ' $z l$ as an "unnecessary etymological difference" at 2:19, but he does not and cannot be expected to go into the question of consistency in rendering the Hebrew by the Syriac. ${ }^{37}$ Here one needs to refer to the consideration of the consistency of rendering by ${ }^{\prime} z l$ of $h l k$ at 1:3 above where this rendering appears quite consistent. Segments 17 to 21 of P can be retroverted to segments 17 to 21 of MT. The added waw

[^124]prefixes at segments 10 and 20 are taken here as characteristic additions of waw at the beginning of non-sequential clauses in P . Accordingly the source of P is assumed to be one for which there is no persuasive evidence of a variation from a source like MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Except for $b h$ the segments in P already described are a word for word or element by element rendering of MT and in the same sequence as those in this verse of MT. At 2:22 below, MT does have $b m$ rendered in P by $b h$. In other cases sub-elements added or subtracted by P based on Syriac syntax such as those in the case of genitive and direct object constructions are not treated as additions. Even if this is an addition it would not be reckoned as affecting the segmentation or sequencing and so this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The prepositional phrase $b h$ could be taken either as an addition or as a feature of mode 4. If it is taken as an addition the rating would still be 5 and if it is not, doubt about that negative conclusion should still be noted, so this mode is rated 5-.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering

$w p$. This renders $w g m$. The rendering of $g m$ by ' $p$ was considered at $1: 3$ and rated 5 wherever so rendered.
dynyhwn. This renders $\check{s} p t y h m$ and this rendering was rated 5 in the previous verse, 2:16.
$\check{s} m^{c} w$. The rendering by this verb of its Hebrew cognate $\check{s} m^{c}$ was rated 5 in discussing 2:2. In this verse the infinitive of the same Syriac verb also renders the infinitive of the same Hebrew cognate and is, of course, also rated 5.
$m t \not t w l d$. This or the variant $m t t l d$ renders $k y$ here and first did so at $1: 19$. The rendering was rated 3 in the discussion of 1:19.
$t^{t} w$. This renders the Qal perf. znw and the Qal narrative in $8: 27$ and 33. The Qal participle of $z n h$ is rendered by the substantive $z n y t^{p}$ at $11: 1$ and $16: 1$. The Qal narrative is rendered by $z n^{\prime}$ at 19:2. This is not consistent, although in the contexts where it is rendered by $z n^{\prime}$ the harlotry is literal and where rendered by this Syriac verb, the context is figurative. These renderings are rated 2 for consistency and would have lower rating if the issue had been accuracy.
' $/ h h^{\prime}$. This renders the plur. form of 'lhym. This rendering of the plur. was discussed at 1:7 and 2:12 and is rated 5. The rendering of the sing. was also rated 5 at $1: 7$ and is so rated in this verse.
'h $h r n$ '. This renders 'hrrym, a rendering that was evaluated at $2: 10$ and rated 5 there. Because the plur. Syriac renders a Hebrew sing. here, this rendering is rated 5-.
$s g d w$. The rendering by this verb of the Hithpael of šḥh (or $\check{s} h ̣ w h$ ) was evaluated at 2:12 and rated 5 there.
$b^{c} g l$. This prepositional phrase comprising $b$ and the adverb to which it is prefixed renders Hebrew $m h r$ in an adverbial sense in this verse and 2:23. The same prepositional phrase renders the imperative of $m h r$ at 9:48. An adverbial form from the Saphel of $r h b$ renders $m h r h$ at 9:54 and the Estaphel of $r h b$ renders the Piel narrative of $m h r$ at 13:10. These combinations of parts of speech are not often found, but the consistency of the use of particular roots is evaluated here and $60 \%$ of the 5 renderings are by this adverial phrase and those renderings are rated 2 .
'wrh'. This renders $d r k$ fourteen times (of which two are plur.), including the rendering here and in $2: 19,22: 4: 9 ; 5: 10 ; 8: 11 ; 9: 25,37 ; 17: 8 ; 18: 5,6,26 ; 19: 27$; and $20: 42$. The Hebrew term is not translated at 19:9. Where rendered as here, the rendering is rated 5. 'zlw. This renders hlkw and the renderings of this Hebrew root were first considered at 1:3 where renderings by this Syriac verb were rated 5-.
'bhyhwn. This renders 'bwtm and the renderings of sing. and plur. forms of Hebrew 'b by forms of this same Syriac root were rated 5 in the discussion of 1:14.
$p w q d n w h y$. This renders mswt in this verse and 3:4. This is not a sufficient number of occurrences to rate for consistency. The rendering by Syriac prq of MT swh is rated 5 at 2:20 and this rendering is considered a corroboration of that rendering. $m r y$. This renders $y h w h$ again in this verse and has been rated 5 wherever it occurs since it was discussed at $1: 1$.
${ }^{'} b d w$. The rendering of 's'h by ' $b d$ was evaluated at $1: 7$ and rated 5 there.
$h k n$. The rendering by this Syriac term of Hebrew $k n$ was considered at $1: 7$ and rated 5 there.

The rating of this mode in this verb is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As explained in the discussion of retroversion, the rendering of $z n h$ by $t^{\circ}$ is another example of a rendering that is not literal at a normal linguistic level, but does render the significance of the term, doing so here at a more reticent or euphemistic level. The addition of the prepositional phrase $b h$ was also explained in discussing the retroversion of this verse. The added instances of waw at segments 12 and 20 are examples of the practice by P of adding the conjunction at the points where non-sequential clauses begin.

There is an instance of genitive construction $c$ at segment 19. In this verse of MT, the verb $\check{s} m^{c}$ takes its complement by means of the preposition ' $l$ at segment 2 and as a direct object without a marker at segment 19 . The $' l$ is rendered by $l$ in P where that could be either a representation of the Hebrew preposition or a direct object construction $e$. The unmarked direct object at segment 19 is rendered in P by construction $d$, and this might possibly be taken as an indication that the $l$ is meant to represent Hebrew ' $l$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A AND B

Here again Tg J has rendered šptyhm by $n g w d y h w n$ and renders 'lhym 'ḥrym by ṭtwt 'mmy'. Otherwise it is more faithful to a Hebrew source like MT. Both the Greek versions have rendered $w g m$ by каì $\gamma \varepsilon$, but A has added каì $\pi \alpha \rho \omega ́ \rho \gamma ı \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o v ̀ ~ \kappa u ́ \rho ı o v ~ b e t w e e n ~ s e g m e n t s ~ 11 ~$ and 12. Both A and B add кaí before their renderings of segment 12. Thus it appears that B is closer to P than are the other two versions.

## וכי־הקים יהוה להם שפטים והיה יהוה עם־השפט והושיעם מיד איביהם כל ימי השופט כי־ינחם יהוה . 2:18 מנאקתם מפני לחציהם ודחקיהם: <br>  <br> 

## RETROVERSION

With the elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 1,7 , and 14 , there are nineteen segments in this verse of MT, thirteen to the athnach and six following it. There are also nineteen segments in P if one treats wkd 'qym as segment 1, ' $m d y n$ ' as segment 7 , wprq 'nwn as segment $8, m n^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$ as segment $9, s^{\prime} m^{c} h w^{\prime}$ as segment 14 , and $m n q d m$ as segment 17 . There are four segments in P to the first punctuation point, segments 5 to 7 to the second such point, segments 8 to 16 to the third, and 17 to 19 to the last. Segment 1 of $P$ can be retroverted to the first segment of MT. Segment 2 of $P$ can be retroverted to segment 3 of MT and segment 3 of P to segment 2 of MT. Segments 4 to 13 of P can be retroverted to
segments 4 to 13 of MT when the absence of a waw prefix at segment 5 is explained, as it will be in the discussion of mode 4 . Segment $14, s^{\prime} m^{c} h w^{c}$ cannot be retroverted to ky ynhm. Segments 15 and 16 can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. According to Costaz, $m n$ qdm, segment 17, can mean either "before" or "on account of," the likely senses of mpny here (of which the causal is more probable). ${ }^{38}$ Segments 18 and 19 of can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. The rendering of the converted perfects as Syriac perfects also requires explanation and that too will be given as one aspect of mode 4.

The plur. forms of $d y n^{\prime}$ at segments 7 and 13 are peculiar to P here among the versions with which it is regularly being compared. They are taken here as features of the translation probably taking account of the fact that the definite articles of the Hebrew are situational or generic. The translation may also be seen as influenced by the fact that the last three occurrences of this word (in 2:16 and 2:17 and in the case of the first occurrence in this verse) are plur.

The next question is whether $\check{s m^{c}} h w^{\nu}$ represents a Hebrew source that differed from ky ynhtm at this point. Insofar as one can match the rather different text of Tg J to that of P , Tg J has wmqbyl (the D participle) ṣlwthwn where P has šm‘ $h w^{\prime} \ldots$. . 'nqthwn. Although neither can be retroverted literally to MT, they might be retroverted to this Hebrew phrase assuming different approaches to a free translation of this Hebrew source. The retroversion of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta \theta \eta$ to $y n h m$ in the Greek Versions is probably possible, but not entirely free of problems either. Smelik takes the position that it " $=$ MT. ${ }^{39}$ Schmitz takes the position that in this verse and 21:6 and 15 there are examples of the "exceptions which confirm the rule"

[^125]that "to comfort is by far the outstanding sense [of נחם ]." ${ }^{40}$ In this verse, one of the exceptions, he finds the sense "to be sorry" in the Greek. The evidence provided from P is not entirely consistent with the conclusion that this verse is relying on the same terminology in the Hebrew source as the terminology on which 21:6 and 15 are based, because in those verses the Hebrew is rendered by the Ethpeel of $t w$. In Tg J it is the Dt of $n h m$. This verse of the Vulgate is rather freely translated, but insofar as it can be matched with P , one finds at this point et audiebat afflictorum gemitus. Dirksen's note reports that there is a prefixed waw before $k l$ in ms 6 h 7 and this would make the Syriac verse less awkward, but it does not do anything to explain the problem of the source of segment 14 of the verse. Accordingly, there is not sufficient evidence to find that segment 14 of P is based on a source that is similar to MT at segment 14 , but the rest of this verse of P will be assumed to have been based on a source that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Except for segment 14 this is a word-for-word translation with adaptations to Syriac syntax that are standard aspects of rendition by P . The conclusion reached here is (1) that the Vorlage is uncertain without an element that represents the $k y$ in MT that is represented by $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and Tg J and (2) that there is even some doubt about whether $y n h \underset{m}{ }$ is the source of segment $14, \mathrm{~s}^{c} \mathrm{~m}^{\text {c }}$. In addition to those questions, this verse of P cannot easily be translated at this point, that is, at segment 14. What is the relation of segment 14 and the segments that follow it to the elements that precede it? In $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and Tg J , segment 14 begins a subordinate adverb clause, a causal clause. Here in P without any conjunction it would have to be an asyndetic independent clause, but then the question becomes: where does the independent clause begin?

[^126]It is awkward in either case, but it could begin either at segment 14 or at $k l$, segment 11. Segment 11 is, apparently, the point at which ms 6 h 7 would begin the clause. That small addition of a conjunction by ms 6 h 7 would make the syntax smoother, but it is not consistent with MT, and there is no evidence for it in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, or B , all three of which treat segments 11 to 13 as part of the preceding clause. The sequence of the segments 2 and 3 is reversed, but the sequence of the remainder of the segments is as literal as it can be if that issue is viewed without consideration of the problem of segmentation at segment 14 .

The development of a rating for this mode has to be on an even more ad hoc basis than in the case of earlier verses considered above. Is it only segment 14 that is impaired, is it the last six segments, or is it the last nine segments? Since the verse is significantly affected, it seems fair to say that more than one segment is impaired. It would also seem exaggerated to treat nine segments, almost half the verse, as freely segmented. Accordingly this will be evaluated as a failure to segment literally the last six segments, almost one-third of the verse. That would rate the segmentation at 3. The reversal of the sequence of segments 2 and 3 will be considered as reducing the literal nature of the sequence to between 89 and $90 \%$ and rate this aspect of this mode at 4. The rating for the mode will be calculated as 3 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. This mode also presents some difficulty for evaluation since there are nineteen segments and no position has been taken on the identity of the Vorlage of $\check{s m} c$. What is clearly missing though is any representation of the ky element of segment 14. Taken together with the doubt about $\check{s m^{c}}$ that will be treated as a subtraction of one segment, slightly over $5 \%$ of the verse. That would still leave the rating at 5 , but with a minus to reflect this conclusion.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$k d$. This renders $k y$ as a temporal conjunction and that rendering was rated 4 at 1:15.
'qym. This Aphel renders the Hiphil of its Hebrew cognate $q w m$, as an Aphel of the same root rendered this Hebrew verb at 2:16 where it was rated 5.
$m r y^{\prime}$. This rendering of $y h w h$ occurs three times in this verse and was rated 5 at $1: 1$.
$d y n^{2}$. This plur. renders the plur. of $\check{s} p t$ once in this verse and the sing. twice. This rendering was rated 5 in the discussion of $2: 16$.
prq. This renders the Hiphil of $y s^{c}$ and the rendering was rated 4.5 in considering 2:16.
${ }^{\prime} y d$ '. The rendering of Hebrew $y d$ by this Syriac cognate was rated 5 at 1:2.
blddbbyhwn. This rendering of 'ybyhm was rated 5 at 2:14.
$y w m y$. This renders $y m y$ here and this rendering was rated 4 at 2:7.
$\check{s} m^{c}$. As a rendering of Hebrew $\check{s} m^{c}$ this was rated at $2: 2$. Here it will not be rated, but even if it were, there are only two other instances of the Niphal of nhm in Judges, at 21:6 and 15, and thus there would not be enough examples for it to be evaluated. It has already been noted that the other two renderings are the same, but different from this one, as well as being more plausible renderings of nhm.
'nqthwn. This renders $n$ 'qtm and the Hebrew term only occurs here is Judges and so it cannot be rated.
$m n q d m$. This renders the prepositional sense of mpny here and was rated 4 at 1:34.
'lwsyhwn. This translates lhṣyhwn here and was rated at 1:34 where the rendering in this verse was rated 2.
$d h w q y h w n$. This renders its cognate dhqyhm only here in Judges. Thus it is quite literal, but, without any other renderings, it cannot be rated for consistency.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. If the Niphal of $n h m$ is the Vorlage of P then the Peal of $\check{s} m^{c}$ is not semantically accurate and any connection between the
two terms has to be mapped by a circuitous route that proceeds from hearing to being affected in a particular way by what one has heard. One may speculate about the reason for the subtraction of $k y$ at segment 14 , but the real explanation is uncertain.

As for syntactic differences, one meets first the omitted waw prefix at segment 5. here the context is the apodosis of a conditional clause of which the protasis is a dependent temporal clause in P. In examples considered in earlier verses the protasis had an infinitive construct as the object of a preposition, but the principle pointed out in those cases seems to the same here: the dependent protasis is not treated as independent of its apodosis. ${ }^{41}$ As argued above the plur. forms of the second and third occurrences of $d y n^{\prime}$ rendering hšpt can be understood as the way Syriac renders the generic or situational sense of the Hebrew sing. with the definite article where the context calls for that understanding of the sense.

There is no prepositional prefix at 'nqthwn like the one at segment 16 of MT. This is probably because $\check{s} m^{c}$ can take its object directly and this is not relevant to how a Syriac verb truer to the sense of MT would take its complement at this point. (At 21:6 and 15 where P renders MT $n h ̣ m$ by ${ }^{\prime} t t w$, those who are the objects of the pity or sorrow are the objects of the preposition $\%$. If the instance in this verse is rendering a direct object, it is an example of direct object construction $d$.)

There are a series of converted perfects beginning at segment 5 and continuing at segment 8 and then at segment 1 of the next verse. These are rendered by perfects and the Syriac renderings were found to be capable of retroversion to the Hebrew in the discussion of retroversion above. Williams comments on this phenomenon as follows:

Syriac wāqtal is used eight times to represent the Hebrew weqātal . . . . This is interesting because often the prefixed waw in Hebrew seems to alter the meaning of $q \bar{a} t a l$ forms in Hebrew to be more like that of the free-standing yiqtōl form. Hebrew

[^127]$w^{e} q \bar{a} t a l$ can take on iterative, durative, or future sense. Syriac waqtal seems to represent past, with no sense of durativity. The translation of $w^{e} q \bar{a} t a l ~ b y ~ w a q t a l ~$ therefore can involve a change in sense from the Hebrew. ${ }^{42}$

At segment 10 there is an example of genitive construction $b$, and at segments 12 to 13 an example of genitive construction $a$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON OF TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has a more generalized rendering of špṭ by $n g w d y n$, but A and B have a more specific rendering like that of P . The Targum also adds $m^{\prime} m r^{\prime} d$ and considerably expands the material in segments 14 to 16 . Both A and B render the initial $k y$ by ö $\tau$, but at $1: 28,8: 1$, and 16:16, they render $k y$ in the same sense by ö $\tau \varepsilon$, and this is taken as a difference. At segments 2 and 3, A has the same sequence as P , but B has moved segment 3 even farther back so that the sequence in B is segments $1,2,4,3$. From segment 5 to segment 18 , A and B are the same, but render segment 19 differently. Where there are terms like those in segment 19 that are similar in meaning, the differences and similarities are not clear-cut and so the differences between A and B as to this terminology will not be calculated as distinguishing either version as more or less similar to P than the other. As a result, based on the sequence, A is judged closer to P than B , and both A and B closer than Tg J .

2:19. והיה במות השופט ישבו והשחיתו מאבותם ללכת אחרי אלהים אחרים לעבדם ולהשתחות להם לא הפילו ממעלליהם ומדרכם הקשה:

[^128]


## RETROVERSION

There are eighteen elements and eighteen segments in this verse of MT, thirteen to the athnach and five following it. There are also eighteen segments in P , three to the first punctuation point, ten more to the second (if $m n^{\prime} b h y h w n$ is calculated as segment 6 and lmplh 'nwn as segment 11) and then five segments between the second and third punctuation points (treating mn 'bdyhwn as segment 16 and wmn 'wrhthwn as segment 17).

The first segment of P can be retroverted to the first segment of MT together with the prepositional prefix of segment $2, b$. This is not a formal equivalence but it is the characteristic way that these temporal constructions of the Hebrew are rendered by P. Here as at $1: 1$ the object of the Hebrew preposition is a noun and not the infinitive construct. The second segment of P , the Peal of $m w t$, can be retroverted as a free translation to the object of that preposition, $m w t$, the construct of a noun. The plur. form in segment 3 can also be accounted for as it was in the previous verse so that segment 3 of P retroverts to the assumed Hebrew text if it is understood as situational or generic. Segment 4 of $P$, a perf., can be retroverted to segment 4 of the Hebrew verse, an imperf. (The question of the tense of segments 4 and 5 will be considered as part of mode 4.) The remaining elements can all be retroverted although at segment 14 of P there is a waw prefix that cannot be retroverted, but it can be explained as an example of the beginning of a non-sequential independent clause that receives an added conjunction in P . The last segment might not be considered the most literal rendering of the Hebrew. Smelik considers it is a failure to render by a literal term (meaning,
one assumes, $\left.q s^{\prime} y t^{\prime}\right) .{ }^{43}$ Accordingly the Vorlage will be treated as one that cannot be distinguished from MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The segments of P translate the segments of MT on a segment by segment or word for word basis, but segments 2 and 18 are considered free translations and reduce the literal nature of the segmentation by slightly more than $10 \%$ so that this aspect of the segmentation is rated 4 . Some adaptation to Syriac syntax is noted for consideration under mode 4. The segments are in the same sequence as those of MT. Therefore this mode is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are not any of these and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w k d$. This rendering of whyh plus the preposition $b$ or $k$ was evaluated at 1:14 and was found to be rendered by wkd in eleven places and rated 5 wherever so rendered.
mytw. This Peal perf. renders the construct of the substantive mwt. This rendering was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:1.
$d y n^{\prime}$. This plur. renders the sing. of špt and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:16.
$h p k w$. This Peal perf. renders the Qal imperf. of $\check{s} w b$. The imperfect of the Hebrew in this context where the narrative is found is followed by a converted perf. These are explained by Joüon as having a repetitive or durative sense. ${ }^{44}$ In addition to this verse, the Peal of $h p k$ renders the Qal of $\check{s} w b$ ten times at $3: 19 ; 7: 3(2 \mathrm{x}), 15 ; 8: 13,33 ; 11: 35 ; 14: 8 ; 20: 48$; and 21:23 (where the order of rendering hlk and šwb is reversed). The Hebrew Qal is rendered by ' $t$ ' at $8: 9 ; 11: 8,31,39$; and 21:14. It is rendered by the Ethpeel of $p n^{\prime}$ twice, at $15: 19$ and 18:26.

[^129]It is rendered by $t w b$ at 6:18 and it is not rendered at 19:7. Thus it is rendered eleven of twenty times by this verb and these renderings will be rated 2 and the other eight renderings will be rated 1 .
$h ̣ b l w$. This Pael renders the Hiphil of šḥt twice in Judges, in this verse and 6:4. That Hiphil is rendered by the Aphel of $\mathrm{rm}^{\prime}$ at $20: 21,25$, and 35 . The rendering in this verse is rated 1. 'bhyhwn. This renders 'bwtm and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:14.
$m ' z l w$. This Peal infinitive renders the Qal infinitive of $h l k$. The rendering of forms of $h l k$ by forms of ' $z l$ was rated $5-$ at 1:3.
' $/ h h^{\prime}$ and 'ḥrn'. These two plur. forms render 'lhym 'ḥrym here. Both are rated 5. The first was discussed at 1:10 and 2:12 and referred to in the discussion of other verses. The evaluation of 'hryn was discussed at 2:10.
mplh. This, together the pronoun that follows it, renders 'bdm, the Qal infinitive with a pronominal suffix. The rendering of forms of the Qal of ' $b d$ of the Peal of plh was evaluated at 2:5 and rated 5 there.
$m s g d$. This renders the Hithpael infinitive of $\check{s h} h \not{h}$ here and the rendering by this verb of what is usually treated as the Hithpael of šḥh was rated 5 at 2:12.
$b s ̣ r w$. This renders the Hiphil of $n p l$ which occurs only here in Judges and so it cannot be rated. Forms of the Qal of $n p l$ occur twenty times in Judges and are rendered eighteen times. Of these eighteen, fifteen are rendered by forms of $n p l$ in $4: 16,22 ; 5: 27(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 7: 12,13(1 \mathrm{x})$; $8: 10 ; 9: 40 ; 12: 6 ; 13: 20 ; 15: 18 ; 16: 30 ; 19: 26 ; 20: 44$ and 46 . It is rendered twice by $r m^{\prime}$ in 3:25 and 19:27, and once by 'tplg at 18:1. The two places where it is not rendered are in 5:27 (one of the three occurrences of the Hebrew verb in that verse) and 7:13 (where there is one other instance of the verb that is in fact rendered). When renderings of the Qal of npl have to be rated, renderings by the Peal of $n p l$ will be rated 4 and the other renderings rated 1.
'bdyhwn. This renders m'llyhm which is a hapax legomenon in Judges.
'wrhthwn. This renders $d r k m$ and this rendering was rated 5 at 2:17. byšt'. This renders $q \check{s} h$ in this verse and it is rendered by 'šn' at $4: 24$. While this is not consistent, there are too few occurrences of the Hebrew term in Judges to rate it for consistency here. By way of contrast all seven examples of $q \check{s} h$ in Exodus are rendered by Syriac $q s ̌ h$. Here it seems at best a rough translation. The rendering of $r^{c}$ and $r^{c h}$ by this term was considered at 2:14.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The semantic accuracy of byšt has been questioned above. The rendering of bmwt by kd mytw, somewhat similarly to the rendering of 'hry mwt at $1: 1$, also raises a question. The fact that these are in contexts similar to those where there is usually an infinitive construct may lead to the rather simple explanation that the translator did not consider these renderings of a substantive by a finite verb as that much different from the rendering of an infinitive construct by a finite verb. The accuracy of the perf. of $h p k$ and $h b l$ to render the imperf. and converted perf. of the source presumed here is also problematic. The participle plus $h w^{2}$ would be expected. ${ }^{45}$ The rendering of $d r k$ by plur. 'wrht' is not readily explicable on semantic or syntactic grounds. Perhaps it is influenced by the plur. pronominal suffix or perhaps it is treated as generic.

Segment 11 comprises a semi-enclitic pronoun object. At segment 13 , the $l$ might be either a preposition or a direct object construction $e$. The rendering of segment 4, a Hebrew imperfect by a Syriac perfect was explained in the discussion the consistency of the rendering of the Hebrew $y s ̌ b w$ by Syriac $h p k w$. At segment 5 there is another example of a converted perf. rendered by a Syriac perf., and the accuracy of this rendering is in doubt based on the

[^130]grounds stated by Williams and quoted in the discussion of mode 4 of the previous verse: 2:18.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Here again Tg J has ṭ'wt 'mmy' for 'lhym 'h$r$ rym. The Targum also uses šb $q$ for the Hiphil of $n p l$, which may not differ greatly in meaning from the Syriac $b s r^{\prime}$, but it is different. The word byšst is added as a modifier of 'wrḥt' where qšh stands in MT. All three versions join P in rendering Hebrew $m w t$ as a verb. The two Greek versions are quite similar, but A adds oủk $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ and B renders $d r k$ as plur. ódoís. The differences in A make it farther from P and the difference in B makes it closer to P . Thus B is closest to P in this verse.

ויחר־אף יהוה בישראגל ויאמר יען אשר עברו הגוי הזה את־בריתי אשר צויתי את־אבותם ולא שמעו .2:20 לקולי:


عתیח حمل.

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segments 1,10 , and 13 there are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach and thirteen following it. The elements of P can be divided or combined and treated as sixteen segments, four to the first punctuation point and twelve following it. This involves counting $w t h m t$ as segment $1,{ }^{c} l$
'ysryl as segment 3 , ${ }^{\prime} d$ as segments 5 and 6 , 'l qymy as segment 10 , the $d$ prefix of pqdt as segment $11, l$ l'bhyhm as segment 13 and bqly as segment 16 .

Setting aside segment 1 at this point, all the other segments of P can be retroverted to the other fifteen segments of MT. The reasons for treating segment 1 as having subtracted an element represented Hebrew ' $p$ at the same time the subtraction is not considered as having arisen from a source text are given in the discussion of $2: 14$. Thus this verse will not be taken as evidence for any source text differing from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. For the same reasons given in the discussion of $2: 14$, the absence of a translation term for ' $p$ changes the segmentation of this verse. As there, it is treated here as a $5 \%$ reduction in the literal nature of the segmentation of this verse, and this does not reduce its rating below 5 but the 5 is given a minus to reflect this deviation from the literal. The sequence aspect of this mode is rated 5 and the mode is rated $5-$.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Here too, the subtraction of a term that would render ' $p$ is considered a departure from literalism and results in rating this mode 5 - as is the case for 2:14.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering

'thmt and mry'. As at 2:14 both renderings are rated 5 .
'brw. This Peal renders the Qal of its Hebrew cognate. This seems to be the only place in Judges where it has the sense of "transgress." The Piel, Hiphil, and Hithpael of 'br are not represented in Judges. All 20 other times Hebrew 'br is rendered, it is by this Syriac cognate: $3: 26,28 ; 6: 33 ; 9: 25,26 ; 10: 9 ; 11: 17,19,20,29(3 x), 32 ; 12: 1(2 x), 3,5 ; 18: 13 ; 19: 12$ and 14. Thus there is no inconsistency in these renderings in Judges. This will be rated 5.
' $m$ '. This renders the sing of $g w y$. The Syriac plur. ' $m m$ ' renders the plur. of $g w y$ at 2:21, 23; $3: 1 ; 4: 2,13$ and 16 . This is taken as evidence of consistency for this occurrence and rated 5. qymy. This rendering of bryty was rated 3 at 2:1.
$p q d t$. This Peal renders the Piel of swyty here and the same Syriac root renders the same Hebrew root at $3: 4 ; 4: 6 ; 13: 14 ; 21: 10$ and 20. This rendering is rated 5 . At $2: 17$ the rendering of $m s w h$ by $p w q d n^{\prime}$ there and at 3:4 was suggested as corroboration for this conclusion.
'bhyhwn. This renders 'bwtm and the rendering of the various occurrences of ' $b$ by this Syriac cognate were evaluated at 1:14 and rated 5 .
$\check{s} m^{\prime} w$. This renders its Hebrew cognate $\check{s} m^{\prime} w$. The rendering was rated 5 at 2:2.
$q l y$. This renders its Hebrew cognate $q w l y$ and the rendering was considered and rated 5 at 2:2.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In the discussion of 2:14 the less literal rendering of $y h r^{-}{ }^{-} p m r y^{\prime}$ found in that verse and this one as well as $3: 8$ was pointed out and contrasted with the more literal approach in $6: 39 ; 9: 30 ; 10: 7$ and 14:19. In those four of these instances that specifically state the object of the anger, that object is the object of the preposition $l$ while the preposition in MT is $b$.

Although 'br at segment 7 in MT takes its direct object with the direct object marker, P has the preposition $l$, as JPS specifies where the meaning is "transgress" or "violate." ${ }^{46}$ In the case of segment 13 , the direct object in P is an example of direct object construction $e$ where MT has the direct object marker. As for segment 16, MT takes the complement qwly with $s m^{c}$ by means of the preposition $l$. In P , the preposition is $b$ and it is clear that Costaz

[^131]considers this the appropriate preposition in this case, ${ }^{47}$ and probable that JPS takes the same position. ${ }^{48}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5-.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has rendered $\tilde{s} m^{c} w$ lqwly by qbylw lmymry as at $2: 2$. As in 2:2 and 2:17, $\check{s} m^{c}$ is rendered by $q b l$, and that is consistent within Tg J but not literal in using the Hebrew cognate. Both A and B have a more literal approach to rendering $q w l$, doing so by $\varphi \omega v \dot{\eta}$. Both also render $\check{s} m^{\prime}$ by compounds of $\dot{\alpha} \kappa o v ́ \omega$. The phrase $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} v \theta^{\prime} \hat{\omega} v$ ő o $\alpha$ is explained by Thackery as "= 'because,' owing to the Hebrew having similar conjunctions formed with the
 Although there are small differences between A and B, neither can be said to be more similar to P than the other, but both are more similar to P than is Tg J .

2:21. גם־אני לא אוסיף להוריש איש מפניהם מן־הגוים אשר־עזב יהושע וימת:


## RETROVERSION

${ }^{47}$ Costaz, Dictionnaire Syriaque-Français, 372, col. 2.
${ }^{48}$ J. Payne Smith, Syriac Dictionary, 584, col. 2.
${ }^{49}$ H. St. J. Thackery, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, Vol. I (Cambridge: University Press, 1909), 25.

With each of the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 1,7 , and 9 , there are ten segments in MT, six to the athnach and four following it. The same number of segments can be identified in P , treating $w^{\prime} p^{\prime} n^{\prime}$ as segment 1 , mn qdmyhwn as segment $6, m n$ ' $m m$ ' as segment 7 , and $d s ̌ b q$ as segment 8 ; thus there are six segments to the first punctuation point and four following it. Setting aside for further comment, the waw prefix of segment 1 , all ten segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. This whole verse is part of a section of divine speech that begins at segment 5 of the preceding verse and does not conclude until the end of the following verse. It is one sentence that begins with a subordinate causal clause in verse 20 , continuing with the main clause in verse 21 , and ending with a subordinate purpose clause in verse 22 .

This calls for explanation of the added waw prefix. Unlike the case of conditional clauses already discussed in connection with earlier verses, at the beginning of verse 21 , this is not the beginning of an apodosis where a waw is not usually found in P and it is not the beginning of a non-sequential clause where an added waw might be found. Williams does note that the waw may be omitted in 1 Kgs "after protases introduced by conjunctions meaning 'because' such as $\pi$ or or $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ (13:26, 20:28, 20:42). ${ }^{י 50}$ JPS says that $w^{\prime} p l$ ' can mean "not even, neither, nor." ${ }^{51}$ If this is so the divine speech might be read in a way like this: Because they did not do X , neither will I do Y, in order to test them. This approach would itself need more testing, but it would explain the addition of the sub-element.

Although Tg J does not add the waw, both A and B have the $\kappa \alpha i$ at this point and Brooke and McLean cite no source that omits it. ${ }^{52}$ On the other hand, the apparatus of the BHK and

[^132]BHS do not note this possible variation. Thus some uncertainty remains, but for purposes of the following discussion it will be treated as an addition and the Vorlage of the remainder of the verse will be considered as one that is indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The elements and segments of P are rendered on an element by element and segment by segment basis, and except for the initial waw prefix the segments are about as close to those to which they correspond in MT as is possible in Syriac. The sequence of P is also the same as in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. If the initial waw prefix is an additional sub-element, it would reduce the literal nature of this mode by less than $5 \%$. The usual approach to rating in such places as these is by the addition of a minus. Because of the additional doubt here this will be marked by $5 / 5-$.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

${ }^{\prime} p$. This renders $g m$ and first did so in Judges at $1: 3$ where the consistency of the rendering was evaluated and rated 5 .
' $n$ '. This renders ' $n y$ and the consistency of the rendering was also evaluated at $1: 3$ and rated 5.
'wsp. This Aphel of $y s p$ renders the Hiphil of $y s p$ here and at $3: 12 ; 4: 1 ; 9: 37 ; 10: 6,13 ; 11: 14$; 13:1;20:22, 23 and 28. These eleven consistent renderings are rated 5.
$m w b d w$. This Aphel of ' $b d$ renders the Hiphil of $y r \check{s}$. The rendering of this Hiphil root by this Aphel root was evaluated at 1:19 and rated 4 there. 'nš. This renders Hebrew 'yš and this is one of the renderings of 'yš that was rated 4 in considering 1:4.
$m n ~ q d m y h w n$. This renders mpny here and this rendering was rated 4 in the discussion of 2:3.
' mm '. This plur. form renders $h g w y m$ here and the rendering was evaluated in the preceding verse and rated 5.
$\check{s} b q$. This renders ${ }^{‘} z b$ and the rendering was rated 5 for consistency at $2: 12$.
myt. This Peal perf.of the verb mwt renders the Qal narrative tense of its Hebrew cognate here and the consistency of this rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. The evaluation of the syntactical issues raised by the addition of the initial waw prefix were discussed in connection with the retroversion of this verse, and that discussion applies equally here. The addition may reflect some small accuracy or inaccuracy of Syriac semantics or syntax.

More recent versions like RSV and NRSV render 'yš so that it is the "any" in the phrase "any of the nations." This seems to differ from the 'nš of P and Tg J and the $\alpha \nsim \delta \rho \rho \alpha$ of A and B, and they probably render the Hebrew more accurately. We might say "anybody" or "a single soul." This 'nš in P is an example of direct object construction $e$ rendering an indefinite direct object in MT which is, of course, without a direct object marker. The circumstantial clause of segment 10 is rendered literally by P .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for its failure to follow P in adding the initial waw prefix Tg J is similar to P , word for word. Codex A is also close to a word for word counterpart of P and has the initial кaí, but without the $\gamma \varepsilon$ believed to render $g m$ in the self-consciously literal LXX tradition. Where it is less literal is in its rendering of $m y t$ by $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \hat{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon v$, perhaps comparable to the genteelism, "pass
away" for "die," or even "pass" instead of "die." Except for its $\gamma \varepsilon$ B is like A in its rendering of MT, but it also is different from MT and the other three versions in its addition of viós Navŋ $\varepsilon v \tau \eta \hat{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$. Accordingly Tg J is considered closest to P in this verse and A is closer than B.

למען נסות בם את־ישראֵל השמרים הם את־דרך יהוה ללכת בם כאשר שמרו אבותם אם־לא: 2:22.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 4, 7, and 14 there are fourteen segments in MT, four to the athnach and ten following it. In P l'ysryl is counted as segment 4 , 'wrḥh as segment 7 , and ' $w l$ ' as segment 14 . The first four segments of P precede the first punctuation point, but there is an added $m r y^{\prime}$ between the segments that represent the third and fourth segments of MT. Three of the segments that represent three of the next four segments of MT are between the first and second punctuation points, but there is (a question of) an added ' $n$ right after the first punctuation point. Moreover, there is no sub-element representing the interrogative $h \bar{e}$ prefix of segment 5 and no segment representing segment 6 . Two segments of P representing segments 9 and 10 follow the added $w n$ between the second and third punctuation points. The segments of P that represent segments 11 to 14 of MT can be distinguished between the third and fourth punctuation points if ' $y k d$ is treated as segment 11 and ' $w l$ ' is treated as segment 14.

Neither the occurrence of $m r y^{\prime}$ nor the occurrence of $n n s^{3}$ among the Syriac elements rendering the four segments of this verse of MT up to the athnach can be retroverted to any segment of the Hebrew phrase in those four segments of this verse. The first would be an addition and the second, a Pael imperf., is a change of syntax from the infinitive construct of its Hebrew cognate, segment 2 of the verse of MT. Although the Syriac imperf. (or dependent imperf.) can be retroverted to a Hebrew infinitive, that is not possible in this verse of P since the added $m r y$ has to be the subject of that imperf. This means the Lord who began speaking in 2:20 and who used the first person pronoun in 2:21 is now referring to himself in the third person. (Dirksen reports no textual variant here.)

Since it is difficult to represent the $h \bar{e}$ interrogative in Syriac, the first ' $n$ could be said to retrovert to it, and thus it is not implausible to say that the elements 'n ntryn represent segment 5 of MT and can be retroverted to it. Since the Syriac participle does not require a pronoun or noun to be used with a participle used as a predicate, one might say that this segment 5 of P can be retroverted to segments 5 and 6 of MT, hšmrym hm. However, even though it is possible, it is not literal. The genitive phrase 'wrhh dmry' of P can be retroverted to segments 7 and 8 of MT.

The next addition, $w n$, cannot be retroverted to any element of MT but it does not change the meaning. The outline of the Hebrew is: [I]n order to test Israel by them: Are they taking care to walk in the way? The outline of the Syriac is: "In order that the Lord might test Israel by them, whether they are keeping the way of the Lord and whether they are walking in it." There seems no great difference between "taking care to walk" and "taking care and walking." Still, it is a free translation, and this understanding helps to understand how segment 9 of MT can be an infinitive and segment 9 of P can be a participle without changing the meaning of the verse. The change of the plur. pronoun of segment 10 of MT to
the sing. of P does not change the meaning either. Instead, it reconciles the sing. of $d r k$ with the number of the object of the preposition. The last four segments of P can be retroverted to the last four segments of MT.

Targum J does not support P at any point where it differs from MT. The Greek Versions and the Vulgate support P by a sing. pronoun at segment 10. The Vulgate has et followed by a finite verb where P has $w^{3} n$ followed by a participle. This gives no support for any of the differences found in P with the possible exception of the sing. pronoun at segment 10. Accordingly, the source of P will be treated as indistinguishable from MT with a qualification as to the sing. at segment 10 .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. The determination of how to calculate the literalism of the segmentation of this verse has to be made without any precedents to guide the effort. Although additions have not often been calculated as having an effect on segmentation, the addition of $m r y$ and $w^{3} n$ are taken here as having had such an effect. They are not pleonastic in the same way that adding ' $/ h^{\prime}$ after $m r y^{\prime}$ might be, nor are they comparable to adding br nwn after yšw. They recast the verse in part in a way that might be said to be "dynamically equivalent." to the source. The effect of this on the segmentation combines with the change of $n s w t$ to $n n s^{\prime}$ to impair the segmentation by two-fourteenths. The addition of $w n$ and the change of segment 9 to a participle are taken here as having the same degree of effect on the literalism of the segmentation. The failure to represent $h m$ literally and the first ' $n$ are taken as features of translation technique to be considered as part of mode 4 and not as issues of segmentation. Thus this portion of this mode is calculated as having been reduced to about $71 \%$ of literality and rated 3 .

On the other hand, the sequence of the segments that represent those in MT has been preserved and so the additions and subtractions or changes in verb form are not taken as affecting the sequence of the elements. Therefore this portion of the mode will be rated 5 and the rating for the mode will be 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The omission of a segment to represent $h m$ and the addition of $m r y^{\prime}$ and $w^{\prime} n$ are treated as non-literal elements for this mode in this verse. The question of whether to calculate the first ' $n$ as an addition or as part of the representation of segment 5 is not so clear-cut, especially because of the lack of a true equivalent to the interrogative $h \bar{e}$. This would be the difference between a verse that is eleven-fourteenths or ten-fourteenths literal as to this mode. Either would result is a rating of 3 . If a resolution of this issue is called for here, it would be that this is not an addition. In either case this mode is rated 3.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.

$m t ̣ l$. This renders $l m ' n$ here and at 3:2 and this is not enough evidence on which to base a rating. As a rendering of $k y$ it was rated 3 at 1:19.
$n n s^{\prime}$. The Pael imperf. of $n s^{\prime}$ renders the Piel infinitive of $n s h$ here and the Pael infinitive renders the Piel infinitive at 3:1 and 4. The Pael imperf. renders the Piel imperf. at 6:39. Accordingly this rendering is rated 5 for consistency. ntrryn and nṭrw. These Peal forms render Qal forms of šmr here. The rendering of the Qal of $\check{s} m r$ by the Peal of this root was rated 5 at 1:24.
'wrḥh. This renders $d r k$ and the rendering of that Hebrew noun by this Syriac was rated 5 at 2:17.
mhlkyn. This Pael participle renders the Qal infinitive of Hebrew hlk here. The rendering by ${ }^{\prime} z l$ was evaluated at 1:3 and there it was calculated that the Pael of $h l k$ renders the Qal of $h l k$
six or seven out of 104 or 105 times that hlk is rendered in Judges. (The uncertainty arises from the question of whether $h l k$ and another verb are transposed at 11:37.) In either case the rendering like the one here would rate 1 .
${ }^{\prime} y k d$. This renders $k{ }^{\prime} s r$ and the various renderings of that word were discussed at $1: 7$ and this rendering was rated 2 there.
'bhyhwn. This renders 'bwtm. The rendering is rated 5 in the discussion of 1:14.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segment 4 of P there is an example of direct object construction $e$ and at segment 7 an example of direct object construction $d$. At segments 7-8, there is an example of genitive construction $c$. The rendering of interrogative $h \bar{e}$ by ' $n$ in the case of an indirect interrogative is a recognized feature of Syriac ${ }^{53}$ and is arguably the best way possible in Syriac to render the Hebrew particle in the context of this verse.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The comparison is somewhat complicated by the changes, additions, and subtractions in P . Targum J adds dtqnn qdm. The two Greek Versions are close to each other and to MT, differing only on the second occurrence of $\varphi \cup \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, A having the aorist middle and B the aorist active. Both have $\varepsilon \grave{i}$ before the first occurrence of $\varphi \cup \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$, supporting the use of ' $n$ by P . Thus they are considered closer to P than Tg J and not distinguishable from each other for the purpose of comparison to P .

[^133]
## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 3 and 10 there are ten segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and three following it. The same segments can be identified in P by treating wšbqw'nwn as segment 1 for purposes of this discussion of retroversion, $l^{\prime} m m^{\prime}$ 'as segment $3, w^{\prime} w b d^{\prime} n w n$ as segment 6 , 'šlm 'nwn as segment $9, b^{\prime} y d^{\prime} d y^{\prime} w^{\prime}$ as segment 10 , and $m r y^{\prime}$ between segments 9 and 10 as an addition. By this reckoning there are four segments to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, and three more plus the addition between the second and third such points.

These ten segments can be retroverted to the ten of MT. Segment 1 can be retroverted if the semi-enclitic ' $n w n$ is seen as part of a direct object construction $f$. The most difficult segment to retrovert is segment 5, but it can be seen as a less literal rendering of lblty (with more discussion of that below). The remaining segments can be retroverted less awkwardly, excluding of course mry before segment 10 . When the other versions being compared here are taken into account it is clearer that there is nothing in this verse of P that gives any evidence of a Vorlage that can be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. If the added $m r y^{\prime}$ is set aside as an issue that affects the literalism of mode 2 , the remaining problem
in the way of seeing the segments as a word for word translation is the use of $w l^{\prime}$ to render lblty. At 21:7 where the verb following this term is clearly the infinitive construct P has $d l$, and that would seem to be an acceptable rendering meaning something like "in order not to" or "so as not to." At 8:1, the only other place in Judges where lblty is found (and rendered $w l^{\prime}$ by P ) the following verb is $q r^{2} w t$, but the BHS note reports that many mss have $q r^{2} t$. In an unpointed text this could be read as a $2^{\text {nd }}$ masc. sing. perf. of $q r^{\nu}$ just as $h w r y s ̌ m$ can be read, even in a pointed text, as the $3^{\text {rd }}$ masc. sing. Hiphil perf. of $y r s ̌$. One may say that the translator should have resolved the problem in favor of an infinitive construct because of the presence of lblty, but that might be what did not happen. If the translator read lblty as only signifying negation (for which we have also the evidence of $8: 1$ ) and also took the verb as finite, then the Syriac tendency to add a waw before a non-sequential independent clause might also have gone into effect. That would require the translator to overlook the lamed or to look on it as something like that which we might refer to as an assertive or appositional lamed (not so likely because of its apparently more common occurrence in poetry). If that is what was going on then that would explain $w^{\prime}$ and would then allow us to take this as intended to be a word for word translation even at this point. If not, then the literal quality of the segmentation would be impaired. Since that impairment can be seen as no more than $10 \%$ of the segmentation aspect of this mode in this verse and since the sequencing is unimpaired, this verse can be rated 5- to take account of the lack of a definitive explanation of segment 5 at this point.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As already explained, the second $m r y$ is an addition and the 'nwn following segment 1 is not. Thus this mode is rated 4.5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$\check{s} b q$. This Peal renders the Hiphil B (or II) of $n w h$ as it also does at 3:1 and 16:26. It is rendered by sym at 6:18 and 20. Based on these examples it is rated 2 for consistency when rated as it is here.
$m r y^{3}$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
' mm '. This rendering of the plur. of $g w y$ was rated 5 at 2:20 where the rendering of the sing. was considered.
'wbd. This renders the Hiphil of $y r s ̌$. In the consideration of the rendering of the same Hebrew verb by Syriac harb at 1:19, this rendering was rated 4.
$b^{\prime} g l$. This renders $m h r$ here and at 2:17 where it was not rated because of a lack of a sufficient number of occurrences on which to base a meaningful rating.
'šlm. This renders $n t n$ here and the rendering of $n t n$ complemented by byd using this verb was rated 5 at 1:2.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This renders $y d$ in the construction referred to in the preceding entry. The rendering was also rated 5 at 1:2.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 4.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The accuracy of the rendering of lblty was discussed in considering the retroversion and segmentation of this verse. It is likely that this is a case where this construction could have been misunderstood because the infinitive that it modifies has the same Hebrew letters as the perf. The fact that a similar situation exists at $8: 1$ weakens an argument that it is impossible to treat this as a perf.

There is an example of direct object construction $f$, 'nwn . . . l'mm' in this verse and an example of genitive construction $b$ at ' $y d^{\prime} d y s ̌ w t^{\prime}$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

All three of the other versions are close and differ from P by rendering lblty hwryš more consistently with MT and not adding a second mry. Thus A and B are equally comparable to P and Tg J is as similar in comparability to the Greek as one might expect given the difference in language. Thus no preference will be given here to any of those three versions in relation to P .

## CHAPTER FOUR

## CHAPTER THREE OF JUDGES

## ואלה הגוים אשר הניח יהוה לנסות בם את־ישראאל את כל־אשר לא־ידעו את כל־מלחמות כנען: 3:1  <br> ד.תدتــع.

## RETROVERSION

With the four pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segments $8,9,10$, and 11 , and with the direct object markers of segments 9 and 11 each treated as part of the segment which it marks, there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and four following it. The verse of P can be divided into twelve segments that correspond to these segments with the $d$ prefix of $\check{s} b q$ treated as segment $3, \check{s} b q$ as segment $4, l^{\prime} y s r y l$ as segment $8, k l d$ as segment $9, l^{\prime} y d^{\prime} w$ as segment 10 and $l k l h w n ~ q r b^{\prime}$ as segment 11, eight segments to the first punctuation point and four following it.

The segments of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT with explanations based on Syriac syntax or translation technique. The first eight segments call for no explanation apart from what will be said in describing features of mode 4 since the question at this stage of the discussion is whether there is any reason to see in these segments a Vorlage different from MT. At segment 9 of P the direct object marker of MT is not represented by P as P represents the direct object marker at segment 8 by $l$. Since we know that there are at least three ways that a direct object marked in MT may be rendered in P and that one of those is without any marking at all, no conclusion can be
drawn from the lack of the $l$ prefix at segment 9 . When we observe that segment 9 is in apposition to the direct object of segment 8 there is even less reason to treat this as evidence for any lack of ${ }^{\prime} t$ in P's source. Segments 10 and 11 do not present difficulties for retroversion, but segment 12 in P renders the proper name in MT referring to the territory by the plur. gentilic proper name, but $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and B do not. Of course "Canaan" is metonomy in MT and the three versions, evoking not the land, but the people of Canaan against whom the future wars were going to be fought. Accordingly no evidence is found here for a Hebrew Vorlage that would differ from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. As the segments are divided in the foregoing discussion of retroversion this is a word for word translation of a text like MT and the elements are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. Thus this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. No elements have been added or subtracted and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

' mm '. This translation of the plur. of gwy was considered in discussing the rendering of the sing. of that Hebrew term at 2:20 and rated 5 there.
$\check{s} b q$. This rendering of the Hiphil B (or II) of $n w h \not h$ was discussed in considering the previous verse, 2:23, and rated 2 there.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
mnsyw. This Pael infinitive of $n s{ }^{\text { }}$ renders the Piel infinitive of $n s h$ and the rendering of forms of $n s h$ by forms of $n s^{\prime}$ was rated 5 at 2:22.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{c} w$. This rendering of Hebrew $y d^{c}$ by Syriac $y d^{c}$ was analyzed at 2:10 and rated 4 there.
$q r b^{\prime}$. This renders the Hebrew noun mlhmh, or its plur. as in this verse, sixteen of the twenty times it is found in Judges, that is, in this verse and $3: 2,10 ; 8: 13 ; 18: 11,16,17$; $20: 17,22,23,28,34,39(2 x), 42$; and 21:22. At $20: 14$ and 18 , the prepositional phrase in MT with mlḥmh as its direct object is rendered by the Ethpaal infinitive of $k t s ̌$. At 20:20, the missing verse, two occurrences of $m l h m h$ are not translated. Thus almost $89 \%$ of the renderings are consistent and this rendering is rated 4.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There are two instances of direct object construction $e$ : at segment 8 and segment 11. Segment 9 in apposition to segment 8 may be contrasted with these two constructions because it uses direct object construction $d$ without any marker and all three segments are marked in MT by ${ }^{\prime} t$. It is clear that this is not based on the fact that the direct object at segment 9 is $k l$ since the direct object at segment 11 is also $k l$.

The phrase $q r b^{\prime} d k n^{\prime} n y^{\prime}$ is an example of genitive construction $b$. Segment 12 of P , $k n^{\prime} n y^{\prime}$, is also a less literal rendering of Hebrew $k n^{\prime} n$. The Syriac renders what is literally territorial in Hebrew but figuratively gentilic by a word that is literally gentilic (an example of metonymy). Thus it illustrates Barr's example of the rendering that is free because it renders the further significance of the figure but not literal because it destroys the figurative sense. As Barr says in his discussion as part of mode 4 using the example of the KJV rendering of șwr by rock in contrast to the rendering of the Coverdale Psalms of the Book of Common Prayer: "The reader of the Prayer Book version . . . no longer knows that the text is a metaphor based on the word "rock."

The absence of a pronominal suffix on $k l$ at segment 9 and the presence of one at segment 13 can be explained based on Williams findings that where $k l$ is independent and

[^134]followed by $d$ it usually has no such suffix and that where it occurs with a definite noun the suffix is often found. ${ }^{2}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

In this verse Tg J is somewhat closer to MT than P , by representing the direct object marker as it usually does and preserving the sing. of $k n^{\prime} n$. Both A and B also render $k n^{\prime} n$ as the land and in the sing., but A has substituted 'I $\eta$ oov̂c for $y h w h$ and B has omitted a rendering of $k l$ before its rendering of mlhmwt. The substitution made by A is considered a greater variation here so that Tg J is considered more similar to P that the Greek Versions and B is considered more similar than A.

3:2. רק למען דעת דרות בני־ישראל ללמדם מלחגָה רק אשר־לפנים לא ידעום:


## RETROVERSION

Moore says: "This verse is clearly corrupt; the restoration is somewhat uncertain. The most conservative course is to follow [Greek Versions]."3 With both pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 5 and 9 there are eleven segments in MT, seven to the athnach and four following it. This verse of P can be divided into the same number of segments, seven to the first punctuation point if bny 'ysryl is treated as segment

[^135]5 and four segments following it to the second and final punctuation point, with $q d m y^{\prime}$ counted as segment 9 .

There are small differences in P which may in fact be important. Setting aside for a moment the rendering of the two infinitives as imperfect, the more important problem with the second, the Piel $l l m d m$, is that it is rendered without a pronominal suffix in P and by the Peal of $y l p$ with the sense of "learn" rather than by the Pael, ' $l p$ with the meaning, "teach." (Of course when the purpose is to teach, it is also the purpose that those taught might learn.) Then at segment 9 no term in P renders 'šr (unless the possibility suggested below is correct) and the pronominal suffix of segment 11 is not rendered. Apparently $q d m y^{\prime}$ is the subject of ' $y d^{\prime} w$ and not an adverb as is lpnym at whose place in the sequence of elements it stands. Thus this verse of $P$ might be rendered: In order that only the generations of the children of Israel might know how they might learn war, [as] only the previous [ones] had not known how. Even this rendering involves some cheating since the verse in P lacks a conjunction to link the last four segments to the first seven and this suggested rendering has added "as" in order to slip one in as unobtrusively as possible. ${ }^{4}$ What Smelik does in his translation of Tg J is to make $q r b^{\prime}$ (rendering segment 7) the direct object of $d y d^{*} w n$ rendering segment 3 and then to translate only one occurrence of $l h w d$ and treat that rendering as modifying l'lpwthwn. This reference to that translation of Tg J is not made to point out any error but rather to show how difficult it is to render the verse of Tg J . The difficulty of rendering it is apposite since it is closer to MT than A, B, or P. Neither A nor B renders $d^{t} t$ and the BHS note indicates this as it also suggests that

[^136]the final mem of segment 11 is enclitic (or is it a mistake for the feminine pronominal suffix?). In addition, based on $P$, one might speculate that the final mem of segment 6 arose from dittography of the following mem and that this addition led to treating lmd as Piel. The Vulgate renders this verse quite freely (assuming its Vorlage is close to MT), and does support P's treatment of lmd as Qal by its use of discerent. As noted in the discussion of 1:10 this is the only place in Judges where the adverbial form of lpnym is rendered by a substantive, but that could be explained as a way of rendering 'šr lpnym, "those who were before." This would then be the way in which P renders the whole phrase, 'šr lpnym.

These considerations do not lead to certainty about whether or not the source text can be distinguished from MT. Many of the differences might have resulted from the difficulties of rendering a text like this one of MT, but they might also have resulted from differences in the source text. The translations considered here do not corroborate each other in support of speculation like that considered here or do so only to a limited extent. Accordingly this verse will be analyzed as if its source had been one that cannot be distinguished from MT, but the conclusions reached will not be made part of the overall evaluation of the portion of P being studied here in the same way as those verses judged to be based on a source that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. As already explained this verse of P can be divided into eleven segments that can be compared to the eleven segments into which this verse of MT was divided. That makes $m t l d$ segment 2 and the imperf. $n d^{*} w n$ segment 3 . Segment 4 together with the suffix of segment 5 renders $d r w t$ and then bny'ysryl renders segment 5 . Segment 6 is rendered by $n^{\prime} l p w n$ (whether or not correctly is to be discussed) with the prefixed $d$ normally but not
always prefixed to a Syriac imperf. when it renders an infinitive prefixed by $l$. Then segment 7 is rendered by $q r b^{\prime}$ and segment 8 by blhwd. The next segment 9 is represented by segment 9 of $\mathrm{P}, q d m y^{3}$, but it is not clear whether this is intended to render only lpnym or to render the whole segment 'šr-lpnym. In the former case it would be an adverb of time ${ }^{5}$ translated as "formerly" or "before time" rather than substantively to refer to the earlier generations who had not learned (or been taught) what they needed to know. In the translation proposed above $q d m y$ is treated as a substantive. If the $d$ relative conjunction is supplied, then the last four segments might be rendered: only what earlier (ones, that is, generations) did not know.

The literalness of the segmentation is not easy to evaluate. Since the text assumed here is not distinguished from MT, one has to consider that segment 6 of P (lacking the pronominal suffix and apparently rendered as Peal rather than Pael) and segment 9 (not specifically rendering 'šr and rendering lpnym as a substantive) are filling in related terms that translate freely the segment as it exists in MT. This means treating their "learning" as a free translation of the Lord's "teaching" them. The Syriac root at segment 6 would be used in a literal translation of segment 6 of MT and other forms of $q d m$ might well render the adverb in segment 8 . However the freedom is at the level of the segment or the word and does not put this verse in the category of a sense by sense as opposed to a word for word translation, or does so only in part. To a considerable extent at segment 6 the effect is only on the semantic level and more a feature of mode 4 than this one. Then at segment 9 it goes beyond that if lpnym is adverbial, since the result of using $q d m y$ where elsewhere qdym renders that Hebrew is to make it more likely that it is a substantive and that makes it the subject of ${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime} w$. If most translators of MT are correct then lpnym modifies ' $y d^{d} w$. On the other hand, it may be that the adverb in MT is being used substantively with the

[^137]relativizer to mean "those who were earlier (or something similar)." If so, P is correct and the others have it wrong. If not, P has not correctly segmented the last three segments and the segmentation of the verse is only about $73 \%$ literal. Whether or not this is true, the segments still maintain the same sequence that they follow in MT. The segmentation would be rated 3 if the usual view that the adverb modifies the verb is accepted and the sequence would be rated 5 with the result that this mode is rated 4. (If P has correctly read MT, then this mode would be rated 4.5 or 5.)
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. If this verse is treated as a rendering of the MT verse the prefixes at segments 3,5 , and 6 are treated as features of Syriac syntax considered under mode 4 and the rendering of the Piel of lmd by the Peal of $y l p$ is considered a semantic question as part of that mode, but the absence of a suffix at segment 6 and a prefix at segment 9 are treated as subtractions. The failure to render what is considered an enclitic mem at segment 11 is also considered a feature of translation technique. Since the two subtractions are below the element level, they are calculated as at most a one-eleventh subtraction from the rating. That would still be rated 5 , but a minus will be added to reflect the presence of some mitigation of the literality as to this mode.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
blhwd. This renders $r q$ twice in this verse and at one of the two occurrences of the same Hebrew in 19:20. At 6:39, it appears to be rendered by twb, but renders both another occurrence of $r q$ in that verse and an occurrence of $l b d$. The Hebrew term here does not appear to have been rendered at 11:34, but lbr may have been intended to express the same sense at a different place in the sequence of elements in that verse. At 14:16 it is rendered by $\check{s} r^{r} y r^{\circ} y t$. One of the occurrences at 19:20 is not translated. Accordingly there is little consistency here and this rendering is rated 1.
$m t t l$. This renders $l m^{\prime} n$ only here and at 2:22 and thus was not rated there. The rendering of Hebrew $k y$ by this Syriac is considered at 1:19.
$n d^{k} w n$. This renders the Qal infinitive of $y d^{{ }^{k}}$ here. The rendering by this cognate of $y d^{c}$ is considered at 2:10 and rated 4 there. This analysis also applies to segment 11 . $d r^{2}$. This plur. renders the plur. of $d w r$ here and the sing. twice at $2: 10$ and was not rated because these are the only three instances of the Hebrew term in Judges. $n^{\prime} l p w n$. This probable Peal of the verb $y l p$ renders the Piel of $l m d$. That Hebrew verb occurs only here in Judges and thus cannot be rated for consistency. $q r b^{3}$. This renders the $m l h m h$, as the plur. form rendered the plur. of the Hebrew in the previous verse where these renderings were rated 4.
$q d m y^{\prime}$. This is taken as rendering lpnym here and was rated 1 at 1:10.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Level and accuracy of semantic and syntactical information. It is unlikely that $n^{\prime} l p w n$ is a Pael as it would have to be if it is to render the Piel of lmd. It would be difficult to find that it is Pael because it has a $3^{\text {rd }}$ person plur. subject that can only be the children of Israel. In the context of the narrative, these Israelites are unlikely teachers, but even if they were, the question would be: Whom did they teach? They needed to be taught so that they might learn. Finally, according to JPS, the Pael imperf. is "much oftener" nlp. ${ }^{6}$ Thus this rendering is not semantically accurate, but it accurately renders the root of the verb and the shift in meaning is very slight.

As already discussed, the two infinitives prefixed by $l$ at segments 3 and 6 are rendered by $d$ plus the imperfect. Although this usually involves the conjunction $d$ as it does here, it is also found without it. ${ }^{7}$ At segments 4 to 5 there is an example of genitive

[^138]${ }^{7}$ Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, §267, 208-09.
construction $b$ and then of genitive construction $a$. At segment 7 there is an example of direct object construction $d$. Here in order to follow up on earlier discussion of $q d m y^{\prime}$ it is noted that the masculine plur. can mean among other possibilities "the ancients" and that the only adverbial use mentioned in JPS calls for the prepositional prefix $b .^{8}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE <br> 3.

If this verse were being rated with certainty as a translation of a verse indistinguishable from MT, it would be rated 3. The possibility that $q d m y$ is rendering both elements of segment 9 would call for a reassessment of that conclusion, but the absence of a conjunction would still raise difficulties since $q d m y^{3}$ cannot be a direct object of the Peal of $y l p$ as 'šr can be the second direct object of the Piel of lmd. If one reaches the conclusion that the majority of ancient mss on which Dirksen's text is based have been corrupted in transmission and that the reading of segment 9 in the 1979 UBS edition of P that includes the $d$ prefix is correct that conclusion would call for a different evaluation.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is more similar to MT, and that of course does not eliminate the problems already discussed above, but it does mean that it is closer to P than are A and B since the points at which those Greek Versions differ from MT are different from those at which P does. Although there are other differences, neither A nor B renders $d^{t} t$ and P does, and P renders the Piel of $l m d$ by a Peal of $y l p$ while both Greek Versions are rendering the Piel (and they are joined by Tg J ).

[^139]
## RETROVERSION

With the one pair of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segment 4, there are 15 segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and six following it. With wklhwn kn'ny' counted as segment 4 , there are nine segments in P up to the third punctuation point. Segment 10, wmn twr follows the third punctuation point. Then $d b n y$ occupies the eleventh place in the sequence of segments and segment 12 , hrmwn , segments 13,14 , and 15 of P follow to the last punctuation point of the verse. Segments 1 to 3 of P retrovert to the same segments of MT. Segments 4 to 7 can be retroverted to the same segments of MT if the plur. renderings are accepted as rendering the plur. sense of the gentilics and the participle in MT. Segments 9 and 10 of P can also be retroverted if the waw prefix of $m n$ is accepted as part of the translation of P that is to be ignored in a retroversion. The segment $d b n y$ cannot be retroverted to segment 11 of MT, $b c l$. Codex B does not represent $b c l$, but both A and the Vulgate do. Segment 11 of P and the myšr of Tg J do not provide consistent support for any alternative. Segments 12 to 15 of $P$ can be retroverted to MT if the waw prefix of segment 13 is also treated as a feature of translation technique to be ignored when retroverting. Accordingly the Vorlage of P will be treated as indistinguishable from MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Based on the conclusions reached in the foregoing discussion of retroversion, this verse of P is a word for word translation of the verse of MT with the exception of the placement of bny
at the point in P where one would expect $b l$, segment 11 of MT. Such occurrences might be called "replacements" rather than additions or subtractions and are a puzzle for consideration as to modes 1 and 2 and are more suited to comment as part of mode 4 . In this case, unlike others, it does not affect the other segments except to the extent that the proper name "Sons of Hermon" or "Hermonites" is not the same name as "Baal Hermon." Even if it is treated as a reduction in the literal quality of the segmentation it cannot be seen as reducing that by more than $10 \%$. It would be even more exacting to find that it interrupts the sequence of the elements of the verse, so this aspect of the mode will be rated 5-. Since the sequence would be rated 5 , this mode is rated $5-$.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As already suggested, the substitution of bny might be treated as both an addition and a subtraction. Therefore this will be treated as such and this mode will be rated 4 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$t r w n$. This renders srny a total of eight times in Judges, once in this verse and seven times in $16: 5,8,18(2 x), 23,27$, and 30 . The rendering is rated 5 .
$y t b y$. This rendering of $y s s^{b}$ was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:9. $t \not t r r^{\text {. The rendering of } h r \text { by this Syriac was also considered at 1:9 and rated } 5 .}$
${ }^{\text {' }} d m$ ' $l$. The use of this construction as a preposition translating $d$ of MT was considered at 1:21 and rated 5 there.
$m^{\prime} l n$ '. The rendering of forms of the Qal participle of $b w^{\prime}$ by forms derived from the verb ${ }^{\prime} l$ was considered at $1: 7$ and $1: 14$. The rendering of Hiphil was discussed at $1: 7$ and rated 2 . The rendering of the Qal was considered at 1:14 and rated 1. Thus it would be rated 1 here. In the three places where the sense is the entrance, or perhaps the approach to a city (this verse, 6:4 and 11:33) this term is used consistently to render the infinitive construct of $b w$. If those occurrences are considered separately, the rendering would not be rated.

This then is a situation where the rendering is consistent in the contexts where it occurs, but not literal. The Targum renders by a term equivalent to the one used here by P . Versions A and B simply transliterate (in slightly different ways) both segments 14 and 15 by a single term. Accordingly this rendering will not be rated but it will be considered to call for a minus to the overall rating of this mode in this verse.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5-.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of $b^{c} l$, segment 11, by bny is of course inaccurate, but the explanation is not obvious. Smelik notes that Smolar and Auerbach "suppose that religious motives led the Targumist to 990id בעל 9,

The renderings of the Hebrew gentilics by plur. forms as well the plur. form of the Syriac participle at segment 7 can be explained in the same way as other similar renderings. From one perspective the plur. may not be accurate, but the more significant consideration is that the plur. is more consistent with the underlying plur. sense of the gentilics rendered and of any participle whose number depends on such a gentilic.

The waw prefixes of $m n$ and ' $d m$ ' were mentioned in the discussion of retroversion. Williams has discussed eight occasions in 1 Kgs where Hebrew ' $d$ is rendered by ' $d m$ ' plus prefixed waw. ${ }^{10}$ The waw prefix of $m n$ is not so clearly supported. The situation identified by Williams closest to this is where "the Hebrew will have a whole list of objects not joined by waw, whereas the Syriac will use waw." ${ }^{11}$ Here we have two regions, that of Mount Lebanon and that of Mount Hermon, the Anti-Lebanon, and the Hebrew text could be viewed as joining them into one. If bny hrmwn does represent a reading of this phrase

[^140]as a gentilic, there may be an additional reason to distinguish the Hivites on Mount Lebanon from some supposed group of Hermonites.

The suffixed klhwn is common before plur. definite animate objects as Williams notes. He also points out that $k l$ with the masculine sing. suffix is used with groups of people. ${ }^{12}$

At segments 2 to 3 there is a genitive construction $b$ as there also is at segments 8 to 9 and 14 to 15 . At segments 7 to 8 there is a genitive construction $a$. The genitive at segments 11 to 12 is not noted here since this element is not treated as part of the source of $P$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5-.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The Targum has rendered the gentilics of segments 4 to 6 as plur. (including the plur. of the participle) just as P has, but the Greek Versions keep the sing. collective proper names in the same places. The geographic reference $b w$ hmt is also rendered by Tg J in a way similar to P at the same time the two Greek Versions transliterate the two words as a single place name (with slightly different spellings). Only A retains a representation of $b^{c} l$ in its place name $\mathrm{B} \alpha \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \rho \mu \omega v$. Accordingly Tg J is closest to P , and B may be considered closer than A because it too shies away from $b c l$.

## 3:4. ויהיו לנסות בם את־ישראל לדעת הישמעו את־מצות יהוה אשר צוה את־אבותם ביד משה:

${ }^{12}$ Ibid., 43-44.

## RETROVERSION

With the three direct object markers joined to their objects by maqqēph each treated as single segments 4,7 , and 11 , there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and nine following it. With l'ysryl treated as segment 4 , ' $n$ šm' $y n$ treated as segment $6, p w q d n w h y$ as segment 7 , the $d$ prefix of $p q d$ treated as segment 9 and $p q d$ treated as segment 10 , and $l^{\prime} b h y h w n$ as segment 11 , thirteen segments can also be distinguished in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point, and nine following it.

The first four segments of the verse in P can be retroverted easily if the absence of a waw at segment 1 is recognized as a feature of Syriac syntax. The fifth segment of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segment as a dependent imperf. rendering an infinitive. ${ }^{13}$ The remaining segments can all be retroverted recognizing that the prefixes of segments 8 and 13 are part of Syriac genitive constructions and that the prefix of segment 10, enumerated here as segment 9 is a normal rendering of ${ }^{2} \check{s} r$. Accordingly the source of $P$ is considered to have been one that cannot be distinguished from MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The segments represent a word for word translation of this verse of MT and they are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtractions of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .

[^141]
## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

mnsyw. This Pael infinitive renders the Piel infinitive of $n s h$ and the rendering by the Pael of this root of the Piel of the cognate Hebrew root was considered at 2:22 and rated 5 . $n d^{c}$. This Peal imperf. renders the $\mathrm{Q} a l$ infinitive of its Hebrew cognate as it did at 3:2. The rendering by this verb of its Hebrew cognate was considered in the discussion of 2:10 and rated 4 there.
šm'yn. This rendering by the Peal and Aphel of this root of the Qal and Hiphil, respectively, of its Hebrew cognate was evaluated at $2: 2$ and rated 5 there. $p w q d n w h y$ and $p q d$. This plur. noun (with the suffixed feature of Syriac syntax) renders the plur. of $m s w h$ here and the verb $p q d$ renders the Hebrew verb $s w h$. The rendering by $p w q d n^{\prime}$ of $m s w_{h}$ at 2:17 was treated as corroboration of the conclusion at 2:20 that renderings of $s w h$ by $p q d$ should be rated 5 . That rendering will be rated 5 here too. $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
'bhyhwn. The rendering by Syriac 'b of Hebrew ' $b$ was rated 5 at 1:14.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This rendering of the Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 1:2.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Segment 1 omits the waw prefix in rendering the narrative tense of Hebrew hyh prefixed, of course, by waw. Even though MT has the narrative tense here, in this context there is no temporal or logical succession since this is only a restatement of what has already been said. Rather this material is epexegetical, even a repetition of earlier epexegesis. Joüon explains this use of the narrative tense as recapitulation or explication. ${ }^{14}$ Whether such an approach of omitting the waw where epexegesis is introduced by the narrative tense is consistently applied in Judges of P has not been considered in reaching the conclusion that is stated

[^142]here. Nevertheless this different use does distinguish the narrative tense at this place and thus a different approach to rendering the waw cannot be treated as inconsistent with the way that Hebrew tense is rendered where a temporal or logical succession is involved.

The rendering of the infinitive in MT at segment 5 is another example of the use of the dependent imperf. to render an infinitive. At segment 6 there is another example of an indirect question introduced by ' $n$ like the first of the two uses of ' $n$ by P at 2:22. At segments 7 to 8 there is an instance of genitive construction $c$ and at segments 12 to 13 , genitive construction $b$. Segment 7 is an example of direct object construction $d$ and segments 4 and 11 of direct object construction $e$.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

All three of the other versions are similar. Both A and B render wyhyw by каi $\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\gamma \dot{v} v \varepsilon \tau \circ$, but Tg J has $w h w w$ in line with P . The Targum renders segment 6 by $q b l$, but that seems to be the case wherever $\check{s} m$ ' has the sense of "listen" in Judges, and it renders the $h$ interrogative by its equivalent $h$. Both A and B render segment 6 by $\alpha \kappa o v ́ \omega$ and the interrogative particle by $\varepsilon \mathbf{i}$, and thus in a way which is more comparable to P . Therefore A and B are considered closer to P .

3:5. ובני ישראל ישבו בקרב הכנעגֵי החתי והאמרי והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי: חتּ

## RETROVERSION

There are ten elements and ten segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and five following it. There are also ten elements and ten segments in this verse of P , six to the first punctuation point, two to the second such point, and two more to the last and final point. The first five segments of P can be retroverted to the first five of MT. The sixth segment of $P$ can be retroverted to segment 9 of this verse of MT and the ninth segment of P can be retroverted to the sixth of MT if one takes account of the additional waw that occurs at the sixth segment of P , and the lack of a waw at the sixth segment of MT. The seventh and eighth segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the seventh and eighth segments of P. The tenth segment of P can be retroverted to the tenth segment of MT. The three other versions and the Vulgate do not support the reversal of order of these two gentilic names. Perhaps some similarity in orthography confused a copyist at some stage in the translation or transmission of the text. In any case the source of $P$ here will be considered to be one that is indistinguishable from MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of MT, but the sequencing does not fully reflect the sequence of the segments of MT. The reversal of the sequence of segments 6 and 9 is judged to reduce the rating of this mode to 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
bny 'ysryl. This phrase was evaluated for consistency at 1:1 and rated 5 there.
${ }^{\prime} y t b w$. This Syriac verb renders $y$ šbw of MT in this verse. Forms of $y t b$ rendering forms of $y s ̌ b$ were evaluated at $1: 9$ and rated 5 there.
bnyt. This renders bqrb here and this rendering was rated 2 in the discussion of 1:29. The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. There is an instance of genitive construction $a$ at segments 1 to 2. Other than that, only the addition of the waw calls for comment here, whether that addition is considered as taking place at segment 6 or 9. This is an example of the phenomenon noted by Williams where P adds waw to a list of objects in MT at points where they are not joined by waw there. "Quite simply it [ P , or P of 1 Kgs , the subject of his study] tends not to list items together without waw." ${ }^{15}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

All four versions are quite similar, with the biggest difference being the deviation from the MT sequence by P . By rendering the gentilics in the plur., Tg J is closer to P , and by adding кגi at segment 6 , A and B are closer to P . The rendering by the plur. is considered a greater difference and this makes Tg J closer to P than are the Greek Versions. There are no differences between the Greek Versions in this verse.

3:6.

> ויקחו את־בנותיהם להם לנשים ואת־בנותיהם נתנו לבניהם ויעבדו את־אלהיהם:


## RETROVERSION

The first problem here is deciding what portion of P is to be retroverted. According to the Preface of the Leiden Peshitta, "[t]he numbering of the verses is that of R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ edition and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia and is therefore not always

[^143]identical with that added by Ceriani." ${ }^{16}$ At this point in Dirksen's edition the text to the left of (7) in the Syriac text just above is in 3:7, but one can see that it is rending the last two segments of this verse in MT which one can see on the next line above. The Hebrew text on that line is the unvocalized text transcribed based on the BHS text and verified in Kittel's edition. It would be very awkward to analyze the two segments of P that Dirksen has included in $3: 7$ as if they were part of that verse and not $3: 6$. Therefore this verse of P is analyzed as if all the segments set out above from P were from 3:6.

With the three direct objects in MT joined by maqqēph to their direct object markers treated as segments 2,5 , and 9 , there are nine segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and two following it. With mn bnthwn treated as segment 2, wbnthwn treated as segment 5 and wplhw l'lhyhwn treated as segments 8 and 9 , there are nine segments to be analyzed here as 3:6 of P , four to the first punctuation point, three to the second, and the final two following "(7)."

Segment 1 of $P$ can be retroverted to segment 1 of MT. The retroversion of segment 2 of P to the same numbered segment of MT is more difficult. The segment of P is understood in a partitive sense and it is puzzling that the daughters they took are in the partitive sense and the daughters they gave are not. A partitive prepositional phrase can be a direct object, sometimes with the $l$ of the direct object preceding $m n .{ }^{17}$ This is not an adaptation to Syriac syntax, but a change, albeit minor, in the meaning of this segment. Perhaps for that reason, $m n$ should be treated as a separate segment, but the numeration already adopted will not be changed even where it is viewed as a separate segment. Since none of the other three versions considered in the analysis of these verses has any such change, the use of the $m n$ here will not be reckoned as based on a source that differs from

[^144]MT. The next seven segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT, and therefore the Vorlage of P is considered to be one that is indistinguishable from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Although the change in segment 2 can be viewed only as the addition of an element or segment, it can also be seen as a departure from a word for word translation because of the difference between this segment and segment 5 in P when they are marked identically in MT. As a change in segmentation, the difference is reckoned at about $11 \%$, so the segmentation is rated 4 . The sequencing remains unimpaired, so this mode with be rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The $m n$ here is judged to be an addition. Since there are nine segments in this verse without the addition, this is calculated as having an $11 \%$ effect on the literal quality in this mode and so the mode is rated 4.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$n s b w$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $l q h$. The Peal of this verb rends various forms of the Qal of the Hebrew verb thirty-three times in Judges: in this verse and 3:21, $25 ; 4: 21 ; 5: 19 ; 6: 20,25,26 ; 7: 8 ; 8: 21 ; 9: 48 ; 11: 13,15 ; 13: 19 ; 14: 2,3(2 x), 8,19 ; 15: 4,6$, 15: 16:12; 17:2(1x), $4 ; 18: 17,18,20,24,27 ; 19: 1,29$; and 20:10. The Ethpeel of $n s b$ renders the Pual of lqh at 17:2. Forms of the Qal of lqh are rendered six times by $d b r$ at $4: 6 ; 6: 27 ; 9: 43 ; 11: 5 ; 20: 10$ and 21:22. The same Hebrew verb is rendered by $g r r$ at $8: 16$, by the Pael of $q b l$ at 13:23, by the Peal of ' $t^{\prime}$ 'at 14:11, and by the Peal of $s{ }^{2} q l$ at 19:28. Thus the root $l q h$ is rendered 34 times by $n s b$, six times by $d b r$, and four times by the four different verbs just mentioned. The six uses of $d b r$ are in contexts where the taking is of other people, but not of a wife where $n s b$ renders the Hebrew. These six renderings will
be treated as consistent among themselves (although JPS includes "taking" of a wife as a possible rendering of $d b r^{18}$ ). This leaves thirty-four clearly consistent and four inconsistent renderings (although 14:11 is a difficult verse). This is consistency in about $89 \%$ of the occurrences considered and for which the rating is 4 .
bnthwn. This renders the plur. of $b t$. The rendering of the sing. was discussed at 1:12 and the plur. at 1:27. The renderings of both are rated 5 . $n s{ }^{\prime}$. This renders nšym. The rendering of the sing. of this Hebrew word by 'ntt' was discussed at 1:12 and rated 5. This Syriac renders the Hebrew plur. here and at 5:24(2x); 8:30; 9:51; 16:27; 21:7(2x), 10, 14(2x), 16(1x plus 1 rendering of the sing. by the plur.), 18, and 23. Thus all fourteen of the Hebrew plur. forms are rendered by the plur. of this Syriac term and the renderings are rated 5.
$y h b w$. This renders $n t n w$. Renderings of $n t n$ by $y h b$ and $n t l$ were rated 4 at $1: 12$. $b n y h w n$. This renders the plur. of $b n$ in the more basic sense of an offspring of particular human parents rather than in the gentilic sense that was analyzed at $1: 1$. The sing. was analyzed at $1: 13$ and rated 5 there. The phrase bny gnbr was considered at 1:20. The other occurrences of the plur. in this non-gentilic sense are at $8: 30 ; 9: 18,24 ; 10: 4$; $11: 2(2 x) ; 12: 9(1 x), 14(3 x) ; 17: 5$ and 11 . This Hebrew plur. is not rendered once at 12:9. Therefore the rendering of the plur. of $b n$ in this non-gentilic sense is rated 5 for consistency.
$w p l h w$. This renders $w y^{\prime} b d w$. The rendering of forms of ' $b d$ by forms of this Syriac verb was discussed at 2:7 and rated 5 there.
'lhyhwn. The renderings by this plur. of 'lhym used in a plur. sense first occur at 2:3 and were rated 5 in the discussion at 1:7.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .

[^145]4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. The rendering at segment 2 of a determined plur. by a plur. in the partitive inconsistently with other renderings in the verse has already been mentioned. It could be an interpretive device of the translator, but no other basis in the assumed source text has been found here to explain it. It is also an instance of direct object construction $d$ as is segment 5. At segment 9 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$.

In 1:12 and 13 , where MT has $l$ 'šh meaning "for a wife," P did not render the preposition $l$. The translator has acted consistently in this verse.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has rendered 'lhyhm by $t^{t} w t h w n$ and A and B have rendered it more literally in the way that P has. Thus A and B are closer to P , but they are indistinguishable from each other.

ויעשו בני־ישראל את־הרע בעיני יהוה וישכחו את־יהוה אלהיהם ויעבדו את־הבעלים ואת־האשרות: 3:7.

.r<dïdmorana

## RETROVERSION

The first two segments of 3:7 in Dirksen's edition have been evaluated as part of the previous verse $3: 6$. With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph each treated as single segments $2,3,7,10$, and 11 , there are eleven segments in MT, eight to the athnach
and three following it. With $w^{r} b d w$ considered as segment $1, b n y$ 'ysryl as segment 2 , $d b y s ̌$ as segment 3 , $l m r y^{\prime}$ as segment $7, l b^{\prime} l^{\prime}$ as segment 10 , and $w^{\prime} l^{\prime} s t r t^{\prime}$ as segment 11 , there are also eleven segments in P , five to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, and three more to the third and last such point. Segments 1 to 5 and 9 to 10 are identical in both MT and P of this verse to segments 1 to 5 and 6 to 7 of 2:11 of both MT and P . See the discussion of retroversion there for the conclusion that six of these seven segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT, and that the sing. of $b c^{c}$ in $P$ is probably not based on a sing. of P's Hebrew source. Segments 6 to 8 and 11 of $P$ can also be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. Thus no Hebrew source different from MT is found lying behind this verse of P .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a straightforward word-for-word translation of this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in the translation. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are not any and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

The renderings of the following terms were rated in 2:11 (or in earlier verses to which there is a reference at $2: 11$ ) as indicated following each item: ' $b d w, 5$; bny ' $y s r y l, 5$; dbyš, 5; mry , 5; plhw, 5; and $b^{c} l^{\prime}, 5$.
$w t ̣$ tw. The Hebrew verb škh occurs only here in Judges and thus the consistency of its rendering cannot be rated meaningfully.
'lhhwn. This rendering of 'lhym in a sing. sense was first evaluated and rated 5 at 1:7. 'strt'. This Syriac plur. renders the plur. 'šrwt here and its sing. renders the sing. of the same Hebrew term at $6: 25,26,28$, and 30 . The rendering is rated 5 although the fact that all the other occurrences are in four of six contiguous verses weakens the significance of the rating.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The comments made about the portions of this verse that are identical to $2: 11$ should also be applied here. In addition, at segments 7 and 11 of this verse there are two additional examples of direct object construction $e$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has rendered the portions of this verse that are identical to 2:11 in the same way it rendered those portions there. However, before the $y w y$ of segment 7, plhn' $d$ has been added. In other respects this verse is rendered similarly by Tg J. The Greek Versions do not make this addition, and are closer to P here. One interesting feature is the inconsistency with which by $y n y$ is rendered. At 2:11 A has $\dot{\varepsilon} v \alpha v \tau i o v ~ a n d ~ B ~ h a s ~ \varepsilon ́ v o ́ t i o v, ~$
 as aorist by both A and B (unlike at 2:11 where A renders as imperf. one verb found in both verses). At 2:11, both A and B use the article $\tau$ oîc with $\mathrm{B} \alpha \alpha \lambda \mu \mu$, but in this verse, A uses $\tau \alpha i ̂ ̧$. Without a firmer basis for deciding otherwise, A and B will be judged indistinguishable in this verse in comparison to P .

3:8. ויחר־אף יהוה בישראל וימכרם ביד כושן רשעתים מלך ארם נהרֵים ויעבדו בני־ישראל את־כושן
רשעתים שמנה שנים:
(1)


## RETROVERSION

With each of the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 1 , 12 , and 13 , there are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and six following it. With wthmt, l'ysryl, wišlm 'nwn, bny' 'ysryl, and lkwšn treated as segments $1,3,4,12$, and 13 , there are also sixteen segments in $P$, three to the first punctuation point, seven more to the second, and six more to the third and last such point.

The first three segments of 2:14, 2:20 and this verse are identical in MT and they also are identical in P. Segments 4 and 5 of MT and $P$ are similar in 2:14 and this verse, but MT has $m k r$ at segment 4 here and $n t n$ at 2:14 (and wymkrm byd later in the verse). In the discussion of $2: 14$, it was concluded that segment 1 of P cannot be exactly retroverted to segment 1 of MT, but the meaning of the first three segments is not changed by this small degree of freedom in the translation. Segments 4 and 5 can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT in both verses even though the verbs differ at segment 4 in MT, but are the same in P. Segments 6 and 7 retrovert to the Hebrew of the same segments, but P like Tg J renders $r$ š'tym more literally rather than as part of a proper name after the approach of A and B . The remaining nine segments of P can be retroverted to the last nine segments of MT. The Vorlage of P is considered to be indistinguishable from MT based on the evidence considered here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. As at 2:14 and 2:20, segment 1 of P is not considered to be a literal segmentation of segment 1 of MT. Here it is a smaller percentage of the verse, but the verse will still be rated 5- for this mode. The sequence of the segments of $P$ is judged to be the same as the sequence of the segments of MT.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one subtraction like the one discussed at 2:14 and 2:20 and this mode is rated 5- for the reasons stated in the discussion of 2:14.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
'thmt. This rendering of the Qal narrative tense of $h r h$ was considered and rated 5 at 2:14. $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
'šlm. This Aphel renders the Qal narrative tense of $m k r$ five times in Judges and was rated 5 at 2:14.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This renders $y d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:2.
$m l k$. The rendering of both the sing. and plur. of its Hebrew cognate by this Syriac was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:7.
nhryn. This renders the dual of Hebrew $n h r$ only here in Judges, and no other form of $n h r$ occurs in Judges. Here and elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures it has the sense of the proper noun by which it is often rendered in English, "Mesopotamia."
$p l h w$. This renders the narrative tense of ' $b d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:7. bny 'ysryl. This rendering of bny ys'r'l was rated 5 at 1:1.
šnyn. The rendering by this Syriac plur. of Hebrew šnym was rated 5 at 2:8. The evidence for that calculation is discussed in considering the rendering by this Syriac of Hebrew šnh at 3:11.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. The $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. pronominal suffix of segment 4 of MT is rendered by the semi-enclitic personal pronoun 'nwn. There is an example of genitive construction $b$ at segments 5 to 6 and 8 to 9 , and of genitive construction $a$ at segment 12. There is an example of direct object construction $e$ at segment 13 of P . The rendering of two instances of $r s^{\prime} t y m$ by the adjective ' $w l$ ' is noted in the discussion of retroversion.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, \& B

Targum J has $r q z^{\prime}$ for ' $p$ as at 2:14 and 20 and has rendered nhrym by $p r t$, the name of the river Euphrates. The Targum's rendering of $r s^{\prime} t y m$ by hyb is comparable to P's rendering by ' $w l^{\prime}$. Both A and B render ' $p$ by the dative, $\theta v \mu \hat{\varphi}$, as at $2: 14$ and 20 . However both of the Greek Versions render the proper name of segments 13 and 14 by a single proper name, each with slightly different orthography. Their renderings of segments 9 and 10 by $\Sigma v p i \alpha a \varsigma \pi о \tau \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} v$ is more comparable to that of P . Thus Tg J has rendered the name of the king in a way more like P while A and B have named the land in a way more similar to the approach of P . Codex A does not name the king twice, but uses the pronoun av่七@̂ for the second occurrence. Thus Tg J and B are closer to P than A . Here Tg J is deemed closer because the name of the king is judged a more important difference than the name of the land and because B has reversed the order of the last two segments of the verse.

3:9. ויזעקו בני־ישראל אל־יהוה ויקם יהוה מושיע לבני ישראל ויושיעים את עתניאל בן־קנז אחי כלב הקטן ממנו:

##  

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 2,3 , and 11 , and with the direct object marker and its object treated as segment 10 , there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and six following it. If in this verse of P bny 'ysryl, wprq 'nwn, and br qnz are treated as three single segments 2, 9, and 11, and $l m r y$ ' and 'tny'l are treated as segments 3 and 10, there are also fifteen segments in P, three
to the first punctuation point, five more to the second, four more to the third, and three to the last such point.

Each of the segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT. Although $q r^{r}$ does not consistently render $z^{c} q$ in Judges, it does render it at several places and although there is a direct object construction $d$ at segment 10 , segment 10 can only be construed as in apposition to segment 6 and thus would retrovert to segment 10 of MT. Accordingly, the source of this verse of P will be considered one that is indistinguishable from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of a Hebrew text like this verse of MT and the elements are in the same sequence as in MT so that this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
$w q r w$. This Peal perf. renders the Qal narrative tense of $z^{c} q$ in this verse, 3:15 and 12:2. The Hebrew verb is not rendered at $6: 6$. The Qal perf. is rendered by $z^{\prime} q$ at $6: 7$ as is the narrative tense at 10:10. At $10: 14$ the Qal imperative is rendered by $s l^{\prime}$. The Niphal is rendered by $q^{()}$at 6:34 (although ms 7a1 has $q r^{\prime}$ ), 18:22 and 23. The Hiphil is rendered by $k n s ̌$ at $4: 10$ and 13. At best one might say that in three of the six places where $z^{c} q$ is rendered, it is rendered by $q r^{2}$. Given the possible inconsistencies in the other binyan, this rendering is rated 1.
bny 'ysryl. This rendering of the cognate phrase in Hebrew was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
'qym. This Aphel renders the Hiphil of its Hebrew cognate here and the same rendering by this Aphel of the Hiphil of the Hebrew verb was considered at 2:16 and rated 5 there.
$p r w q{ }^{\prime}$ and prq. The former of these two terms is a substantive that renders the Hiphil participle of $y s^{c}$ and the latter the Peal perf. which renders here the Hiphil narrative of the same Hebrew verb. All of the renderings of the Hiphil of $y s^{c}$ in Judges are analyzed at 2:16 and rated 4.5 there.
$b r$. This rendering of the sing., $b n$, was first analyzed at $1: 13$ and rated 5 . 'hwhy. This renders 'hy and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:3.
$z^{c} w r$. This renders $q t n$, which rendering was not rated in the discussion of $1: 13$ because of the small number of its occurrences in Judges.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segment 2 , segments 7 and 8 , and segment 11 of P there are three examples of genitive construction $a$. At segments 12 to 13 there is an example of genitive construction $c$.

At segments 6 and 10 there are two examples of direct object construction $d$. These are both direct objects of segment 4 , the second object being in apposition to the first, separated by the prepositional phrase of segments 7 and 8 and the independent clause of segment 9 . In the MT, the second object that is an appositive is marked by ${ }^{\prime} t$. This is an interesting feature of MT since segment 6 of MT is indefinite and segment 10 is definite. A translation might show this by phrases like "namely Othniel," or "Othniel himself." ${ }^{19}$

At segment 9, the semi-enclitic ' $n w n$ renders the pronominal suffix as would be expected. Segments 10 to 15 are identical to segments 3 to 7 in $1: 13$. As such they render the attributive adjective of segment 14 as a verbless relative clause as was also the case as to segment 6 of 1:13.

[^146]
## RATING OF THE VERSE.

5. 

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
Targum J is quite similar to P , differing slightly by rendering the ${ }^{\prime} l$ of segment 3 by $q d m$. Both A and B are also rather similar to P , but have failed to render the bny of segment 7.
 to P and B is closer than A is.

3:10. ותהי עליו רוח־יהוה וישפט את־ישראל ויצא למלחמה ויתן יהוה בידו את־כושן רשעתים מלך ארֵם
ותעז ידו על כושן רשעתים:

##  

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 3 and 5, there are nineteen segments in this verse of MT, fourteen to the athnach, and five following it. If ' $y d^{\prime} d m r y^{\prime}$ is treated as segment 3 , l'ysryl as segment 5 , and $l k w s ̌ n$ as segment 11 , there are twenty segments in P , nineteen that can be considered as filling the places of the nineteen in MT, and one that should be considered an addition, nhryn, between segments 14 and $15, d^{\prime} r m$ and $w$ šnnt. If $^{\prime} y d^{\prime} d m r y^{\prime}$ is segment 3 , there are three segments to the first punctuation point, two segments, 4 and 5 , to the second point, two more segments, 6 and 7, to the third point, seven more plus nhryn to the fourth punctuation point, and the final five segments 15 to 19 up to the last punctuation point. The segments of P will be referred to as 1 to 14 , the addition, and 15 to 19 . Setting aside
the addition, all the segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments in MT except for segment 3. One element of segment 3 , ${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$, cannot be retroverted to $r w h$. Neither $\operatorname{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, nor the Vulgate read any source different $r w h$ at this point. One may speculate as to the reason or motive of the translator who made or copyist who introduced this difference, but it seems unlikely that there was a Hebrew text otherwise as similar to MT as that of P which would have varied the text in this way. Even if there was such a source at the time of the translation, it is puzzling that it was not corrected at some stage in the transmission of the text, especially in light of the theological implications of such a difference. In any case this variation is not considered here as adequate evidence for proposing a variation from the MT in the source on which P is based.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation (or mistranslation at segment 3) apart from the addition, and the elements in P are in the same sequence in P as they follow in MT. Therefore this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The addition of nhryn to the nineteen segments already part of this verse is judged here to reduce its literal quality by about $5 \%$. Accordingly this mode will still be rated 5, but with a minus to reflect the presence of this factor.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

'yd'. This renders $r w h$ once in this verse and pronominally suffixed forms at segments 10 and 16. In eight places, $6: 34 ; 9: 23 ; 11: 29 ; 13: 25 ; 14: 6,19 ; 15: 14$ and $19, r w h$ is rendered by its Syriac cognate. At 8:3 it is rendered by hat. This rendering of $r w h$ will be rated 1 . The other two renderings of $y d$ in this verse are covered by the analysis made at $1: 2$ where the consistency of their rendering was rated 5 . $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
$d n$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of šptt. The rendering of the Qal participle of that Hebrew verb by forms of this Syriac root was rated 5 in the discussion of 2:16. This Syriac verb translates the Qal of špṭ at $10: 2,3 ; 11: 27 ; 12: 7,8,9,11,12$ (1x), 13, 14; 15:20; and 16:31. The Hebrew is not rendered once at 12:12. The renderings in this verse and in the twelve places cited from chapters 10 to 16 are rated 5 . $n p q$. This renders the Qa narrative tense of $y s^{\prime}$ in this verse and the rendering was first evaluated at 1:24 and rated 5 there.
$q r b^{3}$. This renders $m l h m h$, and this rendering was evaluated at $3: 1$ and rated 4 there. 'šlm. This renders the Qal narrative of ntn and the rendering of the Hebrew verb by this Syriac verb in this context was considered at 1:2 and rated 5 there.
$m l k$. This Syriac rendering of its Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 1:7.
'Šnt. This renders the Qal narrative of ${ }^{‘} z z$ here and at $6: 2$, and thus the number of renderings is too small for an evaluation of the consistency of the renderings. See the discussion at $1: 35$ for the rendering of Hebrew $k b d$ by this same Syriac root.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. There are two examples of genitive construction $b$, one in segment 3 and one in segments 13 to 14 . There are two examples of direct object construction $e$, one at segment 5 and one at segment 11 .

The rendering of Cushan-rishathaim takes Cushan as a proper name, but Rishathaim as an adjective. This may be a case of an overly literal rendering as in verse 8 of this chapter.

The rendering of $r w h$ has not been explained here, but it is not a semantically literal rendering. The addition of nhryn provides (probably accurate) information that the reader could easily supply without the addition.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has rendered wthy by šrt, added nbwh mn qdm between the two elements of segment 3 , and added $l^{\prime} g h h^{\prime}$ after segment 6 . Codex A is closest to MT and B adds $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ Xov $\sigma \rho \sigma \alpha \theta \alpha \mu$ after segment 7 and, with similarity to P , adds $\pi 0 \tau \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} v$ after segment 14 . Thus where B makes the former addition, P is closer to A , and where B makes the latter addition P and B are closer to each other than either is to Tg J or A . Since the degree of each of the similarities of $A$ and $B$ to $P$ is not significantly different, no distinction will be made between them, but both will be deemed more like P than Tg J is.

## 3:11. ותשקט הארץ ארבעים שנֵה וימת עתניאל בן־קנז: 

## RETROVERSION

If the last two elements joined by maqqēph are treated as a single segment there are seven segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and three following it. The same segments may be identified in this verse of P if $b r q n z$ is treated as segment 7, with four segments to the first punctuation point and three following it.

All of the segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. Segment 4 of P renders by a plur. form the sing. of $\check{s} n h$ which is plur. in meaning. In thirteen of the twenty-one cases where P renders by this plur. form the form in MT is sing. but plur. in meaning. Accordingly there is no evidence on which to base a source for this verse that differs from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation of a text like MT and the elements follow the same sequence in P that they follow in MT. The rating of this mode is 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
'ttnyḥt. This Ethpeel perf. renders the Qal narrative tense of $\check{s} q t ̣$ in this verse. At 3:30; $5: 31 ; 8: 28 ; 18: 7$ and (probably) 27, the Hebrew verb is rendered by forms of šly. Thus the rendering in this verse is rated 1 and the other renderings would rate 4 .
' $r$ ( . The rendering of ' $r$ ṣ by this Syriac was first rated 5 at 1:2.
šnyn. This Syriac plur. renders the Hebrew sing. šnh here as well as at $3: 14,30 ; 4: 3 ; 5: 31$; $8: 28 ; 10: 2,3,8 ; 11: 26 ; 13: 1 ; 15: 20 ;$ and $16: 31$. The same Syriac plur. renders the Hebrew plur. at $2: 8 ; 3: 8 ; 6: 1,25 ; 12: 7,9,11$ and 14. The Syriac sing. of šnt ${ }^{3}$ renders the Hebrew sing. at 10:48 and 11:40. The consistency of rendering by the same Syriac root of the same Hebrew root was rated 5 at $2: 8$. The consistency of rendering a plur. by a plur. would rate 5 where that category is rated and the consistency of rendering the Hebrew sing. by a plur. when it is plur. in meaning would also rate 5 .
myt. This Syriac perf. renders the Qal narrative tense of Hebrew mwt. That rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.
$b r$. This rendering of Hebrew $b n$ was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:13.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There are no special features of this kind to report here except the genitive construction $a$ at segment 7. The rendering of Hebrew šnh by Syriac šnyn was discussed in connection with the retroversion and consistency of rendering.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has added $d y \check{s}^{\prime} l$ between segments 2 and 3 . Alexandrinus has $\pi \varepsilon v \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa 0 v \tau \alpha$ for segment 3, but B has $\tau \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \kappa o v \tau \alpha$, so B is closer to P than the other two versions.

## 3:12. ויספו בני ישראל לעשות הרע בעיני יהוהו ויחזק יהוה את־עגלון מלך־מואב על־ישראל על כי־עשו <br> את־הרע בעיני יהוה: <br>  <br> R

## RETROVERSION

With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments $10,11,1214$ and 15 , there are seventeen segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and ten following it. There are also seven segments in P that can be identified in the verse leading up to the first punctuation point. By considering $l^{\prime} g l w n$ as segment $10, m l k^{\prime} d m w^{\nu} b$ as segment $11, l^{\prime} y s r^{\prime} y l$ as segment $12, d^{c} b d w$ as segment 14 , and $d b y s ̌$ as segment 15 , one may also divide the segments of this verse of $P$ into ten segments following the first punctuation point in the verse.

All seventeen segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the seventeen segments of MT. As shown in the discussion of the rendering of $h r^{c} b^{c} y n y y h w h$ at 2:11, the Syriac phrase $d b y \check{s} q d m m r y$ is used consistently to do so in all the places cited there, including the two occurrences in this verse. Accordingly there is no evidence by which to propose a Hebrew source for this verse that differs from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of a verse indistinguishable from this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in $P$ as they are in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. This mode rates 5 because there are no added or subtracted elements.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

'wspw. This Aphel of $y s p$ renders the Hiphil of $y s p$ and that rendering was rated 5 at 2:21. bny'ysryl. This rendering of the cognate Hebrew phrase was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m^{\prime} b d$ and ${ }^{\prime} b d w$. This Peal infinitive and the Peal perf. of the same Syriac verb render the Qal infinitive and Qal perf. of 's'h here. The rendering of the Hebrew verb by this Syriac verb was considered at 1:7 and rated 5 there.
$d b y s ̌ q d m ~ m r y$. As stated in the discussion of the retroversion of this verse above this rendering of hr'byny mry' is consistent in all the places cited at 2:11 and the renderings of the first and last terms have been rated 5 throughout Judges, but the rendering by $q d m$ of the Hebrew here was rated 4.
hyl. This Pael renders the Piel narrative tense of $h z q$ here, the Piel perf at 9:24 and in the appropriate form the imperative at $16: 28$. The Qal of $h z q$ is rendered by the Ethpaal of the same Syriac verb at 1:28 and 7:11 as is the Hiphil perf. at 7:8 and Hithpael at 20:22. The Aphel of $h y l$ renders the Hiphil of $h z q$ at 16:26. The Peal of ' $h d$ renders the Hiphil of the Hebrew verb at 7:20; 19:4 and 25 and the Qal of $n s b$ renders the Hiphil at 19:29. If only the Syriac root that renders the Hebrew root in the Qal and Piel are considered, this Syriac root renders the Hebrew root in this verse five out of five times in Judges. The Hiphil of this root renders $h z q$ only two out of six times, and renders the Hithpael of the Hebrew once. Thus the rating would be considered 5 if the Hiphil examples are excluded and 2 if they are part of the calculation. The renderings of the Hiphil will not be considered here.
$m l k$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the renderings in Judges were rated 5 at 1:7. The rating of this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering by byny $y h w h$ by $q d m m r y$ is again an example of one way Barr describes mode 4. His description as applied in this case is quoted in the discussion at $2: 11$. Other comments made about the phrase in which this construction occurs are found in that same discussion.

At segments 2 to 3 there is an example of genitive construction $a$ and at segment 11 an example of genitive construction $b$. At segment 10 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$. In effect segments 5 and 15 are direct object clauses occurring in constructions like direct object construction $d$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Although Tg J is otherwise similar to P , at segment 15 , following MT, the direct object marker is rendered whereas, also following MT, there is no marker at segment 5. Both A and B also render MT similarly to P , but B can be distinguished as slightly different
 latter in both places. Therefore Tg J and A are judged to be equally similar to P in their translations of this verse.

3:13.
ויאסף אליו את־בני עמון ועמלקק וילך ויך את־ישראל ויירשו את־עיר התמרים:


## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segments 3,8 , and 10 there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and six following it. With lbny treated as segment 3, lysryl as segment 8 and qryt $d$ as segment 10 , there are also eleven elements in P , five to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, and three more to the third and last. Except for the plur. forms in P at segments 2, 6, and 7, all the segments of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT. Neither Tg J, A nor B have plur. forms at these three points. Both A and B even have the sing. at segment 9 in common with the Vulgate (cited in the BHS apparatus). Of course the plur. makes sense since the whole point of the verse is that Eglon formed alliances in order to be successful. Given P's comparative freedom with sing. and plur. forms its evidence alone for the plur. is an inadequate foundation for emending the Vorlage in a way that would treat it as different from the text of MT. No such emendation is proposed here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Although the accuracy of the plur. in segments 2,6 , and 7 is open to question this is a word for word translation of a text that cannot otherwise be distinguished from MT. The segments of P are undoubtedly meant to render the same segments of MT and are in the same sequence as those of MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

$k n s ̌$. This Peal renders the Qal narrative of ' $s p$ here and at 11:20, and the Aphel of ' $b d$ renders the Qal perf. at 18:25. The Piel is rendered by the Aphel of $l$ at $19: 15$ and 18. At 2:10 the rendering of the Niphal of 'sp by the Ethpeel or Ethpaal of knš was discussed and
rated 5 based on seven consistent renderings. This rendering by the Qal calls for additional analysis to evaluate for consistency. The consistent rendering by the Niphal seems relevant to evaluation of this rendering by the Qal, but the inconsistent rendering by the Piel might be based on some difference in the sense of the verb in 19:15 and 18. JPS defines the Pael knštwnny as "ye took me in" at Mt 25:35 where the phrase being rendered by the NT Peshitta is $\sigma v v \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \in \varepsilon .{ }^{20}$ The same Greek verb is used by B for the Hebrew verb in this verse. In fact, both A and B use some from of $\sigma ט v \alpha ́ \gamma \omega$ in eight of the twelve verses, while $B$ also uses the same Greek verb in this verse and 10:17. Only at 2:10 and 18:25 do both versions vary from this consistency. This weighs in favor of the conclusion that P could have been consistent in the two renderings of the Piel at 19:15 and 18, but was not. Accordingly this rendering will be evaluated as one of nine consistent renderings out of 12 and rated 3 .
wzlw. This Peal renders the Qal narrative of hlk and that rendering rated 5- at 1:3. $w m h w$. This Peal renders the Hiphil of $n k h$. Renderings of $n k h$ were analyzed at 1:4 and rated 1 there.
wyrtw. The Peal of this verb renders the Qal narrative tense of $y r s ̌$ here. The renderings by this Syriac verb of this Hebrew verb were considered at 2:6 and rated 4 there. The renderings of the Hiphil are considered at 1:19.
$q r y t$. This renders $y r$ as it does at every place in Judges where the Hebrew word is found. It was rated 5 at 1:8.
$d q l^{2}$. This plur. renders Hebrew tmrym here and at 1:16 (also referring to Jericho) and the related tōmer at 4:5. These examples, while consistent, are too few to rate for consistency.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .

[^147]4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There is a genitive construction $a$ at segments 3 to 4 and a genitive construction $b$ at segments 10 to 11 . There are direct object constructions $e$ at segments 3 and 8 and a direct object construction $d$ at segment 10 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is like P except that it has preserved all the sing. forms of the verbs that are sing. in MT and it has rendered 'yr htmrym as qrt' yryhw (accurately but not literally). Both A and B have also preserved the sing. verbs of MT that P has made plur., but they have added $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha \varsigma$ between their representations of segments 2 and 3 and have rendered segment 9 as sing., changes which distance them from P. On the other hand they have rendered htmrym by poıviк $\omega v$ and this makes them closer to P. Although the differences are slight Tg J has one less distinctive difference from P than do A and B (the addition referred to above), so it is judged closest to P . The different renderings by A and B of segment 1 are not considered significant and so they are taken as similar in their likeness to and difference from P .

3:14.

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 2,3 , and 4 , there are seven segments in this verse of MT. If bny 'ysryl in P is treated as segment 2, $l^{\prime} g l w n$ as segment $3, m l k^{\prime} d m w^{\prime} b$ as segment 4 , and $t m n^{\prime} s r^{\nu}$ as segments 5 and 6 , there are also seven segments in $P$. (The joining of the elements that make up a total number of persons or things is not unusual in P . It also is found, among other places, at $8: 10 ; 10: 8$; 20:25 and 44.) All the segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the segments of $M T$ in this verse and a text that cannot be distinguished from P will be treated as the source of this verse of P .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The elements and segments of MT are translated word for word by P and are in the same sequence in P as they follow in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions in P and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
wplhw. This renders the narrative tense of 'bd here and this rendering was analyzed at 2:7 and rated 5 there.
bny 'ysryl. This renders bny ys'r'l throughout Judges since 1:1 and is rated 5.
šnyn. This Syriac plur. renders the sing. of its Hebrew cognate where the Hebrew is plur. in meaning and the rendering is rated 5 at 3:11.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of šnh by a plur. form is not literal but common where the Hebrew is plur. in meaning, and this was discussed when considering the retroversion of 3:11 and the consistency of the rendering in that verse.

There is a genitive construction $a$ at segment 2 and a genitive construction $b$ at segment 4. There is a direct object construction $e$ at segment 3 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

The two Greek Versions are identical and differ from MT and P only in rendering ${ }^{\text {' } g l w n}$ by E $\gamma \lambda \omega \mu$ and by placing the translation of segment 7 before segments 5 and 6 . Targum J does not differ even in these small respects, and is thus deemed more similar to P than those versions.

3:15. ויזעקו בני־ישראל אל־יהוה ויקם יהוה להם מושיע את־אהוד בן־גרא בן־הימיני איש אטר יד־ימיגו
וישלחו בני־ישראל בידו מנחה לעגלון מלך מואב:

 תרגא ד.

## RETROVERSION

With the seven pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments $2,3,8,9$, 10,13 , and 15 , there are twenty segments in this verse of MT, thirteen to the athnach and seven following it. With the first occurrence of bny'ysryl treated as segment 2 and the second occurrence as segment 15 , with $l m r y^{\prime}$ treated as segment 3 , $l^{\prime} h w r$ treated as segment $8, b r g^{\prime} r^{\prime}$ as segment 9 , dbnymyn as segment 10 , and 'ydh dymn' treated as segment 13 , there are also 20 segments in this verse of P , plus the addition of $m n \check{s} b t^{\prime}$
between segments 9 and 10 as well as, perhaps, $h w t$, as an element of segment 12. The first three segments of P are up to the first punctuation point, the next seven segments and the addition of $m n s ̌ b t{ }^{\prime}$ follow to the second punctuation point (the order of segments 5 and 6 being reversed in P ), the next three segments and the added hwt proceed to the third point, and the remaining seven segments go on to the fourth and last such point. The fifth "segment" of P will be referred to as segment 6 , and the "sixth" as segment 5 . The same operation has to be applied to segments 16 and 17 whose order in MT has been reversed in $P$.

The first seven segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the first seven of MT, taking account of the reversed order of segments 5 and 6 . The eighth segment cannot be retroverted to MT because there is a rēs in P where a dālet stands in MT. Since the confusion of these two letters is common in proper names in P , its presence is poor evidence for a text that differed from MT at this point. Segment 9 is read here as a proper name that can be retroverted to the proper name of the same segment in Hebrew. Segment 10 of P is not in a gentilic form as it is in MT, but rather the same idea is communicated with a phrase "tribe of" plus the proper name Benjamin. Earlier in Judges some tribes have been referred to by reference to the respective patriarch's proper name: Judah, Simeon, etc. Now there is a gentilic form in MT and P has rendered by this method. Since the patriarchal name alone might have retroverted to the gentilic, it will be treated as retrovertable and šbṭ $d$ will be treated as an addition. (Tg J has br šbt bnymyn and is different enough from P to discredit it as support for a source common to P and Tg J, that was not known to the translators of A, B, or the Vulgate.) Segments 11 through 13 can be treated as retrovertible, but also as a freer rendering that employs the $d$ plus the added hwt in order to turn the attributive phrase of segments 12 and 13 of MT into the subordinate adjective clause of segments 12 and 13 and the addition found in P. Segments

14 to 20 of P can also be retroverted to segments 14 to 20 of MT, taking account of the reversed order in P of segments 16 and 17. Accordingly this verse of P will be considered to be based on a text that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The questions here are whether or not the verse of P is literally segmented at the addition between segments 9 and 10 and at segments 12 to 13 and the addition between them. These are not necessarily unlike other changes at the sub-element level or involving additions of an enclitic $h w$ to form a composite tense. For example, the rendering of the adjective $h r^{c}$ by $d b y s ̌$ and the use of the participle plus $h w^{\prime}$ to form an iterative or durative verb form have not been evaluated as changes in the segmentation. Here however a somewhat arbitrary line is going to be drawn for the purpose of evaluating this mode. The use of the phrase, šbṭ' dbnymyn is judged as more than an adaptation to Syriac syntax. Rather it is considered a way of rendering segment 10 of MT that is not part of a word for word rendering just as "tribe of Benjamin" would be a different way of rendering "Benjaminite" in English even though the change of meaning has little effect on the whole phrase. The Hebrew of segments 12 and 13 does present problems for a translator. Waltke and O'Connor point out that at this point "the Hebrew does not permit one to decide whether the specifying substantive is an accusative, a genitive, or an appositive. ${ }^{21}$ They are referring to segments 12 and 13 of this verse of MT. The translator of P has rendered it as an adjective clause: "whose right hand was infirm." Smelik takes gmyd bydyh dymyn' as an absolute clause rendered as a prepositional phrase: "with an emaciated right hand. ${ }^{\prime 2}$ These failures to render segment 10 and segments 12 and 13 will be

[^148]calculated as reducing the literal nature of the segmentation to $85 \%$. The reversal of the order of segments 5 and 6 together with 16 and 17 will be taken as reducing the literal nature of the sequence of the segments to $80 \%$ so that this mode should be rated 4 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The additions both of $m n \check{s} b t t^{\prime}$ and of $h w t$ are treated as differences that result in a reduction in the literal nature of this verse in this mode by $15 \%$. Accordingly this mode is rated 4 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering
$w q r w$. This renders the narrative tense of $z^{c} q$ as it did at 3:9 where this rendering was rated 1.
bny 'ysryl. This rendering of the equivalent Hebrew (occurring twice in this verse) was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
wqym. This Aphel renders the Hiphil of its Hebrew cognate here and the rendering by this Aphel of this Hiphil was considered at 2:16 and rated 5 there.
$p r w q$. This renders the Hiphil participle of $y s^{c}$. Renderings of this Hebrew Hiphil by this substantive and by the verb prq were analyzed at 2:16 and rated 4.5 there. $b r$. This rendering of the sing., $b n$, was first discussed at $1: 13$ and rated 5 there. $g b r$. The rendering 'yš by this Syriac noun was first discussed at 1:4 and rated 4 for consistency there.
$p s ̌ y g$ '. This renders 't $t r$ here and at 20:16. Although the renderings are consistent with each other there are too few of them for a calculation of consistency.
'ydh. This occurs twice at segments 13 and 16 and renders its Hebrew cognate. The consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 1:2.
$y m y n$. This renders ymyn (with a pronominal suffix) here and six other times in Judges at $3: 16,21 ; 5: 26 ; 7: 20 ; 16: 29$; and $20: 16$. Thus it is rated 5 .
$\check{s} d r w$. This renders the Qal of $\check{s l h}$ here. The consistency of the renderings of the Piel forms of this Hebrew verb was considered at $1: 8$ and rated 1. In addition to this rendering, the Qal of $\check{s} l h$ is rendered by this same Syriac verb at $4: 6 ; 6: 8,14,35(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 7: 24$; $9: 23,31 ; 11: 12,14,17(1 x), 19,38 ; 13: 8 ; 16: 18 ; 18: 2 ; 20: 12 ; 21: 10$ and 13 : twenty times in all. It is rendered by the Aphel of yšt at $3: 21 ; 5: 26 ; 6: 21$ and $15: 15$ : four times in all. It is rendered by Syriac šlh twice at the second occurrence of the Hebrew verb in 11:17 and at $11: 28$. Thus the rendering of the Qal is rated 3 where it is rendered as in this verse, and 1 where rendered otherwise.
$q w r b n$. This renders $m n h \not h$ in this verse and 3:17 and 18(2x). This Hebrew term is rendered by $\check{s} r w t^{\prime}$ at $6: 18$ and by $s m y d^{\prime}$ at 13:19 and 23 . The four renderings by the term used in this verse are rated 2 and the other three renderings are rated 1.
$m l k$. This renders Hebrew $m l k$ here and the renderings of that Hebrew by this Syriac were rated 5 at 1:7.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. In the discussion of retroversion and of modes 1 and 2, certain differences in the level on which the meaning and syntax of segments 10 and 12 to 13 are rendered by P are considered and that discussion will not be repeated here.

At segments 2 and 15 there are instances of genitive construction $a$ as there is also at segment 9. At segments 19 to 20 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. At segment 13 there may be an instance of genitive construction $c$, but the pronominal suffix is probably referring back to Ehu[d] rather than anticipating "right." At both segment 7 and segment 17 there are instances of direct object construction $d$. At segment 8 there is an example of direct object construction $e$, in apposition to the direct object in segment 7 . As in MT, segment 7 is indefinite and segment 8 is definite.

The orthography of ' $h w r$ for ' $h w d$ like similar differences in other verses is not considered in this verse by verse discussion of literalism.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is closer to MT at the points where P reverses the order of the segments, but A follows the order of P and B does not render segment 5 of MT . On the other hand Tg J is closer to P in adding šybt between segments 9 and 10 and in rendering segments 12 and 13 by gmyd bydyh dymyn' where A and B have $\dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi о \tau \varepsilon \rho o \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi ı \circ$. The latter similarities between P and Tg J are considered more significant here than the former differences and so Tg J is deemed closest to P . Although there are other minor differences between A and B, B's failure to render segment 5 is deemed here to make A closer to P than B is.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 3:16. ויעש לו אהוד חרב ולה שני פיות גמד ארכָה ויחגר אותה מתחת למדיו על ירך ימינו: } \\
& \text { חحר: لm }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

There are sixteen elements comprising the sixteen segments of this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and seven following it. With the $d$ prefix of dtryn treated as segment 5 for the purpose of this discussion and tryn treated as segment 6, the pronominal suffix of wsrh treated as segment 11, and lgw mn treated as segment 12 and the prepositional prefix of segment 13 of MT, there are also 16 segments in P , seven to the first punctuation point,
two more to the second such point, and the last seven to the third. Except for segments 5 and 8 , all the segments of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT. ${ }^{23}$

As for segment 5, it begins an independent clause comprising segments 5,6 , and 7 of MT, to the effect, "and it had two edges." In P it is a genitive construction $b$ so that what Ehu[d] made was a sword "of two edges." Thus we have a different syntax without a change in meaning. Targum J follows MT exactly at segments 5 to 7 , but both A and B have only the attributive adjective: $\mu \alpha ́ \chi \alpha \mu \rho \nu \delta i ́ \sigma \tau o \mu o v$. Brooke and McLean offer no evidence for a Greek source for the $l h$ at segment $5 .{ }^{24}$ The Vulgate is quite free: gladium ancipitem, habentem in medio capulum longitudinis. The habentem might have been evidence for $l h$ if its object had been a noun equivalent of anceps rather than capulum. Thus there is good reason to doubt that P , A and B had a text like MT at this point, but the lack of agreement between the Syriac and the Greek Versions weakens the case against MT as does the evidence of Tg J. If wlh is removed from MT, then $h \mathrm{r} b$ can be read as a construct and P would have the best rendering of that possibility. In this discussion P will be evaluated both on the assumption that it is accurate and that MT is accurate, but rendered freely by P. It would seem that an editor of MT ought to show this possibility.

The next reading, at segment 8 , has the Peal of $q p s$, "he shortened," namely, segment 9, "its length." The Hebrew lexicons treat gmd as meaning a "cubit" or a short one, although the word is a hapax legomenon in MT, and thus the definition is somewhat speculative. Still, it is supported by Tg J's grmyd'. On the other hand A and B have

[^149]$\sigma \pi 1 \theta \alpha \mu \eta ิ \varsigma$ (and other Greek witnesses have $\delta \rho \alpha \kappa$ о $\varsigma^{25}$ ). This would mean a hand span, about nine inches rather than a short cubit, a bit over a foot. Of the commentaries consulted here, only Burney mentions P's rendition of segment 8 , saying that it "is interesting as reading gāmadh . . in place of gōmedh: 'he curtailed its length.." ${ }^{26} \mathrm{He}$ found this interesting as aiding Ehud's effort to conceal the weapon, but rejected it based on Moore's view that "the description of Eglon's corpulence (v. ${ }^{17}$ ) is pertinent only in relation to the fact that a long dirk was buried, hilt and all in his belly., ${ }^{27}$ However, this reasoning is rather thin since the point of the obesity in 3:22 is that the hilt went in after the blade and the fat closed over the blade, not that the length had to be thirteen inches rather than nine to effect the homicide. ${ }^{28}$ In any case we do not know how short Ehud made the blade even if we read, "he shortened it." Here the commentators seem not to have considered as seriously as they ought to have the possibility that gmd should be repointed as a perf. or even a participle. The other versions cited here seem based on unverified speculation (although Tg J might be based on some developing consensus that it means "cubit" or "short cubit"). The rendering by P needs no amending of the consonantal text and the meaning of $g m d$ in other Aramaic dialects makes clearer that Ehud was making a sword shorter than normal rather than one of some standard length. Nevertheless the evaluation of mode 1 will include an evaluation of P as if it faithfully represents an alternative Vorlage and also an evaluation of it as distorting a source like MT.

[^150]The remainder of the verse is treated here as based on a text indistinguishable from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Although either or both segments 5 and 8 of MT could be correct or incorrect, only two evaluations will be made, both correct, or both incorrect. If segment 5 of MT is omitted and segment 4 is treated as in the construct state, and if segment 8 is treated either as a perf. or a participle (recognizing that our Syriac text shows a perf.), then this mode would be rated 5. If it is assumed that P is freely translating a text exactly like MT, then the segments of P would not be a word for word translation because the independent clause beginning with wlh is eliminated and, if $q p s$ is treated as a perf., a new asyndetic independent clause is created (in P , but that does not preclude a conjunction in some possible source). If $q p s$ is a participle, the participle would be complementing the subject, Ehu[d], segment 3. The change in segmentation would affect about 25 to $32 \%$ of the verse and rate 3 , but since the sequence of the segments would not be changed the rating for this mode would be 4 .
2. Addition of subtraction of elements. If P is seen as correctly rendering its Vorlage because it was not the same as MT, then this mode would rate 5 . If MT is accepted as the Vorlage, then one segment, segment 5, wlh, has been subtracted. This would reduce the literal quality of this verse by over $6 \%$, but that would still rate 5 , or 5 - to reflect that this mode has been affected to a minor degree.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$w^{\prime} b d$. This Peal renders the Qal narrative tense of 's'h here, and the rendering was rated 5 in every place it is so rendered at 1:7.
syp'. This renders hrb and the rendering of that Hebrew by this Syriac was rated 2 when 1:8 was considered.
$q p s$. This Peal perf. renders what the Hebrew lexicons treat as a noun, but since it is a hapax legomenon in Judges and the whole Hebrew Bible it cannot be rated.
'wrkh. This renders Hebrew 'rkh which only occurs here in Judges, so it is not rated. The verb of the same root is found once at $2: 7$.
$w^{\circ} s r h$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of hgr and its direct object here. The Pael participle of $z w n$ renders the Hebrew at 18:11, 16, and 17. Therefore the rendering in this verse is rated 1 and the renderings in chapter 16 are rated 3 .
$m n \lg w$. This renders $m t h t$ and, based on the analysis of 1:7, the consistency of this rendering is rated 1 . As stated there the inconsistency of this rendering has no effect on the meaning of the rendering. See also footnote 22 above.
$l b w s ̌ h$. This renders $m d y w$ only here, but the problematic occurrence of $m d$ at $5: 10$ is rendered by $b b t^{\prime}$, and that will be considered in the discussion of that verse. In any event, there are too few renderings for a rating here.
${ }^{〔} t m h$. This renders the construct of $y r k$ here and at $3: 21$. The Hebrew is rendered by $h s$ at $8: 30$ and $15: 8$. The renderings in this verse and $3: 21$ are rated 1.
$y m y n^{\prime}$. This rendering of ymyn was rated 5 in the previous verse, 3:15.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The possible differences in Vorlage will not be discussed as part of this mode. As stated in consideration of the previous verse, the orthography of Ehud/r will not be considered in the verse by verse analysis.

At segment 2 the Hebrew indirect object is rendered by $l h$, but at segment 11, the Hebrew direct object 'wth is rendered by the pronominal suffix. At segments 15 and 16 there is an instance of a genitive construction like the one at segment 13 in the previous verse where the classification is difficult since the suffix seems to refer back to the previous segment rather than anticipate the following one.

It is also difficult to classify the pronominal suffix of segment 7 of P . One possibility might be that $d$ is a relativizer here and the clause is to be translated, "whose edges were two." Another would be that it is part of this verse because it is the means of making clear that the two-edged sword is definite, not just a two edged sword, but the two edged sword. ${ }^{29}$ A more speculative suggestion would be "his own two edged sword." Perhaps an overly speculative suggestion would be that the suffix is an unusual alternative means of rendering the sense given by $l h$ in this verse (and $s y p^{\prime}$ is masculine).

## RATING OF THE VERSE

If the Vorlage is like the MT, the rating is 3 . If it is like the proposed Vorlage discussed above in considering the segmentation (omitting segment 5 of MT and reading segment 8 as a verb), the rating would be 4 .

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Both A and B are close to MT, although they have rendered segments 5, 6, and 7, wlh šny
 segment 9. Targum $J$ is closer to MT at segment 5,6 , and 7 , but also more like $P$ in its use of a phrase like that in P at segments 6 and 7 rather than the single adjective as in A and B . Thus Tg J is deemed closer to P in this verse. The slight difference of the failure of $A$ to render the pronominal suffix of segment 9 is the basis for saying here that $B$ is more like P than A is.

3:17. ויקרב את־המנחה לעגלון מלך מואֵב ועגלון איש בריא מאד:
${ }^{29}$ See Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, 177, §225. A; and 353.

## RETROVERSION

If the two elements joined by maqqēph are treated as a single segment 2 there are nine segments in MT, five to the athnach and four following it. In P there are five segments to the first punctuation point and, perhaps, six following it in Dirksen's text, of which $w^{\prime} g l w n, g b r^{\prime}, d b r y r$, and $t \underline{b}$ can be seen as candidates for retroversion to segments $6,7,8$, and 9 of MT, respectively. If $h w$ can be explained as an enclitic that makes express the implied copulative aspect of the last four segments of MT, then that leaves only mlk as a true addition. As the discussion of retroversion of this verse of P now continues, one might note that the footnote to Dirksen's text shows that ms 9a1 reads this verse after $m l k^{\prime}$ as having six more segments instead of the four segments set out above: šmyn hw ṭb $w g b r^{\prime} h w^{\prime} d b r y r$. This is at least a clue to problems others have had with the verse.

The first five segments of P can be retroverted to the first five segments of this verse of MT without any difficulty. The view taken here is that there is a question of what the translator of P was reading where segment 8 is found. Thus segment 6 of P can be retroverted to segment 6 of MT and $g b r^{r}$ can be retroverted to segment 7 of MT as $t b$ can also be retroverted to segment 9 The remaining segment 8 in $\mathrm{P}, d b r y r$, seems to be part of an adjective clause stating: "who was very simple/innocent/foolish/rude." This is not like $d b y s ̌$ in verses 3:7 and 12 which is an object clause and where the adjective is used substantively in MT. There is no support for the $m l k^{2}$ following segment 6 or for an element representing the copula in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and B . The Targum renders segment 8 of MT accurately, but A and B have $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \hat{1} o \varsigma ̧ \sigma \varphi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha$ (without any alternative in Brooke and McLean), which does not follow MT, and the Vulgate has crassus nimis which is very close to P . Thus this is another place where the interpretations built around the notion of

Eglon's obesity may be questioned. Although the Greek could mean he had some one of several admired qualities like urbanity, cleverness, or courtesy, among others, at the same time the Vulgate places him somewhere in the neighborhood of stupid, and $P$ sees him as more a simpleton or ignoramus. Despite their differences none of the three seem to have indicated obesity and could have been speculating based on the fact that he stepped into Ehud's trap because he was simple, stupid, or polite. If P was reading a text with bry, that should not have led to P 's rendering. On the other hand P could have been reading a text with something like $b r w r$, the passive participle of brr. That could explain bryr in one of its more favorable senses and even explain $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \hat{1} \circ \varsigma$ in the sense of "polished." This ought to be significant enough to have a footnote in the BHS apparatus. However, based on the evidence of ms 9al, at some point either in translation or the transmission of the text, P could have been influenced by the Greek to render by bryr. Then at some stage $\check{s m y n}$ was removed or lost and the text represented in the Leiden Edition became dominant. Although no emendation of MT is proposed here, the possibility that the source of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and the Vulgate differed from MT at segment 8 is a serious one. Nevertheless the first three modes will be evaluated in relation to the text of MT, including segment 8 , with the caution that any conclusions about segment 8 and related elements of the text are tentative in light of the possibility that P's source may have been different from MT at this point.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The problem with the segmentation of this verse is that the clause after the first punctuation point is not a single simple verbless clause as in the portion of the verse of MT following the athnach, but a complex sentence with a main clause that contains the verb $h w^{\mu 0}$ and a

[^151]subordinate dependent clause introduced by the relative pronoun $d$. As noted in the discussion of retroversion, this is different from $d b y s ̌$ at $3: 7$ and 12. Accordingly the last two segments of P will be treated as failing to segment MT literally, reducing this aspect of the mode to $78 \%$ of what a fully literal rendering would be and call for a rating of 3 . Since the additions are ignored in rating this mode and since even these segments follow the sequence as those they freely segment, the character of the sequence will be rated 5 and this mode rated 4.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Although it is clear that $m l k^{\text {p }}$ after segment 6 is an addition, the question of whether $h w^{v}$ is an addition or a feature of Syriac syntax has to be decided. Although it is not possible to state with certainty what the verse would be if it was segmented more literally, the rendering of a Hebrew verbless clause by a Syriac clause with an enclitic $h w^{v}$ is seen in many places where it would not be treated as an addition. Since no factor is seen here that would except this verse from the class that comprises those cases, it will be treated here not as an addition, but as a feature of Syriac syntax. Therefore, with one addition, this mode will be rated 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

wqrb. This Pael renders the Hiphil of $q r b$ here and the Peal of the same verb also renders the Hiphil of the Hebrew at $3: 18$ and 5:25. The Peal of qrb renders the Qal of the Hebrew cognate at 19:13 and the Aphel renders the Qal at 20:24. Thus the same Syriac root consistently renders its Hebrew kindred but one might examine more closely the choice of binyan as to some of those other choices in mode 4 of the verses where they occur. The rendering here is rated 5 .
$q w r b n^{2}$. This rendering of $m n h ̣ h$ was rated 2 at 3:15.
$m l k$. The rendering of $m l k$ was rated 5 at 1:7.
$g b r^{\prime}$. This renders the sing. of ' $y s^{\prime}$ and these renderings were rated 4 at 1:4.
bryr. This is meant to render bry which is a hapax legomenon. If as suggested in the discussion of the retroversion of this verse it renders brwr, that verb does not occur in the MT of Judges and so no rating could be assigned to that rendering.
$t b$. This renders $m^{\prime} d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:15.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. As already noted, bry does not support the rendering of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Vulgate, but it does support the rendering of Tg J. However, the problem may well not be semantic, because it may be textual.

At segments 4 to 5 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$, and at segment 2 an instance of direct object construction $d$ where MT has a direct object marker. The clause of which $g b r^{2}$ is the predicate is a classifying clause and the added enclitic $h w^{\nu}$ is one of the ways verbless clauses in MT are translated in P .

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

4. 

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum $J$ does not depart from the MT at any point where P does, but both A and B , as already noted, render $b r y^{\nu}$ by $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \hat{1} \circ \varsigma$ and this makes them more comparable to P.

However, since B adds кגì غ̇лорєv́Өŋ at the beginning of the verse, that means that A is the most similar to P of the three versions being compared here.

3:18.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ויהי כאשר כלה להקריב את־המנחה וישלח את־העם נשאי המנחה: }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 5 and 7, there are nine segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and four following it. If $w k d$ is treated as segments 1 and 2, and the two occurrences $q w r b n^{\prime}$ treated as segments 5 and 9 respectively, there are also nine segments in P , five to the first punctuation point and four following it. As in earlier verses wkd is treated as retroverting to wyhy k'srr. The other seven segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. The absence of the waw prefix at segment 6 is a feature of Syriac translation of the apodosis of conditional clauses considered a feature of mode 4. Accordingly the source of P for this verse will be considered a source that cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse is a word-for-word translation of a verse indistinguishable from the same numbered verse of MT and the sequence of the elements is the same in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of element. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w k d$. This rendering by this construction of wyhy plus $k y$ or $k \stackrel{s}{ } r$, or plus a preposition whose object is the infinitive construct was discussed at $1: 14$ and rated 5 .
$g m r$. This renders the Piel of $k l h$ here. The other instance of the Piel of this Hebrew verb at $15: 17$ is rendered by šlm. There are no occurrences in other stems. No meaningful evaluation of consistency can be based on only two examples, but one may note that these are not consistent.
$m q r b w$. This Pael infinitive renders the Hiphil infinitive of its Hebrew cognate as the same stem of the Syriac rendered the Hiphil of the Hebrew in the previous verse $3: 17$ where the rendering was rated 5 .
$q w r b n^{\prime}$. This rendering of mnḥh (twice in this verse) was rated 2 at 3:15.
$\check{s} r^{r}$. This Peal renders the Piel of $\check{s} l h$ and those renderings are analyzed at $1: 8$. The renderings like this one are rated 1 there.
' $m$ '. This renders its Hebrew cognate here and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:6.
$\check{s} q y l y$. This Peal plur. passive participle renders the Qal plur. active participle of $n s^{\prime}$ here and at 9:48 and 54. In five other places as recorded in the discussion at 2:4 it is rendered by $r w m$ and in one place also recorded in that earlier verse, it is not rendered. It is rated 1 here.

This mode in this verse is rated 2.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The portion of the verse preceding the athnach is the protasis of a conditional sentence rendered as a dependent clause in P rather than as an independent clause according to the formal structure of MT. Thus the apodosis that follows the first punctuation point lacks the initial waw prefix of the MT apodosis.

The first of the two direct objects at segment 5 is an instance of direct object construction $d$ and the second at segment 7 an instance of direct object construction $e$. Segments 8 and 9 are an instance of genitive construction $a$. Segment 8 is an adjectival participle modifying the direct object, the "people." The passive voice at segment 8 is puzzling since it is the "offering" that is "being carried."

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J renders the verse in line with MT and thus differs from P at all the points requiring comment under mode 4 (except for the direct object construction $e$ and the genitive construction $a$ ). Both A and B also render segment 1 more literally than P and retain the conjunction at the beginning of the apodosis. They differ from each other in that A has $\dot{\omega} \varsigma$ at segment 2 and $B$ has $\dot{\eta} v i ́ \kappa \alpha$ and at segment 8 A has $\alpha \mathfrak{\rho} \rho o v \tau \alpha \varsigma$ and $B$ has $\varphi \varepsilon ́ \rho o v \tau \alpha \varsigma . B o t h$ differ from MT, P, and Tg J in rendering "gifts" in the plur. in both places. Therefore Tg J is considered more similar to P than A and B because of these plur. forms. The differences between A and B do not provide a secure basis for judging one or the other closer to P .

3:19. והוא שב מן־הפסילים אשר את־הגלגל ויאמר דבר־סתר לי אליך המגלך ויאמר הס ויצאו מעליו כל־העמדים עליו:


## RETROVERSION

If the four pairs of elements joined by maqqēph are treated as single segments 3,5,7 and 15 , there are 16 segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and six following it. If mn psylyn is treated as segment 3 , the $d$ prefix following segment 3 treated as segment 4 , the $l$ (to which segment 4 is prefixed) together with $g l g l$ ' counted as segment 5 (considering $g n b$ as a possible addition), $w m r$ treated as segment 6 (with the $l h$ following it considered an addition), $m l t^{\prime} d s t r^{\prime}$ treated as segment 7 (with the following ' $y t$ treated as a feature of translation technique), $l y$ treated as segment 8 (with the following $d m r$ considered an addition), $l k$ treated as segment 9 , and $m l k$ as segment 10 (with the following elements byny wlk considered as additions) the first ten segments of P
corresponding to the first ten segments of MT can be identified in P . The first six of those precede the first punctuation point and the next four are between the first and second punctuation points. Between the second and third punctuation points, one can identify segment $11, w^{\prime} m r$, the addition $m l k$ ', and then the phrase 'brw $m n t m n^{31}$ that seems intended to translate $h s$ freely according to the translator's understanding (or misunderstanding) of its meaning. Right after the third punctuation point wprqw can be identified as representing segment 13 of MT, and then melyw (segment 14 of MT) is without a rendering and $l h w n$ is added. Then klhwn dqymyn can be identified as retroverting to segment 15 of MT (with $h w w$ considered an addition that is a feature of Syriac translation technique) and, finally, lwth can be retroverted to segment 16 of MT.

There is little support for the additions in P from the other versions considered here or cited in the notes of Brooke and McLean. Targum J can be cited for support of $d^{\prime} m r$ by its addition of $l m l l$ ' after segment 8 and in support of the construction with 'yt just before segment 8 . There are other differences from MT in the other versions which are not found in P , but that is not the subject of the inquiry here. Both Tg J and A support a misunderstanding of $h s$ similar to that of P , but B does not, nor does the Vulgate. If $h s$ was unfamiliar to a translator and then immediately followed by a description of the exit of those standing around, then any such translator could have surmised that it was a command to leave the king's presence. What $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and P have done tends to corroborate indirectly the suggestion that they were moving from a term they misunderstood to a term that was reasonable in the context of the verse. The $\Sigma 1 \omega \in \alpha \alpha$ of B corroborates more directly that B had a text with $h s$. However, in B the command for silence seems to have been given only to Ehud, and Eglon then sends the others out of the

[^152]room, apparently meaning that Ehud was to keep his mouth shut until the others had left the room and Eglon could be sure that no one else would hear the message he was expecting from Ehud. All of the versions seem to have got the basic point and there is no reason to exaggerate the differences. The room was cleared so that Eglon could be alone with Ehud.

Accordingly no emendation of the Hebrew source that distinguishes it from this verse of MT will be proposed here, even though there may be reason to doubt that all the changes resulted from an effort to explain what was unclear to this or that translator. The evaluation of P as a translation will be based on the verse as it stands in MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. In the portion of P up to the first punctuation point there are two possible additions, $g n b$ and $l h$. Although these are not judged here as literal, they are evaluated as additions covered by mode 2. They are additions to a word for word translation that is otherwise in the same sequence and do not place the segments in a different syntactical or semantic relation to one another. The material between the first and second punctuation points is judged to change the segmentation by the addition of $d^{\prime} m r$ and that creates a new subordinate
 displaced from their position in MT in relation to segments 6,7 , and 8 , and the other three are additions that also aid the changed segmentation. The added ' $y t$ is considered a feature of mode 4. The material between the second and third punctuation points has (1) an addition, $m l k$, considered a feature of mode 2 , and (2) what is considered a change in segmentation since it varies so greatly from a word for word rendering, namely, the substitution of 'brw $m n$ tmn for $h s$. In particular, $m n$ tmn must be either an addition or a displacement of $m^{c} l y w$. In the rendering of the last three segments between the third and
the last punctuation points, the prepositional phrase lhwn is counted as an addition under mode 2 (perhaps standing in the place of the displaced $m^{\prime} l y w$ ) and the enclitic $h w w$ is counted as a feature of Syriac syntax under mode 4. The added lhwn can also be viewed as a change in the segmentation. These departures from literalism are evaluated as reducing the literalism of the segmentation to about $60 \%$, and this is rated 2 . The sequence is not considered to have been changed (except perhaps for $m n t m n$ ), but the large number of additions and changes in segmentation have made it more difficult to observe. To take account of that the sequence will be rated 4.5 , but whether so rated, rated 4 , or rated 5 -, the overall rating for this mode would be 3 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are two additions up to the first punctuation point, three up to the second such point, one, mlk between the second and third points, and, either mn tmn between the second and third such points or lhwn, between the third and last punctuation point. Of these gnb might be considered as an element of the rendering of ' $t$. Even if this is not reckoned as an addition, as it is here, the following rating would be the same. This is calculated as a $44 \%$ reduction in this mode and the mode is therefore rated 2 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$h p k$. This renders the Qal of $\check{s} w b$ here and that rendering is rated 2 at 2:19.
psylyn. This renders hpsylym only here and at $3: 26$, so there are not enough examples of its rendering to rate the consistency of the rendering in Judges.
$m l t^{\prime}$. This renders $d b r$ and the rendering was rated 1 at 2:4.
str ${ }^{2}$. This renders Hebrew str that occurs only here in Judges and therefore it is not rated.
$m l k$. The rendering of Hebrew $m l k$ by this Hebrew was rated 5 at 1:7. wprqw. This renders the Qal of $y s^{\prime}$ here. When the rendering of this Hebrew verb by $n p q$ was evaluated at $1: 24$, it was found that this was the only one of the forty-four out of
forty-six places where the Qal is rendered that it was rendered by this Syriac verb, and so it is rated a very low 1. At $2: 12$ the Aphel of $n p q$ was found to render the Hiphil of $y s^{\prime}$ in all eight places where it occurs in Judges.
qymyn. This Peal participle of $q w m$ renders the Qal participle of ' $m d$ here and the renderings of forms of ' $m d$ by forms of this Syriac verb were rated 5 at 2:14.
lwth. This renders 'lyw here and ' $l$ has not been rated for consistency, but in the first five chapters of Judges ${ }^{\prime} l$ renders its Hebrew cognate preposition seven times, at 3:10(2x), $12(2 \mathrm{x}), 16,19(1 \mathrm{x})$; and $4: 24$. Hebrew ${ }^{c} l$ is rendered by $b$ twice at $5: 10$. At $1: 14$ and in the next verse, 3:20, Hebrew $m l l$ is rendered by $m n$ and it is rendered once in this verse either by mn tmn or lhwn. Thus the renderings in this verse appear to be inconsistent and that is in a verse that exhibits many departures from the literal.

Even without a rating of 1 for lwth and whatever renders $m^{c} l y w$ in this verse, the rating of this mode would be 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segment 7 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. The addition of ' $y t$ and $h w w$ are instances of the tendency of P to add such terms to verbless clauses. ${ }^{32}$ Of course, $k l h^{\prime} m d y m$ 'lyw is not a verbless clause in MT, but is a substantive participial phrase that turns into a subject clause in $P$.

The occurrence of $g n b$ at segment 5 can be seen as part of the rendering of ' $t$, and thus an example of the tendency to make additions that are introduced to add clarity. See the further discussion of $l$ gnb at $4: 11$.

[^153]A case might be made that the verse as it stands between the second and fourth punctuation points is more than just a free translation and is, instead, a creation of a translator or even a later editor working with some earlier translation. This might even include the two segments immediately preceding the second punctuation point, byny wlk. In particular, once $h s$ becomes 'brw mn tmn, the construction wprqw lhwn seems to follow as an additional bit of creative activity: "Depart from here! And all those standing in his presence removed themselves."

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is similar to P in its addition of ' $y t$ and its treatment of $h s$ as a command to leave the room (although by a sing. verb with a different root). On the other hand, A has Eglon (!) turning back at the carved stone near Gilgal and then specifically names Ehud as the one who asked for a tête-à-tête with the king. Then A names Eglon as the king who said (adding "to all"): 'Eк $\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma o v, ~ a p p a r e n t l y ~ a ~ c o m m a n d ~ t o ~ l e a v e . ~ C o d e x ~ B ~ d o e s ~ n a m e ~ E h u d ~$ as the subject of segment 6 and Eglon as the subject of segment 11, accurately in both cases, but not a literal translation. At the same time B seems to understand $h s$, but takes it as having a singular object, apparently directed to Ehud as already suggested above. Then B renders the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. of the Qal of $y s^{\prime}$ as a Hiphil sing. This in turn leads to the accusative case for the bystanders. Accordingly Tg J is closer to P than either A or B. Because of the many differences between A and B and the various ways in which they differ from P , comparison between them in relation to P is difficult and may not be helpful. Since A agrees with P on the misinterpretation of $h s$, that may make A more like P than B is like P , either in a textual tradition or in knowledge of Hebrew. That similarity could be
considered overshadowed by the report that Eglon was the one who turned back at Gilgal. Whether one can be considered closer to P than the other as a matter of translation technique is not decided here.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ואהוד בא אליו והוא־ישב בעלית המקרה אשר־לו לבדו ויאמר אהוד דבר־אלהים לי אליך ויקם מעל .3:20 } \\
& \text { הכסא: } \\
& \text { +mل + } \\
& \text { (inor }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 4, 7, and 11, there are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, thirteen to the athnach and three following it. The first three segments of P up to the first punctuation point represent the first three segments of the verse MT and can be retroverted to its first three segments of the MT verse (noting the dalet-rēs problem at segment 1). Between the first and second punctuation points, whw ytb can be retroverted to segment 4 in MT and the $h w^{\nu}$ following that segment can be seen as an adaptation to Syriac syntax. Then $b^{c} l y t$ can be retroverted to segment 5 of MT and the segment after this in P, blhwdwhy can be retroverted to segment 8 of MT. The $d$ prefix of the next segment in P might be retroverted to segment 7a of MT, but the role it plays in this verse of P is different from its function in MT. One can retrovert $m t q n^{\prime}$ to mĕqāreh (either the noun or the Piel active participle), but not to méqērâ as the consonants are pointed in this verse of MT. An even less likely possibility would be miqreh. The following hwt of P is likely to be an addition for some syntactical purpose. The $l h$ right before the second punctuation point might be retroverted to the $l w$ of segment 7 of MT, but this would again be as part of a different structure from that of

MT. Following the second punctuation point of $\mathrm{P} w^{3} m r$ can be retroverted to segment 9 of MT, the second $l h$ is an addition, and the second ' $h w r$ can be retroverted to segment 10 to the same extent that the first occurrence of the same proper name can be retroverted to segment 1. Then $m l t^{\prime} d^{\prime} l h^{\prime}$ can be retroverted to segment 11 of MT, ' $y t l y$ can be retroverted to segment 12 by explaining the syntactical motive for ' $y t$. The next element in $\mathrm{P}, d^{\prime} m r$, is an addition in P and then $l k$ can be retroverted to segment 13 of MT. The $w q m$ of P after the third punctuation point can be retroverted to segment 14 of MT, but the following ' $g l w n$ is an addition and after that $m n$ can be retroverted to segment 15 of MT, $m c l$, as at $1: 14$. Finally the last segment of this verse of P can be retroverted to segment 16 of MT.

The major questions about the text on which this verse of P is based arise because of how $P$ does or does not render segments where segments 6 and 7 are now found in MT. Neither Tg J, A, B, nor the Vulgate accurately renders segment 6 of this verse of MT understood as meaning "cool" so that a reader finds byt qyt" in Tg J, $\tau \hat{\varrho} \theta \varepsilon \rho ı v \widehat{\varrho}$ in both A and B, and aestivo in the Vulgate. All four are essentially in agreement in opposition to both MT on one hand and P on the other. The translator of P may have been guessing at the meaning of the consonants as suggested above or the correct vocalization might have been lost in transmission before the vocalization was standardized. Whatever the correct vocalization might be, P does give support to the unvocalized text. The other three versions as well as the Vulgate are not easily explained although it is probably more likely that they associated a cool room with a room used for summer than that they associated a room specially built for Eglon as a summer room. It is less likely, but not impossible. Accordingly, no alternative to segment 6 of MT will be proposed here, but that conclusion is stated with reservations about its certainty.

The added $d^{\prime} m r$ in P is supported in Tg J by $l m l l^{\prime}$, but not by A and B . The terse style of the MT seems more in keeping with what is expected and this places a greater burden of proof on someone who chooses a wordier alternative to a terser passage in MT. The agreement of P and Tg J is not deemed sufficient proof here. Both A and B join P in adding an express mention of Eglon as the subject of the verb that renders segment 14, but Tg J does not. Here too one needs more support before amending the more usually terse MT based only on some pleonasm in some of the versions. Accordingly no source that differs from MT will be assumed in analyzing the literalism of this verse.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The way in which $P$ has recast segments 6 and 7 is the first point in the sequence of segments where this verse of P is not a word for word translation as well as the point at which the sequence of the elements begins to differ from the sequence in MT. Since P does not usually translate so freely, this probably represents an effort to deal with a passage that was difficult for the translator. Whatever the cause, the result was the relative clause dmtqn' hwt lh modifying bclyt'. The other place at which the segments are not a word for word translation is at the added d'mr before $l k$ rendering segment 13 . This dependent imperfect is, of course, similar to an infinitive in its function here and.makes explicit in P what is understood without being expressly stated in MT. More importantly for this mode, the "word from God" is modified by a dependent clause rather than a prepositional phrase after the resegmentation (and addition). This is calculated as a redivision of segments 6,7 and 13 and a change in the sequence of segments 6 and 7 . Since segment 7 is divided into two separated elements this is considered a change in the sequence of three of sixteen segments. This is quantified as reducing the literal quality of the verse by about $19 \%$ so that this mode is rated 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The $h w^{w}$ after segment 4 , the $h w t$ after $m t q n^{\prime}$, and the ' $y t$ are treated as features of mode 4 . The $l h$ after $w ' m r$, segment $9, d ' m r$, and ${ }^{\prime} g l w n$ are reckoned as three additions to sixteen segments. Therefore this mode is rated 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

ๆ. This Peal renders the Qal of $b w$. The rendering of the Hiphil was considered at 1:7 and the rendering of the Qal infinitive at $1: 14$. In addition to the rendering in this verse and 1:14, other forms of the Qal are rendered by forms of this Peal at $3: 24 ; 4: 21(1 \mathrm{x}), 22$; $6: 5(1 \mathrm{x}), 19 ; 7: 17,19 ; 9: 5,27 ; 11: 18 ; 14: 18 ; 16: 1 ; 18: 10,15,17,18,27 ; 19: 14,15,22,23$, 29; and 20:4. This is a total of twenty-four times. The Hebrew Qal is rendered by forms of the Peal of ' $t$ ' at $3: 22 ; 4: 20,21 ; 5: 19,23 ; 6: 5(1 \mathrm{x}$, more probably the ketib), $11 ; 8: 4,15$; $9: 15,26,31,37,46,57 ; 11: 7,12 ; 13: 6(2 x), 8,9,10,11 ; 16: 2 ; 17: 9 ; 18: 2,8 ; 19: 16,17$, $26 ; 20: 26,34 ; 21: 2,8$ and 22 . This is thirty-five times in all. Forms of this Qal are rendered by $m t t^{\prime}$ at $7: 13(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 9: 52 ; 11: 16 ; 14: 5 ; 15: 14 ; 17: 8$; and $19: 10$. This is a total of seven times, of which six are Peal and the one at 17:8 is apparently Peal. The Hebrew is rendered by ${ }^{\text { }} \mathrm{z}$ l at $15: 1 ; 18: 13,20$; and possibly at $18: 7$. This is at least three times. The Hebrew Qal is rendered twice by $h w$ at 13:12 and17. The Hebrew is not rendered at $11: 18$ and probably not rendered at $18: 7$. This means that of the seventy places where it is definitely rendered, $50 \%$ are rendered by forms of ' $t$ ', slightly over $34 \%$ by ${ }^{\prime} l$, and slightly under $16 \%$ by $m t t^{\prime},{ }^{\prime} z l$, and $h w$. The problem is that at some places the context does not necessarily require one of these choices, but one cannot be sure that there are other places where the context does call for the choice made by the translator of P .

In Tg J , in the twenty-four places where P renders by ${ }^{\prime} l$, the rendering is by ' $t$ ': $6: 19 ; 7: 12,19 ; 11: 18$; and 19:29, five times. At $3: 22$ and $9: 15$, where P renders by ${ }^{\prime} t^{\prime}, \mathrm{Tg}$ J renders by ${ }^{\prime} l$. In the seven places where P renders by $m t t^{\prime}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ renders by ${ }^{\prime} t{ }^{\prime}$. In the three places where P renders by ${ }{ }^{2} z l, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ renders by ${ }^{~} l$ at $15: 1$ and $18: 20$, and by ${ }^{\prime} t{ }^{\prime}$ at

18:13. Where P renders by $h w$ at $18: 12$ and $17, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ renders by a form of $q w m$. It is probably fair to leave the last two out of consideration when rating consistency here. This calculation means that $\operatorname{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ renders by ${ }^{\prime} t$ ' in forty-seven and by ${ }^{\prime} l$ in twenty-three places and this is apparently consistent in somewhat over $67 \%$ of the places where the Qal of $b w^{2}$ is rendered by ' $t$ ' in Tg J .

It is likely that the P renderings could have been more consistent without doing any semantic harm even if there are stylistic reasons for the variation. There is no reason to give Tg J undue weight (and this is not a conclusion for or against an opinion that greater attention both to consistency and semantic accuracy might have reached a result different from Tg J$)$. However the greater consistency of Tg J does give it more weight than P in considering this mode. If the consistency of Tg J is adopted as an admittedly shaky device for rating the consistency of P , one can say that P is probably not consistent in rendering by $\urcorner$, as in this verse, in well over $50 \%$ of the places where the Qal of $b w$ is rendered and thus that the rendering should be rated 1 .
$y t b$. This Peal participle renders the Qal participle of $y \stackrel{y}{ } b$ and the renderings of the Hebrew verb by this its Syriac cognate were rated 5 at 1:9.
'lyt'. This renders 'lyt, the construct of 'lyh in this verse and its absolute form in 3:33, 24, and 25 . It is rated 5 accordingly.
$b l h w d w h y$. This renders $l b d w$ here and blhwdyh renders $l b d h$ at 6:37, 39 and 40, but $l b d$ is rendered by str $8: 26$. The renderings by $l b d$ without a suffix are not expected to be consistent with those with a suffix, so the rendering in this verse is rated $5 .{ }^{33}$ $m t q n$ '. This appears meant to render mëqērâ, but might be reading the consonants vocalized as mĕqāreh (perhaps meaning "roof"). The only other occurrence of the former

[^154]is at 3:24 and it is not rendered there by P . The only occurrence of the latter is at Eccl $10: 28$. Therefore there is no rating for consistency of rendering here.
$m l t^{2}$. This renders $d b r$ and the rendering was rated 1 at 2:4.
' $/ h{ }^{\prime}$. This renders 'lhym and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.
wqm. This renders the Qal narrative tense of its Hebrew cognate. The renderings of the Qal cognate of this Syriac verb were rated 5 at 2:10.
$k w r s y h$. With a pronominal suffix added this renders the only instance of $k s^{\prime}$ in Judges and thus the rendering is not rated.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Much has already been said about the rendering of $m q r h$ as vocalized in MT. Strictly speaking this falls under mode 6 of Barr's typology: level of text and level of analysis. In his discussion of this mode Barr concentrates on examples where forms in the Hebrew text were segmented below the word level in the translation. This is not what was probably going on here. In contrast to the different readings by $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$, and the Vulgate, P's reading can be seen as an effort to render accurately the consonants of MT and, if mistaken, it should be so classified rather than being seen as a detour into either free translation or hyper-literalism.

At segment 11, there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. The $h w$ after segment 4 distinguishes the participle that precedes it as "expressing continuance or repetition in past time. ${ }^{35}$ The added 'yt in the rendering of the verbless clause in this verse is explained by Nöldeke's comment that the participle "and d.< . . . mark stages of transition from the Nominal sentence to the Verbal sentence., ${ }^{, 36}$ The pronominal suffix of $k w r s y h$ could be seen as added to emphasize the definiteness of the word in the context or

[^155]simply a feature of Syriac idiom similar to what we are accustomed to seeing in English where it is usual to hear that someone "took his seat" or "left his seat."

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 3.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Like P , mutatis mutandis, Tg J has added ${ }^{\prime} y t$ and $l m l l^{\prime}$, but differs in rendering ' $l h^{\prime}$ by $y w y$. Moreover Tg J's approach to rendering hmqrh differs from P and does not follow P in other ways in which P differs from MT. Both A and B add E $\gamma \lambda \omega \mu$ at the point where P adds 'glwn, but have added $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \gamma v \grave{c} \varsigma$ vizov̂ at the end of the verse. Thus Tg J is more similar to P than either A or B which are similar to each other. The difference between them is that A renders segment 7 by av̇兀ov̂ and B by $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha v \tau 0 \hat{v}$. Since the $l w$ at segment 7 in MT seems more aptly rendered by A, that might be seen as a reason to consider A more similar to P .

## 3:21.

 וישלח אהוד את־יד שמאלו ויקח את־החרב מעל ירך ימינֵו ויתקעה בבטנו:

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph each treated as single segments 3 and 6, there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and two following it. With 'ydh reckoned as segment 3 and syp' as segment 6 there are also eleven segments in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point, five between the first and second such points, and the final two segments preceding the third and final punctuation point. The
segments of P can be retroverted to those of MT so that no Vorlage different from P is assumed for the purpose of analyzing the literal quality of this verse of P or for comparing it with other versions.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation of a verse like this verse of MT with some issues of rendering and mode 4 adaptation. The segmentation is the same and the elements are in the same order in P as in MT. Therefore this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction or elements. No elements are added or subtracted. The rendering of $m l$ by $m n$ is considered a feature of rendering rather than as the subtraction of a sub element. This mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
wwšt. This Aphel renders the Qal narrative tense of šlh. The consistency of the rendering of the various forms of $s$ slh in Judges was rated 1 at 3:15.
${ }^{\prime} y d h$. This renders Hebrew $y d$ with the pronominal suffix joined in P . The rendering of this Hebrew by its Syriac cognate was rated 5 at 1:2.
$s m l^{\prime}$. This renders $s^{\prime} m^{\prime} l w$ here, at 7:20 and 16:29. Although those renderings are consistent, there are not enough of them on which to base a rating. wnsb. This renders the Qal narrative tense of lqh. The rendering of that Hebrew verb by this Syriac term was rated 4 at 3:6.
syp. This renders $h \mathrm{r} b$ and the rendering was rated 2 at $1: 8$.
${ }^{t} t m h$. With a pronominal suffix, this renders the construct of $y r k$ and the rendering was rated 1 at 3:16.
$y m y n^{\prime}$. This renders Hebrew ymyn and the rendering was rated 5 at 3:15.
wmhyhy. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $t q^{c}$ with a suffix corresponding to that found on the Hebrew in this verse. The same Hebrew verb is rendered by $q r^{r}$ at 3:27; $7: 18(2 \mathrm{x}), 20(2 \mathrm{x})$ and 22 . It is also rendered by $n q s \check{s}$ at $4: 21$, by $q^{()}$at $2: 34$, and by the Aphel of $\check{s t^{\prime}}$ at $16: 14$. It is not rendered at $7: 19$. Thus in six of the ten places where $t q^{c}$ is rendered it is rendered by $q r^{r}$ and such renderings would rate at least 2 . It is quite doubtful that $q r^{\nu}$ would fit here but one of the other renderings like $n q s ̌$ for example might fit, and for that reason, this rendering is rated 1.
$k r s h$. This renders $b \not t n h$ here, in the next verse and at $16: 17$. At $13: 5$ and 7 , it is rendered by $m r b^{\circ}$ and that rendering might seem to be used where the meaning is "womb" in the context, but at 16:17, the reference is to Samson's mother's womb and that is evidence that the renderings in chap. 13 could have been consistent. Therefore the renderings in this chapter and chap. 16 will be rated 2 .

The rating for this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As in 3:16 and 17 above, at segments 3 to 4 and 8 to 9 there are constructions which appear to be genitive construction $c$. However, in those constructions "left" and "right" are genitive members with a pronominal suffix in MT, but the genitive members in P have ceded the pronominal suffix to their governing word, " $y d$ " or " $t \cdot m$ "." Thus they are more like genitive construction c, but anomalous.

At segments 3 and 6 there are instances of direct object construction $d$. The rendering of $m \subset$ by Syriac $m n$ is also seen at 1:14 and in the previous verse as well.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is similar to P and even more similar to MT. An interesting inconsistency between P and Tg J is the fact that the genitive constructions in MT with pronominal suffixes that move to the governing words in P (as discussed in mode 4 just above) stay with the genitive member at segments 3 to 4 of Tg J , but move to the governing member at segments 8 to 9 . Tg J preserves $m^{\prime} l$ where P has $m n$. Both A and B have added каì
 differences between those two versions and P , that large addition is enough to support a conclusion that Tg J is the most similar to P . After the addition, A drops the conjunction before the verb that renders segment 1 of the MT (and P) verse, but B keeps it, so this would make B more consistent with P than A is.

ויבא גם־הנצב אחר הלהב ויסגר החלב בעד הלהב כי לא שלף החרב מבטנֵו ויצא הפרשדנה: 3:22.
( n

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segment 2, there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, thirteen to the athnach and two following it. With mrqqh treated as a reduced segment 2 , the $l$ prefix of $m h w t^{\circ}$ treated as segment $7, m h w t^{\prime}$ itself as segment 8 , and $m n$ knsh treated as segment 13, there are also fifteen segments in P. At segment 2 of P there is no element that represents $g m$. The rest of the segment is not usually defined in a way that would allow retroversion to $n s ̣ b$ and this is also true of the retroversion of $m h w t^{\prime}$ to $l h b$, segments 4 and 8 , and of $m s r h b^{\prime} y t$ to $p r s ̌ d n h$ (segment 15). Although the prefixed $l$ at segment 7 might be retroverted to $b^{c} d$ in a directional sense, it is
more likely that its function in P is part of direct object construction $f$ together with skrh so that wskrh $l$ can be retroverted to wsgr $b^{〔} d$. Brockelmann does cite this verse in noting that segment 2, $m r q q^{3}$ renders what Brockelmann expresses in Latin as capulus gladii. ${ }^{37}$ Since $n s ̣ b$ is a hapax legomenon in MT, one cannot compare this rendering by P or the other versions with any other rendering. Smelik says of P's version of segments 2, 4, and 8: "Pesh presents a different picture." ${ }^{38}$ He later says: "Thus the first clause is completely paraphrased: ‘And the abdomen followed the wound.'"39 Given the very slender evidence, one cannot be quite so certain that mrqqh cannot render $n s ̣ b$.

Neither can one be certain that $m h w t^{\prime}$ cannot render $l h b$ in the sense that it is understood in this context. At 13:20, where the sense in that context is "flame," P renders by šlhbyt based on the Shaphel of the Syriac verb lhb. This lends support to the possibility that the translator knew the Hebrew term and knew that its sense here differed from its sense at 13:20, but provides no support for a conclusion that the translator understood the meaning as "wound." The Targum, A, and B all render by words meaning "blade." In the absence of more certain evidence the position taken here is that there is reasonable doubt about whether segments 4 and 8 can be retroverted to segments 4 and 8 of MT, and the analysis of the translation will assume that the word in MT was the basis for the translation by P .

The final issue of retroversion is whether msrhb'yt can be retroverted to the hapax legomenon hpršdnh. Most commentators now relate its meaning to excrement based on Tg J and the Vulgate. Both A and B have $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ (either in verse 22 or 23). If the meaning is "to the vestibule," or some other space in the building, the transition to the

[^156]next verse is awkward. The arguments that support any of these choices are inconclusive. If this hapax does mean "excrement," that involves both a conjecture from the context (supported by pereš) and the assumption that the term is masculine. The solution found in P solves some problems because the point is made in this verse that Ehud hurried away and then the next verse describes the actions he took as he hurried away. Whoever proposes the adoption of P's rendering has to explain what adverb or substantive used adverbially was the legitimate basis for P's rendering. The proposal of RV that the term meant something like "behind" would make sense in the context but has been rejected by those who think that this means the subject of $y s^{\prime}$ would have to be $h r b$. Since $h r b$ is feminine, they reject this proposal, but it would not be out of the question to see $l h b$, a masculine form, as the subject. In P there is no gender problem since $s y p^{\prime}$ is masculine (and can also mean "blade").

Accordingly the Vorlage of P will not be assumed to be different from MT although doubts about segment 15 are in order and better evidence or a better reading of the evidence might either confirm or rule out the accuracy of P's rendering of either $n s ̣ b$ or $l h b$, or both of them.

## LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.

Notwithstanding the doubts about the renderings at segments $2,4,8$, and 15 , as far as this mode is concerned this is a word for word translation of this verse of MT and the segments of $P$ that seem intended to represent the same numbered segments of MT are in the same sequence of those in MT. The absence of $g m$ at segment 2 is treated as a feature of mode 2. Other matters are the subject of discussion as part of mode 4. Because there is doubt about whether the rendering of $m h w t^{\prime}$ was intended to be literal, this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The element $g m$ in segment 2 is not represented in P. Even if that is treated as one-sixteenth of the verse, the rating would still be 5 , but with a minus to note the omission.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

${ }^{\prime} t '^{\prime}$. This Peal renders the Qal of $b w^{\prime}$ here and in the thirty-five other places cited in the discussion of $3: 20$. Based on the discussion of rendering in that verse, there are thirteen other places where $b w$ might be rendered by ' $t$ '. Though conceding there that the significance of those calculations on the question of consistency is not entitled to great weight, renderings by ${ }^{l} l$ were rated 1 . By a similar ad hoc approach here, thirty-six out of forty-nine renderings where ' $t$ ' might have been used are rated 3 .
mrqqh. As already stated this renders a hapax legomenon and cannot be rated. Additional comments are found in the discussion of retroversion and mode 4.
btr. This renders ' $h r$ as a preposition only here in Judges, so it is not rated. Its rendering of 'hry as a preposition is rated 4 at 1:1. Its rendering as an adverb is considered at 1:9. $m h w t t^{\prime}$. This renders $l h b$ twice in this verse. These are the only two instances in Judges where lhb means "blade." Two occurrences of this Hebrew in 13:20 mean "flame" and that may be closer to the basic meaning of lhb. There it is rendered by šlhbyt', the Shaphel of Syriac lhb. Because the only basis for rating consistency in this verse are these occurrences where the contexts may well call for different renderings and because of some doubt about the actual meaning of the rendering in this chapter, no rating for consistency will be calculated here.
$m t ̣ l$. This renders $k y$ in a causal sense and the rendering was rated 3 at 1:15 and 19. skrh. With its pronominal suffix this renders the Qal narrative tense of sgr. In the next verse, 3:23 and at 9:51, it is a door that is being shut. This sample is not large enough for a rating, but it does point in the direction of consistency.
hlb. This renders its Hebrew cognate only here in Judges and so the rendering is not rated for consistency.
šmt With the pronominal suffix this renders the Qal of šlp here and at $8: 10,20 ; 9: 54$;
$20: 2,15,17,25,36$, and 46. All ten renderings can be rated 5 .
syp'. This renders $h r b$ and the same rendering was rated 2 at 1:8.
krsh. This renders Hebrew bṭnw and the same rendering was rated 2 in the previous verse. $n p q$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y s^{\prime}$ and that rendering was rated 5 at 1:24. msrhb'yt. This renders pršdnh, a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Bible. See the consideration of the rendering in the discussion of retroversion above.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In the case of mrqqh and $m h w t^{\prime}$, the renderings may or may not be accurate, but it is not likely that either is based on a different Vorlage. In order to accept a rendering of P like Smelik's, one must posit a setting in which the incongruity of the rendering would not have been noticed. It seems almost unnecessary to point out that, if the area below Eglon's sternum caved in after the "wound," and the fat then closed around the "wound," it would be odd to add that it was because Ehud did not withdraw the sword. It is not clear whether or not the first "wound" in Smelik's rendering is the act of wounding or the effect of the act of wounding. The second occurrence of the word "wound" in his rendering surely must refer to the effect of the act of wounding. That clause makes sense after one is told that the sword, hilt and blade together, have been plunged so deeply into Eglon's belly that the fat has closed in around the blade. If the picture is that the fat has closed around the wound made by the piercing, then it does not matter whether the sword was left in the belly or not. Of course, the narrative at this point is choppy and some implausibility in the recounting of the chain of events would not be surprising.

The correct reading of segment 15, pršdnh, is also obscure, but here the rendering of P makes at least as much sense as the best of the alternative renderings. If it is creative writing it fits the situation better than the first part of the verse discussed in the previous paragraph.

The reason for the pronominal suffixes at segments 2 and 4 is not easy to explain definitively. If the terms to which they are suffixed refer to Eglon's body and his wound, they refer to him. If they are referring back to the syp' (the view to which this commentator inclines) then that clarifies the meaning of the terms to which they are suffixed. In either case the suffix makes clearer that the terms are definite rather than indefinite. As already noted also, the prepositional phrase at segments 7 to 8 of MT complementing segment 5 is rendered at segments 7 to 8 of P by direct object construction $f$. The direct object at segment 12 is rendered by a direct object construction that is not exactly like any examples cited by Williams. It is most like what he calls direct object construction $g$, but differs from his examples because they are all found in places where the direct object precedes the verb. ${ }^{40}$. Here $P$ has the verb at segment 11 plus suffix followed by direct object segment 12 without $l$. Note however that Dirksen's notes show that ms 6h7 does record a "lamadh" prefix to segment 12 .

As concluded in the discussion of $1: 3, g m$ in MT is rendered by ' $p$ twenty-three out of the twenty-eight times it is rendered in Judges. This is the first place encountered in this verse analysis where it has not been rendered.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

[^157]Targum J is a literal translation, only adding $\check{s} p y k$ at the end of the verse. Both A and B also render the first thirteen segments literally and in a similar way, but A does not make its rendering of segments 14 and 15 part of this verse, but part of the following verse (substituting segments rendering a phrase like segments 14 and 15 of B for the segments in B that render the first three segments of 3:23 in MT). Thus insofar as Tg J, A, and B are literal they differ from P at the points where P is not literal, but Tg J adds to the difference by its addition and A adds to the difference by its subtraction. Thus, even though B adds $\mathrm{A} \omega \delta$ after its rendering of segment 14 , it is judged closest to P of the three.

3:23.
ויצא אהוד המסדרֵונה ויסגר דלתות העליה בעדו ונעל:
n

## RETROVERSION

There are eight segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach and five following it. There are also eight segments in P , three to the first punctuation point and five following it. With the exception of segments $2,{ }^{\prime} h w r, 5, t r^{\circ}$, and 8 , wnpq, the segments of this verse of P can be reverted to those of MT. Segment 2 is an orthographic issue and there is almost no question but that MT would have been the source for the translator. At segment 5 the only issue is whether P 's source was sing. as the P segment is sing. rather than plur. as in MT. The other three versions render segment 5 as plur. as do mss 8a1, 10 c 1 , and 11 c 1 of P . Thus the plur. of MT will be the presumed source of P at this segment. The final wnpq is harder to explain, because P does represent accurately the
passive participle of $n^{\prime} l$ by tpyn in the next verse and renders $m p t h$ by $^{\prime} g l y d^{\prime}$ in the verse after that one, 3:25. Thus there is little or no doubt that the translator knew that ' $h w d / r$ had locked the door at some point. This might be explained by supposing that the translator found the sense of "lock" in "ḥd and chose not to repeat what had already been reported, but any such possibility is considerably weakened by the fact that the verb chosen, $n p q$, is the next verb found in the following verse. All the other versions just mentioned have a rendering that can be accepted as being within the range of meaning "lock," and thus there is no case for emending MT at this point. Accordingly P's source will be treated as one that cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. There is no question about the literal segmentation and sequencing of the first seven segments. Unlike the semantic problems at segments $2,4,8$, and 15 of the previous verse, it is clear here that segment 8 of P cannot be rendering segment 8 of MT and that this is a different segment, very similar to the first two segments that follow it at the beginning of the next verse and not a free translation of any elements in this verse. That conclusion does not end the inquiry, because the question of whether this is a mode 1 or mode 2 departure from literalism still has to be answered. Because this is viewed like a subtraction of one segment and the addition of another, and because additions and subtractions as such are deemed not to affect the literalism of this mode, those changes will be evaluated under mode 2 , at the same time that mode 1 in this verse will be rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Although the subtraction of $n c l$ and the addition of $n p q$ affects only one segment, its effect in terms of this mode is considerable. It takes something away, and might have left it at that, but then it adds something, and this is not
in pursuit of an accurate translation on a phrase-by-phrase basis rather than on a word-forword basis. It results in a different verse even though the difference has little effect on the reader's understanding. It is not a semantic question under mode 4 either. Therefore this is a subtraction of one-eighth of the segments and an addition of one-eighth of them and so this mode will be rated 3 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
wnpq. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y s^{\prime}$ as in the previous verse and is also rated 5 here based on the analysis at 1:24. The other occurrence of this Syriac verb in this verse is not rated.
$l k s s t r w n$. With the prepositional prefix $l$ and its object here, this renders $h m s d r w n$ with a directional suffix, a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated here.
whd. This renders the Qal narrative tense of sgr only three times in Judges as shown in the discussion of the previous verse where as here it is not rated.
$t r^{\circ}$. This renders the plur. of $d l t$ in this verse and six other times in Judges at 3:24, 25;
$11: 31 ; 16: 3 ; 19: 22$ and 27 . The rendering is rated 5.
'lyt'. This rendering of 'lyh was rated 5 at 3:20.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Segment 8 has been judged to be an addition rather than a semantic inaccuracy falling into this mode.

At segments 5 to 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. Segment 5 is an instance of direct object construction $d$.

The he directional construction at segment 3 is rendered by a prepositional phrase with $l$.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

This verse of Tg J is a literal rendering of the MT verse, and thus is similar to P except at segment 8. The Greek Versions are similar to each other except that B does not render "Ehud" and they render segment 3 differently. Both of them render segment 4 by $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \omega$ and segment 8 by $\sigma \varphi \eta \vee o ́ \omega$ and this might be rendered "locked" and "wedged" rather than "closed" and "locked" as in Tg J. In any case their rendering is more unlike P than is that of Tg J at segment 4 and no closer to P at segment 8 than Tg J is. The various renderings of segment 3 have not been compared with each other. Accordingly Tg J is judged closest to P here, and A, by rendering Ehud, considered closer than B.

והוא יצא ועבדיו באו ויראו והנה דלתות העליה נעלֵלות ויאמרו אך מסיך הוא את־רגליו בחדר . 3:24
המקרה:

##  .red.lar rerondo

## RETROVERSION

With 't-rglyw treated as segment 14 , there are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and seven following it. In P there are two segments to the first punctuation point that can be retroverted to the first two segments of MT. There are two more segments in P between the first and second punctuation points that can be retroverted to segments 3 and 4 of MT. There are four more segments from the second to the third punctuation point and they can be retroverted to segments 5, 7, 8, and 9 of MT. There are six more segments in P between the third and the fourth, the last punctuation point. The first two can be retroverted to segments 10 and 11 of MT. The next 2 segments of P , lprwtdq' $n p q$, have the same meaning as segments 12,13 , and 14 of MT, but state directly
what is meant (and thus are more literal in one sense), but do not render literally the euphemism in those three segments of MT. If one knows the euphemism, one can retrovert these two segments of P to the three segments of MT. Therefore there is no reason to suspect the source of P at this point, and P 's rendering can be definitely labelled a matter of translation technique. The penultimate segment of P can be retroverted to segment 15 of MT. The last segment of P cannot be retroverted to segment 16 of MT, but it can be retroverted to 'lyh, the governing term in the construct phrase of which segment 16 of this MT verse was the genitive at $3: 20$. Since P did not render hmqrh in 3:20 as a genitive, but as a participle in a dependent clause, it seems that the translator knew that $m q r h$ is referring to the same room that has been in the narrative since 3:20. Therefore there is no reason to be suspicious about P's source because this is most likely a free translation of what we now see in MT. The omission of a segment to render $h n h$, segment 6 of MT, is an example of a feature of translation technique that results in a failure to render $h n h$. Usually it involves the substitution of some form of $h z h$, but that is not necessary here since whzyn is here as a rendering of $w y r^{3} w$. This point is discussed in more detail in connection with the failure to render two occurrences of $h n h$ in the next verse. Accordingly there is no evidence here for a Hebrew source that differs from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The absence of a segment that represents segment 6 of MT is treated as a subtraction under mode 2. The rendering of $m q r h$ by 'lyt' is treated as a departure from literalism under mode 4. The rendering of segments 12 to 14 is treated as a failure to represent those segments word for word as well as a failure to maintain the same sequence as the MT at that point. This reduces the degree to which the verse is literal in both aspects of this mode to about $84 \%$ and thus it is rated 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is no representation of whnh in P and that reduces the literalism of this mode to slightly under $94 \%$. This rates 5 with a minus to distinguish the rating from those not reduced below $100 \%$.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$n p q$. The rendering of $y s^{\prime}$ at segment 1 by the Peal was rated 5 at $1: 24$. The later occurrence of the same Syriac verb is not rated because it is part of a free translation of a Hebrew euphemism.
'bdwhy. This renders Hebrew 'bdyw and the rendering was rated 4 at 2:8.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ lw. This renders $b w$ and the rendering of the Hebrew verb by this Syriac verb was rated 1 at 3:20.
$h z y n$. This Peal participle renders the Qal narrative of $r^{\prime} h$. The rendering was rated 5 in the discussion of 1:24.
[whnh] The failure to render $h n h$ is discussed in more detail in considering the consistency of rendering in the next verse, but not rated for consistency there. $t r^{\circ}$. As in the previous verse this renders $d l t$ and is rated 5 for the reasons shown there. 'lyt'. The rendering of 'lyh by this term was rated 5 at $3: 20$. The use of this word at the end of this verse is not rated.
tpyn. This Peal participle of $t p^{\prime}$ renders the Qal passive participle of $n c$. That verb is found only here and in the previous verse in MT. It was not rendered in the previous verse and it is not rated here.
$k b r$. This renders ${ }^{\prime} k$ here. That Hebrew is rendered by blhwd at 6:39; 10:15: and 16:28. It is not rendered in P at 7:19 and 20:39. Therefore this rendering is rated 1. $t w w n^{\prime}$. This renders $h d r$ in this verse and the equivalent $t w n^{\prime}$ at 16:9 and 12. It is rendered by qytwn' at $15: 1$. Therefore the rendering is rated 3 .

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In spite of the three noticeable differences in the translation of this verse there is no more than a slight change in meaning. The absence of $h n h$ results in a slightly less dramatic narrative. The change from "covering his feet" to "going to the latrine" gives the reader a slightly less euphemistic description in a way somewhat like the difference between "answering a call of nature" and "going to the toilet." Finally, the rendering in P of segment 16 of MT by the word 'lyh' that was modified at 3:20 by hmqrh, the word at segment 16 of this verse, makes clear to the reader that the narrative is referring to the same place in Eglon's residence in 3:20, 23, 24 and 25.

Where P represents segments 7 to 8 of MT and in the last two segments ( 15 and 16) of this verse of $P$ there are two instances of genitive construction $b$. Segment 7 of $P$ is an instance of direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J renders the segments of MT quite literally even though it uses a different euphemism at segments 12 to 14 . At the same time its rendering corresponds more closely to MT: 'byd hw' yt swrkyh for msyk hw' 't-rglyw. The Targum also renders mqrh by the same approach used at 3:20: byt qyt. Both A and B translate in the same literal way up through segment 8 . At segment 9 , B renders $n^{c} l w t$ by the same verb it used to render $n c l$ in the previous verse, but A varies with the verb used to render $s g r$ in the previous verse. In rendering segments 12 to 14 , A has the servants speculating that Eglon is "sitting on the stool" and B has "emptying his feet." This means B is closest to literal at this point. The two Greek Versions render $h ̣ d r$ differently, but B renders mqrh by $\theta \varepsilon \rho ı{ }_{\mathrm{Q}}^{\mathrm{Q}}$
as at 3:20 at the same time A is varying the vocabulary by rendering with кoı $\uparrow \hat{v}$ os. There are a number of variables here that make comparisons among these versions difficult. As to $\operatorname{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and B , only B renders segment 9 of this verse in a way that is consistent with its rendering of segment 8 of $3: 23$. Both Tg J and A render segment 9 of this verse by the verbs used for segment 4 of 3:23. Although $P$ rendered segment 8 of $3: 23$ inaccurately, it has not rendered segment 9 of this verse by the same verb used for segment 4 of $3: 23$, but by a term closer to MT's $n^{\ell} l$, than to its $s g r$. In this minor way, B might be said to be closer to P than are the other two versions.

ויחילו עד־בוש והנה איננו פתח דלתות העליה ויקחו את־המפתח ויפתחו והנה אדניהם נפל ארצה מת: .3:25

.d.ga retre

## RETROVERSION

With ' $d$-bwš and 't-hmpth treated as segments 2 and 9 respectively there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT. With sgy counted as segment 2 , wheyn as segment $3, l$ as segment 4 , 'qlyd' as segment 9 , whzyn as segment 11 , and $l^{\prime} r^{\prime \prime}$ as segment 14 , there are also fifteen segments in this verse of P , seven segments up to the first punctuation point and eight segments numbered 8 to 15 after that point.

As conventionally defined and understood, segment 1 of $P$ can be retroverted to the same segment of MT and segments 5 through 10 and 12 to 14 of P can also be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. Even segment 15 of P can be explained easily as another case where waw is added by P at the beginning of a non-
sequential clause that has no such waw in MT. ${ }^{41}$
The phrase ' $d$-bwš at segment 2 is considered to be freely translated by sgy since forms of aíqúv $\omega$ are used by A and B and Tg J has ' $d s g y$. This points to a Vorlage like MT rendered a bit freely by Tg J and more freely by P. Segment 3 of P can be understood in terms of Williams' explanation of cases where hnh is found at MT at places where "the speaker is the narrator of the account" and "the text-recipients," ourselves, are "the addressees." In those cases, $h n h$ is not represented by $h^{\prime}$. Instead, $h n h$ is dropped and $h z^{\prime}$ is substituted so that the beholder in the narrative is the subject of the verb. ${ }^{42}$ After that change segment 4 with its substitution of $l$ ' for 'ynnw would be necessary to accommodate the change since that particle is required to turn $h n w$ or $h n h w$ into the negative $h n h$ 'ynnw. The explanation of segment 3 also serves to explain how segment 11 of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segment of MT. Segment 14 of P is another instance of the rendering of the he directional in MT by a prepositional phrase in P . Segment 15 in P might be making a clause out of what is the second of two complementing participles of segment 12 in MT. Since there is no marking point making clear whether myt is a perf. or a participle, one cannot be certain. If it is a perf., then the conjunction can be explained as another case of P's addition of waw before a non-sequential clause. If it is verbal adjective, then it would be evidence that two such adjectives that are asyndetic in Hebrew may not be that in Syriac. All of these considerations lead to a conclusion that the source of this verse of P cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The rendering of segment 2 by $P$ is not considered a feature that affects the literal nature of this

[^158]mode, but it does bear on the rating of mode 2 as the subtraction of an element below the level of the segment and it is a non-literal element under mode 4 . Since the verb $h z^{\prime}$ is already represented in the previous verse, the omission of $h n h$ could be treated as a subtraction there, but in this verse, whzyn $l^{\prime}$ is not a word for word rendering of segments 3 and 4 of MT but rather a resegmentation at this point in the verse. In Dirksen's text it creates an asyndetic relative clause, beginning with $l$. The notes to the text show that $d$ is prefixed to that $l^{\prime}$ in mss $8 \mathrm{a} 1^{\mathrm{c}}$ and 9 a fam. The substitution for $h n h$ at segment 11 also results in a change in the word for word nature of the text and make segment 12 the direct object of the verb in P as well as making $\mathrm{rm}^{\prime}$ a participle complementing the direct object rather than the predicate of a nominal clause. The uncertainty about myt has already been described. Without precedents to help evaluate the effect of this on the literal nature of this mode, segments 3 and 4, and 11 and 12 will be evaluated as not literal and the segmentation rated 3. Here again the sequence of the elements is probably not subject to the same criticism partly because the segments of P singled out here are superficially similar to the segments they have recast and because the segments that do the recasting are each in that same sequence in relation to the rest of the verse as the segments they have replaced in the process. Therefore the sequence will be rated 5 and this mode will be rated 4.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Unlike the previous verse where the omission of $h n h$ was considered a subtraction, in this verse it is considered that it is omitted as part of a recasting of the verse affecting mode 1 . The omission of an element representing ' $d$ is considered a subtraction. Whether that is counted as one-fifteenth or one-thirtieth of the verse, the calculation would still reach a percentage of literality over 90 , and so this mode is rated 5 -.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

wktrw. This renders the Qal or Hiphil narrative tense of $h w l$ only here in Judges. The Polel participle at $21: 23$ is rendered by $n q s ̌ t ~ p l g$. These renderings cannot be rated for consistency.
sgy. This renders the Qal infinitive of $b w s ̌$ here. The Polel perf. is rendered by the Eshtaphel perf. of ' $h r$ at 5:28. This is an inadequate basis for a rating, but it is instructive that both contexts involve a delay and that different approaches to rendering that sense from the same root are employed.
[hnh] This Hebrew is not rendered in this verse as such. Ordinarily the failure to render is not catalogued for consistency, but here the failure to render $h n h$ when addressed to the ultimate reader (or "text-recipients" in Williams' terminology ${ }^{43}$ ) of the narrated text will be noted separately. The Hebrew is rendered by $h^{\text {( }}$ (and unless otherwise noted addressee[s] are within the text) at 1:2; 4:22(2x) (ultimate reader addressee); 6:37; 7:17; 8:15; 9:31, 33, 36, 37, 43 (ultimate reader addressee); 11:34 (ultimate reader addressee); 13:3, 10; 14:5, 8 (ultimate reader addressee in both), $16 ; 16: 10 ; 17: 2 ; 18: 9,12$ (ultimate reader addressee); 19:9, 16 (ultimate reader addressee), 22 (ultimate reader addressee), 24; 20:7, 40 (ultimate reader addressee); and 21:19. In the following verses the reader is the addressee and there is no rendering by $h^{\prime}$ and $h n h$ is either replaced by $h z^{\prime}$ or the MT has both a form of $r^{\prime} h$ and $h n h$, and $h z^{\prime}$ serves to render them both: 3:24; 25(2x); 7:13(1x) (1x replaced by $h z^{\prime}$, but part of what is related to someone within the narrative); 19:27; and 21:21 (similar to 3:24). At 7:13, the third of the three occurrences, it is not rendered, but in the translation is covered by the rendering of the second occurrence cited above parenthetically. At 19:19 an instance of $h n h$ is in a clause that is not rendered at all by P .

[^159]Thus $h n h$ is rendered by $h^{\prime}$ nine times where the addressee is the reader of the text and twenty times where the addressee is someone within the narrative. In seven places $h n h$ is omitted and replaced by or already joined to some form of $h z^{\prime}$ where the addressee is the reader of the narrative: $3: 24,25(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 6: 28 ; 7: 13(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 19: 27$; and $21: 21$. The third occurrence in MT at 7:13 that is covered by the rendering of the second should probably be added to this group of seven. This would mean that $h n h$ is rendered by $h^{\prime}$ nine times where it might not have been rendered as in the seven or eight times where it is not. Thus P has a greater tendency to render by $h^{\prime}$, but the approach found in this verse is not unexpected.
$h z y n$. This renders $h n h$ twice in this verse and five other times in the verses just cited above. The rendering of $r^{\circ} h$ by this verb was discussed at 1:23 and rated 5. If this were being rated as a rendering of $h n h$, it would be rated 1 because the discussion just above shows that it renders $h n h$ in fewer than one-half the places where $h n h$ is found in MT. Since it is in something of a twilight zone between a question of consistency and one of semantics or syntax, it will not be rated. However it is an important feature of translation technique and has to be noted as such rather than as a question of Vorlage. pth This Peal perf. renders the Qal participle of its Hebrew cognate once in this verse and the Qal narrative tense once. The same Syriac verb renders the same Hebrew verb at 19:27, but at $4: 19$, the use of the verb in the context of opening a container is rendered by $\check{s} r^{r}$. Accordingly, the rendering in this verse is rated 3. The other rendering would be rated 1.
$t r^{\circ}$. This rendering of $d l t$ was rated 5 at 3:23.
'lyt'. This rendering of 'lyh was rated 5 at 3:20.
$n s b w$. This Peal renders the Qal of $l q h$ here and the rendering was analyzed at 3:6 and rated 4.
' $q$ lyd'. This renders mpth which is a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated.
mrhwn. With its pronominal suffix this renders ' $d w n$ with its suffix. The consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 1:5.
$r m^{\prime}$. This rendering of $n p l$ was rated 1 at 2:19.
' $r$ '. This rendering of $r$ ' s was rated 5 at 1:2.
$m y t$. This Peal perf. or participle renders the Qal participle of $m w t$. The rendering was considered at 1:7 and rated 5 there.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. In this verse of P segments $2,3,4$, and 11 must all be considered as not rendering accurately the semantic value of a Hebrew source like MT and as reworking the syntax of such a source as well.

Nevertheless, the segments as translated yield a meaning similar to the original so that this translation can considered a non-literal or free translation at these points by ancient standards, but not a misleading one.

Segments 4 to 7 of P form an object clause of segment 3, but it is an asyndetic object clause and that would seem to make it unusual. One would expect a construction with a conjunction like $d$ as in 9:55. At segments 6 to 7 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. At both segments 8 to 9 and 11 to 12 of P there are instances of direct object construction $d$. In MT segment 12 is probably not to be considered a direct object, but more in the category of a predicate nominative. At segment 13 of P , there is a participle complementing the direct object of segment 12 and there is another such complement if $m y t$ is read as a participle.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is quite literal except where it adds tryp between segments 12 and 13. This makes it similar to P where P is also literal, but also at segment 2 where both render $b w s ̌$ by sgy. There are minor differences between A and B in rendering segments 1 and 2, and one of those is that A does not render ' $d$ while B does, so this makes A more similar to P as to this element of segment 2 since Tg J also renders ${ }^{\text {' } d \text {. They also differ in rendering the }}$ tense of the copulative sense of segment 4 , but that does not bear on their similarity or lack of similarity to P . This makes Tg J and A more similar to P than B is, since A does not have the element of segment 2 , ${ }^{\text {' }}$, that is also missing in P , and Tg J uses the cognate of the other element of segment 2 present in P's rendering. Based on segment 2 it is hard to choose between them, but since Tg J also makes the addition between segments 12 and 13, A is considered more similar to P in this verse.

3:26. ואהוד נמלט עד התמהמהֵם והוא עבר את־הפסילים וימלט השעירתה:


## RETROVERSION

By treating the two elements joined by maqqēph as segment 7 there are nine segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and five following it. Except for segments 2 and 5 all those segments plus an addition can be found in this verse of P . The first segment in P represents segment 3 of MT (with a waw prefix that can be seen as representing the waw prefix of segment 1 of MT). Then hnwn mttwhyn hww represents segment 4 of this verse of MT (although semantically it may be somewhat closer to $b w \check{s}$ of the previous verse as $m h h$ the word in MT which it renders may be closer to segment 1 of that verse.) Then ${ }^{\prime} h w r$, replacing segment 5 , represents segment 1 of this verse of MT (without the waw
prefix since in P it has become part of an apodosis). Following 'hwr one might expect ${ }^{\text {'tplt, but no segment represents segment } 2}$ of MT but, instead, 'br follows and represents 6 with no element to represent segment 5 of MT. Then lpsylyn witplt represents segments 7 and 8 as one reaches the second punctuation point of P . Then wrht is added and, lastly, lšy'rt represents segment 9 of MT as the verse ends. (No effort has been made to explore any subtlety in the translator's approach, as for example the possibility that rht might be intended to represent one of the occurrences of $m l t$. That would change the mode into which that translation technique should be classified, but not the fact that the translation departs from the literal approach.) There is no support in Tg J , A , or B for the changed order of the segments or for the addition and subtractions. Both A and B make additions between their elements representing segments 4 and 5 of MT, but these do not support the changes made by P. Without more evidence to support a contrary conclusion, no source for P that differed from the text of MT will be presumed here.

LITERALISM. 1 Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. There is a failure to segment literally insofar as ' $h w r$ is not the subject of the missing MT segment 2 , but rather formally the subject of segment $6,^{\prime} b r$, in place of the pronoun found at segment 5 of MT that refers to him. Then there is the failure to segment lšyrt as the complement of 'tplt, but instead as the complement of the added wrht. This is a situation where subtractions and additions have resulted in a segmentation different from that of MT and thus a departure from a word-for-word translation. This is calculated as affecting four of the nine segments and the verse is given a rating of 2 for segmentation. Only the four segments of P representing segments 6 through 9 of P are considered to follow the sequence of MT (since the addition is not taken as affecting the sequence). This produces a rating of 1 for sequencing and 1.5 for the mode as a whole.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Neither segment 2 nor segment 5 of the MT is represented in P , and these are considered subtractions. The wrht before segment 9 is an addition. Both hnwn and hww are considered features of mode 4. Thus one-third of the segments are either added or subtracted and this mode is rated 3.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
mttwhyn. This Ethpaal participle of twh renders the Hithpael infinitive of $m h h$. The same Hebrew infinitive is rendered by the Ethpeel of $k r k$ at $12: 8$. This is not an adequate number of occurrences for a rating.
'br. This renders its Hebrew cognate and was rated 5 at 2:20.
psylyn. This renders Hebrew psylym as it also did at 3:19, its only other occurrence in Judges. It is not rated.
'tplt. This Ethpaal renders one of the two occurrences of the Niphal of $m l t$ in this verse. The same Syriac verb renders the same Hebrew verb at 3:29. Thus there are too few occurrences for a rating.

With only one rendering rated for consistency, and that rendering one that first occurred in an earlier verse, this mode will not be rated in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segment 7 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$ and at segment 9 the directional $h \bar{e}$ is rendered by a prepositional phrase with the prefixed $l$. The hnwn in P seems to be rendering the prepositional suffix of segment 4 of MT, the infinitive construct with that suffix. The $h w w$ in P is making explicit that the participle is used in the repetitive or durative sense. ${ }^{44}$

RATING OF THE VERSE. 2.

[^160]
## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Both the Greek versions have an addition after their rendition of segment 4 of MT which points out the obvious: $\hat{\eta} v \dot{o} \pi \rho o \sigma v o \hat{\varrho} v \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varrho}$. Otherwise they are literal translations and differ only in their spelling of the rendition of segment 9 , with B adding a $\tau$ not found in A . Targum J translates literally without addition or subtraction. Sine the additions of A and $B$ have no resemblance to anything in $P$, that makes them more different from $B$ than $T g J$ is.


## RETROVERSION

With two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 9 and 10, there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and six following it. If bny ${ }^{\prime} y s r y l$ is treated as segment 9 and $m n t w r r^{\prime}$ as segment 10 , there are also twelve segments in this verse of $P$, six to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, and two more to the third. Every segment of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT if one grants that $w k d$ can be retroverted to $w y h y b$ and that the finite verb following $w k d$ can be retroverted to the prepositional phrase at segment 2 of MT. The absence of the waw prefix on segment 3 can also be recognized as a feature of Syriac translation technique which translates an apodosis preceded by a waw in MT without such a suffix in P. Accordingly the source of P will be presumed to be one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT and the segments of the translation can be matched to those of MT when one takes account of Syriac syntax. Those segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT, and this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w k d$. This rendering of wyhy plus a prepositional phrase or a conjunction was rated 5 at 1:14.
${ }^{\prime} t$. This is the first time that the rendering of the infinitive of $b w^{\prime}$ by a finite form of ${ }^{\prime} t$ has been considered. The rendering by the participle of $c l l$ was rated 1 at $1: 14$ and the rating of all the other forms of $b w^{\nu}$ where rendered by forms of $l l$ was rated 1 at 3:20. Here, based on the analysis at 3:20 forms of $t^{\prime}$ ' rendered forms of $b w^{\prime}$ other than the infinitive in thirty-three of the forty-seven places where it was estimated that a rendering by ' $t$ ' would be appropriate. Therefore this rendering will be rated 3 . $q r^{\circ}$. This renders $t q^{c}$ in the sense that it is rendered here in six places in Judges cited at $3: 21$. The Hebrew is also rendered once by each of the following four verbs at the places cited in the discussion of 3:21: $m h^{\prime}, n q \check{s}, q^{\circ}$, and $\check{s t^{\prime}}$. Based on that analysis this rendering is rated 2 .
šypwr. This renders šwpr here, at 6:34 and 7:18 (2x). The same Hebrew is rendered by $q r n t^{\prime}$ at $7: 8,16$, and $20(2 \mathrm{x})$. The same Hebrew is rendered by Syriac $q r n$ at $7: 22$. At 7:19 one occurrence of the Hebrew is not rendered. Thus this rendering is found in four of the nine places where the Hebrew is translated in Judges and is rated 1. $t \not t r^{r}$. This rendering of $h r$ was rated 5 at 1:9.
wnhtw. This rendering of $w y r d w$ was rated 4 at 1:9.
$' m h$. This renders ' $m w$ and the rendering of the Hebrew preposition by its Syriac cognate was rated 4 at 1:22.
bny 'ysryl. This rendering of bny ys's'l was rated 5 at 1:1.
$q d m y h w n$. This renders lpnynm. The rendering of the prepositional form of lpny by $q d m$ was rated 5 at 2:14.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The absence of the waw prefix at segment 3 of P is consistent with other similar renderings by P of the apodosis of conditional clauses where the MT prefixes the waw at the beginning of the apodosis.

There is a genitive construction $a$ at segment 9 and a genitive construction $b$ at segments 5 to 6 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

But for the addition of byt by Tg J between the prefixed $d$ of segment 6 and the rest of segment 6 , P could be retroverted to Tg J more easily than to MT, and the explanations as to segments 1 to 3 would be explained in the same way in discussing the retroversion. The translation of A is also similar to MT except for the omission of any element that can be retroverted to segment 10 . By contrast, B does not omit a rendering of segment 10 , but does add $\mathrm{A} \omega \delta \varepsilon i \varsigma \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$ I $\sigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda$ between its renderings of segments 2 and 3, making itself least like $P$. Here the addition by $\mathrm{Tg} J$ is considered a lesser difference from $P$ than is the omission by A.

## ויאמר אלהם רדפו אחרי כי־נתן יהוה את־איביכם את־מואב בידכֵם וירדו אחריו וילכדו את־מעברות . 3:28 <br> הירדן למואב ולא־נתנו איש לעבר: <br>  

## RETROVERSION

With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments $5,7,8,13$, and 16 , there are eighteen segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and nine following it.

Eighteen segments can also be distinguished in P . The first two to the first punctuation point, and the third and fourth to the second such point. If $m t l d{ }^{\prime} \operatorname{srlm}$ is treated as segment 5 , $b^{c} l d b b y h w n$ as segment 7 , and $m w^{\prime} b y^{\prime}$ as segment 8 , the fifth to the ninth segments can be located between the second and third punctuation points. If $b t r h$ is counted as segment 11 , the tenth and eleventh segments fall between the third and fourth punctuation points. If $m^{\prime} b r t^{\prime}$ is counted as segment 13 , the twelfth to fifteenth segments are found between the fourth and fifth punctuation points. Then with $w l$ ' $\check{s} b q w$ treated as segment 16 , segments 16 through 18 are between the fifth and sixth punctuation points.

Every segment of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT. Perhaps $t w$ as the rendition at segment 3 of $r d p w$ might be questioned since the analysis at 1:6 showed that it was the only one of the eleven occurrences of $r d p$ in Judges that is rendered by ' $t$ '. (At 8:4 $r d p$ is rendered by $r h t$, but the other nine are rendered by Syriac $r d p$.) This probably does not call the Vorlage into question since this is the only one of these occurrences where the speaker is calling others to move in some way after the speaker and not after any third party. The plur. of 'yd rendering the sing. of $y d$ has been seen since 1:2. Accordingly, the source of P will be treated as one that is indistinguishable from the text of MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. Thus this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$t w$. As already discussed above this rendering of Hebrew $r d p$ is the only one of the eleven occurrences of $r d p$ in Judges so rendered. The nine rendered by Syriac $r d p$ were considered at 1:16. This may well be a situation in which the Syriac cognate could not be used. One would want evidence from other Syriac sources, especially the Peshitta, where a call by someone for others to follow demonstrated that Hebrew $r d p$ could be rendered by its Syriac cognate in that situation.
btry. This renders 'hry and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:1.
$m t t d$. This renders $k y$ and the various renderings of $k y$ are rated at 1:15 and this rendering is rated 3 there.
'šlm and $\check{s} b q w$. Both of these Syriac verbs render ntn in this verse. The rendering of $n t n$ in the context where it is rendered by 'šm was rated 5 at $1: 2$ and the renderings by $y h b$ and $n t l$ were also rated 5 at $1: 12$. The rendering by $\check{s} b q$ was discussed at $1: 34$ and not rated because $n t n$ is only rendered three times by this Syriac verb, and because the other two renderings that have been rated were rated separately because of a distinction in the sense in the context where each of those renderings is found.
$m r y$. This renders $y h w h$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:1.
$b^{c} l d b b y k w n$. This renders 'ybykm and the rendering of the Hebrew noun by this Syriac noun was rated 5 at 2:14.
'ydykwn. This renders $y d k m$ and the rendering of forms of $y d$ by forms of ' $y d$ was rated 5 at $1: 2$.
wnhtw. This Peal renders the Qal narrative tense of $y r d$ and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:9.
$' h d w$. This renders $l k d$ in the nine places listed in discussing 1:9. In four or five other places listed there the Hebrew is rendered by forms of $k b s ̌$ and rated 1 in those places. The rendering in this verse occurs in $65 \%$ of those fourteen places. Because there is some uncertainty about whether the rendering at $1: 12$ is by $k b s ̌$ or ' $h ̣ h$, this rating will be $2+$. $m^{\prime} b r t$. This renders $m^{c} b r h$ only here and at 12:5 and 6 . Thus it is not rated. 'nš. This renders 'yš here. The various renderings of that Hebrew term were considered at $1: 4$. This rendering was rated 3 there.
$n^{\prime} b r$. This dependent imperf. renders the infinitive of its Hebrew cognate. Rendering by this Syriac verb of its Hebrew cognate were rated 5 at 2:20.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Although the $d$ prefix at segment 16 is somewhat unusual, one sense of $d$ used as a preposition in JPS is "against." ${ }^{" 45}$ At segment 18 there is an instance of the dependent imperf., a construction whereby $d$ plus the imperf. renders MT $l$ plus the infinitive. As often been seen before "Moab" used metaphorically in MT is rendered in P by "Moabites," the meaning implicitly designated by the metaphor rather than by the metaphor itself.

At segments 7 and 8 there are two instances of direct object construction $d$, the second in apposition to the first. At segment 13 there is another instance of direct object construction $d$ and at segment 17 , an instance of direct object construction $e$.

[^161]
## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
Here again Tg J renders the verse of MT literally with fewer adaptations of the syntax than
 a preposition. Moreover, B renders the prepositional suffixes of segment 7 and segment 9 by $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\rho} v$. As a result Tg J is more similar to P than A and B are, and A is more similar to $P$ than $B$ is.

3:29.
ויכו את־מואב בעת ההיא כעשרת אלפים איש כל־שמן וכל־איש חיל ולא נמלט איש:

##  <br> .err Wadre

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segments 2,8 , and 9 , respectively, there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and three following it. If $m n m w^{\prime} b y^{\prime},{ }^{\prime} y k{ }^{\prime} s^{\prime} r^{\prime}, k l d^{c} t y r$, and $w k l g b r$ are treated as segments $2,5,8$, and 9 , respectively, there are also thirteen segments in this verse of P , seven to the first punctuation point, and six following it. The order of segments 3 and 4 in MT is reversed in P .

The segments of P can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments in this verse of MT with some explanations. At segment 2, the added $m n$ yields a partitive sense that may be more graceful syntax and the rendering of $m w^{\prime} b$ by $m w^{\prime} b y^{\prime}$ may be necessary here with the rendering by $q t l$, even though the gentilic for the country of the
people is expected anyway. As for the reversed order of segments 3 and 4, it is less common, but not unusual, to find the demonstrative preceding the substantive in Syriac in order to give it prominence. ${ }^{46}$ At segment 4 the sing. 'yš is rendered by the plur. gbryn as was first seen at 1:4. In $d^{\prime}$ tyr at segment 8 one finds a construction somewhat similar to the rendering by $d b y \check{s}$, first seen at $3: 7$. There the Hebrew adjective used substantively was the direct object of ' $b d$. Here it may be that $k l$ does not easily modify another modifier without any express substantive in the syntactical construction. Based on these considerations, it is concluded here that the source of P was a Hebrew text that cannot be distinguished from the text of MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word rendering by P of the segments of this verse of the MT, and the segmentation is rated 5 . The change in the word order is evaluated as an $11 \%$ reduction in the literal nature of the sequence and the sequencing is rated 4 . This mode is rated 4.5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. While there are features of the translation that have to be evaluated as part of mode 4 , only one of those might be considered as the addition of an element here, and that is the $m n$ that is segmented as part of segment 2 in the division into segments decided in considering the retroversion above. This would have less than a $4 \%$ affect on the rating of this mode in this verse. Therefore this mode will be rated 5- to show this conclusion.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering. $w q t!l w$. This renders wykw and the rendering of that Hebrew verb by this Syriac verb was rated 1 at 1:4.

[^162]$z b n$ '. This renders ' $t$ in this verse and eight other times at $4: 4 ; 10: 14 ; 11: 26 ; 12: 6 ; 13: 23$; $14: 4 ; 21: 14$ and 24 . It is not rendered at $2: 22$. This rendering is rated 5 .
gbryn, $g b r$, and 'nš. Both the sing. and plur. of $g b r$ render ' $y \check{s}$ here, as does 'nš, and those renderings were rated 4 in the discussion of 1:4.
'tyr. This passive participle renders $\check{s} m n$, a hapax legomenon in Judges, and is not rated. hyltn. This adjective renders hyl here and the same Hebrew is rendered by hyl' at 6:12, 11:1 and 21:10. The Hebrew is rendered by adjectives, qrbnt' at $20: 44$ and by hyltn' at 20:46, and not rendered at 18:2. The renderings by hylt and hyl $l^{\prime}$ might be considered as consistent among themselves since they are based on the same root. That consistency is found in five of the six places where the Hebrew is rendered, and would be rated 4, but where the adjective is used the genitive construction is lost. From that perspective the rendering in this verse and verse 20:46 might also be seen as less consistent. Accordingly this rendering will be rated 2 . Renderings by hyl' would be rated 3 .
${ }^{\prime} t p l t$ This renders the Niphal of $m l t$ here and the rendering was not rated in the discussion of 3:26 where the only two other occurrences of this verb are found. One of those was rendered by this same Syriac verb, and the other was not rendered. The rendering here is not rated either.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Smelik takes the view that 'tyr should be rendered "rich," and that is a possible meaning of the Syriac. A more likely meaning that is in accord with šmn in MT would be "well-nourished" or "well-fed." Ringgren explains the meaning of šmn as "well-fed, able-bodied" in this context. ${ }^{47}$ JPS and Costaz both include "rich" among the meanings of this term, but JPS also includes "fertile" and Costaz includes "abondant" (French translation) and "plentiful" (English

[^163]translation). ${ }^{48}$ The translator of P would have been ignoring the context to have meant that all ten thousand of these warriors were rich in possessions as opposed to meaning that they were fighting men very fit for their duties. The rendering by Tg J , like the rendering by A, does not seem to pick up the question of the fitness of the men. Eising's view that 'yš hyl in MT usually refers to warriors should probably guide our understanding of the Syriac rendering of this phrase. ${ }^{49}$ This is corroborated by the fact that P renders MT 'nšy$h y l$ at 20:44 by $g b r^{\circ}$ qrbtn'. Smelik also comments on the rendering of $n k h$ by $q t \underline{l}$ and suggests that the $q t \underline{l}$ is used when the "smiting" resulted in death and cites the rendering at 1:10 of Tg J as an instance where $m h^{\prime}$ was used in Tg J because those struck still are alive at 1:20. That is not true of $P$ if the three named at $1: 10$ are the three sons of Anak at 1:20 since P uses $q t \underline{l}$ at $1: 10$.

Other features of this mode were pointed out in discussing retroversion: the use of the partitive $m n$ at segment 2 (also an instance of direct object construction $d$ ); the fronting of the demonstrative at segment 4 to 3 ; the plur. renderings at segments 2 and 7; and the rendering of $\check{s} m n$ by a relative clause. The rendering of $m w b$ by a plur. gentilic is an example of the rendering of the name of a country as a metaphor for the people of the country by the more literal term that refers directly to the people. Thus it is a free translation of the metaphor, but a literal translation of the meaning referred to by the metaphor.

The renderings of $k l$ are examples of the use of $k l$ in P without a suffix where the term modified is in the absolute state and the meaning of the term is indefinite (even if it is the first member of a genitive construction). ${ }^{50}$ Of course, it is not necessary to explain the

[^164]absence of a suffix for $k l$ in P , but the presence of one. This case of two unsuffixed occurrences of $k l$ is noted to illustrate the contrast.

There genitive construction at segments 9 to 10 in MT has become a noun modified by an adjective in P .

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Although the rendering of segment 8 by Tg J is questioned here, otherwise Tg J renders the segments and the sequence of this verse more closely to MT than P does. This involves an understanding of the rendering by Tg J of segments 9 and 10 as meaning "warrior" as Gropp understands the phrase rather than as "champion" as Smelik understands it. (The difference is not in reality very great.) The rendering of segment 8 seems even freer in A: $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha \varsigma ~ \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \mu \alpha \chi \eta \tau \alpha ̀ \varsigma ~ \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̇ v ~ \alpha v ̉ \tau o i ̂ \varsigma ~ w h e r e a s ~ B ~ h a s ~ \pi \alpha ̂ v ~ \lambda ı \pi \alpha \rho o ̀ v, ~$ closer to the sense of MT and P as that sense is understood here. Both A and B render segments 9 and 10 by $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha$ öv $\delta \rho \alpha \delta v v \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \omega \varsigma$, but B renders ' $t$ at segment 3 by $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha$. Accordingly, Tg J is considered more similar to P , and A is considered more similar than $B$ is.

3:30.


## RETROVERSION

There are eleven segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and four following it. There are also eleven segments in P , seven to the first punctuation point and four following it.

The segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT except that the third segment of P corresponds to the fourth in MT (except for the prepositional prefix that corresponds to the prefix of segment 3 of MT) and segment 4 of $P$ corresponds to segment 3 of MT (minus the prefix now attached to the displaced segment 4 of P ). Now $P$ has rendered segment 3 here as it rendered segment 3 in the previous verse where the Hebrew was 't. This contrasts with B that renders by $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \underset{\sim}{l}$ in both verses. Both Tg J and A follow MT consistently in rendering segment 3 .

Questions about retroversion can be explained as in the previous verse. The people of Moab referred to metaphorically by referring to the land or the kingdom are named literally in P and this means the verb of which they are the subject must be plur. The reversed order of segments 3 and 4 gives prominence to the demonstrative. The plur. at segment 11 of P renders the sing. form in segment 11 of MT which has a plur. sense in the context. Accordingly the source of P will be considered one that cannot be distinguished from the text of MT based on available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation and segmentation by P of the verse of MT, and the segments are in the same order in P as in MT except at segments 3 to 4 where the order is reversed. The segmentation is rated 5 . Here the sequencing affects a larger percentage of the verse than at $3: 29$ so that the sequencing is rated 3 . This mode is rated 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. No elements are added or subtracted and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$w^{3} t t b r w$. This Ethpaal renders the Niphal of $w t k n^{c}$ here, at $8: 28$ and 11:33. The Peal of the same Syriac verb renders the Hiphil of the Hebrew verb at $4: 23$. This rendering is rated 5. $z b n^{3}$. This renders $y w m$, which occurs fifty-two times in the MT of Judges as referred to or cited at $2: 7$. The only other place where $y w m$ is rendered by this term is at $15: 1$. This rendering is rated 1.
thyt. This renders Hebrew tht and the rendering was rated 3 at 1:7.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This renders $y d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:2.
$w s ̌ l y t$. This renders $w t s ̌ q t ̣$ and the rendering was rated 4 in the discussion of 3:11.
' $r{ }^{\prime}$. This rendering of ' $r$ s was rated 5 at 1:2.
šnyn. This renders šnh and the rendering of that Hebrew sing. where it is plur. in the context in MT by the Syriac plur. was rated 5 at 3:11.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The comments made in discussing retroversion about the plur. forms in P at segments 2 and 11 also apply here as do the comments about the rendering of $y w m$ by $z b n^{\prime}$ (and the rating given that rendering in discussing mode 3) and about the reversed order of segments 3 and 4. At segments 6 to 7 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

4. 

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for the addition of 'nš between segments 6 and 7, the addition of $y \check{s} r^{\prime} l$ between segments 9 and 10 , and the rendering of segments 3 and 4 as they appear in MT, Tg J is similar to P and renders segment 2 by a gentilic similar to that of P . Both A and B are quite similarly literal through segment 11 , even at segment 2 where P and Tg J are not
literal as to the exact form of the proper name. However, A and B add considerable and similar material after segment 11 and so that makes them similarly different from P while Tg J is no different than in the ways already mentioned. Thus Tg J is considered more similar to P in this verse.

ואחריו היה שמגר בן־ענת ויך את־פלשתים שש־מאות איש במלמד הבאר וישע גם־הוא את־ישראל: 3:31
חת
.1.<imarran

## RETROVERSION

With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments $4,6,7,12$, and 13 , there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and three following it. With $b r$ ' $n t$ treated as segment $4, m n$ plšty' as segment $6, s ̌ t m$ ') as segment 7 , ${ }^{\prime} p h w$ as segment 12 , and $l y s r^{\prime} y l$ as segment 13 , there are also thirteen segments in P , four to the first punctuation point, six more to the second point, and three more to the third and last such point in this verse.

With the explanations to be made throughout the discussion of this verse, the segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT. At segment 6 there is another rendering of the direct object in the partitive sense like the rendering at 3:29. At segment 9 , the sing. of 'yš with a plur. sense in MT is rendered by the plur. in P , as also in the previous and earlier verses. Accordingly the source of this verse of $P$ is treated here as indistinguishable from the text of MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation of a verse like this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The only element in this verse that might be considered an addition or subtraction is the $m n$ at segment 6 . As at $3: 29$, this mode will be rated 5 - to show that small degree to which this mode in this verse is not fully literal.

## 3. Consistency or not consistency of rendering.

btrh. This renders 'hryw and this rendering was rated 4 at 1:1.
$b r$. This renders $b n$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:13.
whrb. This renders wyk in this verse and the rendering was rated 1 at 1:4.
gbryn. This renders 'yš in a context where it has a plur. meaning and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:4.
$m s s^{\prime}$. This renders $m l m d$, a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Scriptures and thus not rated here. (It is of course based on the root lmd so that its meaning is not difficult to understand in the context.)
$t w r^{\circ}$. This renders hbqr in this verse, but it is a hapax legomenon in Judges and cannot be rated here.
' $p$. This renders $g m$ here and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:3.
wprq. This renders wyš and the rendering was rated 4.5 at 2:16.
This mode is rated 3 in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. To what has already been said about the consistency of the translation of the Hiphil of $n k h$ in the discussion of mode 4 at 3:29, an additional comment about the variation in rendering will be added here. One might raise a question similar to the question that Smelik raised at $3: 29$ by asking whether the reader is supposed to understand that there is something different about the smiting of
the Philistines in this verse from the smiting of the Moabites at 3:29. None of the other three versions regularly compared here raise the question, nor does the Vulgate do so. The same is true of KJV, ASV, RSV, and NRSV.

In this verse too the translator persists in specifying by use of $m n$ that the 600 men were only some of the Philistines. There is an instance of genitive construction $a$ at segment 4 and a genitive construction $b$ at segments 9 to 10 . At segment 13 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Since Tg J renders the verse even more literally than P , it can only be said to be different at points where explanation has been given for treating P as literal, or at points where the literal quality of P has been questioned, as for example by P's addition of $m n$ or P's inconsistency in rendering $n k h$.

Both A and B have rendered hyh by $\dot{\alpha} v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta$, and plštym by $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \mathrm{o} \varphi u ́ \lambda o v s$. Here B renders ' $n t$ by $\Delta \mathrm{v} v \alpha \chi, b m l m d$ by èv $\tau \hat{\varrho} \dot{\alpha} \rho \circ \tau \rho o ́ \pi \mathrm{o} \delta \mathrm{t}$ (plowshares) and $g m h w$ by каí $\gamma \varepsilon$. Then A renders bmlmd by $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau o ̀ \varsigma ~ \mu o ́ \sigma \chi \omega v$ and does not render $g m$. The rendering of bmlmd by A is puzzling. Should A's rendering be translated: "besides the calves of oxen" (or, perhaps, "bulls")? (The Syro-Hexaplar version renders A's version here into Syriac.) This could be taken as a metaphorical statement about the difference between seasoned warriors and raw recruits, or those higher in rank and those lower. In any case it is easier to conclude that Tg J is more like P than A or B , but harder to choose between those two. Without the difference at $\Delta \mathrm{v} v \alpha \chi \mathrm{~B}$ could be considered more similar. The failure by A to render $g m$ may not be any more significant than B's pleonastic rendering. The different
renderings of bmlmd seem to be the key. The rendering by B as "ploughshare" of bulls is less difficult than that of A , and one who takes that position would have to say that B is less dissimilar to P than A is.

## CHAPTER FIVE

## CHAPTER FOUR OF JUDGES

4:1. ויספו בני ישראל לעשות הרע בעיני יהוגה ואהוד מת:
. ג.

## RETROVERSION

There are nine segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach, and two following it. There are nine segments and an addition in this verse of P , with wwsp counted as segment $1, t w b$ counted as an addition and bny counted as segment 2 with the remaining seven segments counted as segments 3 through 9 . The addition and segments 1 through 7 precede the first punctuation point, and segments 8 and 9 follow that point.

All of the numbered segments of P can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments of MT with the following explanation. At 2:11, 3:7 and 12 (twice), $h r^{c} b$ cyny is rendered by $d b y s ̌ q d m$ and Tg J renders the same way here. Both A and B render in a similar way, but each with a different preposition. Therefore, apart from the addition of $t w b$, the source of P is found to be indistinguishable from the text of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Except for the addition of $t w b$ (not found in the similar construction at $2: 12$ ) this is a word for word translation of a text like that of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as those seem in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one addition only, twb, that has been mentioned already, and it reduced the quantitative literalism of this verse by one-ninth. This mode is rated 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$w w s p w$. This Aphel renders the Hiphil, wyspw. Renderings by the Aphel of ysp of the Hiphil of $y s p$ were rated 5 at 2:21.
bny 'ysryl. This rendering of bny ys'r'l was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m^{\prime} b d$. The rendering of 's'wt by this Syriac verb was rated 5 at 1:7.
$d b y s \check{ }$. The rendering of $h r^{\prime}$ by this phrase was rated 5 at 2:11.
$q d m$. This translation of $b^{c} y n y$ was rated 4 at 2:11.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m y t$. The Peal perf. renders the Qal perf. of $m w t$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The addition of $t w b$ is of some interest here since the phrase in segments 1 to 7 of MT is found four times in Judges at $3: 12$; this verse; $10: 6$; and $13: 1$, but the series starts with segments 1 to 5 of 2:11 (up to the athnach) where the finite verb is wy's'w and where the details of the "doing" are then described for the first time in Judges (serving other gods, the Baals and Ashtaroth) continuing into $2: 12-13$. At $3: 7$ the first five segments are the same as at $2: 11$, followed by a similar, but not identical, description of the offenses. The same five segments are found again at 6:1 (but without the explanation of the evil that was done as in 2:11ff and 3:7). Thus what is described is a series of seven related passages that has three passages beginning with wys's and four that begin with wyspw. In MT the three begin "and they did evil," and the four begin "and they again did evil."). If the three are represented by A and the four by B , the order is AABBABB . However in P the fourth, in this verse, and the
seventh at 13:1, add $t w b$. Thus the series in P is AABB*ABB*: "did evil," "did evil," "again did evil," "yet again did evil;" and then "did evil," "again did evil," and "yet again did evil." This might be interpreted as showing some method behind the addition of $t w b$ rather than a random, capricious insertion. It also suggests that there was an understanding of the structure of the narrative and how a different level of consistency is part of the translation when the seven statements are rendered identically in relation to the Vorlage at the same time that two in the succession have this small addition that then fits into a consistent pattern of variation. These two small additions have the effect of emphasizing that they are connecting links in the narrative that might be described as bad, bad, worse, even worse; bad, worse, even worse. The Syro-Hexaplar does not add $t w b$ in this verse nor in 13:1.

At segments 2 to 3 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$. At segment 5 the rendering of $h r^{r}$ by $d b y s ̌$ is found in all seven verses just described above, and the comments about that construction at 2:11 apply here It is also a direct object construction d).

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for the addition, Tg J and B are as close to identical to each other as they are likely to be. Neither A nor B renders $h r^{r}$ by the brief relative clause as do P and Tg J , so they cannot be considered as similar to P as is Tg J . Segments 8 and 9 are not rendered by A, and this makes B more similar to P than A is.


```
.
```


## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 5 and 9 , there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach, and six following it. With w'slm 'nwn treated as segment $1, m l k$ ' $d k n ' n$ treated as segment 5, the $d$ prefix of 'mlk treated as segment 6 and 'mlk itself as segment 7, wrb hylh treated as segment 9, and ytb $h w$ as segment 12, this verse of P can also be divided into fourteen segments, five to the first punctuation point, two more to the second point, three more to the third, and four more to the fourth and last such punctuation point in this verse.

As the segments are divided here, each can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segment of MT. Therefore the Vorlage of this verse P will be considered to be indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse is a word-for-word translation of $4: 2$ of MT, and the elements are in the same sequence as they are in MT. Therefore this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As in the case of $h w^{3}$ at 3:20 the $h w^{3}$ in this verse between segments 12 and 13 is considered the normal accompaniment to a Syriac participle rendering a Hebrew participle that expresses repetition or duration in the past, but it is considered a feature of mode 4 . Therefore this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
w'šlm. This renders wymkr (with a pronominal suffix that is rendered by a semi-enclitic in P ), and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:14.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
${ }^{\prime} y d$ '. This renders Hebrew $y d$, and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:2.
$m l k$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.
'mlk. This Aphel renders the Qal of $m l k$ here and at 9:8 and the Hiphil of the same Hebrew verb at 9:16 and 18. The verb is not rendered at 9:6 although the noun mlk is rendered by P in that verse. This rendering is rated 5.
$r b$. This renders $\dot{s} r$ here and at 2:7 and its plur. $r w r b n^{\prime}$ renders the plur. of $\dot{s} r$ at 5:15; $7: 25 ; 8: 3,6$; and $10: 18$. The sing. is rendered by šlyṭ at $9: 30$. This is considered to be consistent in seven out of eight places and rated 4.
hylh. With the pronominal suffix this renders $s b^{b}$ here and at $4: 7 ; 8: 6$; and $9: 24$; and the rendering is rated 5 .
$y t b$. This renders $y w s ̌ b$ here and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9.
' $m m$ '. This plur. renders $g w y m$ and the renderings of the sing. and plur. of $g w y$ by the sing. or plur. of ' $m$ ' were rated 5 at 2:20.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segments 3 to 4, 5, and 13 to 14 there are three instances of genitive construction $b$. At segment 9 there is an example of genitive construction $a$. As at 3:20, the participle at segment 12 is used with $h w$ to render the sense of repetition or duration in the past. The pronominal suffix at segment 9 may have been added to specify that it was Nabin/Jabin's army, but its most important function is probably to made clear that $r b$, "commander" is definite and that Sisera was the commander of the army. Segments 8 and 9 comprise an example of genitive construction $a$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for its rendering of haršt by tqwp krky and P 's rendering of ybyn by $n b y n, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ is quite similar to P . The translations of A and B are identical to each other and render heršt by a transliteration, A $\rho \iota \sigma \omega$, as P also transliterates in rendering the same proper place name. For this reason A and B are judged more similar to P than is Tg J .

## 4:3. ויצעקו בני־ישראל אל־יהוגה כי תשע מאות רכב־ברזל לו והוא לחץ את־בני ישראל בחזקה עשרים

שנה:



## RETROVERSION

With the four pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 2, 3, 7, and 11, there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach and twelve following it.

This verse of P can also be divided into fifteen segments with bny 'ysryl treated as segment 2 , lmry as segment $3, m t \not t w l d$ as segment $4, t s^{\prime} m$ " as segments 5 and $6, m r k b t^{\prime}$ $d p r z l$ as segment 7 (together with the following $h w y$ ' $y t$ ), $l h$ as segment 8 , whw as segment 9 , mšbd $h w$ as segment 10 and lbny as segment 11 . The first three segments of this verse of P precede the first punctuation point, the next five plus the added ' $y t$ thwy precede the second punctuation point, and the final seven segments precede the third and final punctuation point. The segments of this verse of $P$ can be retroverted to the segments of MT that have been identified by the same numbers in both texts, with explanation of some elements of segments 7 and 10 in mode 4 . Thus the source of P is considered to be one that cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of the corresponding verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. As to this mode, this verse is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As already stated, the elements 'yt hwy of segment 7 and $h w$ of segment 10 are considered features of mode 4 and thus there are not additions or subtractions to be evaluated under this mode and it is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w^{s} z^{c} q w$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $s^{c} q$ here and the Qal of the same verb is rendered by $g^{\circ}$ at $10: 13$. The Niphal of $q^{\circ}$ at $7: 23,24$ and $12: 1$, and by 'sp at $10: 17$. The renderings of $z^{\text {c }} q$ are considered at 3:9. This rendering is rated 1 for consistency. bny 'ysryl. This rendering of bny yśr'l was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m t \not t w l$. This rendering of $k y$ in a causal sense was rated 3 at 1:19.
$m r k b t$. This plur. rendering of the sing. term $r k b$ where it is collective or plur. in meaning was rated 5 at 1:19.
przl. This renders $b r z l$ here, at $1: 19$ and 4:13, its only three occurrences in Judges. Thus it has not been rated.
$m s ̌ b d$. This renders $l h ̣ ̣$ and based on the analysis at $1: 34$ the rendering is rated 1.
$q t y r^{2}$. This renders hozq$\hat{a}$, found only in this verse and 8:1 in Judges, and therefore it is not rated.
šnyn. This renders šnh and the rendering was rated 5 at 3:11. The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The same examples of genitive construction $a$ occur at segment 2 and segments 11 to 12 , and an example of genitive construction $b$ occurs at segment 7. The phrase at segments 11 to 12 is also an example of direct object construction $e$.

At segment 10 the participle followed by $h w^{\nu}$ represents the Hebrew perf. This is an example of the "form expressing continuance or repetition in past time." Williams refers to two places in 1 Kgs where the Syriac participle plus $h w$ rendering the Hebrew perf. "seems to represent continuous action in the past." Williams refers to two places in 1 Kgs where the Syriac participle plus $h w$ renders the Hebrew perf. when it "seems to represent continuous action in the past." ${ }^{2}$ The addition of 'yt hwy here at segment 7 illustrates the tendency of Syriac not to render verbless clauses without a copula. It may also be influenced by the tendency to make clear when those predications are in past time by the addition of the enclitic form of $h w^{v}$ in a way that is similar to the same practice seen when it is used with the participle. ${ }^{3}$

The Syriac plur. $m r k b t$ again renders the Hebrew sing. form that is collective or plur. in meaning.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

In this verse Tg J translates MT word-for-word without the kinds of syntactical adjustments P has made at segments 7 and 10. In line with its usual practice Tg J has
${ }^{1}$ Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, 216, § 277.
${ }^{2}$ Williams, Syntax of Peshitta of $1 \mathrm{Kgs}, 111$.
${ }^{3}$ See Nöldeke, Syriac Grammar, 238, § 299 (past time); 243-44, § 305 (use with 'yt similar to use with participle); and $216, \S 277$ (use of $h w^{v}$ with participle).
rendered ' $l$ by $q d m$ where the object of the preposition is $y h w h$, as at 3:9. On the other hand A and B render $b r z l$ by an adjective, $\sigma \iota \delta \eta \rho \hat{\alpha}$, rather than by a genitive. These are quite small differences, but the difference in $A$ and $B$ is considered marginally greater than the choice of preposition by Tg J so that Tg J is considered slightly more similar to P than the other two versions.

4:4.
ודבורה אשה נביאה אשת לפיזדות היא שפטה את־ישראל בעת ההיא:
חה.

## RETROVERSION

With the marked direct object ${ }^{\prime} t-y s^{\prime} r^{\prime} l$ treated as segment 8 , there are ten segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and five following it. This verse of P can also be divided into ten segments with the first five preceding the first punctuation point. After the first punctuation point $h w y$ hwt is identified as segment 6 , l'ysryl as segment $8, b h w$ as segment 10 (although it occupies the ninth place in the sequence of the segments of this verse of P), ${ }^{4}$ and $z b n^{\prime}$ as segment 9 (but at last, or tenth, place in this verse of P ). At segment 4 of P the construct of 'ntt has dropped the silent nun. As the segments in this verse of P have been numbered here they can be retroverted to the segments of this verse of MT as they are also numbered. The proper name at segment 5 is treated as a particularity of P as are many other proper names. One notes that the dalat changes places with the taw and that the dalat in P then becomes a reš. The added element hwt at segment 6 is treated as a feature of Syriac translation technique to be noted as an aspect of mode 4. Therefore the

[^165]source of this verse of P is presumed to be a text that cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation in P of this verse of MT, and the first eight segments follow the MT sequence, but the ninth and tenth segments do not. This reduces the literal quality of the sequence to about $80 \%$. Because of that reduction, this mode is rated 4.5
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Apart from the elements that are features of mode 4, there are no additions or subtractions in this verse of P and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
' $n t t$ ' and ' $t t$. The first of these renders 'šh and the second, 'št. The rendering of the sing. of 'šh by one of these Syriac terms occurs fifty-two times in P as shown in the discussion at 1:12 where these renderings are rated 5 .
nbyt'. This renders nbyh, a hapax legomenon in Judges and thus not rated.
$d y n^{\prime}$. This fem. sing. Peal participle renders the feminine sing. Qal participle of špt. The rendering was rated 5 at $2: 16$. The renderings of other forms of the Qal were rated 5 at 3:10.
$z b n '$. This renders ' $t$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 3:29.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segments 4 and 5 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$ and at segment 8 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$.

The addition of the waw prefix at segment 6 is unusual because P does not seem to treat the first five segments as a verbless clause. Ordinarily a verbless clause in P includes some kind of copula and there is none here. If there were, then the waw prefix would be
expected because it would begin a non-sequential clause. Also unexpected at segment 6 is the added hwt which would not be unexpected following segment 7 . Williams points out that he and Joosten have only found the second person of forms of $h w$ preceding the participle. He does note at the same time that whw forms do precede the participle. ${ }^{5}$ In the next verse, at segment 2 , the normal order is found, and the Syro-Hexaplar preserves the normal order in this verse.

The comments about the position of the demonstrative before the substantive made in discussing that phenomenon at 3:29 also apply to the same phenomenon at segments 9 and 10 of this verse. The rendering of the proper name lpydwt by lpytwr is another instance of the transposition of letters in a proper name that is a recurring feature of this translation. It does not occur in the Syro-Hexaplar and that would give some indication that the phenomenon is not linked to its Syriac provenance in particular.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for its more accurate rendering of the proper name, its rendering of segments 6 and 7 by the pronoun and participle according to MT, and its adherence to the MT word order at segments 9 and $10, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ is quite similar to P . Both A and B preserve a proper name at segment 5 similar to the one in MT and their word order at segments 9 and 10 also follows that of MT. However, they both render špṭh by a finite verb (probably an imperf., but the form could also be aorist). To that extent they might be said to be marginally less similar to P than is Tg J . There is no difference between the two of them.

[^166]```
ו\mp@code{4:5. והיא יושבת תחת־תמר דבורה בין הרמה ובין בית־אל בהר אפרֵים ויעלו אליה בני ישראל למשפט}
```



```
    #
```


## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 3 and 8 there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and five following it. With $y t b^{\text {' }}$ $h w t$ considered segment 2 (albeit in third place in the sequence of elements in P), thyt dql considered segment 3 (fourth in the sequence of P ), $d b w r^{\circ}$ considered segment 4 (second in the sequence of P ), and byt ' $y l$ as segment 8 , there are also fifteen segments in P , four to the first punctuation point, six more to the second, and five more to the third and last punctuation point. With the syntactical questions that will be considered as part of mode 4 taken into account, the segments of P identified here can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments of this verse of MT with important exceptions. The second of the two elements in segment 3, $d q l^{\prime}$, cannot be retroverted to the first member of a genitive construction as in MT since it is not in a genitive construction in P , and segment 4 dbwr , is not the second member of a genitive construction either. Clearly $d b w r^{3}$ in P is not a genitive and $d q l^{\prime}$ is not the first member of a genitive construction. Although the changed sequence of the segments is more readily apparent the elimination of the genitive construction is more significant. Neither Tg J, A, B, nor the Vulgate makes this same change. The same change is found in the Syro-Hexaplar (suggesting influence from the Old Greek). At the same time it is interesting that both members are preserved in the translation and that Deborah is the subject of the verb in both constructions (implied in MT, expressed in P) and the palm tree is her location. Even if it
is not likely it seems possible that the translator of P did not want to suggest that Deborah the Prophetess was sitting under a tree identified with Deborah, the nurse of Rebecca. Whatever the cause for the unusual variation, it will not be made the basis for an emendation of the Vorlage of P here. The Vorlage will be taken to be one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. From the first punctuation point, segment 5 to the end of this verse of P , this is a word-for-word translation of segments 5 to 15 of the same verse of MT. Although on the face of it segment $4, d b w r^{\prime}$, is similar to segment 4 of MT, the change of sequence has given it a different identity. Not only does "Deborah" abandon the role of identifying the tree, but becomes the named subject of the verb and changes the role of $h y$ from that of an independent pronoun to one of a pronoun dependent on "Deborah." Only segment 2, the participle plus $h w t$, stands comparatively free from this scramble. Accordingly the segmentation of the verse of P is judged to be changed as to three out of fifteen segments and rated 3.5. The sequencing is judged to affect two of the fifteen segments, $d b w r^{\circ}$ and $d q l^{\prime}$, and rated 4. This mode is rated 4-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The fact that there are no additions or subtractions is an example of how P is able to preserve quantitative literalism even when translating freely or inaccurately. This mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$y t b^{3}$. As at $4: 2$ this renders the participle of $y s{ }^{\prime} b$ and renderings of $y s ̌ b$ by this Syriac verb were rated 5 at 1:9.
thyt. This render thet and that rendering was rated 3 at 1:7.
byt. This renders byn twice in this verse and at $4: 17(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 13: 25(2 \mathrm{x})$; and 16:31( 2 x$)$ : eight times in all. It is rendered by bynt at $5: 11,16$ and $27(1 \mathrm{x})$. It is rendered once by byny at $11: 27$. It is rendered by ' $l$ twice at $9: 23$. It is not rendered once at $5: 27$. (The second rendering at 4:17 may be a rendering of byt, "house," and a subtracting of byt as a rendering of byn. Here as at $4: 17$, the rendering at $4: 17$ is counted as a rendering of Hebrew byn, not byt.) Except for the renderings by ' $l$, these renderings are considered consistent. If so, thirteen of the fifteen renderings would be consistent, and that means that just under $87 \%$ are consistent and that the consistency is rated 4 . To show that this rating is open to a lower estimate, it will be rated $4-$. $t \not t r^{r}$. This renders $h r$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9.
slqw. This Peal renders the Qal of $l h$. The rendering was first evaluated at $1: 1$ and rated 5 there.
bny 'ysryl. This phrase rendering its Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 1:1.
$d y n^{\prime}$. This renders the substantive mšpṭ in this verse and at $13: 12$. At $18: 7$ the Hebrew is rendered by $n m w s^{\prime}$. With only three examples there is not an adequate basis for an evaluation of consistency.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4.5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The participle $y w s ̌ b t$ showing circumstance or repetitive action in the past is rendered in P by the participle plus $h w t$. As asserted in the discussion of this mode at 4:3, this is the way that the Hebrew participle is translated by P when the Hebrew context shows duration or repetition in the past. It also is another example of the way P often tries to make even clearer what is already clear from the context of the source being translated.

Rather than render $b h r$ at segment 9 and its associated genitive by a prepositional phrase that is part of the main clause like the lemma, P has added $d$ and turned it into a
dependent relative clause. In this same place segments 9 and 10 make up an instance of a genitive construction $b$. There is an instance of genitive construction $a$ at segments 13 to 14.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has numerous additions so that it must immediately be considered most unlike P. ${ }^{6}$ The Greek Versions are similar to each other, but A has added $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \varepsilon \imath ̂$ between the renderings of segments 14 to 15 and renders segment 15 by the infinitive phrase $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\kappa \rho i v \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha 1$. Although B adds definite articles before the names of the two cities, it does
 15 by the Ettaphal infinitive of $d w n$ and thus provides a reason to suspect that A has preserved the Old Greek rendering. The differences between A and B mean that B is the more similar to P of the two.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ותשלח ותקרא לברק בן־אבינעם מקדש נפתלֵי ותאמר אליו הלא צוה יהוה אלהי־ישראל לך ומשכת 4:6 } \\
& \text { בהר תבור ולקחת עמך עשרת אלפים איש מבני נפתלי ומבני זבלון: }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { חه حت, וحملم. }
\end{aligned}
$$

[^167]
## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segments 4 and 12, there are twenty-five segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and nineteen following it.

With qrt counted as segment 2, br $^{\prime} b y n^{\prime} m$ as segment 4 , mn rqm as segment 5 , ' $l h^{\prime} d^{\prime} y s r y l$ as segment 12 , mn bny as segment 22 , and wmn bny as segment 24 , there are also 25 segments in this verse of P .

Based on the reasons given in the discussion of mode 4 for the absence of the waw prefix at segment 2 , the segments of P to the first punctuation point can be retroverted to the segments of P up to the athnach, except for segment 5. As Smelik notes, Tg J agrees with P at some points (as at 11:16 and 17) in rendering segment 5 , $q d$ š, by rqm. At this point $\operatorname{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplar all agree on the rendering of $q d \check{s}$, and so the rendering by P is considered a feature of P 's translation technique. In the segments after the athnach, at segment $9, \mathrm{P}$ has no element representing the interrogative $h \bar{e}$, but this is a matter of a limitation of Syriac vocabulary to be discussed in more detail. At segment 10, the added pronominal suffix is supported by $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and the Vulgate, but not by Tg J . With this addition and the addition of the $d$ prefix at segment 13 , there is an addition to the verse that does not change its meaning, but states expressly what is already clear from the context, namely that the command was specifically for Barak. At segment 14 , the accuracy of the rendering of $m s ̌ k$ is debatable, and the failure to render it in the next verse suggests that the translator may have been uncertain of the meaning. The rendering is taken as the translator's effort to understand the word at segment 14 of MT. Segments 17 through 25 can be retroverted to the Hebrew of MT by taking account at segment 21 of the regular practice of P to render the Hebrew sing. by a plur. where the sense of the original is plur. or collective in meaning. Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse of P is considered indistinguishable from the MT verse based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The first six segments of $P$ representing the first six of a Hebrew verse like MT are divided like those of MT to the extent that can be expected consistent with Syriac syntax. The absence of the waw prefix at segment 2 is a feature of mode 4 . From segment 7 to segment 16 the segments are also divided as in the Hebrew if we note the absence of the $h$ interrogative at segment 9 as a result of a limitation of Syriac vocabulary and consider the $d$ prefix of segment 13 to be a recitative particle that makes clear what the reader otherwise knows (which is that a direct quotation follows). The added pronominal suffix at segment 10 also expresses only what is already apparent. (The possibility that the converted perfects at segments 13,14 , and 17 are dependent imperf., dependent on the prefix, at segment 13 is discussed under mode 2 below.) The segments from 17 to 25 are also divided by P as in the Hebrew with the plur. at segment 21 expressing the plur. sense of the Hebrew sing. Therefore the segmentation is rated 5 and since the segments of P are in the same order as those of MT the sequence of the segments is also rated 5. If segments 13,14 , and 17 are dependent imperfects, that would call for a reevaluation of the rating of the segmentation, so this mode is rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The subtraction of the prefix of segment 2 is considered a feature of mode 4 and not of this mode. The pronominal suffix of segment 10 and the added prefix of segment 13 are added elements of those segments. The added prefix is either a recitative particle (if the addition is reinforcing the literal syntax of the Hebrew) or the introduction of a dependent imperf. (if the syntax is being recast). In either case the syntax is not usual as the translation of a Hebrew imperative followed by a converted perf. For example at 11:6 lkh whyyth becomes in $\mathrm{P} t^{\prime} h w y$. Nöldeke says: " $[\mathrm{W}]$ ithout $\curvearrowright$ the $2^{\text {nd }}$ person of the Impf. is but seldom used with imperative force; the

Impt. is the proper mood for this. ${ }^{, 7}$ This may mean that segment 13 is a dependent imperf., and that P is translating freely as: "Did not the Lord God of Israel command thee to go and encamp, etc.?" This would not be a change of meaning (accepting $y t b$ as inaccurate but not contradicting the sense of the Hebrew). In fact it would help explain the presence of the suffix at segment 10 . Whichever interpretation of the translation is adopted, the suffix and prefix discussed here are additions, and each is counted as one-half of one segment of the twenty-five segments. At segment 9 , the failure to render the $h$ prefix is considered a subtraction and will also be counted as one-half of one of twentyfive segments. This would be only $6 \%$ of the verse and lead to a rating of 5 - for this mode.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

wšdrt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of šlh. The consistency of the rendering was considered at 1:8 and rated 3 .
$q r t$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $q r^{\prime}$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:17. $b r$. This rendering of $b n$ was rated 5 at 1:13. $p d q[k]$. Without the suffix this Peal renders the Piel of $s ̣ w h$. The rendering was rated 5 at 2:20.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
' $/ h h^{\prime}$. This renders the construct of ' $l h y m$ and the rendering of that Hebrew in relation to the one God was rated 5 at 1:7.
$t^{\prime} z l$. This Peal imperf. renders the imperative of $h l k$. The rendering of forms of $h l k$ by forms of 'zl was rated 5- at 1:3.
$w t t b$. This renders wmškt in this verse. In the next verse, segment 1 of MT has the $1^{\text {st }}$ person sing. of the same verb, but the first element or segment of $P$ has the $3^{\text {rd }}$ plur. perf.

[^168]Peal of ' $t$. At 5:14 the rendering is quite free and the position of this Hebrew verb is taken by a form of Syriac $k t b$. At 20:37 the Hebrew verb is rendered by Syriac hlk. Thus there is no basis for finding consistency. Because it is questionable whether there are actually renderings in the next verse and at $5: 14$. this rendering will not be rated. The rendering here does impair the literal quality of the verse.
$t \not t r r^{\circ}$. As in the previous verse this rendering of $h r$ is rated 5 based on the analysis at 1:9. $w t d b r$. This renders the Qal converted perf. of lqh. The rendering by $n s b$ of this Hebrew verb was rated 4 at $3: 6$, but cases where this "taking" in the Hebrew involved people other than a wife, as opposed to "things," were set aside for the purpose of that analysis. In the six places considered at 3:6 involving the taking of persons, the rendering was by this Syriac, and therefore this rendering will be rated 5.
' $m k$. This renders Hebrew ' $m k$ and the rendering by this Syriac of its Hebrew cognate was rated 4 at 1:22.
gbryn. This renders 'yš in a context where it has a collective or plur. meaning and that rendering was rated 4 at 1:4.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4.5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The pair of verbs at segments 1 and 2 is syndetic in MT but rendered as asyndetic by P . All the versions consulted here, Tg J, A, B, the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplar, have rendered the members of the pair as syndetic. In Williams' discussion of asyndeton of the verb he observes that there are only seven different verbs that occur in first position in these asyndetic pairs, and one of those is $\check{s} d r$, which, he says, occurs three times in $1 \mathrm{Kgs} . \mathrm{He}$ does not cite the verses, but two of them are at 1 Kgs 12:3 and 20 and the second verb in those two pairs is $q r^{2} .{ }^{8}$ In 2 Kgs , there are at least two asyndetic pairs of verbs where the

[^169]first verb is $\check{s} d r$ at 6:13 and 23:16. In those places the verb in second position is lqḥ. All of these renderings by $\check{s} d r$ are Syriac perf. translating the Hebrew narrative tense. At Judg 16:18, the same two verbs used in this verse and in $1 \mathrm{Kgs} \mathrm{12:3}$ and 20 are asyndetic in P and syndetic in the Hebrew. Dirksen notes no textual variations that are syndetic. Thus there is good reason to conclude that this asyndeton is a feature of the translation technique in P .

As noted in the discussion of retroversion both P and Tg J sometimes render $q d \check{s}$ by rqm. Three more times in this chapter, at verses 9,10 , and $11, \mathrm{P}$ renders by rqm. There is no basis in this text to connect it with rqm at Josh 18:29 which is allotted to Benjamin and not Naphtali to which it appertains here.

At segment 9 , the failure to render the $h$ prefix is considered a subtraction. The rendering (or not) of that element is discussed in greater detail in connection with mode 4 of $4: 14$.

The translation segments 13,14 , and 17 were also considered in the discussion of retroversion and mode 2 . There the prefix of segment 13 was treated as recitative, but the possibility that the three imperf. verbs were dependent on that segment was acknowledged. If that was the translator's intention, then that is also a matter that may affect mode 1 , and is certainly rendering by a syntax on a different level from the Vorlage. In effect, direct discourse is turned into indirect discourse, and the discourse is now part of an object clause.

At segment 4, segments 22 to 23 , and segments 24 to 25 there are three examples of genitive. construction $a$. At segments 5 to 6 , segment 12 , and segments 15 to 16 there are three instances of genitive. construction $b$. At segments 19 to 21 there is an instance of direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5-.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J does not differ from MT as P does in the ways that are pointed out in the foregoing discussion of this verse. It is also closer to MT in its choice of $n g d$ to render segment 14 and in its rendering of segment 21 by a sing. form. On the other hand, it adds byt between segments 5 and 6 . All three versions treat segments 1 and 2 as syndetic. Both A and B add "Deborah" after segment 1, and for segments 13 and 14 have only к $\alpha i$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v ́ \sigma \eta$, taken here as a failure to render segment 14 . After segment $12, \mathrm{~B}$ adds $\sigma o i ̀$ which is taken here as the equivalent of the pronominal suffix at segment 10 of P . Both A and $B$ render segment 21 as plur. The addition after segment 1 and the subtraction of segment 14 are judged to make A and B less similar to P than Tg J . The addition of oot by B is judged to make it slightly closer to P than A is.

4:7. ומשכתי אליך אל־נחל קישון את־סיסרא שר־צבא יבין ואת־רכבו ואת־המונֵו ונתתיהו בידך:

## RETROVERSION

With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments $3,5,6,8$, and 9 , there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and two following it. With $\ln h l^{\prime}$ considered segment 3 , $l$ sysr ${ }^{\prime}$ as segment $5, r b$ hyl' as segment 6 , wl mrkbth as segment 8 , and $w^{c} l h y l^{\prime}$ as segment 9 , there are also eleven segments in this verse of P , seven to the first punctuation point, segments 8 and 9 to the second punctuation point, and two more segments to the end of the verse.

Notwithstanding the quantitative literalism of this verse that might invite a high rating under mode 1 , segments 1,2 , the ' $l$ of segments 5,8 , and 9 of this verse of P cannot be meaningfully retroverted to the corresponding segments of this verse of MT. Segment 7 raises the same kind of problem for retroversion seen in other places where something like yod-nun or dalat-resh confusion seems to be taking place, but such problems can be resolved for purposes of retroversion by treating them as matters covered by mode 4. As the verse of P stands, the subject of the verb at segment 1 must be the 10,000 men from the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulon, and the information communicated by the verse is closer to a description of the events of 4:10 than a quotation of what God is saying he is going to do after Barak agrees to obey his, God's, command and reaches Mount Tabor.

Segment 1 would have to be a $1^{\text {st }}$ person sing. Aphel of 't' and the preposition at segments $2,5,8$, and 9 would have to be rendered so as to be consistent with the preposition in segment 2 of MT and the direct object markers of segments 5, 8, and 9 . Except for segments 3,10 , and 11 of P , the rest of the verse has a different meaning in P from the one that it has in MT. If the translator was dealing with a damaged Hebrew text, this could be the result of the effort to deal with that damage, but no such scenario is advanced here.

Based on Tg J, A, B, the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplar, the evidence for a $1^{\text {st }}$ person sing. subject of segment 1 is very strong. Based on the first four versions the support for treating Sisera, his chariots and army as direct objects of that verb is also strong. Thus it is likely that a text like that of MT would have been available to the translator, and that either a damaged Hebrew text or some later difficulty in the transmission of the text of P resulted in this mistranslation. Dirksen cites no MS that would support a text closer to MT. The quantitative literalism, the sequence of the segments, and the superficial similarity of the content of the segments that are treated here
as not literal are evidence of the possibility that whoever produced the verse as we have it had a text that was very much but not necessarily exactly like MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. A verse like this that has so many superficial similarities to MT is difficult to evaluate. If only three of the segments are treated as literal, the segmentation would be rated 1 . To account for the peculiar nature of these differences, that will be made $1+$. The order of the segments also presents problems for evaluation because of the similarities between the segments as they should have been rendered and the segments as they have been rendered. The segments as they are numbered in both verses follow the same sequence. The rating for the verse as a whole will not include any factor for sequence.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Since the segmentation has been treated as not literal and the rendering of the verse preserves the same number of segments, which segments can be identified with the segments of MT (however misleading they may be as a rendering of the verse), the segments that cannot be treated as rendering the segments they represent will be considered subtractions only for the purpose of assigning a rating to this mode in this verse. Segments 1,2 , and one-half of segments 5,8 , and 9 will be so calculated for a total of three and one-half of eleven segments. This would make this verse about $68 \%$ literal for a rating of 3 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w^{2} t w n$. This is rated 1 as a rendering of wmškty. See the discussion of the rendering of the Hebrew verb in the previous verse.
$n h l l^{\prime}$. This renders $n h ̣ l$ and the rendering is rated 5 at 4:13.
$r b$. This rendering of $s$ s was rated 4 at 4:2.
$h y l^{\prime}$. This rendering of $s b^{\prime}$ was rated 5 at 4:2. The other occurrence of this Syriac term renders hmwnw and that is a hapax legomenon in Judges.
w'šlmywhy. This renders wnttyhw, and the rendering of ntn by 'šlm was rated 5 at 1:2.
' $y d$ '. The rendering by this Syriac of its Hebrew cognate was also rated 5 at 1:2.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information.

See the evaluation of the retroversion and segmentation of this verse above. At segment 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$, and at segments 3 to 4 and 6 to 7 there are two instances of genitive construction $b$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. The rating of the segmentation of mode 1 , and of modes 2 and 3 is 2 .

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

No comparison with these versions is made for this verse. See the comments on retroversion.

4:8.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ויאמר אליה ברק אם־תלכי עמי והלָכתי ואם־לא תלכי עמי לא אלך: } \\
& \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments 4 and 7, there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and five following it. With ' $n$ ' $z l$ ' 'nty counted as segment $4,{ }^{\prime} z l n$ ' as segment $6, w n l$ ' as segment $7,{ }^{\prime} z l{ }^{\prime}$ 'nty as segment 8 , and ' $z l^{\prime} n$ ' as segment 11 , there are also eleven segments is this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, and five to the third and last such point. All
of the segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT. Although the verb forms in segments $4,6,8$, and 11 of MT are imperf., converted perf., imperf., and imperf., all four are participles in P, but they can be retroverted to the forms in MT as explained in discussing mode 4. Accordingly, no Hebrew source for P distinguishable from MT is considered here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of a verse like that of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they follow in MT. This mode is rate 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions, and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
${ }^{\prime} z l^{\prime},{ }^{\prime} z l n{ }^{\prime},{ }^{\prime} z l{ }^{\prime}$, and ${ }^{\prime} z l$. These are all Peal participles of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ rendering three imperf. forms and one converted perf. of $h l k$. The first and third participles are identical feminine forms, and the second and fourth are identical masculine forms, except that the pronoun is enclitic on the second. The rendering of $h l k$ by ${ }^{\prime} z l$ was rated $5-$ at 1:3.
'my. This renders its Hebrew cognate preposition twice in this verse with the same pronominal suffix. The rendering was rated 4 at 1:22.

The rating for this mode in this verse is $4: 5$.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Williams notes that "Syriac qātel may also render the Hebrew form yiqtōl (in past, present, or future . . .) with or without a pronoun following the participle. ${ }^{n}$ He also observes that only the $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ person pronouns occur in the examples he studied in 1 Kings. ${ }^{10}$

[^170]As is usual in the case of the waw at the beginning of an apodosis of a conditional sentence the waw prefix of segment 6 of MT is omitted by P. Of interest perhaps, though not a question of translation technique, is that there is no waw at the beginning of the apodosis at segment 10 of MT. At the beginning of that conditional sentence at segment 7, there is a waw and the conditional sentence is negative.

Less expected in Syriac is the omission of a waw prefix at segment 1. This is not the beginning of an apodosis and is not closely connected to an immediately preceding imperative like the case of segments 1 and 2 of $4: 6$ above where P omits the waw prefix. A possible but by no means a definitive explanation is that this is seen as a closely connected sequence of response to segment 7 of 4:6: "She said to him." Now, "he said to her." Then in the next verse, 4:9, at segment 1 where the waw is also omitted by P: "She said." The addition by P of $l h$ there at $4: 9$ might be explained as a means of calling attention to this sequence. In 4:19 and 4:20 at segments 1 and 2 of both verses where Sisera is speaking to Jael, the waw prefix is preserved by P at 4:20. Perhaps this results from the fact that there are two successive statements by Sisera and not a back and forth exchange between the two of them.

See below the discussion of one omission of the waw at segment 1 of $4: 9$ where the omission can be explained in relation to findings of Williams.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J preserves the finite verbs and waw prefix of segment 6, but is otherwise as close to P as one can expect. Both A and B represent the eleven segments in MT identically to each other, using finite forms of $\pi$ о $\rho \varepsilon$ v́o $\mu \alpha 1$ four times and omitting any element that
would represent the prefix of segment 6 . So far as these portions of the verse are concerned they are identically closer to P than Tg J is, but then they both add the same thirteen words. For this reason, Tg J must be considered closer to P than are the other two versions.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 4:9. ותאמר הלך אלך עמך אפס כי לא תהיה תפארתך על־הדרך אשר אתה הולך כי ביד־אשה ימכר יהוה } \\
& \text { את־סיסרא ותקם דבורה ותלך עם־ברק קדשה: } \\
& \text { لا } \\
& \text { т. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the four pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments $10,15,18$, and 22, there are twenty-three segments in this verse of MT, eighteen to the athnach and five following it. If the second element in this verse of $\mathrm{P}, l h$, is counted as an addition along with $b r q$ between the second and third punctuation points, there are also twentythree segments in this verse of P , counting ' $z l^{\prime}$ ' $n$ ' as segment $3, b r m$ as segments 5 and 6 , $t s ̌ t b h r$ as segments 8 and $9,{ }^{\prime} l{ }^{\prime} w r h^{\prime}$ as segment 10 , the $d$ prefix of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ as segment $11,{ }^{\prime} z l$ as segment 13 with 'nt as segment $12, m t t l d$ as segment $14, b^{\prime} y d^{\prime} d^{\prime} n t t$ ' as segment 15 , ${ }^{-s y s r^{\prime}}$ as segment 18, 'mbrq as segment 22, and lrqm as segment 23. Except for segment 23 all of the numbered segments can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments of MT. The rendering of $q d s ̌$ by rqm illustrates a practice or convention in P which has been noted before in general (and specifically as to this rendering at 4:6), and which is not treated in this discussion as a reason to suspect a source different from MT as to this rendering. The Syriac treated as segments 5 and 6 and segments 8 and 9 renders the same
sense as a Hebrew Vorlage like MT. According to the JPS entry for brm that term with ${ }^{\prime} l^{\prime}, l$, or $l w$ is rendered in English as "but, but yet, however, nevertheless." ${ }^{11}$ This can be interpreted as meaning that $P$ has rendered the two segments 5 and 6 of MT by one segment so that together with the following $l^{\prime}$ they render the three segments literally. However it is arguable that segments 8 and 9 could have been rendered periphrastically and thus that the rendering by a single segment is a limited venture into free translation territory. Although this conclusion casts no doubt on the conclusion about the Vorlage, it must be considered in evaluating mode 1 . The absence of a waw prefix at segment 1 and the reversal of the order of segments 12 and 13 are judged to be applications of Syriac syntax to be considered under mode 4. The additions of $l h$ and $b r q$ are judged to be the translator's effort to add clarity to what may already be clear enough. Accordingly, no Vorlage different from MT will be posited in the following discussion of the verse.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Except at segment 8 to 9 where tštbhr renders thyh tp'rtk (setting aside any mode 2 factors) this is a word for word translation by P of a Hebrew verse like that of MT. Although that pair of elements accurately renders their meaning, they render it less literally than would have been possible and thus impair the extent to which the segmentation is literal by a fraction over $8 \%$. The reversal of the sequence of segments 12 and 13 is considered to impair the literal quality of the sequence by over $8 \%$. Thus the literal quality of this mode is reduced by over $8 \%$ and the mode is rated $5-$.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The elements $l h$ and $b r q$ have already been pointed out as additions and reduce the literalism as to the quantity of segments by a fraction over $8 \%$. This mode is rated 5 -.

[^171]3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$m^{\prime} z l,{ }^{\prime} z l^{\prime},{ }^{\prime} z l$, and ${ }^{\prime} z l t$. As in the previous verse and at $1: 3$, these renderings are rated 5 . ${ }^{\prime} m k$ and ' $m$. This rendering of the cognate Hebrew preposition was rated 4 in the analysis at $1: 22$.
brm. This renders 'ps, a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated.
tštbhr. The Eshtaphal of bhr renders thyh tpr ${ }^{2}$ rtk here. Since it is a semantically accurate but slightly free rendering of the Hebrew it would be difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, since the underlying Hebrew noun is a hapax legomenon is Judges, it cannot be rated. 'wrh'. This renders $d r k$, and the the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 2:17. $m t l d$. This rendering of $k y$ in a causal sense was rated 3 at $1: 19$.
${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This rendering of $y d$ was rated 5 at 1:2.
'ntt'. This rendering of 'šh was rated 5 at 1:12.
nšlmywhy. This renders the Qal imperf. of $m k r$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:14. $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
wqmt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of qwm. The rendering was rated 5 at 2:10.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Something has already been said about how the semantic information of segments 5 to 6 and 8 to 9 has been communicated without change in meaning. The omission of the waw prefix at segment 1 can be explained in a way similar to the explanation of the omission of the waw prefix at segment 1 of $4: 8$. Williams has found that "[s]ometimes Syriac participle / lamadh + suffix may be used to translate wayyōmer forms," and that in some but not all places in MT "they are followed by suffixed $\rfloor$ or $\boldsymbol{J}^{\text {r. . . ." He says that "[a] fundamental rule with }}$ these forms is that they are sequential and not conversation initial." He adds: "Even if no
verb of speaking occurs before them there is something to which a response is being given. ${ }^{12}$ Segment 1 seems to be such a response.

At segment 3 the participle of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ renders the imperf. of $h l k$, a feature of Syriac syntax discussed as part of mode 4 of the previous verse. At segment 15 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$ and at segments 16 to 18 an instance of direct object construction $f$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5-.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J renders all of the elements of MT, makes no additions (as P does) or subtractions, and does not reverse the order of segments 12 and 13 . Thus it is quite similar to P except at those points where P varies from MT. Both A and B add $\gamma \mathbf{i v} \omega \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ before their representations of segment 6 (as the Syro-Hexaplar adds the equivalent Syriac). In $\mathrm{A} \varepsilon i \varsigma \mathrm{~K} \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$ renders segment 23 , and in $\mathrm{B}, \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \mathrm{K} \alpha \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$. Thus Tg J is closer to P than the Greek Versions and A is more like P than is B . The Syro-Hexaplar has $m n$ at segment 26, and that raises the possibility that B is closer to the Old Greek Version at that point.

4:10. ויזעק ברק את־זבולן ואת־נפתלי קדשה ויעל ברגליו עשרת אלפי אֵיש ותעל עמו דבורה:


[^172]
## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments 3 and 4, there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and three following it. With lzbwlwn counted as segment 3 , and wlnptly counted as segment 4 , and ${ }^{\prime} p$ considered an addition, there are also thirteen segments in this verse of P , five to the first punctuation point, five more to the second, two more before the addition, and a thirteenth and final segment after the addition and before the last punctuation point. Of the first five segments of $\mathrm{P}, 2,3$, and 4 can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of MT without more explanation. Segment 1 is rendered by the same Syriac verb at $4: 13$ and the same Aramaic verb renders segment 1 at $4: 10$ and $4: 13$ of $T g J$ as well. Segment 5 is rendered by the same name that renders $q d \check{s}$ at $4: 6$ and 4:9. The plur. forms at segments 6 and 10 can also be understood based on many previous instances where 'yš in a plur. or collective sense is rendered as plur. by P . When the renderings of $r g l$ were analyzed at $1: 6$, this rendering by ' $m$ showed up and can be understood as rendering the sense of the Hebrew even if it is more prosaically literal in representing the meaning than it is literal in representing the lemma. Neither Tg J, A, B, the Vulgate, nor the Syro-Hexaplar provide any support for the addition of ' $p$. It clarifies what is already obvious. Accordingly, the Vorlage of P will be considered to be indistinguishable from the text of MT based on the evidence and the foregoing explanation.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Except for the addition of ' $p$ this is a word-for-word rendering of the segments of a verse like this verse of MT, with the particular approaches to translation already noted. The segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in the MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is only the one addition of ' $p$ already mentioned and that is counted as a little less than an $8 \%$ reduction in the literality of this verse. Therefore the verse is rated 5 - in this mode.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

wknš. This renders the Hiphil of $z^{c} q$ here and at $4: 13$. Renderings of the Qal were evaluated at $3: 9$ and rated 1 . The Niphal is rendered by $q r^{\nu}$ at $6: 34$ and $q^{\circ}$ at 6:35. The Niphal is rendered by the Gt of knš at 6:34 and 6:35 of Tg J. Either the Ethpeel or Ethpaal of knš in Syriac would render the same sense. At 4:3 the same kind of inconsistency was found as to $s^{\prime} q$. Given the inconsistency and the possibility of greater consistency, this rendering will be rated 1 .
wslqw. This Peal form renders the Qal of ' $/ h$ twice in this verse. The rendering was considered at $1: 1$ and rated 5 there.
'mh. This renders brglyw. This rendering also shows up at 8:5. At 3:24 the euphemism "covering his feet" was rendered by lprwtdq" npq. These are not consistent renderings by ' $m$, but they will be treated as a special class that calls for treatment under mode 4 , but not mode 3. The rendering of $r g l$ by its Syriac cognate was rated 3 at $1: 6$. See the discussion of the rendering by ' $m$ of its Hebrew cognate at $1: 22$.
gbryn. This rendering of ' $y s{ }_{s}$ with a plur. sense in the context was rated 4 at 1:4.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of $q d \check{s}$ by rqm was first seen at 4:6 and is found only in this chapter of Judges. The rendering of brglyw by 'mh is an instance of the phenomenon Barr describes: "literal translation preserves the metaphor, free translation renders the further significance of the metaphor but destroys the actual significance of the metaphor itself." ${ }^{13}$ What is interesting about

[^173]examples like this is that such metaphors are so obvious that they probably communicate the further significance quite easily in the language that is the target of the translation. In this verse of course, both the metaphor at segment 7 of MT and the further significance at segment 12 are found in the source, but rendered both times by the term of further significance. To some extent the rendering of segment 1 might also be seen as the further significance of having the tribes called to Kedesh, but the call and the gathering are much closer in meaning and the call is not a metaphor for a gathering.

At segments 3 and 4 of P there are two instances of direct object construction $e$. Once again the plur. gbryn renders 'yš as a collective noun.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J adds šy $y t \underset{~ b e f o r e ~ s e g m e n t s ~}{ } 3$ and 4 and renders ' $y s ̌$ by the sing. of $g b r r^{\prime}$, but renders brglyw as P does. Codex A renders segment 1 by $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i \lambda \varepsilon \nu$ and segment 5 by $\varepsilon i \varsigma ~ K \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$ and B renders segment 1 by $\dot{\varepsilon} \beta o ́ \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ and segment 5 by $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa K \alpha \delta \eta \varsigma$. Both preserve the metaphor of segment 7 and render segment 10 by a plur., and A moves segment 13 to a place between the rendering of the prefixed waw and the principal element of segment 11. This might be calculated as three points of difference between P and Tg J (the two additions and the sing. of segment 10), two between A and P (the rendering of segment 7 and the changed sequence of segment 13) and two between B and $P$ (segment 7 and the $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa$ at segment 5). Notwithstanding how close all the versions are to each other, the Greek Versions are judged here to be closer to P than Tg J . As for A and $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{A}$ is considered more similar to P because the changed sequence is not considered as great a difference as is the $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa$ of $B$.

4:11. וחבר הקיני נפרד מקין מבני חבב חתן משׁה ויט אהלו עד־אלון בצענים אשר את־קדש:


## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 11 and 14 there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and six following it. With 'dm' lbttmt' counted as segment 11 and 'l gnb rqm counted as segment 14 , and with mn qyn and mn bny counted as segments 5 and 6, there are also fourteen segments in P , four to the first punctuation point, four more to the second point, and six to the third and last such point. One might, as Smelik does, ${ }^{14}$ treat $g n b$ as an addition, but ' $l g n b$ can still be retroverted to ' $t$. The rendering of segment 3 by $n p q$ might be questioned in light of the use by Tg J and the Syro-Hexaplar of $p r \check{s}$, but Smelik does not question that rendering. On the other hand he does question as an unnecessary etymological difference the rendering of segment 9 , $n t ̣ h$, by $n q \check{s} .{ }^{15}$ This issue is considered in more detail in discussing mode 3, but it seems clear that the Syriac can retrovert to segment 9 of MT. One might see segment 12 as rendering the ketib. Based on these conclusions and further discussion as part of mode 4, the Vorlage of this verse of P is considered to be one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of a Hebrew verse like that of MT (with material

[^174]at segment 14 that must be evaluated under mode 2 ), and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The presence of $g n b$ at segment 14 can be taken as an addition. Based on the discussion of its use in mode 4 it may be seen as a small piece of evidence showing P's tendency to clarify, even when clarification is unnecessary. Even considered as an addition it would not reduce the rating of the verse below $96 \%$. This calls for rating it by a qualified 5-.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$n p q$. With the preposition $m n$ this renders the Niphal participle of $p r d$, a hapax legomenon in Judges. Therefore the rendering is not rated.
$h m w h y$. With a pronominal suffix this renders Hebrew htn and the rendering was rated 5 at $1: 16$.
wnqš. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $n t ̣ h$ here. At 9:3 the Qal of $n t ̣ h$ is rendered by the Ethpeel of $s b^{\prime}$, at 16:30 by the Peal of $n g d$, and at $19: 8$ by the Peal of $s l^{\prime}$. The Syriac term $n q s ̌$ as meaning "pitch" in the phrase "pitch a tent" seems to have its origin in the driving of the tent peg into the ground whereas the Hebrew nṭh means "pitch" in that same context based on the stretching or extending of the cloth of the tent itself. Thus the sense of $n t t h$ in this verse does not match the sense in the other three verses. More consistency might be expected with respect to rendering the other occurrences of $n t ̣ h$, but the occurrence in this verse is not unusual in relation to other renderings of $n t ̣ h$ by $n q \check{s}$ elsewhere in P where the context is one where a tent is being set up. Four examples from Genesis (12:8; $26: 25 ; 33: 19$; and $35: 21$ ) and two from 2 Samuel ( $6: 17$ and 22) are among those that make clear this rendering is not unusual. Accordingly, this rendering will not be rated in this verse.
$m s ̌ k n h$. This Syriac term (here with a pronoun suffix) renders ' $h l$ in this verse, in $4: 17,18$, 20,$21 ; 5: 24 ; 6: 5 ; 7: 8,13(2 x) ; 8: 11 ; 19: 9$ and $20: 8$. The rendering is rated 5.
$b t \not t t^{\prime}$. This renders 'lwn in this verse and that Hebrew is rendered by blwt' at 9:6 and 9:37, the same Syriac by which the Hebrew is rendered in the Syro-Hexaplar of this verse. These are not consistent, but there are not enough of them to be rated.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Although $l$ by itself could mean "near" just as 'l without ṣbwt' can have a causal sense whether or not followed by $s$ sbwt', in both the construction in this verse and the construction in the case of the causal sense the addition makes it easier to be certain about the exact sense of the preposition at that point in the narrative. Thus the place of $g n b$ in this verse is to make clear the particular sense of $l$ rather than adding new meaning or merely repeating some sense that is tautological. For this reason it is reckoned here as a mode 4 feature and thus not as unequivocally a mode 2 feature.

At segments 5 to 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$. At segments 7 to 8 there is an instance of genitive construction $c$. At segments 9 to 10 there is an instance of direct object construction $d$. At segment 12 the prepositional phrase that modifies ${ }^{\prime} / w n^{16}$ asyndetically in the Hebrew modifies it in P by a terse verbless dependent clause, a method of rendering that has been seen regularly in the verses of P already studied.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

[^175]In contrast with $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ has rendered qyny and qyn, segments 2 and 4, by šlm'h, 'lwn of segment 11 by myšr, segment 12 by 'gny', and segment 14 consistently with MT. Although A has rendered segment 1 by к $\alpha i$ oi $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o v, B$ has rendered that segment by $\mathrm{X} \alpha \beta \varepsilon \rho$. Both have rendered segment 6 by $\mathrm{I} \omega \beta \alpha \beta$. Then A has rendered segment 12 by
 segment 14 consistently with MT. The other segments of all three are considered consistent with MT and P. This is calculated as three differences from P by B , four by A , and five by Tg J . Thus B is closest to P and all three agree with each other (and not with P) only at segment 14 .

4:12. ויגדו לסיסרֵא כי עלה ברק בן־אבינעם הר־תבור: חسهח لم.

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 6 and 7 there are seven segments in this verse of MT, two to the athnach and five following it. With the $d$ prefix of slq counted as segment 3 , slq counted as segment 4, br d'byn'm counted as segment 6, and ltwr dtbwr counted as segment 7 there are also seven segments in this verse of P. All seven segments of P can be retroverted to the corresponding segments of this verse of MT. The prepositional prefix of segment 7 of $P$ renders the adverbial accusative sense of segment 7 of MT. Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse is considered one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of a Vorlage like this verse of MT and the segments are in the same order in P as they are in the Hebrew verse. This mode is rated 5. 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions. The added prefix at segment 7 is a mode 4 feature that adapts this Hebrew to Syriac syntax. This mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

whwyw. This Pael renders the Hiphil narrative of $n g d$ in this verse and various forms of the Hiphil eleven more times at $9: 7,42 ; 13: 6,10 ; 14: 2,69 ; 16: 6,10,13$, and 15 . The Pael renders the Hophal once at 9:25 and the Ethpaal renders the Hiphil at 9:47. The Hiphil of $n g d$ is rendered by forms of $p s ̌ r$ at $14: 12,13,14$, and 19. It is rendered by ' $m r$ four times at $14: 16(3 \mathrm{x})$ and $17(1 \mathrm{x})$. It is rendered by $g l^{p}$ four times at $14: 17(1 \mathrm{x}) ; 16: 17$ and $18(2 \mathrm{x})$. It is not rendered once. This makes fourteen renderings by the root $h w$, four by $p s ̌ r$, four by ' $m r$ and four by $g l$ ', and one occurrence not rendered. With just under $54 \%$ rendered as in this verse, the rendering is rated 2.
$s l q$. This renders $t h$ here and the rendering was rated 5 at $1: 1$.
$b r$. This renders $b n$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:13.
$t \not t r r^{\text {. This renders }} h r$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As already mentioned, at segment 7 P renders the adverbial accusative of the Hebrew by a prepositional phrase, or, one might argue, by a direct object construction $e$. At segment 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$ and at segment 7 an instance of genitive construction $b$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Except for its rendering of segment 7 by what would be considered a genitive construction $a$ in $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ is identical to P . Segment 1 of B is rendered as a $3^{\text {rd }}$ person sing. while A holds to the plur., but A has used the preposition $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi l$ with the accusative at segment 7 and $B$ uses $\varepsilon i \varsigma$ with the accusative. The sing. at segment 1 is not a literal rendering, but it conveys the sense of the plur. pseudo-passive. At segment 7 the preposition used by $B$ is considered closer to P than the rendering by A . The difference in the sing. at segment 1 of B seems more clearly a difference. This would make A closer to P than B , but Tg J is judged closest to P in this verse.

4:13. ויזעק סיסרא את־כל־רכבו תשע מאית רכב ברזל ואת־כל־העם אשר אתֵו מחרשת הגוים אל־נחל
קישון:



## RETROVERSION

With the two sets of three elements joined by two maqqēphs counted as segments 3 and 8 , and the pair of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segment 13 , there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and four following it. If klhyn mrkbth is counted as segment 3 , $t s^{c}$ as segment 4 as it is joined with the $m$ to be counted as segment $5, w k l h$ ' $m$ ' as segment 8 , the $d$ prefix of ' $m h$ as segment 9 , ' $m h$ itself as segment $10, m n$ $h r s ̌ t$ as segment 11 , and $[w]$ ' $d m$ ' lnhl' as segment 13 , there are also fourteen segments in $P$, three to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, segments 8 to 12 between the second and third punctuation points, and the final two segments to the last punctuation
point. All the segments of P can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments of this verse of MT except for the waw prefix of segment 13 (omitted in ms 8a1 according to Dirksen). Neither Tg J, A, B, the Vulgate, nor the Syro-Hexaplar adds the conjunction. This may be a feature of Syriac syntax or it may be a scribal addition, and the question will be considered in discussing mode 4. Accordingly, the Vorlage of this verse of P is reckoned as indistinguishable from MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation of a Hebrew Vorlage like this verse of MT and the segments of P are in the same sequence as are those of MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions. The added waw at segment 13 is considered a feature of mode 4. This mode is rated 5. If the waw is a subtraction, the rating would be 5-.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w k n s ̌$. This renders the Hiphil narrative tense of $z^{c} q$. The rendering was rated 1 at 4:10. mrkbth. This plur. renders $r k b$ twice in this verse, but without the pronominal suffix the second time. The rendering was rated 5 at 1:19.
$p r z l^{\prime}$. This renders $b r z l$ which occurs in Judges only here, at 4:3 and 1:19 where the rendering was not rated.
' $m$ '. This renders $h^{\prime} m$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:16.
${ }^{\prime} m h$. This renders Hebrew ${ }^{' t}$ and the rendering was rated $3+$ at 1:3.
' mm '. This renders the plur. of $g w y$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:20.
$n h \not l$. This renders its Hebrew cognate at 4:7 (where it was not analyzed), at 5:21, and at 16:4. It is not rated.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Williams discusses cases of $k l$ with a suffix and notes that the suffixed pronoun matches the noun with which $k l$ is combined in gender and number. He says: "The most outstanding feature of all the examples is that they are probably all definite. ${ }^{י 17}$ Here of course the plur. noun in $P$ is feminine and renders a Hebrew sing. collective noun. Williams also observes of the combination $\mathrm{kl}^{\text {' }}{ }^{\prime}$ ' (found in this verse) that in 1 Kgs there are thirteen "examples of suffixed $k l$ with ' $m$ ' and none without" the suffix, and opines that this "shows that distribution is not random. ${ }^{י 18}$

As for the waw prefix added to the first element of segment 13, Williams has found
 would weigh in favor of the conjunction as a feature of Syriac syntax and not as the result of scribal correction. That might also suggest that ms 8 al was correcting to a Hebrew text like MT or to another version.

At segments 6 to 7,11 to 12 , and 13 to 14 , there are three instances of genitive construction $b$. Segment 1 has 2 direct object constructions at segment 3 and 8 , and both are instances of construction $d$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is a rendering very similar to P , but it renders hršt by tqwp krky (Smelik: "the fortress of the cities"). Although A adds three words not in the other versions, it is

[^176]otherwise similar to B which is most similar to P here. Those Greek Versions render hršt by Apı $\sigma \omega \theta$.

4:14. ותאמר דברה אל־ברק קום כי זה היום אשר נתן יהוה את־סיסרא בידך הלא יהוה יצא לפניך וירד ברק
מהר תבור ועשרת אלפים איש אחריו:



## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph reckoned as single segments 3 and 11, there are twenty-four segments in this verse of MT, sixteen to the athnach and eight following it. With $l b r q$ counted as segment 3 , $l s y s r^{\circ}$ counted as segment $11, m t t d$ as segment $5, h n$ ' $h w$ counted as segment 6 , the $d$ prefix of 'šlm counted as segment 8 and 'šlm as segment $9, h$ ' as segment 13 , and $m n t ̣ w r$ as segment 19 , there are also twenty-four segments in this verse of P , twelve to the first punctuation point, four more segments to the second such point, four more to the third, and four more to the final punctuation point.

This verse of P can be retroverted to the verse of MT with comment necessary as to some matters such as the enclitic form of the pronoun at segment 6 and the rendering of segment 13 by $h$. It is clear that no different Vorlage lies behind any such matters and so it will be assumed to be indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of the MT verse and the segments are in the same order in P as they are in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Except for elements that are considered features of mode 4 there are no additions or subtractions. That includes the enclitic form at segment 6 and the rendering of $h l^{\prime}$ by $h^{\prime}$ at segment 13 . This mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$q w m$. This renders its Hebrew cognate here. The rendering was rated 5 at 2:10.
$m t t l$. This renders the causal sense of $k y$ here and the rendering was rated 3 at 1:19.
$y w m^{\prime}$. This rendering of $y w m$ was rated 4 at 2:7.
'šlm. This renders ntn and the rendering in this context was rated 5 at 1:2.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
${ }^{\prime} y d$ '. The rendering of $y d$ by this Syriac was rated 5 at 1:2.
$n p q$. This renders $y s^{\prime}$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:24.
$q d m y k$. The rendering of the prepositional form of $l p n y$ by $q d m$ was rated 5 at 2:14. wnht. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y r d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9. $t \not t r r^{2}$. This renders Hebrew $h r$ and the translation was rated 5 at 1:9.
gbryn. This translates 'yš where it has a plur. or collective sense in the context. The rendering was rated 4 at 1:4.
'mh. This renders 'hryw and the rendering was rated 1 at 1:1.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Nöldeke notes that "the employment of a copula is far more usual" than the rendering of a verbless clause without a copula. ${ }^{20}$ For this reason segment 6 could have been a strictly literal translation, but by the addition of the enclitic form of $h w$ it represents an application of Syriac syntax that can be characterized as "far more usual."

[^177]At 4:6 above the $h \bar{e}$ interrogative prefix is not represented in $P$. At $10: 11 ; 11: 7$, 24; and 15:11, the same approach is used to represent Hebrew $h l^{\prime}$ that was used at 4:6, namely, representing the Hebrew by Syriac $l^{\prime}$ alone. At 8:2; 9:28 and 38, Hebrew $h l^{\prime}$ is translated by Syriac $l^{\prime} h w^{\prime}$. At 6:13 neither element of Hebrew $h l^{\prime}$ is represented in P. At 14:15 an entire interrogative clause introduced by Hebrew $h l^{\prime}$ is not rendered. At 5:30 it appears that $k b r$ renders Hebrew $h l^{\prime}$ and that will be discussed there. At 6:14 and 15:2, the same technique used in this verse of P is found in the rendering of $h l^{\prime}$ by $h^{\prime}$. All of these examples seem to be techniques for responding to the lack of an interrogative particle in the Syriac of the P translator.

Williams observes as to 1 Kgs 21:19, where MT hrṣht wgm-yršt is rendered by P as $h^{\prime}$ qtlt wh' yrtt, that "this may be because the results of both actions are visible to Ahab at that very moment. ${ }^{י 21}$ In a footnote at this point Williams speculates on the alternative possibility that "at an early stage when the Peshitta was translated the Syriac dialect of the translator prescribed an interrogative $h \bar{e}$, similar to . . . other Aramaic dialects. . . ." He adds that "this interrogative was misanalyzed by later Syriac writers and scribes who assumed it to mean "behold."" This seems unlikely since the problem arises in this Book of Judges as well as other books of the Old Testament Peshitta. If it were only true as to Judges alone, the eleven other instances in the verses cited above where $h \bar{e}$ is not rendered by $h^{\prime}$ would have to be explained. It seems unlikely that $h$ was rendered by $h^{\prime}$ understood as an interrogative particle in three verses and not so rendered in eleven others. In all three places where $h^{\prime}$ is used here the questions are in the nature of rhetorical questions as to which whoever posed them was calling for an affirmative answer. Thus the Syriac translator was getting around the problem of the lack of an interrogative particle by turning the rhetorical question into a vigorous assertion that evoked the underlying

[^178]intention in posing the rhetorical question. ${ }^{22}$ This seems to be the approach when the question in MT calls for an affirmative response. When the question calls for a negative response as at $4: 6$, the rendering is as a negative declaration.

At segment 11 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$. At segments 19 to 20 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. Segment 23 renders ' $y s ̌$ in a collective or plur. sense by a Syriac plur. Segment 24 is not accurately rendered by $P$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has added $m l^{\prime} k^{\prime} d$ between segments 13 and 14 and $l \cdot s ̣ l h^{\prime}$ between segments 15 and 16 , and also has not added a copula at segment 6 ; it renders segment 13 by $h l^{\prime}$ and $g b r^{r}$ as sing. In A and B segment 6 is also rendered without a copula, but segment 13 is rendered oủk ioov̀ by A and ö öı by B , and both A and B translate segment 23 as plur. They make no additions and therefore A is judged closer to P than is B , and both Greek Versions are closer to P than Tg J .

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ויהם יהוה את־סיסרא ואת־כל־הרכב ואת־כל־המחנה לפי־חרב לפני ברֵק וירד סיסרא מעל המרכבה . 4:15 } \\
& \text { וינס ברגליו: } \\
& \text { 和 }
\end{aligned}
$$

[^179]
## RETROVERSION

With the two sets of three elements each joined by two maqqēphs counted as segments 4 and 5 , and the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 3 and 6 there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and six following it. With lsysr ${ }^{\circ}$ counted as 3 , wlklhyn mrkbth counted as segment 4 , wlklh m̌sryt counted as segment 5, and $b p w m^{\prime} d h r b^{\prime}$ counted as segment 6 there are also fourteen segments in this verse of P , eight to the first punctuation point, and six following it to the second and last such point in the verse. All of the segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of this verse of MT. The kinds of differences treated under mode 4 will be discussed there. Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse is considered to be one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation of the corresponding verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they follow in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are not any. Segment 11 of MT is translated in the same way as was a similar segment at $1: 14$, and this will be noted in discussing mode 4 . This mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$w t b r$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of hmm which verb occurs only here in Judges, and so it cannot be rated.
$m r y$. This renders $y h w h$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m r k b t h$. With an added pronominal suffix this plur. renders $h r k b$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:19. The sing. of the same Syriac renders Hebrew $m r k b h$ in this verse and 5:28. Since this Hebrew term only occurs twice in Judges, it cannot be rated, but can be
seen as corroboration for the consistency of the rendering of $r k b$. The sing. $m r k b h$ is actually sing. in meaning, and that distinguishes it from $r k b$ with its collective or plur. meaning.
mšryth. With an added pronominal suffix this renders hmhnh in this verse and twenty-eight more times at $4: 16(2 x) ; 7: 1,8,9,10,11(2 x), 13,14,15(2 x), 17,18,19,21(2 x), 22(2 x)$; $8: 10(2 x), 11(2 x), 12 ; 13: 25 ; 18: 12 ; 21: 8$ and 12 . The rendering is rated 5. $p w m$. This renders $p y$, the construct of $p h$, where it refers to the "edge" of $h r b$ ' and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:8.
$h r b^{\prime}$. This rendering of $h r b$ was rated 1 at $1: 8$. See the discussion there for a consideration of the somewhat different approach taken in rating the consistency of the rendering of $p y$ and the rendering of $h r b$.
$q d m$. This renders the preposition lpny and the rendering was rated 5at 2:14.
wnht. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y r d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:19. $w^{\prime} r q$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $n w s$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:6. $r g l$. The rendering of Hebrew $r g l$ by its Syriac cognate was discussed at $1: 6$ and rated 3 there where rendered as it is here.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As first noted at $1: 14$, in all seven places where MT of Judges has $m l$, Syriac of P has $m n$. This tends to show that $m n ' l$ would be awkward to the translator. The Syro-Hexaplar also renders by $m n$, probably based on a source more like A. At segment 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. At segments 3, 4, and 5, there are three instances of direct object construction $e$. The comments made about suffixed $k l$ in discussing mode 4 of 4:13 also apply here at segments 4 and 5. In both of those segments the nouns in $P$ have suffixes even though they do not in MT. This probably underscores the fact that they are definite.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
Targum J is quite similar to P , although its use of $\operatorname{ptgm}$ to render $p y$ is considered a difference here. Both A and B render similarly to P (and Tg J ), but they render py by $\sigma \tau o ́ \mu \alpha \tau 1$ and are therefore closer to P in this respect. The only difference between A and B is that A renders $m^{c} l$ by $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o}$ and B by $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha_{\alpha} v \omega \theta \varepsilon v$. The rendering of B may be more literal, but A is closer to P .

וברק רדף אחרי הרכב ואחרי המחנה עד חרשת הגויםם ויפל כל־מחנה סיסרא לפי־חרב לא נשאר 4:16
עד־אחד:

##  <br> 

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 11,13 and 16 , there are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and seven following it. With klh mšryth $d$ counted as segment 11, bpwm' dhrbb counted as segment 13, kd hey counted as segment 16 , and $w^{\prime} n$ š between segment 13 and segment $14, l^{\prime}$, set aside as an addition, there are also sixteen segments in this verse of P , nine to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, and three more segments following the addition to the third and last such point. The first thirteen segments of P can be retroverted to the first thirteen of a verse like that of MT. The added segment following segment 13 cannot be retroverted, but segment 14 can be. Segment 15 of P cannot be retroverted to segment 15
of MT, but it is easy to make a connection between no one being left and no one having escaped. Segment 16 of P is rendered by JPS as "alive." ${ }^{23}$ Although it does not contradict ' $d$ ' $h d$, "not even one," it is quite a different way of making the point. Neither the addition of P nor its rendering of segments 15 and 16 have any support in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Syro-Hexaplar. The Vulgate seems to be translating quite freely, but provides no support for P. Brooke and McLean cite the Old Latin for "et nemo remansit saluus" ${ }^{24}$ and that lines up with $w^{\prime} n s ̌ l$ ' . . $k d h y$, but "remansit" does not fit with 'tplt, and is probably a rendering of $\lambda \varepsilon i ́ \pi \omega$ or some compound of that like $\kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \varphi \theta \eta$. Those verbs would lead back to a Hebrew verb like the Niphal of $\check{s} r$. One might speculate on confusion between ${ }^{\prime} d$ and ' $w d$ or between either and $k d$. (At 2:14, no instances of the rendering of ' $w d$ by $k d$ were found.) One can imagine a migration between ' $d$ ' $h d$ and ' $w d ~ h y$ in either direction, but the transition to $k d$ moves a step farther. It is even harder to see 'tplt as based on segment 15 of MT unless one sees it only as quite a free translation. The conclusion that results from these observation is that one cannot rule out a different Vorlage for P in this section of the verse. Nevertheless, the verse of P will be evaluated as if it was based on a Vorlage indistinguishable from MT, but the calculation based on that evaluation will have to be qualified as to the addition and the last three segments.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of the first thirteen segments of a verse like this verse of MT. The added segment after segment 13 does not fit into what would be a word-forword translation of the remaining portion of this verse of MT. The addition of 'nš is the only element of the clause that makes it less quantitatively literal; $l^{\prime} t p l t \underline{ } k d h y$ is

[^180]quantitatively the same as $l^{\prime} n \check{s}^{\prime} r^{\prime} d^{\prime} h(h d$ and superficially similar to it to the degree that one might accept it as the second half of a line of poetry with a stronger but quite similar content: "Not one was left; nobody escaped alive." If some illustration like this is appropriate, then these elements or segments of $P$ do not represent those of MT. In a case like this there is a problem for applying Barr's typology. Is this a subtraction followed by an addition? Here the true addition will be treated as part of mode 2, but segments 15 and 16 will not be considered a literal segmentation. This reduces the literal rating of the segmentation below $88 \%$ so that it is rated 4 . Since the literal segments through 14 follow the same sequence in P as in MT and since segment 15 and 16 of P should either be left out of consideration or considered as "dummy" segments that follow the same sequence as the originals for which each substitutes or stands as a free translation, the sequence of the elements will be rated 5 . The rating for this mode in this verse is 4.5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As already discussed, 'nš is reckoned as an addition and this reduces the rating for this mode to less than $94 \%$. Since that is in the range rated 5 , this mode will be rated 5 -.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$r d p$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:6.
btr. This renders Hebrew 'hry twice in this verse and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:1. mrkbth. With the added suffix this plur. renders $h r k b$ in this verse and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:19.
mšryth. This renders Hebrew hmhnh twice in this verse and the rendering was rated 5 in the previous verse.
'mm'. This plur. renders hgwym and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:20.
wnplt. This renders the Qal narrative of Hebrew npl. The rendering was rated 3 at 2:19. $p w w^{\prime}$. The rendering by this term of $p y$ in the Hebrew phrase py hrb was rated 5 at $1: 8$. $h r b^{\prime}$. This renders Hebrew $h r b$ and the rendering was rated 1 at 1:8.
${ }^{\prime} t p l t!$. This represents the Niphal of $\check{s} \breve{r} r$ and is not accepted as a rendering of it here. The only other occurrence of the Niphal is at 7:3 where it is rendered by the Eshtaphel of ' $h \mathrm{r}$. The only other occurrence of the Hebrew verb in Judges is of the Hiphil at $6: 4$ where it is rendered by $\check{s} b q$. Even if this Syriac verb were reckoned as an accurate rendering of the Hebrew there would not be an adequate number of occurrences to evaluate consistency. However, the inconsistency of rendering is consistent with the possibility that the Vorlage of this Syriac term is not $\stackrel{s}{s} r$.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segments 4 and 6, P has added pronominal suffixes and this may be either to specify that these segments are definite or to clarify that they appertain to Sisera. At segment 15 , both $k l$ and the noun with which it is combined have the pronoun objects. As it was observed in discussing the previous verse, Williams has found in 1 Kgs that when $k l$ has a pronoun suffixed, the word with which it is combined is definite. In $4: 13$, where ' $d$ was rendered by $w^{\text {' }} d m$ ' $l$, it was noted that Williams has found eight occasions in 1 Kgs where ${ }^{'} d$ is translated in this way. In this verse at segments 7 to $8,{ }^{\prime} d$ is translated ${ }^{\prime} d m{ }^{\prime} l$ without the $w$ prefix.

There is a genitive construction $c$ at segments 11 to 2 , and two genitive constructions $b$ at segments 8 to 9 and at segment 13 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J differs from P by rendering $h r$ řt as $t q w p$ krky as at $4: 13$, by rendering wnplt by $w^{*} t q t y l t$ and the py of segment 13 by ptgm, as well as by rendering segments 15 and 16 according to MT. Both A and B translated similarly to P except at segments 15 and 16,
and, as to A alone, by $\delta \rho v \mu o v$ at segment 8 . Segment 8 is rendered by A $\rho \iota \sigma \omega \theta$ in B and thus B is considered closest to P .

וסיסרא נס ברגליו אל־אהל יעל אשת חבר הקיני כי שלום בין יבין מלך־חצור ובין בית חבר הקיני: . 4:17



## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 4 and 13, there are seventeen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and nine following it. With $l m s ̌ k n^{\prime}$ counted as segment 4 and $m l k{ }^{\prime} d h \underset{s w r}{ }$ counted as segment 13 , segments 1 to 8 of P can be counted up to the first punctuation point by setting aside the addition of $w l$ between segment 3 , $b r g l$, and segment 4 . Segments 9 and 10 follow that first punctuation point and two additional elements, 'yt $h w$ ', follow those segments between segment 10 , $\check{s} l m^{\prime}$, and segment 11 , byt. Segments 12,13 , and the segment wbyt then follow. The latter, wbyt, could represent either segment 14 or 15 , and that means that one of those segments is present and the other is subtracted; here it will be treated as segment 14 for the purpose of the discussion without denying that it might be otherwise. After that, segments 16 and 17, hwbr qyny, follow to the second punctuation point, the end of the verse.

The segments 1 to 14 , and 16 and 17 can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments of MT, but the orthography of segments 5 and 12, even of 7, raises doubts about their retroversion. These doubts are somewhat allayed by familiarity with the variations in the rendering of proper names by P which has already been encountered.

Furthermore, the absence of a pronominal suffix at segment 3 is puzzling. Although BDB renders the Hebrew as "on foot" and JPS defines brgl as "on foot," ${ }^{25}$ at 4:15 P has rendered Hebrew brglyw by brglwhy. Thus both renderings of P , at $4: 15$ and here, can be retroverted to the Hebrew, but the inconsistency has to be noted.

The additional $w l$ has no support in $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Syro-Hexaplar, but the Vulgate does follow "fugiens" with "pervenit" and that might be rendering a source term on which both additions are based. On the other hand there is a similar likelihood that a translator would have found the idea that Sisera left his chariot with the intention of going directly to Jael's tent too abrupt a transition. If so, the addition allows a transition between the abandonment of the chariot and the later reaching of a point where he decided to seek shelter from Jael.

Although the copulas between segments 10 and 11 are additions, they are the kind of additions that are regularly made by P and, here, even by B , the Syro-Hexaplar, and the Vulgate. At segment 14 or 15 , one of the two segments has been subtracted, but it could be either one. In all three other verses cited at $4: 5$ where the Hebrew is byn $X$ wbyn $Y$, the Syriac is byt $X$ wbyt $Y$. Because of those examples, that is what is seen more likely here. It is conceded that this is far from conclusive, but it is a simple solution. Accordingly no source that can be distinguished from MT will be considered P's Vorlage here.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The segments of P numbered above as 1 to 14 and 16 to 17 are a word for word translation of the same-numbered segments of this verse of MT. The segment $w^{c} l$ between segments 3 and 4 is an addition and the missing segment of P , whether 14 or 15 , is a subtraction. As in other places, of which 4:3 is an example, the addition of $y t h w^{\prime}$ is treated as a feature of

[^181]mode 4 and not as an addition. Thus the segmentation of the verse is rated 5 , as is the sequence, since the sixteen segments into which P is divided follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one addition, $w l$, and one subtraction, segment 14 or 15 , almost $12 \%$ of the verse, so this mode is rated 4 .

Consistency or non-consistency or rendering.
${ }^{\text {'r }}$ q. This renders the Qal perf. of $n w s$, and renderings of $n w s$ by this verb were rated 5 at 1:6.
rgl. This renders its Hebrew cognate and such renderings were rated 3 at 1:6.
$m s ̌ k n$ '. This renders Hebrew ' $h l$ and rendering by this means of this Hebrew was rated 5 at $4: 11$.
'ntt. This renders the construct of 'šh, and renderings of 'šh by this Syriac were rated 5 at 1:12.
$m t l d$. This renders $k y$ in a causal sense and such renderings were rated 3 at $1: 19$.
$\check{s} l \bar{a} m \bar{a}$. This renders $\check{s} l w m$ here and that Hebrew is rendered either by this Syriac or its absolute form at $6: 23,24 ; 8: 9 ; 11: 13,31 ; 18: 6,15 ; 19: 20$; and $21: 13$. The rendering is rated 5 .
byt. This is reckoned here as rendering byn twice in this verse. The rendering was rated 4- at 4:5. (If the second occurrence had been taken as byt, house, the rating would be 5.) $m l k$. This rendering of its Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 1:7.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As already observed above the proper names $y l$ and $y b y n$ are rendered by ' $n$ ' $y l$ and nbyn. One might speculate that the first of the two in Hebrew refers to some animal and that it is rendered by a term that means "flock" of the same or a similar animal in Syriac. The second name may
involve the same $y \bar{o} d-n \bar{u} n$ exchange encountered elsewhere in P. It is interesting that the Syro-Hexaplar renders $y l$ as P does, but renders $y b y n$ literally. The added copula ' $y t h w^{\prime}$ is explained as the characteristic approach to a verbless clause in Syriac at 4:14. There is an instance of genitive construction $a$ at segments 6 to 7 and two instances of genitive construction b at segments 4 to 5 and segment 13 . The inconsistency between the rendering of Hebrew brglyw at 4:15 and its rendering in this verse was noted in the discussion of retroversion above.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J does not add $w^{c} l$ and ' $y t h w^{\prime}$, does not subtract segment 15 (alternatively 14), and keeps the pronominal suffix at segment 3 , but renders qyny by šlm’ $h$ as at 4:11. Neither A nor B adds segments comparable to $w^{c} l$ nor subtracts segment 15 , and both render segment 3 as plur. with a genitive pronoun and segments 8 and 17 by Kıvaiov. However A renders segment 2 by $\alpha v \varepsilon \chi \omega \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ and B by $\varepsilon \not \varphi v \gamma \varepsilon v$ and B adds $\hat{\eta} \nu$ where P has added ' $y t h w$. Thus both A and B are closer to P than Tg J and B is closer than A .

ותצא יעל לקראת סיסרא ותאמר אליו סורה אדני סורה אלי אל־תירֵא ויסר אליה האהלה ותכסהו . 4:18
בשמיכה:


## RETROVERSION

With the single pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 11 , there are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, eleven to the athnach and five following it. With wl' $t d h l$ counted as segment 11 , there are also sixteen segments in this verse of P , six to the first punctuation point, five more to the second, and five more to the third and last such point.

All the segments of $P$ can be retroverted to the corresponding segment of this verse of MT and there is no evidence here of any Vorlage that can be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of a Hebrew verse like that of MT and the sequence of the segments is the same in P as it is in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
wnpqt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y s^{\prime}$ and the renderings of that Hebrew verb by this Syriac were rated 5 at 1:24.
$l^{\prime}$ 'wr'h. With the prepositional prefix and pronominal suffix, this renders the Qal infinitive of one of the Hebrew verbs $q r^{2}$ in this verse and at 4:22, 6:35; 7:24: 11:31, 34; and 20:31. The Hebrew infinitive and a suffix are rendered by lqwblh at 14:5 and 19:3 and lwqblhwn at 20:25. At $15: 14$ the construction is rendered by lmqtlh. With seven out of eleven or about $63 \%$ of the renderings consistent with the rendering in this verse, the rating is 2 . sty (2x) and st . These Peal imperatives and the Peal imperf. render Qal imperatives and a Qal narrative tense of swr. This rendering was rated 3 at 2:17. $m r y$. This renders 'dny and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:5.
$t d h l$. This renders the Qal imperf. of $y r^{\circ}$ in this verse and 6:10, 23, 27; and 8:20. The rendering is rated 5. One occurrence of a Niphal participle at 13:16 has not been considered.
$m s ̌ k n '$. This renders ${ }^{\prime} h l$, a rendering rated 5 at 4:11.
wksyth. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $k s h$ with the equivalent suffix here as the same Syriac renders the same Hebrew in the next verse. These are the only occurrences of this verb in P , so the rendering is not rated.
hemylt'. This renders śmykh, a hapax legomenon in Judges, and not rated for that reason.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segment 2 there is the characteristic rendering of $y l$ by P that is discussed in more detail in considering mode 4 of the previous verse. At segments 3 to 4 the infinitive construct $q r^{2} t$ is rendered by a substantive rendered as part of a genitive construction $c$. At segment 5 waw plus a participle renders a Qal narrative tense of 'mr. Williams has found that this occurs, as here, in the "combination waw + participle / lamadh + suffix." He says, "It occurs three times, not following a verb of utterance but rather a verb of motion. ${ }^{י 26}$ Here the construction follows a verb of motion. At segment 11 P has added a waw prefix. This can be explained by Williams' conclusion that where "a clause is introduced by $\boldsymbol{\sim} \checkmark$ in Hebrew but by $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\mathrm{a}}$ in Syriac" "[t]hese clauses in Hebrew often represent information that is not sequential to the previous clause. ${ }^{27}$ Segment 14 of MT with its he directive is rendered by a prepositional phrase in P .

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

5. 
[^182]
## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J renders the verse in a way that is quite similar to P , but does not adapt features of Syriac syntax such as rendering segment 5 by a participle (and thus renders by the perf.) and not adding a waw prefix to segment 11 . The translation terminology in $A$ and $B$ is different at segments $3,7,9,12,15$, and 16 . Except for segment 16 where $A$ has $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \varepsilon$, the terms may be similarly legitimate. Whether or not this is true at segment 16, A has added $\alpha v \jmath \imath \hat{\eta} \varsigma$ after segment 16 , and this is clearly a difference from $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$, and B . The Targum is judged to be most similar to P here and B is more similar to P than A is.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 4:19. } \\
& \text { ויאמר אליה השקיני־נא מעט־מים כי צמֵאתי ותפתח את־נאוד החלב ותשקהו ותכסהו: }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 3,4 , and 9 , there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and five following it. With 'šq'yny counted as segment 3 , qlyl $m y$ ' counted as segment 4 , $m t l l d$ counted as segment 5 , șhyt as segment 6, and hlyṣ̣ as segment 8, there are also eleven segments in this verse of P , six to the first punctuation point, and five more to the end of the verse.

All of the segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of this verse of MT. At 1:24, thirty occurrences of $n^{\prime}$ in the Hebrew of Judges were considered and none of them were found to have been rendered in P , although three were considered to have elements that could arguably be seen as intended to render this particle. This verse was not one of those, and so the absence of an element to represent this particle is
not treated as evidence for the absence of one in MT. Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse of P is considered to be indistinguishable from this verse of MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word-for-word translation of a verse like that of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they follow in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions and one minor and insubstantial subtraction of any element in P that would make it possible to know that segment 3 of MT contains a $n^{\prime}$. The Targum represents this by $k^{k} n$. The Syro- Hexaplar represents it by $h k y l$ probably representing the same $\delta \eta$ we see in A and B . The Vulgate has "obsecro." Thus this mode is rated 5-.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
'šq'yny and 'šqyth. These two Syriac Aphels of $\check{s} q$ ' render the Hiphil of $\check{s} q h$ with the appropriate pronominal suffixes. The renderings are consistent but this Hebrew verb only occurs here in Judges, so the rendering is not rated.
qlyl. This renders the only occurrence of $m^{\prime} t$ in Judges, and so it is not rated for consistency.
$m y$. This renders $m y m$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:15.
$m t l d$. This renders the conjunction $k y$ in a causal sense. The rendering was rated 3 at 1:19.
$s$ s.hyt. This verb renders the Qal of $s m^{\prime}$ only here and at $15: 18$. The noun $s \underset{m}{ } y^{\prime}$ renders the noun $s m^{\prime}$ at $5: 18$ as well. The rendering is not rated for consistency.
wšrt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of pth The rendering was rated 1 at 3:25.
$h l y s^{\prime}$. This rendering of $n^{\prime} w d$, a hapax legomenon in Judges, is not rated for consistency. $h l b$. This renders its Hebrew cognate in this verse and 5:25, and this sample is not reckoned an adequate basis for a rating of consistency.
wksyth. This Syriac renders the Piel narrative tense of its Hebrew cognate which is found only here and in the previous verse where it was not rated.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The subtraction of an element to represent $n^{\prime}$ should be noted as a matter of Syriac syntax as well, but the technique adopted by the Syro-Hexaplar is also of interest to show what technique might have been available to the translator of P .

It appears that, at segment 4 of P , the adjective $q l y l$ modifies $m y^{j}$ rather than joining it into a genitive construction as in the Hebrew. At segments 8 to 9 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. At segments 4 and 8 there are two instances of direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J is quite similar to P but does represent $n^{\prime}$ by $k^{\kappa} n$ and adds lmšty before segment 7. Of less significance, perhaps, is that segment 6 is rendered by the Peal participle plus ' $n$ ' and that segment 7 is rendered by the Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew. Both A and B add "Sisera" after segment 1 , and represent $n$ ' by $\delta \eta$. They differ from each other in rendering segment 11 as they did with respect to the same word in the previous verse, 4:18. However, B renders the pronominal suffix of segment 11 by av̉tóv, and A does not render a pronoun object of the verb at segment 1 , but rather has added $\tau$ ò $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi o v \alpha v ̉ \tau o \hat{v}$. (This is as in the Syro-Hexaplar.) Thus, if the addition of Tg J is judged more significant than the addition of "Sisera," as it is here, B is more similar to P than the other two versions, and Tg J is more similar to P than A is.

4:20. ויאמר אליה עמד פתח האהל והיה אם־איש יבוא ושאלך ואמר היש־פה איש ואמרת אין:

. 1.

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as segments 7 and 11, there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and nine following it. If whw $d \ldots$. $n s ̌$ is counted as segments 6 and $7,{ }^{\prime} t t^{\prime}$ counted as segment $8, s^{\prime} l$ lky as segment 9 , $d^{p} y t$ tnn as segment 11 , and $l h$ considered an addition, there are also fourteen segments in $P$, five to the first punctuation point, seven more to the second punctuation point, and then the last two segments between the second and third punctuation points with the addition of $l h$ between those last two segments.

All of the segments of this verse of P except the addition before segment 14 can be retroverted to $P$, although the rendering of segments 6 and 7 is free and out of sequence and some other differences considered features of mode 4 must be explained. Therefore the Vorlage of this verse is judged to be one that cannot be distinguished from MT. The BHS note directs attention to the fact that the Syriac of the Walton Polyglot, of the Urmi Edition and of the Mosul Edition, as well as Sperber, all have the feminine form as segment 3. Whether or not that is evidence of a manuscript tradition extant in the second century of our era, MT does not have that form and that is the subject of inquiry here. Dirksen's edition would tend to indicate that there was no such reading in $P$ before the twelfth century. There is also no evidence of a different reading of segment 13. The explanation suggested here is that segment 13 is following the inflection of segment 3 .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Except for $w^{v} n h w d\left[^{\prime} t^{\prime}\right]^{\prime} n s \check{s}^{\prime}$, segments 6 and 7 (the brackets enclose segment 8), this is a word for word translation of this verse of MT with the addition that has already been identified to be considered under mode 2 and certain syntactical adaptations to be considered under mode 4. One can see in the Syro-Hexaplar what a literal segmentation would be: wnhw' d'n 'nš (followed by the rendering of segment 8, $n^{\prime} t^{\prime}$ ). Despite the period of about 400 years that separates the two Syriac versions, in many places the syntax is quite similar, but not here. At the same time there is probably no change in the meaning resulting from this change in P . Nevertheless, the segmentation is not literal. This is evaluated as reducing the literal quality of the segmentation by over $14 \%$ and the literal quality of the sequence by the same amount. This mode is therefore rated 4.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one added segment, the $l h$ just before segment 14 . This is considered to reduce the literal quality of this mode by $7 \%$ and a fraction and this mode is therefore rated 5-.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$q w m$. This renders the Qal imperative of ' $m d$. Renderings of forms of ' $m d$ by forms of $q w m$ were rated 5 at 2:14.
tr ${ }^{( }$. This renders the noun $p t h$ in this verse, and at 9:52; 19:26 and 27. The Hebrew is rendered by Syriac $m^{\prime} l n^{\prime}$ at $9: 35,40,44 ; 18: 16$ and 17. The rendering in this verse is rated 1.
$m s ̌ k n$ '. This renders ' $h l$ and the rendering was first rated 5 at 4:11.
${ }^{\prime} t$ '. This Peal participle renders the Qal imperf. of $b w$ in this verse and the consistency of this rendering was rated 3 at 3:22.
'nš. This renders 'yš twice in this verse and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:4.
$\check{s} l$. This renders its Hebrew cognate here and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:1.
'yt. This renders $y s ̌$ here, at $6: 13 ; 18: 14$; and $19: 19(2 x)$. It is rendered at $6: 36$, if at all, by $h w$. This is consistent in over $83 \%$ of the occurrences and rated 4 .
tnn. This renders $p h$ here. The same Hebrew is rendered by $h r k^{\prime}$ at 18:3 and 19:9. This is not consistent, but there are too few occurrences for a rating.
lyt. This renders ' $y n$ here and at $6: 5 ; 7: 12 ; 11: 34 ; 12: 3 ; 14: 3 ; 17: 6 ; 18: 1,7,28(2 \mathrm{x}) ; 19: 1$, $15,18,28$; and $21: 25$. It is probably represented by $l$ at $3: 25 ; 18: 10 ; 19 ; 19$; and $21: 9$. It is represented by $l^{\prime}$ 'yt at 7:14 and 14:6. At 9:15, Syriac 'n $l$ ', and at $9: 20$ Syriac ' $l^{\prime}$ ' renders Hebrew 'm 'yn. Hebrew ' $y n$ is rendered by $l$ ' $h w$ ' at $14: 9$ and 16:15. Thus it is rendered as in this verse at sixteen out of twenty-six occurrences, and this is over $61.5 \%$ consistency. It is rated 2, but with a plus because of the similarity to this rendering of the renderings at 7:14 and 14:6.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The syndetic pair of verbs at segments 8 and 9 of MT are rendered by an asyndetic pair in $P$. The asyndetic rendering by P of verbs that are syndetic in MT has been explained by Williams. Of the thirty-eight examples he cites, the first of the two verbs is a verb of motion. It is not clear whether any of these correspond to this asyndeton. ${ }^{28} \mathrm{He}$ does observe an instance at another point in his discussion where the imperf. in a protasis of MT beginning with ' $m$ is rendered by a participle and the converted perf. in the apodosis is rendered by a participle without a waw prefix. ${ }^{29}$ Here segments 6,7 and 8 begin the protasis, but segment 9 continues it asyndetically following a verb of motion. After segment 9 , segment 10 , wmr continues the protasis syndetically, and the syndeton can be explained as a case of joining of two non-sequential clauses. Finally at segment 13 the apodosis begins and that is

[^183]asyndetic in Syriac as one might expect anyway. The $d$ prefix at segment 11 is taken as the recitative form where the element at this point in MT is an interrogative particle. Here $P$ does not need a special approach to deal with the absence of such a particle in Syriac because the segment $s^{\prime} l$ makes that interrogative feature of the syntax clear. Another possibility Williams raised were cases where a pronominal addressee indicator $(l+$ pronominal suffix) is employed by P after forms of ' $m r$ where there is no such indicator in MT. ${ }^{30} \mathrm{He}$ does not consider examples where a Syriac imperative is rendering a Hebrew converted perf. as is the case at the addition of $l h$ between segments 13 and 14, but the same principle should apply.

At segment 9 the pronominal suffix of the MT is rendered by $l k y$, an adaptation that must follow once the verb is rendered by the participle, since the participle cannot have a pronominal suffix. There is a genitive construction $b$ at segments 4 to 5 . The $b$ prefix of segment 4 gives effect to the adverbial accusative of MT.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4-.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J has the feminine sing. form of the imperative at segment 3 and renders segments 6 and 7 literally as well as rendering segments 8 and 9 syndetically. It also renders segment 14 by $l$ rather than by $l y t$. Otherwise it is faithful to MT in a way similar to P . After segment 2 B adds "Sisera," after segment $3, \delta \eta$, and after segment $8, \pi \rho o ̀ \varsigma ~ \sigma \varepsilon$. The addition after segment 8 is also made by A and $\sigma 0$ is added after segment 10 , but the other two additions made by B are not found in A. Both A and B render segments 6 and 7 literally (although A renders 'yš by $\tau \iota \varsigma$ and B by $\dot{\alpha} v \dot{\prime} \rho$ ) and render segments 8 and 9

[^184]syndetically. The greatest difference is in A's addition at the end of the verse which repeats the last six words of 4:19 (in a slightly different form) about covering Sisera. Therefore Tg J is considered most similar to P and B more similar to P than is A .

ותקח יעל אשת־חבר את־יתד האהל ותשם את־המקבת בידה ותבוא אליו בלאט ותתקע את־היתד . 4:21 ברקתו ותצנח באֵרץ והוא־נרדם ויעף וימת:



## RETROVERSION

With the five pairs of elements joined by maqqēph treated as single segments $3,4,7,13$, and 17 , there are nineteen segments in this verse of MT, sixteen to the athnach and three following it. With 'ntth dhwbr counted as segment 3 , the first skt' as segment 4 and the second as segment 13 , 'rzpt' as segment 7 , and $k d h w d m k$ as segment 17 , there are also nineteen segments is this verse of P , five to the first punctuation point, the next three to the second punctuation point, the following three segments, 9,10 , and 11 , to the third punctuation point, the next three segments to the fourth punctuation point, then another three to the fifth such point, and, finally, the last two segments 18 and 19 to the sixth and last punctuation point.

Except for segment 11 all the segments of P can be retroverted to the samenumbered segments of MT. The reading by P of segment 11 has no support from Tg J ("in secret"), from A ("silently" or "softly"), from B ("secretly"), or from the Vulgate which supports A as the Syro-Hexaplar does also. The reading of P seems based on a guess from the context that might have seen segment 11 as parallel to segment 17 .

Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse will be considered to be a text that cannot be distinguished from MT based on the available evidence.

## LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.

Except for segment 11 this is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT. Even segment 11 can easily be identified as arising from a misunderstanding of $l$ t't. These kinds of mistakes are not easy to classify under Barr's typology. They are features of mode 4, but it would be difficult to evaluate them under mode 3 when, as here and often elsewhere, this is the only occurrence of the lemma in Judges. Such an occurrence would have to be made a special case for evaluation that would be more like a comparison of the lexical knowledge of the translator of Judges with that of other translators of a few forms of the verb $l^{\prime} t$ in other books of P , than an evaluation of consistency. It would also be artificial to treat such a rendering as, first, subtraction and, then, addition at this point in the verse. It does seem relevant to point out that, whatever the lexical knowledge of the translator, he did not grasp the grammar of the Hebrew. Although the rendering is by a conjunction and a participle, the source is a prepositional phrase that the translator seems to have understood as including an infinitive construct since the preposition $b$ is rendered by the temporal or circumstantial conjunction. However, the translator has failed to note that the supposed infinitive construct has no genitive member and thus that the preposition must be a means of turning a substantive into an adverb (which with its object might still be rendered either as an adverb or an adverbial prepositional phrase). Instead the translator has turned the construction into a clause dependent on $k d$. Therefore this segment will not be considered a literal segmentation of the verse. That departure from the literal will only reduce the evaluation of the segmentation to a fraction below $95 \%$, and give the segmentation a rating of 5-. The sequence of the segments is judged to be the same as the
sequence of MT, and that includes segment 11 despite its failure as a literal segment. Accordingly this mode will be rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions, and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
wnsbt. This renders the Qal of $l q h$ and the rendering was rated 4 at 3:6.
'ntth. This renders the construct of 'šh and renderings of 'šh by 'ntt' were rated 5 at 1:2. $s k t$. This renders Hebrew $y t d$ twice in this verse and at 4:22 and 5:26. The Hebrew is rendered by $n w l^{\prime}$ twice at $6: 14$. The consistency of the rendering here is rated 3 .
$m s ̌ k n$ '. This renders ' $h l$ and the rendering was first rated 5 at 4:11.
whdt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of sym and the rendering was rated 1 at 1:28. 'zrpt'. This renders $m q b t$, a term found only here in Judges, and thus it is not rated.
' $y d h$. This renders $y d h$ and the renderings of Hebrew $y d$ by this Syriac were rated 5 at 1:2. $w^{c} l t$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $b w$. Renderings of $b w^{\prime}$ by ${ }^{\prime} l$ were rated 1 at 1:12.
wnqšt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $t q^{c}$ and the rendering was rated 1 at 3:21. This rendering is rated 1 based on reasons given for rating the rendering by $m h^{\prime}$ at 3:21. $s, d^{c} h$. This renders $r q t w$ in this verse and in 4:22 and 5:26. It is not rated for consistency. $w t b^{\prime} t$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $\operatorname{spnh}$ and the rendering was not rated in the discussion of its only other occurrence in Judges at 1:14. The Syriac root rkn is used there.
$d m k$. This renders the Niphal perf of $r d m$. The Hebrew verb occurs only here in Judges and is not rated for consistency. See mode 1 for rendering $l ' t$ by this verb at segment 11 . 'ttrp. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y^{\prime} p$, a Hebrew verb that occurs only here in Judges. The substantive of $y^{\prime} p$ is rendered by 'yypyn at $8: 15$. The rendering is not rated.
wmyt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of mwt. The rendering of that Hebrew by this Syriac was rated 5 at 1:7.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. As already noted segment 11 is not literally rendered and does not have the same meaning as the same MT segment. It is not semantically accurate and does not accurately reflect the syntax of that MT segment. The possibility of a damaged text and a guess by the translator was suggested above. At 4:17, a suggestion about the orthography by which the proper name $y l$ is rendered in P was proposed.

There is an instance of genitive construction $c$ at segment 3 and of genitive construction $b$ at segments 4 to 5 . There are three examples of direct object construction $d$, at segment 4 , segment 7 , and segment 13. At segment 17 , the waw prefix is rendered by $k d$, and segment 17 comprises an adverbial clause that is not sequential to segments 15 and 16 , but modifies them as such a clause. Muraoka touches briefly on this: "Although one occasionally meets with examples of the classic circumstantial clause" dependent on the conjunction waw, "it is more often than not transformed into a variety of constructions: often introduced by 31

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Targum J renders $y l$ and segment 11 literally. Otherwise it is as similar to P as one can expect consistently with the differing characteristics of the two dialects. Of interest here is

[^185]the fact that it renders by the same roots as P at segments, $1,3,4,5,7,8,9,12,13,14$, 16,17 , and 19.

In A segment 14 is rendered by $\gamma v \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$, "jaw," and it also appears that segment 17 is rendered by $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \rho ı \sigma \varepsilon v, ~ " c o n v u l s e d, " ~ a n d ~ t h a t ~ \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma o v \tau \hat{\omega} v \gamma \circ v \alpha ́ \tau \omega v \alpha v ̉ \tau \eta \zeta$ is added after that. Then where segment 18 would be expected, $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \grave{~} \xi \dot{\varepsilon} \psi u \xi \xi \in v$ appears. In B segment 14 is rendered by крото́ $\varphi \varphi$ and segments 17 and 18 are rendered by $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega \dot{\varsigma}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \kappa о \tau \dot{\omega} \varphi \eta$. The renderings by B of segments 17 and 18 are much different from both P and MT, but not quite so different as A is. Accordingly Tg J is judged closest to P , and B is not so different from P as is A .

והנה ברק רדף את־סיסרא ותצא יעל לקראתו ותאמר לו לך ואראך את־האיש אשר־אתה מבקש ויבא . 4:22
אליה והנה סיסרא נפל מת והיתד ברקתו:

## a <br> ד.

## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments 4,12 , and 13, there are twenty-two segments in this verse of MT, fourteen to the athnach and eight following it. With sysr' counted as segment $4, \operatorname{lgbr}$ ' counted as segment $12, d b^{\circ}$ 'nt counted as segments 13 and 14 , btr preceding segment 4 considered an addition, and wha' (between segments 16 and 17) following immediately after the fifth punctuation point considered an addition, twenty-two segments can also be distinguished in P corresponding to the twenty-two segments in this verse of MT. The first four segments of P plus btr precede the first punctuation point, the next three proceed to the second point, the next
two to the third point, the next five segments to the fourth point, the next two, segments 15 and 16 , to the fifth point, the added whz' plus the next four segments 17 to 20 to the sixth point, and the last two segments to the seventh and final punctuation point. Except for the two additions all of the segments of P can be retroverted to the correspondingly numbered segments of MT, although the sequence of segments 13 and 14 is different from that of MT. The additions and the changed sequence are considered feature of Syriac translation technique. They are not supported by $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, or B . Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse will be considered one that cannot be distinguished from the text of MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation in P of a verse indistinguishable from this verse of MT. Although there are two additions and other features calling for comment under mode 4, the segmentation of this verse is rated 5. The sequence of segments 13 and 14 does not follow the MT sequence and this reduces the literal quality of that aspect of this mode to a fraction under $91 \%$, and therefore this mode is rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The additions of btr after segment 3 and whz' after segment 16 have already been noted in the discussion of the retroversion of this verse. The addition of $h z^{\prime}$ in connection with the rendering of $h n h$ was discussed at 3:25, and will also be the subject of comment as part of mode 4 . Here these addition reduce the extent to which the verse is quantitatively literal to a fraction under $91 \%$ and so this mode is rated 5-.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$h$. This renders $h n h$ twice in this verse. As discussed at 3:25 this Syriac renders this Hebrew twenty-eight of the thirty-four times it is rendered in Judges. (It is not rendered three times.) This is a consistency of about $82 \%$ and rated 4.
$r d p$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:6.
wnpqt. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $y s^{\prime}$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:24. $l^{\prime} w^{c} h$. This renders lqr'tw and the rendering was rated 2 at 4:18.
$t$. This renders $l k$ here and nine other times listed at 1:3. There, 105 occurrences of hlk were found to have been rendered: eighty-eight times by ' $z l$, nine by ' $t$ ', and eight by other terms. Because of the clear distinction between the contexts where hlk is rendered by ${ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{z} l$ on the one hand and ' $t$ ' on the other, ' $t$ ' was not treated as inconsistent with renderings of $h l k$ by ${ }^{\prime} z l$, but the other eight renderings were. Six of those eight were by hlk and they cannot be treated as inconsistent with ' $t^{\prime}$ ' if ' $z l$ is not, but the other two renderings can be considered inconsistent. Therefore this rendering is rated 4.
' $h w y k$. This renders ' $r^{\prime} k$. This rendering of the Hiphil was rated 5 for the reasons stated in the discussion of the rendering of $r^{\prime} h$ by $h z^{\prime}$ at 1:24 and the rendering by $h w^{\nu}$ at 1:25. $g b r^{r}$. This renders $h \not y s s^{\prime}$ and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:4.
$b^{\circ}$. This renders the Piel participle of $b q s ̌$ and the Ethpeel of the same Syriac verb renders the same Hebrew Piel at 14:4 even as the Peal renders the Piel participle at 18:1. At 6:29 the Piel imperative is rendered by ' $q b$. The rendering in this verse is rated $3+$. $w^{c} l$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $b w^{v}$ here and the rendering was rated 1 at 3:20. $r m^{\prime}$. This rendering of $n p l$ was rated 1 at 2:19.
myt. This Peal participle (or perf.) renders the Qal participle of its Hebrew cognate and was rated 5 for consistency at 4:21.
$s k t$. This renders Hebrew $y t d$ and was rated 3 for consistency at 4:21.
$s d^{c} h$. This renders rqtw and the rendering was considered at 4:21 and not rated there.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Here again ' $n$ ' $y l$ for $y l$ presents a puzzle for which a kind of solution has been proposed in considering this mode at 4:17, but that solution was not advanced as definitive.

The addition of $b \operatorname{tr}$ (or rendering of ${ }^{\prime} t$ ) is a departure from the Vorlage. Here it seems unlikely that $b t r$ renders ' $t$. The earlier occurrences of $r d p$ at 1:6; 3:26 (where $r d p$ was rendered by ' $t$ '); and $4: 16$ were all complemented by 'hry and that was rendered by btr, but in two later verses where $r d p$ is complemented by a direct object, 8:12 and 9:40, P does not add btr. This would tend to show that Syriac syntax does not require btr here and that it is probably an addition influenced by the fact that $r d p$ is often complemented by 'hry.

As to segment 8 where waw plus participle of ' $m r$ renders the narrative tense of ' $m r$, Williams notes that this rendering occurs three times in 1 Kgs where ' $m r$ follows a verb of motion and is itself followed by lamadh plus a suffix. Here wtṣ' (or wnpqt) is the verb of motion and $l h$ follows in conformity with Williams' observation. ${ }^{32}$

At segment 12 there is an instance of direct object construction $e$. The changed word order as segments 13 and 14 is taken here to be an adaptation to the normal word order in Syriac where the enclitic pronoun follows the principal word in the predicate. As Williams says: "Hebrew tends to have pronoun / participle where Syriac has participle / pronoun., ${ }^{33}$

The addition of whz' after segment 16 also fits with Williams' explanation of a tendency of P to add $h z^{\prime}$ to $h n h$, or substitute the former for the latter when the reader is the addressee. As was pointed out above in discussing 3:25, this is not an invariable practice, but a tendency, and here the addition of $h z^{\prime}$ may clarify that Barak is the addressee of $h^{2} .{ }^{34}$

[^186]The added waw prefix of myt at segment 20 may be explained by the tendency of P to add waw at the beginning of non-sequential clauses where Hebrew does not do so. Williams notes this phenomenon taking place where the participle, as here, begins an independent non-sequential clause and where the Hebrew has no waw. ${ }^{35}$ Here of course the participle could be taken as an attributive complementing "Sisera" or as a predicate.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
The Targum has not added btr or $h z^{\prime}$ or changed the sequence at segments 13 to 14 . Nevertheless it has added tryp after sysr at segment 18 and $n^{\prime} y s^{\prime}$ after $s k t^{\prime}$ at segment 21. Both A and B follow Tg J in not making that addition or changes in sequence made by P . In addition they do not make the additions of Tg J just mentioned. They are otherwise similar to P , but A differs from the others by rendering segment 22 by $\gamma v \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$. Segment 22 is rendered by $\kappa \rho о \tau \alpha \varphi \varphi$ in $B$. Thus $B$ is closer to $P$ than the other two versions.

4:23.
ויכנע אלהים ביום ההוא את יבין מלך־כגנען לפני בני ישראל:


## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements, $m l k-k n^{\wedge} n$, joined by maqqēph counted as segment 7 there are ten segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and three following it. With lnbyn
counted as segments 5 and 6 and $m l k^{c} d k n^{c} n$ as segment 7 , there are also ten segments in this verse of P .

Except for segment $2, m r y^{\prime}$, rendering 'lhym the segments of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of this verse of MT with allowance made for the retroversion of nbyn to $y b y n$. Segment 2 of P renders 'lhym by mry' and the same rendering is found in Tg J while A has кúpıos $\mathfrak{o} \theta \varepsilon o ̀ \varsigma ~ a n d ~ B r e n d e r s ~ m o r e ~ l i t e r a l l y ~$ according to MT by the latter term alone. The Vulgate has "Deus" and the SyroHexaplar, $m r y y^{\prime}$. At 6:20, MT has h'lhym and P has mry'; A has кupiov, B has $\theta \varepsilon o v ̂, ~ T g ~ J ~$ follows P, Vulgate has "Domini," and Syro-Hexaplar is like P. At 6:36 both MT and P render inconsistently with each other in the same way as they do in this verse and 6:20. Both A and B have $\theta$ cóv, Tg J is like P, Vulgate has "Deum," and the Syro-Hexaplar again is like P . At 13:9 MT and P again have the same inconsistency with each other, A and B have $\theta$ cós, Tg J is like P, Vulgate has "Dominus," and the Syro-Hexaplar ' $/ h$ '. At 20:27 where MT has h'lhym, P has $m r y$, A has кupíov, B has кupíov tov̂ $\theta$ cov̂, the Vulgate has "Dei," and the Syro-Hexaplar is like P. Other MSS support readings that could be rendered "Lord." Thus it is hard to rule out the possibility that P had a source that differed from MT as to this one word, and tempting to speculate that it was a Greek source. It seems possible that the Old Greek did have a different reading from MT and that B and the Vulgate corrected themselves by reference to a Hebrew text like MT. Since the Targum has a tendency to render 'lhym by $y w y$, it does not provide much support for a conclusion that it had a Hebrew text reading yhwh. Therefore it will be assumed here that P had a source for this rendering and that the inconsistency is not a matter of translation technique. Otherwise the Vorlage will be assumed to be indistinguishable from the text of this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation of a Vorlage indistinguishable from MT, except that the Vorlage may have had $y h w h$ at segment 2 and with the qualification that P translates $y b y n$ by nbyn. The segments follow the same sequence in P that they follow in MT and so this mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w t b r$. This renders the Hiphil narrative tense of $k n^{\prime}$ and renderings of $k n^{c}$ by this verb were rated 5 at 3:30.
$m r y$. The assumption was made above that this renders $y h w h$ and that rendering was rated 5 at $1: 1$. Renderings of 'lhym are discussed at 1:7. This rendering would be rated 1 as a rendering thereof. This rendering will not be rated in this verse.
bywm'. This rendering of bywm was rated 4 at 2:7.
$m l{ }^{2}$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and was rated 4 at 2:7.
$q d m$. This renders the preposition lpny and the rendering was rated 5at 2:14.
bny 'ysryl. This rendering of the cognate Hebrew phrase was rated 5 at 1:1.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Since $m r y$ at segment 2 is taken here as based on a source used by the translator it is assumed to be an accurate translation. No definitive explanation has been developed for the rendering of $y b y n$ by nbyn, but the rendering is accepted as a feature of Syriac translation technique and one that is consistently applied. There is an instance of genitive construction $b$ at segment 7 and of genitive construction $a$ at segments 9 to 10 . There is an instance of direct object construction $e$ at segment 5 to 6 , Inbyn.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5.

COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B
Except for its use of $y t$ to render ${ }^{'} t$ and its literal rendering of $y b y n, \mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}$ is quite similar to P. Vaticanus is similar to MT and that means that it has "God" rather than "Lord" at segment 2 and thus is not as similar to P as is Tg J . On the other hand, A has added "Lord" to "God" in rendering segment 2 and has changed the sequence of segments 3 and 4, placing them after "Canaan," segment 7. This probably makes A less similar to $P$ than $B$ is.

4:24. ותלך יד בני־ישראל הלוך וקשה על יבין מלך־כגֵען עד אשר הכריתו את יבין מלך־כנען:



## RETROVERSION

With the three pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments 3,8 , and 14, there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach, and six following it. With $w^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$ counted as segment $2, d b n y$ ' $y s r y l$ counted as segment 3 , and ' $z l$ ' hwt counted as segment 1 , and the failure to represent $h l w k$ classified as a subtraction, the treatment of the first four segments of MT by P can be understood if the understanding is also informed by the understanding that the waw prefix of ${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$ in P represents the waw prefix of segment 1 of MT. (That is to say, segments 1 and 4 of this verse of MT are considered the Vorlage of that waw prefix together with 'zl' hwt.) With w'šn' counted as segment 5 , with the first $m l k^{\prime} d k n^{\prime} n$ counted as segment 8 and the second counted as
segment 14, with dqtlwhy counted as segments 10 and 11, and lnbyn counted as segments 12 and 13, segments 5 to 14 can also be identified in P and correspond with the samenumbered segments in MT.

The segments identified as 1 to 3 of P can be retroverted to the segments of MT with corresponding numbers. Segments 5 to 14 of P can be retroverted to segments 5 to 11 of MT by accepting the participle at segment 5 of P for the adjective form in MT. These leaves a gap at segment 4, but the sense of segment 4 may be present in a non-literal way. Helfmeyer observes, citing this verse among others, that the "dynamic aspect of hālakh appears clearly in the metaphorical meaning 'grow, increase, progress." ${ }^{\text {³6 }}$ JPS
 growing, increased more and more." ${ }^{37}$ Waltke and O'Connor question whether the postpositive infinitive can express duration, ${ }^{38}$ but it seems here that the Syriac translator thought that it could do so when he rendered the finite verb by the participle plus $h w t$. Nöldeke describes this form used by the translator as "expressing continuance or
 Vorlage in a non-literal way. Targum J, A, and B represent segment 4 by the participial form of the same verb used at segment 1. This is their approach to the problem raised by the syntax in this verse of P and does not imply a different Vorlage from the text of MT. Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse will be assumed to be a Hebrew text indistinguishable from this verse of MT.
${ }^{36}$ Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, 1978, s. v. "halakh," by F. J. Helfmeyer.
${ }^{37}$ J. P. Smith, Syriac Dictionary, 9, col. 1-2.
${ }^{38}$ Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 585.
${ }^{39}$ Syriac Grammar, 216, § 277.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Segments 2 to 3 and 5 through 14 of this verse of P are word for word translations of the same-numbered segments of MT. The construction 'zl hwt is probably intended to translate segments 1 and 4 , although in the context of this verse of P it is part of the translation of the first four segments of this verse which renders accurately the meaning of segments 1 to 4 of MT. Notwithstanding the degree to which it is accurate, this approach by P is reckoned as reducing the literal quality of the segmentation to a little under $86 \%$. The sequencing is also impaired as to the first three segments and that is reckoned as reducing the literal quality of the sequencing to a fraction under $80 \%$. Accordingly this mode will be rated 3.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one subtraction here, segment $4, h l w k$, and that reduces the literal nature of the quantity to a fraction under $93 \%$. This mode is rated 5-.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

${ }^{\prime} y d^{\prime}$. This renders $y d$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:2.
bny'ysryl. This renders the cognate phrase in MT and was rated 5 at 1:1.
${ }^{\prime} z l l^{\prime}$. This participle with $h w t$ renders the Qal narrative tense of $h l k$ as well as, perhaps, comprising the meaning added by the Qal infinitive construct of the same verb. The rendering of $h l k$ by ${ }^{\prime} z l$ was rated $5-$ at $1: 3$.
${ }^{\prime} \check{s} n$ '. This renders $q s ̌ h$. The Hebrew was rendered by byšt ${ }^{\prime}$ at 2:19 and not rated since these are the only two occurrences in Judges.
$m l k$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and was rated 5 at 1:7.
${ }^{\prime} d m$ ' $d$. This is the only time that ${ }^{\text {' } d}$ ' $\check{s} r$ occurs in Judges. This seems an appropriate rendering for places where ' $d$ is used as a conjunction based on the evaluation of consistency of ' $d l$ at $1: 21$, but the rendering of the sole construction of this construction cannot be rated under that circumstance.
$q t!l w h y$. This renders hkrytw, the only instance of the Hiphil of this verb in Judges. None of the seven occurrences of the Qal at 2:2 are rendered by this Syriac. This rendering is not rated.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The rendering of wtlk. . . $h l w k$ is considered accurate but not literal in this verse and this conclusion has already been set out in the discussion of the retroversion of the verse. At segments 2 to 3 there is a genitive construction $b$, within segment 3 , bny ' $y s r y$, there is a genitive construction $a$, and within each of the identical segments 8 and 14, there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. At segments 11 to 12 there is an instance of direct object construction $f$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.

## COMPARISON WITH TG J, A, AND B

Both Tg J and B are similar to P to a comparable degree, but A has replaced segments 12 to 14 by av̉zóv, and does not have a relativizer at segment 10 where both Tg J and B do. All three versions render segment 4 by a participle of the verb at segment 1 . Thus it is not clear that either Tg J or B is more similar to P than the other, but it is clear that A is somewhat less similar to P than are those two.

## CHAPTER SIX

## CHAPTER FIVE OF JUDGES

5:1.

## ותשר דבורה וברק בן־אבינֵעם ביום ההוא לאמר: <br> 

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 4, there are seven segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and three following it. With br 'byn'm counted as segment 4 there are also 7 segments in this verse of P . All the segments of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of P . The Vorlage of this verse of P is judged to be indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation of the segments of a verse like this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they follow in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$w s ̌ b h t$. This renders the Qal narrative tense of $\operatorname{syyr}$ here and at 5:3. The substantive syyr is rendered by $t_{s} b w h t^{\prime}$ at $5: 12$. Thus there are too few renderings for a rating of consistency. $b r$. This rendering of Hebrew $b n$ was rated 5 at 1:13.
$y w m$. This renders $y w m$, and the rendering was rated 4 at 2:7.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. This is one of the few places in P of Judges in which Hebrew l'mr, the infinitive, used as a recitative particle is faithfully rendered as an infinitive prefixed by $l$ and used as a recitative. See discussion of mode 4 at 1:1. At segment 4 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B.

Normally in this chapter no comparison with Tg J will be made, but in this verse Tg J is quite similar to P , but renders $y w m$ by ' $d n$ '. Alexandrinus has rendered segment 1 as a sing. like that in MT, Tg J, and P, but B has rendered it as plur.; B renders segment 7 by a participle which is judged to be more similar to the infinitive of MT, P , and Tg J than the aorist active of A . The different rendering of $y w m$ by Tg J is considered here to be the greatest difference from P , and the rendering by B of segment 1 as a plur. is considered to be a greater difference than A's rendering of the aorist of ' $m r$ so that A is considered more similar to P than are B and Tg J .

5:2.

## RETROVERSION

There are seven segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and two following it. There are also seven segments in this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point, and four following it. As the TDOT entry for $p r^{\text {c }}$ says:

Both the meaning and background of the beginning of the Song of Deborah, biprōac $p^{e} r \bar{a}{ }^{\circ} \hat{O} \underline{t} b^{e} y i s ́ r a \bar{a} \bar{e} l=l$ (Jgs. 5:2) are the subject of vehement dispute. It can be understood against the background for holy wars, "When the flowing hair was let loose in Israel." Of course, one can understand the expression as a reference to the military leaders, "that leaders lead in Israel." (LXX , en tó ārxasthai archēgous). Finally, Craigie's explanation with reference to the Arabic faraja is worth considering: "When the people offered themselves completely," which parallels the following sentence nicely. [Footnotes omitted.] ${ }^{1}$

No solution is offered there. Superficially the question of retroversion should not be difficult since the segments $1,2,3$, and 5 are rendered by Syriac cognates of the Hebrew and segments 5 and 7 are among the best evidenced renderings in Judges. Even at segment 6 where one might find it easier to retrovert the Pael of Syriac brk, retroversion of the Pael of šbḥ can be justified. Only segment 4 presents difficulties that make it harder to justify. The Hithpael of $n d b$ is understood here to involve an offering by or of the people. The Syriac rendering is in the range of meaning of "praise" or "song of praise." That is possible as a free translation that makes praise the offering, but is less than fully accurate to the extent that anything other than praise is what is actually intended as the offering. The lexicons give several meaning for the root letters $p r^{\prime}$ in Hebrew and in Syriac and some cite this verse for one of the meanings. ${ }^{2}$ Here as in the TDOT entry, the question is not going to be resolved. Rather, it will be assumed that P correctly understood the sense of the $\mathrm{pr}^{\text {c }}$ root and the verse of P will be analyzed based on the assumption that the Vorlage of this verse of P cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

[^187]LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. At segment 1 the Syriac sing. noun of the $p r^{\text {r }}$ root renders the Qal infinitive construct of the same root, both prefixed by $b$. The noun might be seen as rendering an infinitive construct under other circumstances, but in this verse it cannot be since it has a genitive member in MT at segment 2 and that genitive member has become the Ethpeel perf. of the same root in P at the same time that segment 3 "Israel" has lost its prepositional prefix and become the subject of segment 2. This makes all three segments of P a free rendering of the segments 1,2 , and 3 of MT, but with a meaning that is derived from that of MT. Thus a Syriac speaker might read MT to mean: "For the avenging of the vengeance in/against Israel. . . ." The corresponding segments 1-3 of P might be rendered: "For the vengeance that Israel took." Segments 4 to 6 of P can also be seen as a free translation of MT, reading MT as: "For/by the people's offering of themselves, bless. . . ." Those segments of P can be read: "For/by the praise of the people, praise. . . ." Thus six of the seven segments fall into the free translation category. The segmentation aspect of this mode would rate 1 . The segments seem intended to guard the sequence of the segments and that aspect will be rated 5 with a minus to show the peculiarity of the sequence in a verse like this. The rating for this mode in this verse is 3-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Here again it might be argued that there has been extensive subtraction followed by addition, but the view taken here is that the rendering of the segments is free, not that some segments present in MT have been subtracted and other segments have been added. Thus this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$p w r$ 'nwt' and 'tpr'. The Syriac substantive is rendering segment 1, the Qal infinitive of the Hebrew cognate of the Syriac. The Syriac Ethpeel is rendering the Hebrew substantive that is also a cognate of the Syriac. These are the only two occurrences of the root in Judges and so the renderings are not rated.
$t s ̌ b w h t$. This substantive renders the Hithpael infinitive construct of $n d b$. The Hebrew verb only occurs one other time in Judges at 5:9 where the Hithpael participle is rendered by prysyn. The rendering is not rated for consistency.
' $m$ '. This renders Hebrew ' $m$ and its consistency was rated 5 at 1:1.
šbḥw. This renders the Piel imperative of brk here. The Hebrew Piel is rendered by the Pael of brk at 5:9 and 13:24. The Ethpaal of brk renders the Pual of its Hebrew cognate twice at 5:24. The Qal of the same Hebrew verb is rendered by the Peal of brk at 17:2. Thus the consistency of this rendering is rated 1 and that of the others, 4 . $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. No definitive position has been taken here to decide that one of the alternative readings of the first colon is correct. This means that the notion of vengeance has not been excluded and thus that the Syriac terms based on the root $p r^{\text {c }}$ were intended to render the Hebrew in a semantically accurate way even if the segmentation is not literal. ${ }^{3}$ The question of syntax does not necessarily arise here because the syntax of the first colon is taken as a free translation and not as an aspect of this mode.

At segments 4 to 5 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$ and at segment 7 an instance of direct object construction $e$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B.

[^188]Here A renders $p r^{r}$ in terms of $\alpha \not \rho \chi \omega v$ and $\not{ }_{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega$ and B in terms of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\sigma} \pi \tau \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\mu} \mu \mu \alpha$. Any argument that the meaning of $p r^{c}$ can be stretched to render either or both of these Greek words will not be the subject of an estimate here. The rendering of the Hithpael of $n d b$ by A has the sense of choice, but in B as emended by Rahlfs it has the sense of offering that MT has and might be stretched to comparability with B on those grounds. However in B itself we find the aorist passive infinitive of $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \sigma \sigma t \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ which has the opposite meaning of "do/act unwillingly." This leads here to the conclusion that there is no basis for a reliable judgment for differentiating between the comparability of these two Versions to P .

5:3. $\quad$ שמעו מלכים האזינו רזנים אנכי ליהוה אנכי אשירה אזמר ליהוה אלהי ישראל:
D.

## RETROVERSION

There are twelve segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach, four more to 'šyrh, and four more to $y s^{\prime} r^{\prime} l$. Eleven of those twelve segments can be identified in $P$ : segments 1 and 2 fall before the first punctuation point, segments 3 and 4 are between the first and second punctuation points, segments 5,6 , and 8 follow to the third punctuation point, and segments 9 , the added $l h, 10$ (lmry'), segments 11 and 12 to the fourth and last punctuation point. Segment 7 has not been rendered by P. All eleven segments rendered by $P$ can be retroverted, respectively, to segments 1 to 6 and 8 to 12 of MT. The omitted first person sing. pronoun is treated as a subtraction by P since B , the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplar repeat that personal pronoun. Neither A, B, the Vulgate, nor the SyroHexaplar add the $l h$ between segments 9 and 10. Accordingly the Vorlage of P will be
considered one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT based on the available evidence.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-or-word translation by P of this verse of MT with one subtraction and one addition which do not affect the meaning of this verse in the translation. The segments as rendered follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT, and this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one subtraction, namely of any element to represent segment 7 , and one addition, $l h$, between segments 9 and 10 . This is calculated as an impairment of the quantitative literality of the verse by almost $17 \%$, and therefore this mode is rated 4 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$\check{s}{ }^{\prime}$ 'w. This renders the Qal imperative of the Hebrew cognate of this Syriac verb. The rendering was rated 5 at 2:2.
$m l k$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.
șwtw. This Syriac renders the Hiphil imperative of 'zn, the only occurrence of this Hebrew verb in Judges, and thus not rated for consistency.
šlyṭ. This plur. renders Hebrew rznym, the only occurrence of this Hebrew verb in Judges. It is not rated for consistency.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ which occurs twice in this verse was rated 5 at 1:1.
'šbḥ. This renders 'šyrh. The Hebrew verb occurs in Judges only at 5:1 and in this verse. The substantive $\check{s} y r$ is rendered by $t s ̌ b w h \not t^{p}$ at $5: 12$. There is no rating of these occurrences for consistency.
'zmr. This renders the Piel imperf. of $z m r$, a Hebrew verb that occurs only here in Judges. The rendering is not rated in this mode.
' $/ h$ '. This renders the construct of ' $l h y m$ in reference to $y h w h$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The subtraction of segment 7 and the addition of $l h$ cannot be explained based on familiar features of Syriac translation technique, although Syriac may have a tendency not to repeat personal pronouns expressed in the MT as subjects. ${ }^{4}$ It may also be the case that Syriac has a tendency to add pronominal addressee indicators. Williams has analyzed a passage in 1 Kgs 20:13-14 where there are five added instances of $l h$ after ' $m r$. He sees these additions as having "textured the dialogue." Here that is only seen as a possible tendency of the translation. One question that might be studied is whether the translator considered that the Hebrew was poetic and thus made additions or subtractions for prosodic reasons. ${ }^{6}$ That seems unlikely, but that study has not been undertaken here. At segments 11 to 12 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE <br> 5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

 A omits the second occurrence of the first person sing. pronoun and $B$ renders it; A does not render segment 10, but B does. Therefore B is considered more similar to P than A because A makes an addition after segment 4 where $B$ and $P$ do not, and a subtraction of

[^189]segment 10 where B and P do not. Only by retaining the second $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$, segment 7 , is B dissimilar to P when A is similar.

## יהוה בצאתך משעיר בצעדך משדה אדום ארץ רעשה גם־שמים נטגפו גם־עבים נטפו מים: 5:4.  مـتنـ

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 9 and 11 there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and three following it. Although questions will have to be answered about whether some of the segments now to be identified in P by number can be retroverted to the segments of MT with the same numbers, the segments of P can be sorted out. Those segments of P can also be divided into thirteen segments with $d m n s^{\prime} y r$ counted as segment $3, k d h l k t$ counted as segment 4, bynt halt' counted as segment 5, 'p šmy' counted as segment 9 , $w n n n$ ' counted as segment 11, and $r s$ counted as segment 12. There are three segments to the first punctuation point, five more to the second, two more to the third, and the final three to the fourth and last punctuation point.

The retroversion of the first three segments is complicated only by the $d$ prefix of $m n$. In this context it is unusual. Does the relative clause modify the second sing. pronoun or the infinitive? It is probably the infinitive and this gives the relative clause adverbial effect but the meaning remains the same: "O Lord, when thou came out (or at thy coming out that was) from Seir." There is no support for the added $d$ in $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Vulgate, but the Syro-Hexaplar has rendered the same way as $P$. This suggests the
possibility of Old Greek influence, but not a different Hebrew Vorlage. The next three segments, 4 to 6 , also need comment since segment 4 renders the preposition plus infinitive plus pronominal suffix by adverb plus finite verb without an independent pronoun subject. This approach to rendering a Hebrew preposition with an infinitive construct as its object is the more typical approach in P , rather than the more literal approach employed by P at segment 2 of this verse. Segment 5, plur. hqqlt', renders śdh. The picture in MT in segments 1 to 3 is that the Lord came out of Seir, and then in segments 4 to 6 that he marched from the territory of Edom, another name for Seir. In P the Lord came out as one from Seir, and then traveled among the open fields of Edom. This might represent a sequence in P from the first colon to the second. Nevertheless, although this is a somewhat free rendering, there is no substantial contradiction between the translation and the source. Segments 7 to 10 of MT are rendered quite literally. The last three segments, 11 to 13 , or at least the first two, are translated somewhat freely, with the substitution of the waw prefix at segment 11 for the $g m$ of MT (when that was rendered literally at segment 9) and the rendering of $n t p$ at segment 12 by rs (when the same Hebrew was rendered by its Syriac cognate at segment 10). Both Greek Versions have кaí in both places where MT has $g m$. Then B renders both occurrences of $n t p$ by the same verb and A once by the same verb with a prefixed $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa$ and once without it. These examples point more to free translation than to a different Vorlage. Thus the rendering of $g m$ by waw at segment 10 is considered an inconsistent rendering. Accordingly, the source of P will be assumed to be one that cannot be distinguished from MT, but with a concession to the possibility that the prefix of segment 3 might have been supported by a source consulted by the translator of P .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Once again the evaluation of the segmentation is complicated, because it is so easy to connect the segments of P to the segments of MT and to calculate the number of segments as the same in both the Syriac and the Hebrew verses. This complication is also present because the sequence of the segments in P is so obviously based on the sequence of the segments in MT. However, at the same time, one who makes these calculations has to see that the translator does exercise considerable freedom within these limits and then resolve the question of whether a freely rendered segment can be considered part of a literal segmentation or whether it can only be considered a characteristic to be evaluated under mode 3 or mode 4. The approach to the dilemma proposed here is to treat it as a question of drawing a line between categories when the line is not easy to define. This is similar to a boundary dispute where neither of two parties can prove exactly where the line between their competing interests falls, but both do know that it falls within a larger distance that can be defined. They have to evaluate what they can compromise and what they cannot. Sometimes an arbitrator with no more knowledge of the exact location of the boundary than the parties themselves is charged with or given the authority to decide.

This approach is applied here to decide that segment 3 and segment 5 are not divided literally. Segment 3 rendering $m n s y r$ with the added prefix is reckoned to be distinguishable from the rendering of $h r^{c}$ by $d b y \check{s}$ (already seen several times in this study) because there is a greater difference between the meaning of the lemma and the translation in segment 3 of this verse than there is between the lemma and the translation in the case of $h r^{c}$. The same reasoning is judged to apply to the difference between $m n$ and bnyt here and Hebrew $m^{c} l$ and Syriac $m n$ in the places where that translation occurs. The difference in this verse is greater. Accordingly, two of the thirteen segments will not be considered literally segmented and the segmentation will be rated 4 . Such failures to segment literally
may also affect the literal quality of modes 3 or 4, or both. Nevertheless the sequence of the segments will be judged literal not only because the other segments follow the same order in P as they do in MT but also because even segments 3 and 5 occupy the same positions in the sequence as the segments they freely represent. Thus this mode is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The prefix at segment 3 is reckoned as an addition but evaluated as less than $4 \%$ of the verse. Thus this mode is rated $5-$.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
$m p q k$. This renders the Qal infinitive with the same suffix, $s^{\prime} t k$ and the rendering of the Qal of $y s^{\prime}$ by the Peal of $n p q$ was rated 5 at 1:24.
$k d$. The consistency of rendering prepositions plus infinitive construct by $k d$ was rated 5 at $1: 14$. There only examples following wyhy were studied. This rendering is not viewed as inconsistent with those examples, but it is considered inconsistent with the literal rendering at segment 2 of this verse and segment 6 at 5:31. Thus it will be rated 1 here. $h l k t$. This renders the Qal infinitive of $s^{c} d$ and that verb is a hapax legomenon in Judges so the consistency of the rendering is not rated.
bynt. This renders Hebrew $m n$ here. At 5:11, 16, and 27 (1x), bynt renders Hebrew byn. That Hebrew is not rendered at 5:27. As a rendering of byn it was rated 4 - at 4:5. In this verse, as a rendering of $m n$, it is rated 1 .
$h q l t$. This renders śdh and the rendering was rated 2 at 1:14.
' $r$ '. This renders ' $r$ ṣ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 1:2.
$z^{c} t$. This Peal of $z w^{c}$ renders the Qal of $r^{c} s$, a hapax legomenon in Judges and thus not rated for consistency.
' $p$. This renders $g m$ once in this verse, and that rendering was rated 5 at $1: 3$. At segment 13 it appears to be rendered by a waw prefix. Based on the analysis at $1: 3$, that would be rated 1 . Ordinarily the renderings by that prefix have not been evaluated for consistency. Since that inconsistency is internal to this verse and the rendering by ' $p$ has been rated 5 , the two will be averaged and that will be assigned as the rating for the two renderings. The average is 3 .
$\check{s} m y$. This renders $\check{s} m y m$ in this verse, at 5:20; 13:20; and 20:40. The rendering is rated 5.
ntpw. This renders the Qal perf. of its Hebrew cognate that only occurs in this verse. The other occurrence in this verse is rendered by the Peal of $r s s$. Although these are only two occurrences of the Hebrew in Judges and there might be semantic or poetic reasons for the variation, an authentically literal rendering of the verse would be consistent. Thus these two renderings are rated 1 for consistency.
' $n n$ '. This renders 'bym, a term that occurs only here in MT of Judges, and is therefore not rated for consistency.
$m y^{\prime}$. This renders $m y m$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:15.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Several semantic differences have already been discussed: the rendering of $m n$ by bynt at segment 5 ; the waw prefix at segment 11 ; and the inconsistent rendering by $k d$ at segment 4 and $r s$ at segment 12. The more literal rendering of segment 2 is noteworthy and the matter of rendering occurrences of the prepositions $b$ and $k$ with the infinitive is discussed more at $5: 31$. The addition of the $d$ at segment 3 is difficult but does not have substantial effect on the meaning of that colon. The preposition together with the plur. rendering a sing. at segment 5 might be seen as transforming what would be described in traditional
terminology as synonymous parallelism into something closer to what would be described as synthetic parallelism. There is an instance of genitive construction $b$ at segments 5 to 6 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

4. 

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

The only differences between A and B are that B adds a direct object after the rendering of $n t p w$ at segment 10 and A renders the same Hebrew verb inconsistently as between segments 10 and 12. These differences between A and B make A more similar to P than B is.

5:5. הרים נזלו מפני יהוה זה סיני מפני יהוה אלהי ישראל:


## RETROVERSION

There are ten segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and six following it. With $m n q d m$ counted as segment 7 there are also ten segments in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point and six following it. Segments 1 and 5 both have an added waw prefix, but by taking account of those elements as aspects of translation technique, segments 1 to 8 and 10 can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. Only $q d y s^{\breve{s}}$ cannot be retroverted to segment 9 of MT, but in a stock phrase like this the clear connection between segment 9 of MT and segment 9 of the Leiden Peshitta can be apprehended. Segment 9 of MT is supported by Tg J, A, B, the Vulgate, and the SyroHexaplar. What is perhaps more important in relation to P is that it is supported by MS

9 a 1 and its family. Accordingly the Vorlage of P is considered to be indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. With the qualifications already noted this is a word-for-word translation of this verse of MT, except for segment 9. Unlike examples such as the rendering of $m n$ by bynt in the previous verse that go close to or even beyond the limits of free translation, this rendering by $q d y s^{\breve{\prime}}$ is considered here to be well within the limits of free translation. This reduces the rating of the segmentation aspect of this verse to 4.5 . The segments of the translation are in the same sequence as they follow in MT. Therefore this mode is rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The added prefixes at segments 1 and 5 are considered aspects of mode 4 and not aspects of this mode. The separated $m n$ at segment 7 is considered a matter covered by mode 3 and not this mode. Therefore this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering. $t w r{ }^{\circ}$. This Syriac plur. renders the plur. of $h r$ in this verse and renderings of $h r$ by this Syriac were rated 5 as to this mode at 1:9. $d l w$. This renders $n z l w$ and $n z l$ is a hapax legomenon in Judges and not rated. $q d m$. Without $m n$ preceding it this renders the preposition mpny once in this verse, and at a fraction over 13\% of the occurrences in Judges as calculated at 2:3. It is also inconsistent with the other rendering of mpny by $m n q d m$ in this verse and rated 1. $m r y$. This renders $y h w h$ twice in this verse and that was rated 5 at $1: 1$.
$m n q d m$. This rendering of the preposition mpny was rated 4 at 2:3. $q d y s^{\prime}$. Out of fifty-five times ' ${ }^{\prime}$ hym is translated in Judges by a sing. form of Syriac it is rendered forty-nine times by ${ }^{\prime} / h^{\prime}$. Only here is it translated by this Syriac as shown at 1:7. This inconsistent rendering is rated 1.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The added waw at segments 1 and 5 fits with one of the categories identified by Williams where P adds waw. In this category the Hebrew clause is of the basic form subject / predicate, but has no waw before the subject." "This type of clause is non-sequential." These additions fall into this category except that the verb is gapped in the second colon or clause. This could be one piece of evidence that the translator does not understand Biblical Hebrew poetry as we do since the addition of the conjunction impairs the terse quality of the original. At the same time the gapping of the verb seems to create no difficulty for the translator.

At segments 9 to 10 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. The rendering of 'lhym by $q d y s^{\prime}$ ' is reckoned here to be a scribal emendation. The inconsistencies like the two different renderings of mpny here, and the inconsistent rendering of $m n, g m$, and $n t p$ in the previous verse might be seen to show a pattern of intention to vary the renderings.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

The two Greek Versions are identical except that B has added E $\lambda \omega 1$ after its rendering of segment 4. They are otherwise similar to MT which makes them differ from P where P differs from MT. Thus A is more similar to P in this verse.

5:6. בימי שמגר בן־ענת בימי יעל חדלו ארחות והלכי נתיבות ילכו ארחות עקלקלות:

[^190]


## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 3 there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and five following it. With $b r$ ' $n t$ counted as segment 3 , wdmhlkyn $h w w$ counted as segment 8 , and trys ${ }^{\prime}$ counted as an addition, there are also twelve segments in this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point, four more to the second punctuation point, two more segments, 8 and 9 , plus the addition to the third punctuation point, and then the final three segments to the fourth and last punctuation point. Each of the numbered segments of P can be retroverted to the segment of MT that has the same number, with the qualification expressed earlier in this study as to the rendering of $y l$ by ' $n$ ' $y l$. The addition has no support in $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or the Vulgate. Here it is considered to be an interpretive addition. Therefore, the Vorlage of this verse of P will be considered one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT based on the available evidence. The pointing of segment 7 of MT is accepted.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word for word translation of this verse of MT with the addition between segments 9 and 10 already identified and with some elements of segments $2,4,8,9$, and 11 needing comments in mode 4 . The sequence of the twelve segments is the same in P as in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. An addition between segments 9 and 10 reduces the literal quality of this mode to a fraction under $92 \%$. This mode is rated 5 -.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
ywmwhy. This renders the construct plur. of ywm twice in this verse and renderings of the Hebrew by its Syriac cognate were rated 4 in this mode at 2:7.
$b r$. The consistency of this rendering of $b n$ was rated 5 at 1:13.
$p s q w$. This renders $h d l w$ once in this verse and twice in the next. The same Hebrew verb is rendered by Syriac $\check{s} b q$ at $9: 9,11$, and 13 ; and by $\check{s l y}$ at $15: 7$; and $20: 28$. The renderings by $p s q$ are rated 1 for consistency.
'wrht'. This plur. renders Hebrew 'rḥwt twice in this verse, but the Hebrew word occurs only here in Judges so it is not rated for consistency.
mhlkyn and hlkw. These Paels both render their Hebrew cognates in this verse, but the rendering was rated 1 in the discussion of this mode at 2:22.
šbyl? This renders ntybwt and the Hebrew term occurs only here in Judges. It is not rated.
$m^{\prime} w m t$ '. This plur. renders 'qlqlwt which occurs only here in Judges and is therefore not rated.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The addition reflects the translator's interpretation that the Hebrew is making a contrast between ntybwt and 'rhwt 'qlqlwt based on the adjective that describes the routes the travelers had to take once the usual routes were put out of use. This is a likely interpretation and in accord with the metaphor of the verse that probably means that the way of obedience to the commandments of God became disused and, instead, the way of disobedience, the crooked road, was taken by the people of Israel. In short, it means to help the readers understand the poetry, and, perhaps, deprives them of the pleasure of doing that on their own. Since discerning the meaning is not a difficult exegetical exercise this may be another instance where there is an added term to clarify what is already comparatively clear.

At segment 4 a prefixed waw is added. This is another place like others where Williams has found the added waw at the beginning of a non-sequential clause beginning with a note of time. ${ }^{8}$ Some commentators argue that the period of Jael was sequential to that of Shamgar, but the question here is how the translator viewed that matter.

At segment 8 there is a more expanded rendering of the participle, turning it into a noun clause by adding $d$ and giving the clause an explicit copula by adding $h w w .{ }^{9}$ At segments 9 and 11 there is an added prepositional prefix that tends to show that Syriac calls for a adjunct to $h l k$ to take the $b$ preposition. ${ }^{10}$ At segment 1 to 2 there is an instance of genitive construction $c$ and at segment 3 and segments 4 to 5 two instances of genitive construction $a$. The inconsistent constructions are noteworthy, in particular in the difference between the first at segments 1 to 2 and the third at segments 4 to 5 .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

There is only one substantial difference between A and B and that is where A represents segments 7 as $\beta \alpha \sigma \lambda \varepsilon i \hat{\varsigma}$ and B does so as ódov̧̀. Thus B is considered more similar to P than A .

5:7. חדלו פרזון בישראל חדֵלו עד שקמתי דבורה שקמתי אם בישראל:
${ }^{8}$ Ibid., 88.
${ }^{9}$ As Nöldeke says, "[s]entences with the Substantive verb ranc can scarcely be regarded as truly Verbal sentences." Syriac Grammar, 245, § 309.
${ }^{10}$ This seems to be true of Onkelos and Jonathan Aramaic as can be observed in this verse of Tg J.


## RETROVERSION

There are ten segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and six following it. With $q m t^{\prime} n$ ' as segment 6, there are also ten segments in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, and three more to the third such point. Since there are translation question about this verse even for contemporary translators, the question here is whether P was rendering a verse that either can or cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT. With the minor exception of the $d$ prefix of segment 3 the position here is that this verse of P can be seen as derived from this verse of MT.

At several points in the verse, this position needs to be explained. Although the plur. form of segment 2 of P may mean a rural area, it is rendering a sing. form that refers to the population of such an area. That Hebrew przwn may have a plur. or collective meaning. At segment 6 there is an added enclitic pronoun that emphasizes the first person inflection of the verb. At segment 8 there is no element to represent the $\check{s}$ of MT, and the reason why this is seen as governed by the first such $s ̌$ is discussed at mode 4. It is interesting that P renders qmty as a first person sing. even as more recent translations like RSV and NRSV render as second person feminine sing. and A and B render by the third person sing. The corresponding elements buried among the elements of the expanded verse of Tg J are also first person sing. It is quite improbable that P has any source different from the unpointed text of MT. Therefore the source of P will be assumed to have been a text that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.
Except for the $d$ prefix of segment 3 this is a word for word translation by P of this verse
of MT. The absence of a $d$ prefix at segment 8 is a matter for consideration under modes 3 and 4. The rendering of segment 2 is also a question to be considered under modes 3 and 4. The sequence of the elements in P is the same as that of those in MT and this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. The absence of a prefixed conjunction before segment 8 is a mode 4 matter, but since it is an element of a segment it is counted as a subtraction of one-half of a segment.. The added ' $n$ ' at segment 6 is considered the addition of one-half a segment. Thus this mode will be considered $90 \%$ literal and rated 4.5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$p s q w$. This renders whdlw as it did in the previous verse where it was rated 1. šth ${ }^{\text {p }}$. This renders przwn only here in Judges. The Hebrew occurs one other time at 5:11 where it is rendered by 'sgy. The only support for repetition of the same translation term in both verses is in Tg J . The consistency of the rendering is not rated here.
${ }^{\prime} d m$ ' $d$. This renders ' $d \check{s}$ as a conjunction here. The use of ' $d l$ as a preposition is rated 5 at 1:21 and the other occurrences of ' $d m$ ' are analyzed there. The use of ${ }^{\prime} d m{ }^{\prime} d$ to render ' $d$ ' $\check{s} r$ is considered at 4:24 and not rated. This rendering is very similar to $4: 24$, but it is the only occurrence of ' $d \check{s}$ in Judges and not rated for consistency.
$q m t$. This renders its Hebrew cognate, and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:10.
${ }^{2} m$ '. This consistently renders Hebrew ' $m$ here as well as in $5: 28 ; 8: 19 ; 9: 1(2 \mathrm{x}), 3 ; 14: 2,3$, $4,5,6,9,16 ; 16: 17 ; 17: 2(2 x), 3(2 x)$, and $4(2 x)$. The rendering is rated 5 .

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segment 3, the difference resulting from the use of a $d$ prefix and a $b$ prefix is something like the difference between the "rural areas" "of Israel," and the "rural areas" "in Israel."

Arguably that is a free translation but not significant enough to change the rating of mode 1. The enclitic pronoun at segment 6 adds some flavor to the assertion of the verse and leaves the reader in no doubt that the translator of P was reading the verb as first person sing. The absence of a relativizer before segment 8 may be an instance where relative clauses occur in a series and repetition of the relativizer is unnecessary. "Where several relative clauses occur in a series, they may be satisfied with one $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, even when they are not constructed alike." ${ }^{11}$

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Neither A $(\varphi \rho \alpha \zeta \omega v)$ nor B ( $\delta v v \alpha \tau o i)$ render segment 2 by a term similar in meaning to the term used by P which is something like "(unwalled) areas in the country," or "rural areas" as suggested above. Both Versions render segments 6 and 8 by third person sing. forms. One point of similarity to P is found only where B renders segments 1,2 , and 4 as plur. while A has the sing. in those places. This makes B somewhat more similar to P.

יבחר אלהים חדשים אז לחם שערים מגן אם־יראה ורמח בארבעים אלף בישראל: 5:8.

.1.to.ron realr

## RETROVERSION

[^191]With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 8 , there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and six following it. With the three segments of P that precede the first punctuation point counted as segments 1,2 , and 3 , and the next three to the second punctuation point as segments 4 , 5 , and 6 (with a waw prefix added to segment 4), and with the other segments counted as will now be described, there are also twelve segments in this verse of P . The first three segments of P can be retroverted to the first three of MT, with an explanation of the sing. forms at segments 2 and 3. Segment 4 of P can be retroverted to segment 4 of MT except for the waw prefix. Segments 5 and 6 cannot be retroverted to segments 5 and 6 of MT as those segments are pointed, but could be retroverted to the repointed text discussed below. The next segment of P, syp $^{\prime}$, after the second punctuation point, cannot be retroverted to segment 7 of MT, but it can be retroverted to another implement of military weapon ( $m g n$ is a hapax legomenon in Judges). Segment 7 of MT is supported by B ( $\theta$ vpcós), Tg J (tpysyn), and the Vulgate ("clipeus"); P is not supported by the more ambiguous $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon ์ \rho \eta$ of A or by the Syro-Hexaplar, $s t r^{\prime}$, which is similar to A. The next segment, at eighth place in the sequence of the P segments, rwmh $^{\prime}$, can be retroverted to segment 9 of MT. The apparent addition that follows next, $l$, cannot be retroverted literally to MT but can be explained in relation to the ' $m$ element of segment 8 . The next element, $n t h z$ ', occupies ninth place in the P sequence of segments, and, together with $l^{\prime}$, it can be retroverted to segment 8 of MT. Then segment 10, bynt'rb'yn can be retroverted to segment 10 of MT although the preposition might have been translated more literally. Segments 11 and 12 can be retroverted too with the same qualification as to the $d$ prefix of segment 12 as to the $d$ prefix of segment 3 of the previous verse of P , 5:7.

Accordingly no source is proposed for P that differs from MT with the qualification as to the pointing of segments 5 and 6 .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The English Versions (for example, KJV, ASV, RSV, and NRSV) generally render segment 1 and the verb of segment 8 by some form of past time, but Rubens Duval says: "L'imparfait ne se rencontra à peine pour le présent absolu ou présent de l'indicatif, qu'exprime le participe." Then he renders syp' wrwmh' l' ntḩz' as: "on ne voit ni glaive ni lance." He gives no examples of its use for past time, but describes its future, modal, prohibitive, subjunctive, and conditional uses. ${ }^{12}$ In whatever way the Hebrew prefixed tense is meant to be rendered here by the Syriac with respect to time, it is unlikely that P is to be rendered in the sense of past time. Whether that observation is accurate or not, the rendering by the Syriac imperf. of the Hebrew prefixed tense reflects a reproduction of the form of the Hebrew source. As a result the verse of P can be translated: "God is choosing something new and at that time neither the barley bread nor sword nor spear is seen among any of the forty thousand of Israel." Alternatively either or both verbs could be seen as future or modal.

Moreover, $l^{\prime}$ nth $z^{\prime}$ (segment 8 ) can be understood as a syntactically possible segmentation of ' $m-y y^{\prime} h$ if we understand ' $m$ here as an interrogative particle in a clause expecting a negative response. The BDB entry here defines ' $m$ as "Num ? expecting the answer $N o$, especially in a rhetorical style. ${ }^{13}$ Thus, just as where $h$ interrogative is rendered by $h^{\prime}$ when expecting an affirmative answer, or by some construction including $l$ when a negative answer is expected, so here ' $m$ is rendered by $l$ ' to give that negative response.

[^192]The rendering of segment 3 by a sing. cannot be explained fully, but a reader can see the idea of God declaring that he will do a "new thing" at Is 43:19 and Jer 31:22. The addition of a seyāmē would make segment 3 plur.

The added waw prefix at segment 4 is not surprising in this chapter of Judges since all five occurrences of ${ }^{\prime} z$ in Judges are found in this chapter, including this verse and verses $11,13,19$, and 22 . None of those occurrences is prefixed by waw in MT; three of the four in P are so prefixed, but the one is verse 11 is not (and ms 7al keeps the waw there). This may be explained based on Williams' finding in 1 Kgs . There he concludes that most of the places where P adds waw are at the head of non-sequential clauses. ${ }^{14}$ The occurrence at verse 11 can be understood as a sequential clause. The renderings by $P$ of segments 5 and 6 are exactly the same as the renderings of the same Hebrew letters at $7: 13$ where the first letter of lhem there is pointed by a seghol rather than a qāmeṣ and the first letter of s'rym there is pointed as a sin rather than a shin and the second letter has the holem vowel rather than the qāmeṣ. The rendering of segment 6 by the English Versions like RSV and NRSV as an adverbial accusative in a verbless clause is questionable and no satisfactory rendering of segments 5 and 6 based on MT vocalization has yet been found.

Accordingly, the segmentation of P is considered to be a word for word translation of a verse where segments 5 and 6 are vocalized as at 7:13 of MT. The $d$ prefix of segment 12 is analyzed as a mode 4 feature like the similar rendering of $b$ by $d$ in the previous verse. The segmentation understood like this would be rated 5 . The sequence at segments 8 and 9 of P does not follow the sequence at segments 8 and 9 of MT and this reduces the rating of that aspect of this mode to 4 .

The rating for this mode is 4.5 .

[^193]2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no elements in P that either add something not in MT or its unvocalized text, or subtract something that is there. This mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$n g b$. This renders the Qal imperf. of $b h r r$ in this verse and the same Syriac verb renders the Qal participle at 20:34. The same Hebrew verb is rendered by $s b^{\prime}$ at $10: 14$. The Hebrew is not rendered twice at $20: 15$ and 16 . Thus there are not a sufficient number of renderings for a rating.
' $/ h h^{\prime}$. This renders 'lhym in a sing. sense and such a rendering was rated 5 at 1:7. $h\left(t{ }^{2}\right.$. This renders $h d s y^{\prime} y m$ here and at three other places where the same Hebrew refers to the ropes that bound Samson: $15: 13 ; 16: 11$ and 12. The rendering is rated 5. hydyn. This renders ' $z$ here and at $5: 11,13,19$, and 22. It is rated 5 . $l h ̣ m$. The segment that this renders is pointed lāhem, a hapax legomenon in Judges. The Hebrew to which the revocalized letters could be retroverted is rendered by the same Syriac at $7: 13 ; 8: 5,6,15 ; 13: 16 ; 19: 5$ and 19. With the Hebrew so vocalized, the rendering would be rated 5 for consistency. $s^{\iota} r^{r}$. The segment that this renders is pointed as šéc̄arim in MT and that Hebrew is rendered by the sing. or plur. of $t r^{\circ}$ at $5: 11 ; 9: 35,40,44 ; 16: 2,3 ; 18: 16$ and 17. Those renderings would be rated 4 and this rendering would be rated 1 . In evaluating this verse of P , this rendering was treated as rendering śécorim and that Hebrew is found only at 7:13 where it is rendered as it is here, but that is not considered an adequate basis for a rating. It is however a circumstance that tends to cast doubt on the vocalization in this verse. syp ${ }^{\prime}$. This renders $m g n$, a hapax legomenon in Judges, so it cannot be rated. See the analysis of the rendering of $h r b$ at $1: 8$ for other renderings of syp'. rwmh'. This renders its Hebrew cognate that occurs only here in Judges.
$n t h z^{\prime}$. This renders the Niphal of $r^{\circ} h$ and such renderings of $r^{\prime} h$ are rated 5 at 1:24.
bynt. This renders $b$ and renderings of $b$ were evaluated at $1: 1$ and not rated because of the great diversity among them. It is reasonable to say that the rendering here could have been literal, but also difficult to rate the consistency, so it is not rated.

Based on the four examples that were rated, this mode is rated 5 in this verse. If segment 6 of $P$ is evaluated as a rendering of segment 6 as vocalized in MT, this mode would be rated 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Several of the elements of this translation are the subject of differing opinions among the commentators and the approach adopted by P may be judged possible even if one takes a different position as to the particular element questioned. As will now be discussed, some aspects of the translation in this verse of P may be judged mistaken, and others as aspects of translation technique or less than strictly literal.

Segments 1 to 3 are a possible rendering of the same segments of MT. Since there is considerable disagreement about the exact meaning of the clause, P's translation is arguable even if the sing. of segment 3 is not strictly literal. Still one cannot say that there is any clearly measurable difference between "new things" and "something new."

Segments 4 to 6 have already been described as the translation of a clause that continues to the end of the verse. The added waw prefix at segment 4 was explained as a feature of Syriac syntax where the beginning of a non-sequential clause often adds this conjunction. It does appear that the translator was reading the Hebrew letters with the understanding that they were vocalized differently from the vocalization of MT. Although the juxtaposition of the barley loaves and the military weapons (and the rendering of segment 9) is problematic and the sequence of the segments varies from the MT at segment 9 , the result can be defended as a satisfactory effort to deal with a puzzling passage, especially segments 5 and 6 as pointed in MT and the position of segment 9 in

MT. The rendering of the bread, the sword, and the spear as disjunctive subjects of segment 8 also seems to be a satisfactory solution to the problem of how to render this section of the verse in a less incoherent way. While the rendering is not strictly literal it is reckoned here as an effort to observe the modes of literalism as far as possible while working to mitigate the incoherence.

Segment 10 has already been described as accurate even if bynt not strictly literal. The same observation applies to the $d$ prefix of segment 12 . It is not necessarily a genitive construction here since it is rendering a preposition. Segment 3 as understood here is a direct object construction $d$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. Based on the ratings given modes 1, 2, and 3, this verse would be rated 5 , but perhaps it calls for a rating system that allows for " 5 ?" since so many of the judgments have to be particularly tentative and some matters covered by mode 4 point to a degree of freedom in translation.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

The rendering of segments 5 and 6 by P is supported by A ; B represents the verb of segment 8 , does not subtract segment 12 as A does, and then renders segment 8 as third person sing. as P and MT do. The rendering of segments 5 and 6 is considered most significant here, so A is judged more similar to P .

5:9. לבי לחוקקי ישראל המתנדבים בעים ברכו יהוה: لص,

## RETROVERSION

There are seven elements or segments is this verse of MT, five to the athnach and two following it. If ' $m r$ is counted as an addition and 'ylyn dpryšyn is counted as segment 4 , seven segments can also be counted in P and lined up with the seven segments of this verse of MT. Segments $1,3,5,6$, and 7 of $P$ can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. Whether segment 2 or the element pryšyn of segment $4^{15}$ can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT is a matter for more consideration in the discussion of the literalism of the verse that follows. At this point one can observe that the often reliable ms 9 a 1 has a seyāmē at segment 2 . Semantically segment 2 is at least understandable as a rendering of that segment of MT. ${ }^{16}$ The elements 'ylyn $d$ of segment 4 are considered features of Syriac syntax. One might argue that the principal element of the segment, prysyn, is not rendering this Hebrew participle there, but the Hebrew is supported by B and the free rendering of the Vulgate. The source of P will be considered as indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

## LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements.

Except for the addition of ' $m r$ this is a word-for-word translation of this verse of MT. with adaptation to Syriac syntax at segment 4 and questions about the semantic accuracy of segment 2 and segment 4 . In this case the addition does have an effect on the literal quality of the verse since it goes beyond specifying or clarifying what might otherwise be inferred and chooses one possible interpretation among several to describe what segment 1

[^194]is doing in relation to segment 2 . If the addition had been omitted the reader of the translation would have had to decide what was going on. The addition of P is merely another proposal like the "goes out" of RSV and NRSV. Since the verse without the addition can be rendered as "my heart belongs to the authorities," this addition is seen to reduce the literal quality of the segmentation by P to a fraction under $86 \%$. Since the sequence of the segments remains the same, that aspect of the mode is rated 5 and the mode as a whole is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As already stated, the added elements of segment 4 are considered features of mode 4 and ' $m r$ is considered an addition. Ordinarily an addition would not be considered a feature of mode 1 , but this is viewed as a special case where the addition affects both modes. Thus this mode is rated at a fraction under $86 \%$ or 4.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

lby. This renders its Hebrew cognate in this verse and in twelve other verses: 5:15, 16; $9: 3 ; 16: 15,17,18(2 x), 25 ; 18: 20 ; 19: 3,5$; and $20: 22$. At $19: 16$ the Hebrew phrase of which is a part becomes a free translation and that translation that does not include any term that can be a specific rendering of $l b$ : wyṭb $l b k$ becomes wnttb $l k$. This is considered inconsistent, but since it is only one of fourteen renderings, the consistency of this rendering is rated 5 .
$m b d q n^{\prime}$. This renders the construct plur. of the Qal (or Poel) participle of hqq. At 5:14 the Poel participle is rendered by the same Syriac term. A similar substantive form from the same root renders a Hebrew substantive of this root at $5: 15$. Since these are the only occurrences in Judges, no rating is proposed here. Weitzman comments on this rendering as noted above.
pryšn. This renders mtndbym, the Hithpael participle of $n d b$. The infinitive of the Hebrew is rendered by tšbwhth at $5: 2$. Thus there can be no rating with only two occurrences in Judges. The semantic accuracy has already been discussed and Weitzman's comments on that issue noted.
' $m$ '. This renders its Hebrew cognate, the consistency of which rendering was rated 5 at 1:16.
brkw. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 4 at 5:2.
$m r y$. The rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at $1: 1$.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The added ' $m r$ seems speculative, just as "goes out" in RSV and NRSV is speculative. The simple approach suggested above is to treat segment 2 as a dative of possession. The rendering, or expanded rendering, of segment 4 is not literal, but the inconsistency of the rendering of segments 4 and 6 of this verse with the rendering of segments 4 and 6 at $5: 2$ is more striking. At the same time that the rendering of segments 4 and 6 differs so greatly, segments 5 and 7 of this verse and of 5:2 are identical in MT and are rendered by identical Syriac terms at segments 5 and 7 in the same two verses of P. Even A renders segment 4 differently in 5:2 from its rendering in this verse (as does the Syro-Hexaplar), but B is consistent. All three of those Versions are consistent at segment 6 is both verses. Only P is inconsistent and such a degree of inconsistency is unusual in P . Moore says of 5:9-11: "The text of these verses has suffered so badly that there is no reasonable hope that any art or skill by the critic will ever be able to restore it." ${ }^{17}$ What can be said of P's work is that it does not show a great effort to be semantically consistent, but it does show a pattern of

[^195](sometimes superficially) similar segmentation as well as similar sequencing with only a small departure from quantitative literalism.

At segments 2 to 3 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$. Segment 4 is rendered as a relative clause but with the masculine plur. 'ylyn in addition to $d$. Here one might wonder whether 'ylyn is added to balance ' $m r$ in the first colon of the verse. Segment 7 is an instance of direct object construction $e$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5-.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

The only significant difference between $A$ and $B$ is in rendering segment 4 where $A$ has
 therefore neither is considered closer to P. The Syro-Hexaplar has hyltn', plur., and thus is closer to A. (The free translation of the Vulgate may be closer to B.)

5:10. רכבי אתנות צחרות ישבי על־מזָין והלכי על־דרך שיחו:
.

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 5 and 7, there are eight segments in this verse of MT, five to the tebir and three following it. With $b b t^{p}$ counted as segment 5 and $b^{\prime} w r h t^{\prime}$ as segment 7 there are seven segments in this verse of MT, three to the first punctuation point, and four to the second such point. The eighth segment of this verse of MT would seem to be represented in $P$ by the first segment of the
next verse. Both $A$ and $B$ also represent segment 8 of MT as the first segment of 5:11. Segments 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. Segment 3 of P is understood as a slightly different color ("white" or "silver") from that of segment 3 of MT ("reddish-gray" or "tawny"). (In Modern Hebrew ṣhwr does mean "white.") In B the translator seems to have read şhr. Perhaps the Vulgate gives some support for P's reading with "nitentes." Segment 5, bt, "houses," is at first surprising, but it may have its origin in a Hebrew reading, and even more likely in the Old Greek. In B those who are seated are غ̇лı̀ крıтпрíov and in the Vulgate they are "in judico." In the Syro-Hexaplar, they are 'l byt dyn', but this is preceded by a phrase not found in MT, that is before segment 4 of MT: $w^{\star} l q r w k$ (plur.). This is what is found in A and thus A's $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \nu \hat{\rho} v$ is not rendering segment 5 of MT, but something found in A and not found in MT. Burney believes A is rendering $m d y n,{ }^{18}$ but A must be rendering whatever lies behind what the Syro-Hexaplar renders by $q r w k$. Together A and B each render one part of all that is rendered by the Syro-Hexaplar. Boling cites Freedman for the view that $m d y n$ is derived from $d y n$, "judge," and means something like judgment seat (apparently influenced by B). ${ }^{19}$ Thus, directly or indirectly, it seems that segment 5 of P must have its origin in something like the plur. of byt dyn and does not provide any cogent evidence for a source that differed from MT at this point. The plur. form at segment 5 of P is not accurate even if it has a basis in a reading like byt dyn. The plur. form of segment 7 of P is also inaccurate. Since segment 8 of MT, syhw, appears to be rendered by $r n w$ that begins the next verse of P and since both A and B have also rendered it as the first segment of 5:11, this verse and 5:11 will be analyzed as if syhw had been the first segment of 5:11.

[^196]Based on these considerations a text like the first seven segments of MT is considered the source of P although difficulties in translation or transmission (where $d y n^{\prime}$ in the phrase byt dyn') might have produced the text of P now available to us.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Here again the verse being considered is not particularly suited to the application of Barr's typology. The waw prefixes of segments 1 and 4 are features of Syriac syntax, but the awkwardness of their presence in Hebrew poetry as opposed to prose needs to be taken into account. Whether or not segment 3 of $P$ is semantically imprecise it is accepted here as part of a word-for-word translation. If imprecise, that would be understood as a feature of mode 4. On the other hand $b t^{\prime}$ is not part of a word-for-word translation even if it can be explained in relation to MT as a loss of $d y n^{\prime}$ after $b b t^{\prime}$. Therefore the literal quality of the segmentation is reckoned at a fraction under $86 \%$. The sequence is not considered to have been impaired, so this mode is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. One might be tempted to speculate that an element of segment $5, d y n^{\prime}$, was subtracted from this verse. That is considered too speculative a conclusion to support a calculation about the literal quality of this mode, and the absence of a literal segment at the point where it would have been rendered has already affected the rating of mode 1 . As in other places the added waw prefixes are treated as features of mode 4 . The displacement of the rendering of segment 8 into the next verse is not counted as a feature of this mode in this verse. Thus this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$r k b y$. This renders Hebrew rkby here and two other times in Judges, at 10:4 and 12:14. Although there are only three occurrences their consistency with the renderings of rekeb considered at 1:19 and with the renderings of $m r k b h$ at 4:14 and 5:28 support a conclusion that these renderings are consistent even though they are not rated.
'tn'. This renders the plur. of 'twn, a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated.
$h \not w r t t^{\prime}$. This plur. renders ṣhrwt, a hapax legomenon in the Old Testament.
$y t b y$. This renders $y$ šby and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9.
$b b t^{2}$. This purports to render $m d y n$ as the plur of $m d$. At 3:16 $m d y w$ is vocalized consistently with its being a form of $m d$. That is not true here, but its relation to $d y n$ is considered likely, and its relation to the place name at Jos 15:61, unlikely. Thus the question of consistency does not apply here.
mhlky. This renders the Qal participle of hlk and that rendering was rated 4 at 1:22.
'wrht'. This plur renders the sing. of $d r k$ here. As at 2:19 the plur. is not easily explained, but all of the renderings of the Hebrew in Judges are rendered by this Syriac. The renderings by the plur. in P of the sing. in MT are rated 5-.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 5-.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Although there is doubt about the rendering of segment 3 and the plur. form at segments 5 and 7, the important question about P if B , the Vulgate, the Syro-Hexaplar, and Freedman are right is why P lacks $d y n^{\prime}$. Its absence here is reckoned to be the result of some mistake, whatever may be the description of that mistake. The construct forms of segments 4 and 6 parallel the Hebrew forms where the genitive components are prepositional phrases. Nöldeke cites examples of this kind of construction in discussing "Participles used as nouns." ${ }^{20}$ The first of the three participles, segment 1 , is part of a genitive construction $a$, and the other 2 at segments 4 to 5 and 6 to 7 are more like genitive construction $a$ than like $b$ or $c$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5-.

[^197]
## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

At segment 2 A has $\dot{v} \pi o \zeta v \gamma i \omega v$ and B has ővov $\theta \eta \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \alpha \varsigma$ so that B is more semantically accurate in rendering MT and closer to P in that respect, but A is closer in rendering segment 2 as plur. At segment 3 A has nothing and B has $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu \beta$ pías, apparently reading the $h$ rather than the $h$. At segment 5, A has $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \eta v \hat{\omega} v$, probably based on the same source as the Syro-Hexaplar between segments 2 and 4. (The Syro-Hexaplar does not represent segment 3.) At segment 5, B has kpitn ${ }^{\circ}$ ov, in line with the Vulgate, the SyroHexaplar, Freedman, and the suspected basis of the rendering by P. Segments 6 and 7 are not rendered by A, but they are rendered by B (with some additions). Based in particular on B's rendering of segments 6 and 7, B is deemed more similar to P than A , but there are so many variations among MT and all the versions mentioned here that there is uncertainty about either the source used by P or the condition of the physical document containing that source.
[שיחו] מקול מחצצים בין משאבים שם יתנו צדקות יהוה צדקת פרזנו בישראגל אז ירדו לשערים .5:11
עם־יהוה:

##  

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segment 15 there are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, eleven to the athnach and four following it. With ' $m$ ' $d m r y$ counted as segment 15 there are sixteen segments in P , identifying the first segment, $r n w$, as segment A , and counting $m n m l^{\prime}$ as segment 1 . Segment A and segments 1 to 4
precede the first punctuation point, segments 5 to 8 precede the second punctuation point, segments 9 to 11 precede the third punctuation point, and segments 12 to 15 continue to the final punctuation, the strong doubled sign of four points.

Segment A can be retroverted to segment 8 of $5: 10$ although the semantic accuracy is disputed. After that there are a number of questions and several ways they have been answered by the ancient and modern translations. The most difficult problems are presented by segments 2 and 4 . In P it seems to be "inquirers" and "teachers" or something similar to each of those proposed renderings. In A it is either "those who are backing up" or "those who are striking up [music]" (usually understood as the latter) and, segment 4, "those rejoicing." In B it is like A at segment 2 and "those drawing water" at segment 4. Segments 1 to 4 of the Vulgate are apparently to be rendered as "where chariots have collided and the army of the enemies has been strangled." The Targum at segment 4 has byt šqqy dmy, meaning a place where one might draw water, but segment 2 is hard to identify in the reworked text of Tg J. Although one suspects the accuracy of the rendering by P at segments 2 and 4, the affirmative evidence for a text alternative to MT is weak as to those segments. What is at least as likely is that either the document on which the translator relied was damaged or the translator was uncertain about the meaning of the text. In either case the translator might then have estimated the meaning. We cannot know the semantic range of $h \stackrel{s}{s}$ and $m s^{\prime} b y m$ which the translator understood since both are hapaxes in Judges and, as to segment 4, the related $\breve{s}^{\prime} b$ does not occur in Judges. As will be pointed out in discussing mode 4 , segment 1 of P can be retroverted to segment 1 of MT although it is not the most literal rendering. Segment 6 of P cannot be retroverted to segment 6 of MT as the letters are vocalized, but it can be retroverted if the letters are revocalized to represent the $3^{\text {rd }}$ masculine plur. Qal imperf. of $n$ tn as it also is understood by A, B and the Syro-Hexaplar. This does seem to be a place where there is a reasonable
basis for amending the vocalization of MT. Segments 7 to 9 of P can also be retroverted to segments 7 to 9 of MT except for the sing. form and the pronominal suffix of segment 9 (considered a feature of mode 4). Segment 10 of P cannot be retroverted to the corresponding segment of MT, but seems closest to the rendering of B : $\alpha$ и̋ $\xi \eta \sigma o v$. The rendering of A, $\varepsilon$ vío $\chi \cup \sigma \alpha v$, and the Syro-Hexaplar, 'thylw, are similar in meaning. On the one hand we find the sense of augmentation, and on the other that of strengthening. The two meanings are not so very different, but all four are different from MT. None of the four render segment 2 of 5:7 the same way they render this identical segment of MT. (The Vulgate renders both segments by "fortes," but this does not support MT.) The consistent use of pshey by Tg J supports MT, but also tends to show that other versions did not understand or were influenced by a different source. There is considerable difference among the commentators about this segment. No solution to the problem is advanced here.

Accordingly, the source of $P$ here is considered to be MT except that (1) segment A is in this verse; (2) segments 2 and 3 were either in a portion of the source text that was not understood or obscured by physical damage; (3) at segment $6 y t n w$ was read as the prefixed tense of the Qal of $n t n$; and (4) at segment 10 P was influenced by some source different from MT and it is likely that a similar influence affected B in particular, but is also likely to have affected A and the Syro-Hexaplar, even the Vulgate.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. What seems most likely here is that the translator of P was trying to make a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew text available to that translator and to translate the segments in the same sequence they followed in that text. The sequence is likely to have been rendered literally. Such a conclusion is speculative here because of the difficulty of
making a clean analysis of a verse like this one. Notwithstanding that difficulty, such a verse does show a translation discipline that committed the translator to translating segment by segment and to maintaining the same sequence and the same number of segments as MT. What cannot be decided is whether any of the segments that cannot be retroverted to MT were literal segments of the source on which any such segment was based. Without deciding that, no reliable rating of the segmentation of this mode can be made. If one estimates that segments 2 , 3 , and 10 are not segmented literally, the segmentation would be rated 3.5 . Since the sequence of the remaining segments is maintained, that aspect of the mode would be rated 5 , and this mode would be rated 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Since the absence of segment 8 of MT in the previous verse is not counted as a subtraction, the addition of what is called segment A here cannot be counted as an addition. There are no other additions or subtractions. Insofar as a rating could be assigned under the special circumstances of this verse, the rating would be 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

The following are translations by P of the hapax legomenon in Judges indicated in each case and not rated: rnw of šyḥw; bswy of mhṣsym; and mlpn' of mš'bym.
$m l$. This plur. renders $q w l$ only here in Judges. The ten other renderings are by the Syriac cognate as set out at $2: 2$. This rendering is rated 1 .
bynt'. This renders byn and the rendering was rated 4 - at 4:5.
tmn. This rendering of $\check{s} m$ was rated 5 at 1:7.
ntlwn. This is intended to render the Qal imperf. of ntn. If this rendering had been included in the calculation at 1:12, the rating would still have been 4 .
$z d y q w t h$. With the pronominal suffix added this renders $s(d q(w) t$ twice in this verse. These are the only two occurrences of the Hebrew term in Judges and not rated. $m r y$. This rendering of $y h w h$ occurs twice in this verse and was rated 5 at 1:1.
'sgy. This occupies the position where prznw would be rendered. Since the Hebrew is found only here and at 5:7 it would not be rated even if it had been reckoned to render that Hebrew term.
hydyn. This renders ${ }^{\prime} z$ and the consistency of the renderings of that Hebrew was rated 5 at 5:8.
$n h t$. This sing. renders the Qal plur. $y r d w$ and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:9.
$t r^{(r)}$. This sing. renders $\breve{s}^{\prime} r y m$ here and at the seven other places listed in the discussion of the consistency of the rendering of the same term in MT by $\check{s} r^{r}$ at $5: 8$. The Hebrew source there was suspect. As rendered here and in the seven other places if would be rated 4.
' $m$ '. This renders its Hebrew cognate and that rendering was rated 5 at 1:16.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Smelik reckons that $q w l$ is rendered by ' ${ }^{\prime} r^{\prime}$ by Tg J in this verse ${ }^{21}$ and that both the rendering of Tg J and ml ' are "modifications." That may be, but $q w l$ still can include a meaning that can be rendered by $m l$ ' by application of the opinion expressed in the TDOT entry: "[I]n some instances the term qôl refers primarily to that which a voice articulates, i. e., to the actual content, and less to the phonetic elements. ${ }^{י 22}$ It is conceded here that $q l$ would have been more literal, but $m l^{\prime}$ is not inaccurate. If musical instruments were involved, one might meditate on the sound, but P does not have music in view. This rendering makes the fact that the voices are speaking words with semantic content the further meaning of what is in this context the metaphorical use of "voice" in MT.
${ }^{21}$ Targum of Judges, 274.
${ }^{22}$ TDOT, Vol. XII, English Translation (Grand Rapids \& Cambridge, 2003) s. v. קול, 583.

Segments 2 and 4 are hapaxes in Judges. The Piel of $h \underset{S}{s}$ is a hapax in the Old Testament. Even the Pual at Job 21:21 and Qal at Prov 30:27 give no help in understanding the meaning here. (Both RSV and NRSV note that the meaning of the Hebrew of segment 2 is uncertain, but there is no such note at Job 21:21 or Prov 30:27.) Segment 4 is a hapax legomenon in the Old Testament, but the verb on which it is based does occur nineteen times outside of Judges. Since all those places involve drawing water, the usual rendering (like that of B and contemporary versions) is plausible, but difficult in the context. Since water is not mentioned in this verse, once a translator decided that segment 2 meant something like "inquirer," it would have been understandable to conclude that segment 4 meant something like "person who draws out answers" or "place where answers are drawn out."

The rendering of segment $6, y t n w$, by P has strong support in $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and the SyroHexaplar for the possibility that the Hebrew letters were originally meant to be vocalized consistently with P's rendering in this verse. Smelik reckons that segment 6 in Tg J is rendered by $y d^{23}$ and the Vulgate has no element that renders the segment. If the rendering was mistaken it would be a feature of Barr's mode 6 , as a misreading of the pointing.

As mentioned above A and the Syro-Hexaplar have renderings of segment 10 that are similar to each other just as $B$ has a rendering similar to that of P , and all four might be harmonized with each other more easily than with MT.

At segments 1 to 2 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$ as there also is within segment 15 . At segment 7 to 8 there is an instance of genitive construction $c$. At segments 6 to 7 there is an instance of direct object construction $d$. Segment 10 is

[^198]considered part of a relative clause that includes segment 11 ，although segment 10 is part of a genitive construction in MT．

RATING OF THE VERSE．Any rating of the verse would have to be qualified and is difficult to compare with other verses where there are not so many semantic problems and unusual constructions．Based only on the rating of modes 2 and 3，the overall rating of this verse would be 4．5．The estimate made for mode 1 would lower that to 4 ．

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

In the sequence of segments the first substantial difference between $A$ and $B$ is at segment 4 where both differ from P ．At segment 7 B agrees with P ，but A has סík人ıor．At segment 10 ，$\alpha 0 ̋ \xi \sigma o v$ of B is considered closer to P than $\dot{\varepsilon} v i ́ \sigma \chi \sigma \sigma o v$ of A ．At no other points where the two diverge in minor ways is either considered significantly more similar to P ． Therefore B is considered more similar to P in this verse．

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segments 6 and 11 there are eleven segments in this verse of MT，six to the athnach and 5 following it．With wmlly tšbwht＇counted as segment 6 ，brh d＇byn＇m counted as segment 11 ，and＇tyry counted as segment 5 ，there are also eleven segments in this verse of P ，three to the first punctuation point，three more to the second，and five more to the third and last such point．

Except for segment 5 all the segments of P can be retroverted to the samenumbered segments of this verse of MT. The other versions consulted here, A, B, the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplar all support segment 5 of MT, but Tg J has a verb of the same root at segment 5 . Uncharacteristically in this chapter Tg J can be retroverted to MT without any additions except at this segment 5. The renderings of both Tg J and P could be seen as a free translation, but the extent of their agreement cannot easily be attributed to coincidence. Thus it is probable that they were under a common influence, but not so likely that the influence was found in the Hebrew manuscript tradition. Of course one ought not overlook the possibility that the ' in P was mistakenly dropped. Accordingly the source of this verse will be treated as one that cannot be distinguished from MT, but with caution exercised as to segment 5 .

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Except for segment 5 this verse of P is a word-for-word translation of this verse of P . The added waw prefix at segment 6 is considered a feature of Syriac syntax under mode 4 . The rendering of segment 5 together with the prefix is seen as an alteration of the segment since no waw is added at segment 2 and segment 5 of MT is a syntactical twin of segment 2. Therefore segment 5 impairs the literal quality of the segmentation and that aspect of this mode is reduced to a fraction under $91 \%$. The sequence does not deviate from that of MT, so this mode is rated 5-.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none, since the prefix of segment 6 is treated as a feature of mode 4 . With the changed segmentation of segment 5 , its prefix is also a matter of syntax more than of addition. This mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
'tt'yry. Three of the four occurrences of the Qal of ' $w r$ in this verse are rendered by this its Syriac cognate. Since this Hebrew verb is almost always found in poetic passages this is the only verse in Judges where it is found. The fourth occurrence is rendered by the Ethpaal of $y d^{\prime}$. The first three occurrences are rated 3 and the fourth is rated 1.
mlly. This Pael renders the Piel of $d b r$. As set out at $1: 20$, in nine of the twenty-six places where $d b r$ is rendered in Judges it is rendered by this Syriac. In that verse and in fourteen other places Hebrew $d b r$ is rendered by Syriac 'mr. Accordingly it is rated 1 here.
tšbwht'. This renders Hebrew šyr and the Hebrew verb is rendered by Syriac šbḥ at 5:1 and 3. Those two are the only occurrences of the verb in Judges and this is the only occurrence of the noun. Thus they are consistent, but too scarce in Judges to be rated. $q w m$. This rendering of its Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 2:10.
$\check{s} b y$ and šbyk. This verb and this noun render Hebrew šbh and šby, respectively. Both Hebrew words occur only here in Judges, and so they are not rated.
brh. With the added pronominal suffix this renders $b n$, and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:13.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The possibility that Tg J and P either share a common source or that one of the two was influenced by the other was suggested above. They might also have shared a source where this variation had arisen. At whatever point it appeared it might have been the result of free translation.

The added waw prefix of segment 5 does not fit into any commonly observed pattern. Williams has found "that in three cases where there is a pair of feminine imperatives (the first of each pair being مחק or Jirs) a waw is added in the Syriac. ${ }^{\prime 24}$ This does not fit the situation in this verse. Williams also observes that syndetic pairs of

[^199]feminine forms in Hebrew become asyndetic in Syriac, and comments: "From this we may conclude that there is a greater degree of fluctuation between asyndeton and the construction with waw in feminine imperatives." ${ }^{25}$ If that observation applies here, the fluctuation occurs in the very short space from segment 1 to segment 5 .

The genitive construction $c$ at segment 11 is surprising. Up to this point in Judges, in every case of Hebrew bn plus the proper name of the father, the Syriac has rendered by genitive construction $a$. At segment 6 and at segments 9 to 10 there are two instances of direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Codex B is almost as close to MT as it could be and thus only differs from P at segment 5, but A has made a large number of additions. Therefore B is more similar to P in this verse. Unlike most other verses in this chapter, the rendering of Tg J is similar to P and that includes segment 5. However, Tg J renders segments 1, 2, and 4 by the imperative of $s b h$ and therefore it would be considered less similar to P than B in this verse.

5:13.
אז ירד שריד לאדירים עֵּם יהוה ירד־לי בגבורים:


## RETROVERSION

${ }^{25}$ Ibid.

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 7 there are eight segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and three following it. With dnht ly counted as segment 7 there are also eight segments in this verse of P , six to the first punctuation point and two following it.

Here again one can discern a connection between each of the segments of P and the same-numbered segment of MT. Segments $1,2,6,7$, and 8 can readily be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. Segment 3 of P with the sense of "deliverer" seems to arise from a problem in P's source or a misunderstanding of the Hebrew since it is hard to see it as a free translation of śryd. The rendering seems to be a guess that segment 3 is referring to Barak. After speculation about segment 4, whether or not based on an understanding of śryd the Syriac translator rendered the term in a way that described Barak in this context as a "deliverer." The ' $m$ at segment 5 may have been taken for the Hebrew preposition and rendered by this Syriac preposition, a possible translation that fits within the context of the rest of the P translation of this verse.

These observations lead to the conclusion that the differences at segments 3, 4, and 5 do not give substantial support to a source different from MT. The BHS apparatus for this verse suggests an alternative reading for this verse supposedly based on $B$ and $C$, and other alternatives appear in A and the Syro-Hexaplar, but in fact $B$ is seen here to support MT. Accordingly no source that differs from MT is proposed as a source for P in this verse.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of segments. This could be classified here as a word-for-word translation despite the errors at segments 3,4 , and 5. This is a possibility envisioned by Barr and is the subject of further comment at mode 4 (although more likely a feature, in part of Barr's mode 6). Nevertheless, segment

3 would still be a free translation, and perhaps even segment 4 would be too. This will be reflected by rating the segmentation at 3.5 . The segments as understood in P are in the same sequence that they follow in MT. If so, this mode would be rated 4. On the other hand the verse might be seen as a free or erroneous translation based on a failed effort to make sense of a text the translator did not understand or that was damaged. That would result in a rating of 2 for the segmentation and 5 for sequence for a rating of 3 for this mode. The former approach is followed here.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
whydyn. This rendering of ' $z$ was rated 5 at 5:8.
$n h t$. This renders $y r d$ twice in this verse and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:9.
$m p s y n$. This renders śryd, a hapax legomenon in Judges, and the rendering is not rated.
$m s ̌ b h ̣ w$. This renders 'dyrym here. At 5:25 the same Hebrew is rendered by gnbr'. The rendering in this verse is inaccurate but there are not enough occurrences to make a meaningful rating.
$m r y$. This renders $y h w h$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:1.
$g b r^{2}$. This sing. renders the plur. gbwrym in this verse and at 5:23. At 6:12 and 11:1 the Hebrew is rendered by gnbr. These are not rendered as consistently as they might be, but because they are quite similar, the rendering by $g b r^{\circ}$ is rated 4 -.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4.5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Unless the lexicographers are wrong about the definition of mpsyn', this is an inaccurate rendering of the Hebrew and would reduce the semantic literalism of this verse by $12.5 \%$ if this mode 4 were being rated in this study. Segments 4 and 5 are also semantically inaccurate and together would reduce the semantic literalism by another $25 \%$ so that the verse would only be rated 2 for semantic accuracy if that calculation were being applied.

The added waw at the beginning of the verse calls for an explanation. If the view that Syriac usually joins non-sequential clauses by waw is correct, then that would mean that the translator here does not see this hydyn $/ z$ as sequential to the $h y d y n /{ }^{\prime} z$ at $5: 11$. Williams' example of the additon of waw before a note of time is most germane as an explanation of this addition. ${ }^{26}$ The $d$ prefix of $n h ̣ t$ at segment 7 also calls for comment. It probably would not be present if segment 5 were semantically correct. As the verse stands in P segments 7 and 8 are in apposition to segment 3 , and $d$ has the sense of "the one who" or "he who" in the phrase to the effect: "he who came down to me manfully."

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5. (The qualifications are suggested in the foregoing discussion.)

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Although B is closer to MT, but differing is some details like the rendering of $l y$ by $\alpha v ̉ \tau \hat{\text {, }}$, A is very different and none of its differences make it more similar to P but do show similarity to the Syro-Hexaplar. Thus there are more points of similarity between B and P than between either of them and A .

5:14. מני אפרים שרשם בעמלק אחריך בנימין בעממֵיך מני מכיר ירדו מחקקים ומזבולן משכים בשבט


[^200]
## RETROVERSION

There are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and eight following it. With wmi zbwlwn counted as segment 12 , there are also fifteen segments in this verse of P, four to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, four more to the third and four more to the fourth and last such point.

Segments $1,2,4,5,6,8,9,11,12$ and 15 of P can be retroverted to the samenumbered segments of MT. Segment 3 of MT is variously rendered: A, $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \mu \mu \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \tau \sigma$
 (like B but freer); and the Syro-Hexaplar, sm bryšs dylhwn (of interest since it only requires that the first shin of MT become a sin and be joined to an added mem). Except for A and P , the other versions tend to support MT or something close to it. ${ }^{27}$ At segment 7, A, B, the Vulgate, the Syro-Hexaplar, and even Tg J support MT. ${ }^{28}$ At segment 10, $n p q$ renders $y r d$, the only time in Judges where that is the case as shown in the discussion of the rendering by $n h t$ at $1: 9$. Ordinarily $n p q$ renders $y s^{3}$, but it is unlikely that this rendering is based on that Hebrew. Segments 13 and 14 of P are also not based on the same numbered segments of MT. However, segments 13 and 14 of P are supported by Tg J. Segment 13 of MT is supported by A, B and the Syro-Hexaplar. Perhaps here P did have access to interpretive material that was part of the same tradition as that of the Targums. Nevertheless, there is enough support for MT to make it likely that a text like MT was in existence at the time the translator of Judges was working. Part of the problem may have risen in the history of transmission, because segments 1 and 2 of this verse are at the end of $5: 13$ in the UBS Edition of $P$, and that explains the waw prefix if it begins a non-sequential independent clause, but it is a problem if segments 1 and 2 are

[^201]simply dangling. Therefore, no Hebrew text different from MT will be proposed here, but it will be assumed that P was not alone in rendering $\check{s} b t \underset{t}{ }$ by a word that meant an implement for writing, perhaps based on an interpretive tradition.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation of segments $1,2,4,5,6,8,9,11,12$, and 15 of this verse. Segment 3 is considered a free translation perhaps referring to the "deliverer," namely Barak, or to his servants, those allied with him. In his TDOT article, Renz proposes with qualifications that the first four segments can be translated: "(There set out) some from Ephraim whose root [=origin] is in Amelek." What is suggested here is that P is referring to those whose roots were in Amelek as "his servants" in Amelek, or to something Barak did there as "his deeds.". This is a simple solution and would mean that this segment is being freely translated as opposed to concluding that the translator had a misunderstanding of a word that was translated according to the translator's sincere but misinformed effort.

If Weitzman is correct as to segment 7, the translator was dealing with a text that was hard to read and concluded that it was a word which was then rendered by segment 7 . He reaches this conclusion, following Joosten, because using this Syriac term for "'love' is almost wholly alien to P in the Old Testament." Moreover this is not like segment 3 where the free translation moved from a metaphorical to a more concrete term. Rather, it is in the opposite direction. Weitzman concludes that "the least difficult conclusion" is to emend to b'mmyk. Based on this conclusion segment 7 of P is taken as an effort to deal literally with the source where the corruption suggested by Weitzman occurred (perhaps in this case of an earlier Syriac source and not of any then-extant manuscript of P and not based on an undamaged reading similar to P ).

The rendering of segments 13 and 14 by P and Tg J is considered here to be heavily influenced by the presence of segment 15 and the meaning of that term to the rabbis and the translators of P. Jeremias notes in his article that "only once" in the New Testament is $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \varepsilon v \varsigma_{\varsigma}$ "used as the title of a higher . . . official in the ordinary Greek sense of 'clerk' or 'secretary."" Rather, "[t]he normal Jewish use . . . is very common." Thus whether the translator was Jewish or Christian the meaning was understood as a translation of the Aramaic and Hebrew terms used at segment 15 and meant "a 'man learned in the Torah,' a 'rabbi,' an 'ordained theologian.' ${ }^{29}$ If this was the presupposition of the translator it would have been difficult to imagine anyone "carrying the scepter" of a scribe. Someone with that view could imagine that a scribe's "scepter" was his writing instrument and from that we get "those who write with the 'pen' of the scribe." That is one possibility. If correct it would make segments 13 and 14 a free translation. As a result segments 3,13 , and 14 would be considered free translations and segment 7 a mistaken literal translation. This would make $20 \%$ of the segments free translations and the segmentation would be rated 3.5 . Since the segments, including the four just mentioned, follow the same sequence not only of those that they are deemed to have translated freely, but also those that they may have translated mistakenly, the sequence is rated 5 and the rating for this mode is 4 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5.

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$b t r k$. This rendering of ' $h r$ was rated 4 for consistency at $1: 1$.
'bdwhy. This freely translates $\check{s} r s ̌$, a hapax legomenon in Judges.
$h \not \omega b k$. This erroneously replaces 'mmyh and is not rated.

[^202]$n p q$. This renders $y r d$ only here in Judges and is rated 1. See the discussion of consistency at 1:9.
$m b d q n^{\prime}$. This and the other occurrences of renderings of the root $h q q$ in Judges were not rated at 5:9.
$k t b y n$. This freely translates mškym. The translations of this Hebrew verb in P were not rated at 4:6.
$q n y$. This renders šbt only here. In twelve of the fifteen other places where Hebrew šbt occurs in Judges it is rendered by $\check{s} b t ̣$. Here the consistency of this rendering is rated 1. $s p r$. This renders $s p r$, a hapax legomenon in Judges.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The semantic accuracy of segments $3,7,13$, and 14 has already been discussed and those discussions apply to this mode as well. See 5:9 for the discussion of the semantic accuracy of segment 11 .

The prefixed waw at segment 3 is an added element in P. This may be a case where items in a list not joined by waw in MT are joined by waw in P. ${ }^{30}$ At segment 13 there is an added $d$ prefix, a common practice of P where a participle in Hebrew becomes part of a relative clause in P . At segments 14 and 15 there is a genitive construction $b$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 3.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

At segments $2,4,5,6,9,12$, and, perhaps, segments 1,8 , and $15, B$ and $P$ are in accord. Only at segments $6,9,12$, and perhaps 8 , are A and P in accord. Therefore B is considered more similar to P than A is.

[^203]```
5:15. ושרי ביששכר עם־דברה ויששכר כן ברק בעמק שלח ברגלֵיו בפלגות ראובן גדלים חקקי־ל: 
```




## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 3 and 13 there are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, nine to the athnach and four following it. With 'm $d b w r^{r}$ counted as segment 3 and $b d q l b^{\prime}$ as segment 13 , there are also 13 segments in this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, four more to the third, and two to the fourth and last such point.

Except for segment $7^{31}$ the segments of P can be retroverted to the samenumbered segments of MT with acceptance of the orthography of the proper name at segment 11 and explanation of certain elements as part of mode 4 . Segment 7 of MT has support in A, B, Tg J, and the Syro-Hexaplar. It is most probably an error made in the transmission of the text, although a damaged qoph might have been taken for a mem. Thus there is little reason to doubt that a text like that of MT was extant at the time of the translation, but the text available to the translator of P might have presented difficulties at segment 7.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation of twelve of the thirteen segments of this verse of MT.

[^204]Additional explanation for some of the twelve segments will be given in the discussion of mode 4. Segment 7 of P is not a translation of segment 7 of MT, but it is not considered a free translation. Instead it seems to have resulted either from a mistake or from a damaged MS that arose as early as the time the Hebrew text was in the hands of the translator or as late as the date of the earliest MS of P that witnesses to the error. Although it changes the meaning of the verse at that point it can be fit into a translation that varies only at that point and does not call for a reevaluation of any other segments of the verse. Accordingly it is not an impairment either of the segmentation or of the sequence of this verse, and the mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$r w r b n{ }^{\prime}$. This renders śry and the rendering was rated 4 at 4:2.
' $y k$. This renders $k n$ here, but BDB states that $k{ }^{2} r r$ is understood in this context and not expressed, but $k n$ is understood to be part of a construction meaning "in the same proportion," that is, "like."32 At 1:7, the discussion of the rendering of $k{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} r$ showed that in sixteen of twenty-two place ' $y k$ was part of the rendering of $k \prime \breve{s} r$. Of course, $k \stackrel{s}{s} r$ is only implied in this verse and thus the rendering is not rated, but this tends to show the consistency of the rendering under the special circumstances of this verse.
' $m m$ '. This renders ' $m q$ or some term that looked like ' $m$ or 'mym to the translator. In all seven other places where ' $m q$ occurs in Judges, it is rendered by ' $w m q$ '. Normally this would be rated 1 and the effect of that rendering on the rating of this mode and this verse will be shown.


[^205]rglwhy. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 3 at 1:6.
plgwt'. This renders its Hebrew cognate which occurs only in this verse and the next in Judges. It is not rated.
rwrbyn. This renders $g d w l y m$. See the discussion of the rendering by $r w r b t^{t}$ at $2: 7$. The rendering is not rated.
$b d q y$. This renders hqqy here. See the discussion of the rendering by $m b d q n^{\prime}$ at 5:9. See also the note discussing this rendering in relation to the rendering of hqr in the next verse in the discussion of the retroversion of this verse. This rendering is not rated.
$l b$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 5:9.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 . If the rendering by ' mm ' is counted, the rating would be 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Segment 7 of P was evaluated above as the result of a scribal error or damaged manuscript at some stage in the translation or transmission of the text. Segment 11 is puzzling like other renderings of proper names by P . In rendering $n$ by $l$ it may be a new example of letters that are exchanged in translation. As discussed in the note to the retroversion of the verse, Weitzman considers that the rendering of $h q q$ by forms of $b d q$ had come to be a common understanding of the translators of P .

At segments 1 to 2 and 10 to 11, there are two instances of genitive construction $b$, and at segment 13 an instance of genitive construction $a$.

At segment 1, P omits the waw prefix, probably because this material is sequential.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 4.5. (If ' $\mathrm{mm}^{\prime}$ ' is included in the mode 3 rating: 4.)

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

In this verse B keeps the conjunction at segment 1 , adds каì $\beta \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa$ after segment 3, renders segment 7 literally, but is otherwise similar to P . On the other hand, A makes numerous changes to the verse, so B is considered more comparable here.

```
5:16.
    למה ישבת בין המשפתים לשמע שרקות עדרים לפלגות ראובן גדולים חקרי־לב:
```



## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 11 , there are eleven segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and four following it. With ytb 'nt counted as segment 2 and $b d q y l b^{\prime}$ counted as segment 11, there are also eleven segments in this verse of P , nine to the first punctuation point and two following it.

Segments 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8 to 11 can be retroverted to MT. Segment 4 is particularly difficult. The rendering of B is $\delta \gamma \gamma \mathrm{o} \boldsymbol{i}^{\prime} \alpha \varsigma$ (two of something, perhaps saddlebags), but A and the Syro-Hexaplar seem to be transliterating the Hebrew. The Targum renders by thwwy" in a way similar to the "terminos" of the Vulgate. The definition of BDB is "fire-places" or "ash heaps" and of Kohler-Baumgartner "two saddle bags" (like B). In TDOT the view of Beckman is advanced interpreting "še riqot and the flocks metaphorically: Reuben has settled (yšb) in a location such that apotropaic whistling awaits him."33 This tends to help one understand segments 6 to 7 , but leaves segment 4 described vaguely as a "location," a general description that might fit other renderings. The picture is not unclear: the tribe of Reuben was on the sidelines not committed to support its kin in other tribes; but there is uncertainty about the Hebrew term that is a key

[^206] 481.
part of the metaphor that describes Reuben's tergiversation. For the purpose of this mode, šbyl' is accepted as P's way of rendering that metaphor literally even if it is not a semantically accurate rendering of segment 4 . This is based on the assumption that segment 4 of MT is a metaphor for a location not fully identified and segment 4 of P is another metaphor for a location not fully identified. This does not mean a case of rendering a metaphor by its further significance, but rendering a metaphor by another that the translator judges to give a similar meaning to the verse. This is of course speculative, but not in conflict with any evidence actually available to us. Segment 6 of $P$ is similar in meaning to MT, but may not render it exactly, and the Aphel of the Syriac cognate $\check{s} r q$ might have been more semantically literal, but not necessarily so. Furthermore, $s w q{ }^{\circ}$ is close enough in meaning to preclude a conclusion that it could not be retroverted. Segment 7 is somewhat different because the Syriac transposes the second and third of the root letters. The result is not too far from the meaning of the Hebrew ("flock" or "herd") since the plur. of "wild ass" would amount to a herd of wild asses. This seems to be an error that was made at the time of translation because ' $d r$ in the sense of herd or flock is rare or not found in Syriac although it is found in Jastrow's dictionary.

In conclusion, the source of this verse of P is considered to be a text indistinguishable from the text of MT, with the opinion qualified as to segment 4 and discussed above.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This verse of P is a word-for-word translation of a Hebrew verse like this verse of MT although the semantic accuracy of segment 4 does not have strong support. Segment 6 is a somewhat free translation, and segment 7 is based on a misreading of the Hebrew, but deemed intended to render it. Since any departure from literal at segment 6 only reduces
the rating for the segmentation aspect of this mode to $91 \%$, that aspect is rated $5-$. The sequence that the segments follow is rated 5 and this mode is rated 5 -.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are not any and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$y t b$. This renders $y s ̌ b$ and rendering was rated 5 at 1:9.
bynt. This renders byn and the rendering was rated 4 - at 4:5.
šbyl'. This renders mšptym, a hapax legomenon in Judges, and it is not rated.
$m s ̌ m$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 5 at 2:2.
$s w q$. This renders $\check{s} r q w t$ and this Hebrew is found only here in Judges and therefore the consistency of the rendering is not rated.
' $r d$ '. This plur. renders ' $d r y m$ inaccurately. Since the Hebrew is a hapax legomenon in Judges, the rendering would not be rated for consistency even if it were accurate.
plgwt'. This renders its Hebrew cognate in Judges and does so only here and in the previous verse where it was not rated. rwrbyn. This rendering of gdwlym is not rated for the reasons given at 2:7.
$b d q y$. Unlike the previous verse this renders hqry that occurs only here in Judges. The Hebrew verb of the same root occurs twice at $18: 2$ where the Qal infinitive and the Qal imperative are rendered by the same Syriac root as the one analyzed here. The renderings are consistent and may corroborate Weitzman, but there are too few for evaluation of consistency.
$l b$. This renders $l b$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 5:9.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5-.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. There are significant semantic problems at segments 4,6 , and 7 and those have already been discussed. If a rating were being calculated for the semantic aspect of this mode, the rating would be no more than 3 .

There are two instances of genitive construction $b$ at segments 6 to 7 and 8 to 9 There is an instance of genitive construction $a$ at segment 11. At segment 6 there is an instance of direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 5-.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Both A and B deal differently from P with segments 4 and 7. At segment 6 they are similar to each other with forms of $\sigma \hat{\rho} \rho \gamma \mu \alpha$, but it is open to debate as to whether P or they are closer in meaning to MT. At segment 8 the $\delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon i v$ of A is different from B and P, both of which are more similar to MT at this point. The same observation is true of A's rendering at segment 11 by $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \nmid \chi \vee 1 \alpha \sigma \mu o i$. Therefore B is considered more similar to P in this verse.


## RETROVERSION

There are fifteen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and seven following it. With ${ }^{\prime} l s p r$ counted as segment 11 there are also fifteen segments in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, four more to the third, and three to the fourth and final punctuation point.

Segments $2,3,4,5,8,9,10,11,12,13$, and 15 of this verse of P, and most probably as well segment 14 can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of this verse of MT. Although segment 1 is not literal, the connection is obvious since the allotment of Gad overlapped the area known as Gilead and since the other names referring to human figures in verses $5: 16$ to $5: 18$ derive from the names of some of the tribes of Israel, and through those tribes to Jacob's sons. For this reason segment 1 is not seen as in conflict with segment 1 of MT, but as a free translation or some exercise of freedom in the transmission of the translated text. Segment 6 appears to be a particularly full spelling of $l m n$. Other possibilities would be less likely renderings of Hebrew $l m h$, such as a combination of $l m^{\prime}$ and $n^{\prime}$. In either case it would not conflict with segment 6 of MT and is less than fully literal in a different way from the way any segment or element has yet been so reckoned in the first five chapters of Judges. In fact the usually reliable ms 9a1 has $l m$ ' and the orthography of the text meeting Dirksen's standard is probably an error that arose in the transmission of the text. Segment 7 of P is also puzzling because it seems to be an active participle from the geminate verb $g r$ and not derived from Syriac $g w r$ that would have a meaning different from Hebrew gwr. Here Hebrew gwr seems to take a direct object, but at $17: 8 ; 19: 1$ and 16 it takes its direct object through the preposition $b$. English Versions like RSV and NRSV add "with." The meaning of $g r$ that fits here from the lexicons is "draw" or "drag." Those meanings are transitive and suggest activities one might associate with mooring or beaching boats. The Syro-Hexaplar, A and B can all be rendered by "sojourning (or dwelling) among boats." The Vulgate has "vacabat" which suggests the idea that Dan had time for boating when he or they should have been at Mount Tabor fighting. Thus as to segment 7 it seems that $P$ was trying to render a text like MT and did so in error rather than by an intention to render freely. That might have been motivated by squeamishness about the meaning of Syriac $g w r$, but that is unlikely
since elsewhere in Judges P has no trouble rendering $g w r$ by ' $m r$. At segment 14 it appears that P was rendering by a derivative of the root $t r^{c}$, similar in meaning to the Hebrew root prs.

None of the differences between a preferable reading of segments 1,6 and 7 and the rendering by P are judged here to be based on a source that can be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. Segments 2 through 5, 8 through 15 are a word for word translation of the samenumbered segments of this verse, and segments 6 and 7 are intended to render the Hebrew Vorlage of those segments. The rendering of segment 1 of P is considered to be a free translation of that segment of MT that does not change the meaning of the verse, and may clarify it for some readers who would not understand the connection between "Gilead" and "Gad." That freedom reduces the literal nature of the segmentation of this verse to a fraction over $93 \%$. The sequence remains literal and this mode is rated 5 -.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
${ }^{\prime} b r r^{\prime}$. This renders ' $b r$ here and at $7: 25 ; 10: 8$; and $11: 18$. The rendering is rated 5 for consistency.
$\check{s} r^{r}$. This renders the Qal of škn twice in this verse and once at $8: 11$, but these are the only two occurrences in Judges, and so it is not rated for consistency.
$g ' r$. This renders $g w r$ here. The Hebrew verb is rendered by ${ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{m} r$ at $17: 7,8,9 ; 19: 1$ and 16. It is rated 1 here.
spyn'. This renders 'nywt, a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated.
$y t b$. This renders $y s ̌ b$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9.
spr ${ }^{2}$. This renders $h w p$, a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated.
$y m^{\prime}$. This renders $y m y m$ here, at $7: 12$, and at 11:11. It is not rated. $t w r^{\prime} t \mathrm{~h}$. This renders mprsyw here, a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Scriptures and not rated.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At 11:1 and 2 Hebrew $g l^{k} d$ is rendered by Syriac $g l^{\prime} d$, but in those verses Gilead is the father of Jephthah. In this verse P is doing what someone would do who considered Gilead metonymy for Gad, the tribe that was more associated with the geographical area. The renderings of segments 6 and 7 are considered in the discussion of retroversion and that discussion is also relevant here on the question of semantic accuracy.

At segments 2 to 3 and 11 to 12 there are two instances of genitive construction $b$. At segment 8 there is an instance of direct object construction $d$.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

In Alexandrinus segments 7 and 10 are rendered by the same verb, but B distinguishes between them, agreeing with A at segment 7 , but rendering segment 10 by $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta$ เ $\sigma \varepsilon v$ in a way similar to MT and P. However, at segment 11 A may be more quantitatively similar to P than B is. At segment 14 the $\delta$ r $\varepsilon \xi$ ódors of B is reckoned to be more similar to P than the $\delta 1 \alpha \kappa о \pi \grave{\alpha} \varsigma$ of A. These are debatable estimates, but based on those, B is considered more similar to P than A is.

## RETROVERSION

There are nine segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and three following it. There are also nine segments in this verse of P , five to the first punctuation point and four following it. All the segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. There is no evidence of any Hebrew source that differs from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT and the segments follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT. This mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. No elements have been added or subtracted and this mode is rated 5.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in rendering.
' $m$ '. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:16.
$h s d$. This renders the Piel of $h r p$ here and at $8: 15$ its only other occurrence in Judges. Thus it is not rated.
$n p s ̌ h$. This renders Hebrew $n p s ̌ w$ here and forms of $n p s ̌$ at $5: 21 ; 9: 17 ; 10: 16 ; 12: 3 ; 16: 16$, 30; and 18:25(3x). This consistency is rated 5 .
$m w t^{2}$. This substantive renders the infinitive of the cognate Hebrew verb. The renderings of the Hebrew substantive by verb forms of the Syriac cognate were rated 5 at $1: 1$. The rendering of the Qal of the Hebrew by the Peal of Syriac and by this substantive was discussed at 1:7. The renderings at both $1: 1$ and $1: 7$ are all rated 5 , including of course the rendering here.
$r w^{\prime}$. This renders mrwmy here. It is a hapax legomenon in Judges and not rated.
$h q l h$. With the pronominal suffix this renders Hebrew śdh. The rendering was rated 2 at 1:14.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. As already observed, the rendering of Hebrew mwt by its Syriac cognate includes examples of the rendering of a Hebrew verb by a Syriac substantive as well as a substantive by a verb. This tendency is not strictly literal and might be motivated by an intention to avoid awkward syntax in the target language.

At segments 8 to 9 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$, and at segments 3 to 4 there is an instance of direct object construction $d$. The pronominal suffix of segment 9 may be intended as a clarification but the nature of that clarification is not clear. It could be either intended to refer back to Naphtali or intended to emphasize that $\dot{s} d h$ is being rendered as definite rather than indefinite. The omitted waw prefix at segment 6 may have been omitted because that segment begins a clause considered sequential.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

At segment 3 B renders óveı $\delta i \zeta \omega$ by the aorist indicative and A does so by an aorist participle. Except for the orthography of "Naphthali" where A adds a $m u$ at the end of the word, they are otherwise identical. That makes B more similar to P than A by a narrow margin.

5:19.

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 9 there are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, ten to the athnach and four following it. With 'l my counted as segment 9 and the segment preceding segment 9 , ${ }^{\top}$ tknšw counted as an addition there are also fourteen segments in this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, then segment 8 , the addition, segments 9 and 10 to the third punctuation point, and the final four segments between the third and fourth punctuation points.

Segments 1 to 3 of $P$ can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT as segments 4,6 , and 7 of P can also be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. The same is true of segments 8,9 , and 10 and 12, 13, and 14. Segment 5 in Dirksen's text is very suspect. It is the only place in Dirksen's text where the Niphal of lḥm is rendered by the Syriac verb knš in any form. Except in the next verse, in P of Judges the Hebrew is rendered by the Ethpaal of $k t s ̌$. See the discussion of rendering by $m t k t s ̌ w$ at $1: 1$. The question is further complicated by the fact that Dirksen's note states that ms 9al also renders segment 3 by knš rather than by the form of $k t s ̌$ as at segment 3 and elsewhere in Judges. Because of the general reliability of ms 9 a 1 , one might expect a critical edition to correct segment 5 to conform to segment 3 and not the contrary. If so corrected, segment 5 could also be retroverted to the same segment of MT. For purposes of this discussion what will be assumed here is the possibility that the Leiden Peshitta might not correctly report the variation. An additional disconcerting fact is that Smelik states that ${ }^{\prime} t k t s ̌ w$ does
not equal nlhmw. ${ }^{34}$ He does not express the same view as to the other twenty-seven times this Syriac root is rendered by the Ethpaal of $k t s ̌$. It appears that his comments have arisen from some confusion between the rendering of nlhm in 5:20 and the inconsistent renderings in this verse. That confusion may have been increased by the addition. Both A and B render segment 3 by $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} \alpha \nu \tau o$ and segment $5 \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, but they regularly vary their renderings of the Hebrew verb between these two Greek verbs and sometimes use other verbs as well. The Vulgate has "pugnaverunt" for both segment 3 and segment 5. The Syro-Hexaplar has 'stdrw bqrb' at segment 3 and ' $q r b w$ at segment 5. This all suggests the possibility of an influence of the LXX on the mss of P, perhaps even on the original translation.

Segment 11 of MT, $b s^{c}$, is a hapax legomenon in Judges as to this substantive and the verb does not occur at all in Judges. As happens elsewhere with the more obscure hapaxes, P seems to have guessed at the meaning and turned the construct phrase of segments 11 tol2 into a list of two items joined by the waw prefix added to segment 12 .

The position taken here is that the source of the translation by P was a Hebrew text that cannot be distinguished from MT and that the Urtext of P was likely to have had identical verbs at segments 3 and 5. Segment 11 is considered to be a somewhat free adaptation of the text along with segment 12 . The $\pi \lambda \varepsilon o v \varepsilon \xi i \alpha v$ of A and the 'lwbwt' of the Syro-Hexaplar tend to support segment 11 of MT. Since this is an evaluation of the translation of Dirksen's text and the MT is found to be otherwise supported, the evaluation will be of Dirksen's text as a translation of a text like MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT except for segment 5 and segments

[^207]11 and 12 as well as the addition between segments 8 and 9. The addition does not, of course, bear on the evaluation of this mode. As for segment 5, the text of the Leiden Edition of P seems to have reimagined the poetry. Instead of iterating that "they fought," the first ten segments become: The kings came and they fought; and then the kings of Canaan assembled/gathered, at Taanach they assembled/gathered by the waters of Megiddo. Then at segments 11 and 12, P has translated the construct phrase, "silver plunder," as "money (or some other material goods) and silver." Accordingly three of the fourteen segments are considered free translations and the segmentation aspect of this mode is rated 3. Since the segments follow the same sequence they follow in MT, that aspect of the mode is rated 5 and this mode is rated 4.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There is one addition between segments 8 and 9 and that reduces the rating for this mode to 5 -.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
${ }^{\prime} t w$. This renders $b ' w$ and the rendering was rated 3 at 3:27.
$m l k$. This renders its Hebrew cognate twice in this verse, and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:7.
${ }^{\prime} t k t s ̌ w$. This renders $n l h m w$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:1.
hydyn. This renders ' $z$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 5:8.
${ }^{\prime} t k n s ̌ w$. This renders $n l h m w$ and is rated 1 based on the discussion of the rendering of the Niphal of the same Hebrew verb at $1: 1$.
$m y^{\nu}$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:15.
$q n y n^{2}$. This renders the substantive $b s^{c}$. This is the only occurrence of the substantive of this root in Judges and there are no occurrences in Judges of the verb based on this root. It is not rated for consistency. $k s p^{\prime}$. This renders Hebrew $k s p$ here, at 9:4; 16:5, 18: 17:2(2x), $3(2 \mathrm{x}), 4(2 \mathrm{x})$, and 10 . This rendering is rated 5 .
nsbw. This renders the Qal of $l q h$ and the rendering was rated 4 at 3:6.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 4 . If segment 5 had been rendered like segment 3 , the rating would be 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The discussion of the retroversion of segments 3,5 , and 11 and 12 and also of the addition bears on the semantic accuracy of those segments in the context of the verse. The changed meaning can be seen in the translation proposed in the discussion of segmentation above. Notwithstanding Smelik's view that the Ethpaal of $k t s ̌$ is not the equivalent of the Niphal of lhem in this verse, the position advanced here is that it is.

In the verse as constructed in Dirksen's edition, the change at segment 5 alters the semantic information in the clause from an iteration of the clause in segments 1 to 3 that adds information about who the kings were and makes it into a new clause that changes what they were doing, namely "gathering" rather than "fighting." Then segments 8 to 10 plus the addition produce a new clause that relates where they assembled, possibly meant to imply that they fought there, but not expressly stating that as in the MT verse.

The added waw prefixes at segments 3 and 4 are considered to arise from P's tendency to add this conjunction between non-sequential clauses. The new clause that begins at segment 8 may thus be considered sequential, as would be the clause beginning at segment 11 .

At segments 6 to 7 and 9 to 10 there are two instances of genitive construction $b$. Segments 11 and 12 are instances of direct object construction $d$, even if not accurate renderings of MT.

RATING OF THE VERSE
4.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

After segment 1, B has added $\alpha v ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} v$, and at segment 11, A has $\pi \lambda \varepsilon o v \varepsilon \xi i ́ \alpha v$ in contrast to B's less accurate $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho o v$. Neither A nor B has changed the genitive construction at segments 11 to 12 or made the addition. A is reckoned more similar to P in this verse.

5:20.
מן־שמים נלחמו הכוכבים ממסלותם נלחמו עם־סיסרא:

## RETROVERSION

With the two pairs of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segments 1 and 6 there are six segments in this verse of MT, two to the athnach and four following it. With ' $d b w q r b$ ' counted as segment 2 , $m n d w k y t h w n$ counted as segment 4 , $m n \check{s} m y$ counted as segment 1 , and ' $m$ sysr' as segment 6 there are also six segments in this verse of P , segments 2,3 , and 4 to the first punctuation point, and segments 5,1 , and 6 to the second punctuation point.

Although segments 4 and 5 of P need to be explained in order to understand how they can be seen as rendering those segments of this verse of MT and the position of segment 1 of P noted as not following the sequence of MT, this verse of P is not considered evidence for any Hebrew text that can be distinguished from MT. Both A and B support MT in this verse, as does the Syro-Hexaplar.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments and sequence of elements. Except for segment 5, the segmentation of this verse of P is considered to be a word for word translation of the same-numbered segments of MT. Segment 4 is not fully accurate and has, perhaps the sense of "places," rather than "highways" or "courses," but it is reckoned
to be the result of inadequate information rather than freedom in rendering. Segment 5 is another matter since the translator has rendered the first occurrence of nlhmw at segment 2 by ' $b d w q r b$ ', the same Hebrew verb at segment 5 is rendered less literally by gapping ${ }^{\prime} b d w$ at segment 5. This is judged to make segment 5 a free translation and to reduce the literality of the segmentation by one-sixth giving this aspect of this mode a rating of 4 . The change in sequence involves a shift of a segment from one colon of the verse to the next and this is reckoned as a one-third reduction in the literal quality of the sequence for a rating of 3. This mode is rated 3.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. It is arguable that segment 5 involves the subtraction of one element of that segment and therefore this mode is rated 5-.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
' $b d w q r b$ '. This renders $n l h m w$ once at segment 2 and is undoubtedly associated with the less than literal rendering at segment 5 . As shown in analyzing the rendering of the Hebrew verb by $m t k t s 5 w$ at $1: 1$, in twenty-eight of the thirty or thirty-one places the Hebrew verb is rendered, it is rendered by the Ethpaal of $k t s ̌$. This rendering is rated 1. $k w k b$ '. This renders $h k w k b y m$, a hapax legomenon in Judges. It is not rated.
$d w k y t h w n$. With the pronominal suffix this renders mslwtm in this verse, but it is rendered by šbyl' at 20:31, 32, 45; and 21:19. It is rated 1 in this verse.
$\check{s} m y$. This renders šmym and the rendering was rated 5 at 5:4.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 2 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Although the rendering of segments 2 and 5 is inconsistent with other renderings of the Hebrew in Judges, it is not inaccurate. The rendering does introduce a direct object not present in the Hebrew so that segment 2 is an instance of direct object construction $d$ and segment 5 may be seen as a second direct object of the same verb.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 3.5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Segments 2 and 5 of MT are rendered by $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ \omega$ in A and by $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \sigma \omega$ in B, but those differences do not change the degree of comparability of the two Versions in relation to P . Neither do their different renderings at segment 4 create relevant distinctions between their degrees of comparability to P . Otherwise, the two are similar and so they are considered similarly comparable to P in this verse.

5:21.


## RETROVERSION

There are ten segments in this verse of MT, seven to the athnach and three following it. There are also ten segments in this verse of P with bnhl' counted as segment 1 , grp 'nwn as segment 3 , nḥl dqyšwn as segments 6 and 7, and wnhl dqrmyn as segments 4 and 5 . Thus there are two segments to the first punctuation point, five more to the second such point, and the final three, segments 8,9 , and 10 , to the third and last punctuation point.

Except for the prepositional prefix of segment 1 , segments 1 to $3,6,7$ and 4 can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. Segments 8,9 , and 10 can also be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT, except that segment 8 appears to be a $3^{\text {rd }}$ person form in P rather than the $2^{\text {nd }}$ person form as in MT. Neither the prefix of segment 1 nor segment 5 itself can be retroverted. A possible explanation of the preposition is that at some stage the prepositional phrase became part of the last clause of

5:20 and that clause stated: "[they made] war from heaven against Sisera at the torrent of Kishon." There is possible evidence for the division between the two verses in the 1979 United Bible Societies edition of the Peshitta. If this alternate verse division was present in the oldest readings as found by Dirksen and Dirksen then conformed the verse division to that of MT without any other changes, it would have become a kind of orphan in the context of this verse. If this happened it might have also led to the transposition of segments 4 and 5 with segments 6 and 7. None of the ancient versions regularly cited here support the preposition or the transposition.

These comments still do not explain qrmym. The simplest explanation that might be suggested is that there has been reš-dalat confusion. This is the view of Burney. ${ }^{35}$ The MT is also supported by the $\kappa \alpha \delta \eta \mu \nu$ of A and the qdmym of the Syro-Hexaplar, both of which look like transliterations as well as by B which seems to be trying to translate the same term by $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha i \omega v$. This would be either the obscure $q d w m y m$ now present in MT or the puzzling plur. form of the segholate qedem. Boling cites the proposal of Cross and Freedman to "repoint" segment 5 as a $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ sing. masculine perf. Piel with a $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ plur. masculine suffix. ${ }^{36}$ Burney had already taken the same position. ${ }^{37}$ That involves overlooking both the šureq and the long hireq, whereas the ancient transliterations only ignore the šureq (assuming it was there).

For these reasons none of the differences that show up in P support a text different from that of MT. Whatever the differences, neither A, B, the Vulgate, nor the SyroHexaplar provide any cogent evidence for emendation of the Hebrew text. They confirm some of the problems faced by any translator. Therefore this verse will be analyzed on the

[^208]assumption that it was based on a text that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT with the qualification that the original translator may have been faced by physical problems in the available text.This analysis will not exclude the possibility that a relocation of the first two segments as suggested above may have taken place during the transmission of the text with accompanying changes in the translation to accommodate that relocation. Those will be considered features of the typology of the translation technique, and not grounds for emending the verse.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The first seven segments of P are understood here as stating: "At the torrent of Kishon, the torrent of Kishon and the torrent of Karmin swept them away." If one assumes, somewhat artificially, that this fairly represents the first seven segments of P , and if segments 4 to 7 of MT are considered in apposition to segments 1 and 2, then that cannot be the case in $P$, because segments 1 and 2 of $P$ are adverbial and segments $6,7,4$, and 5 are a compound subject of segment 3. It is exceedingly difficult to calculate the effect of these changes on the literal quality of the segmentation. As an admittedly rough estimate, it will be considered $50 \%$ of these seven segments. Since the final three segments are literal translations, this aspect of this mode will be rated 2. The sequence of the segments is reckoned to be impaired to a similar extent and this mode is rated 2.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

$n h \not l$ '. This renders Hebrew nḥl three times in this verse and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 4:13.
grp. This renders its Hebrew cognate which is a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Scriptures, and so it is not rated.
$t d r k$. This renders the Qal imperf. of the Hebrew cognate of this Syriac verb here. At the only other occurrences of the Hebrew verb at 9:27 (Qal) and 20:43 (Hiphil), it is rendered by the same Syriac, but number of renderings is not sufficient for a rating.
$n p \check{s} y$. This renders Hebrew npšy and the rendering of that Hebrew by this Syriac was rated 5 at 5:18.
$h y l$ '. This renders ' $\bar{o} z$ here and the only other occurrence of the Hebrew in Judges is rendered by 'šyn'. The related ' $a z$ is rendered by mryr' at $14: 14$ and by tqyp at 14:18. Thus there is no consistency in these sample, but two occurrences in each of two forms, one an adjective and one a noun, even with a similar meaning are not considered an adequate basis for a rating.

This mode in this verse is rated 5 , but with a qualification since only two renderings are rated.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. At segments 1 to 2, 6 to 7 , and 4 to 5 there are three instances of genitive construction $b$. At segment 8 English Versions like RSV and NRSV render tdrky as imperative although A and B do so as future. As noted in discussing 4:6, Nöldeke says that the imperf. is rarely used with imperative force without $l$. Thus P is less likely to intend an imperative. This is especially true since in MT $d r k$ is $2^{\text {nd }}$ feminine sing. imperf. and in P it would be $3^{\text {rd }}$ feminine sing.imperf., probably with a volitive sense. In effect this is little different from an imperative, but the syntactic information is different in P from that in the source. Segment 10 is understood here as an adverbial accusative. At segment 3 the pronoun is comparable to a direct object construction $d$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 3.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

The two Versions are quite similar to each other, differing at segment 3 where A has $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ and $\mathrm{B}, \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \sigma ט ́ \rho \omega$. Neither of these is deemed to change its comparability to P vis-à-vis the other. As already mentioned A has $\kappa \alpha \delta \eta \mu \mu$ at segment 5 and B has $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha i ́ \omega v$. This would make A more comparable to P although the comparability is impaired by P's use of $r$ rather than $d$.

5:22.
אז הלמו עקבי־סיס מדהרות דהרות אביריו:


## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 3 there are six segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach and three following it. With ' $q b$ ' drkšh counted as segment 3 and $m n n s m t^{\prime}$ as segment 4 there are also 6 segments in this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point and three more to the second such point.

The first and second segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. In doing so the first proposal might not be to retrovert npl to hlm and the fact that segment 2 of MT is plur. raises a question, but it still seems likely that the Syriac is based on that Hebrew in the way that one might vary "footsteps struck the ground" by "footsteps fell on the ground." The latter may not be "literal," in the sense of being identical, but if both are translating the same term in a different language, one might be more literal and the other freer or simply a synonym. Without evidence of a different Vorlage segment 2 of P will be assumed to have been based on segment 2 of MT. Segment 4 of P does not align with the usual rendering of the rare term in segment 4 of MT, whose only two appearances in the Old Testament are in this verse. The Hebrew is
considered to give the sense of movement, and the Syriac the sense of sound. This makes the Syriac look like a reasonably good, but mistaken, guess in the context of this verse. The only occurrence of the verb of the same root in Hebrew is at Nah 3:2 and the rendering by P there ( $n p r$ ) appears to be a guess too. Segment 5 of P cannot be retroverted to the same segment in MT, but is taken here as a free translation of the second appearance of segment 4 in this verse of MT and expresses adjectivally (by the genitive construction) in P what is expressed by repetition in MT. Segment 6 of P can be retroverted to segment 6 of MT. Despite the difficulties at segments 2,4 , and 5 , there is no evidence for a Vorlage that can be distinguished from this verse of MT. The translations of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and P all show the difficulties that might be encountered by a translator of this verse. While that does not provide clear and cogent support for a Vorlage exactly like MT at the difficult segments, it is a feeble basis for correcting that text in favor of a different source.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Except for segment 5 this is a word-for-word translation by P of this verse of MT. Although P may have had difficulty rendering segments 2 and 4, the rendering of segment 5 is more likely an effort to represent freely the emphasis placed on a particular term of the verse by repeating that term. Instead of repetition, an adjectival genitive phrase is used for that purpose. Accordingly the literal nature of the segmentation is reduced by about $17 \%$ and rated 4. The segments follow the same sequence as they do in this verse of MT and therefore that aspect of this mode is rated 5 . The mode is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.

hydyn. This rendering of ' $z$ was rated 5 for consistency at 5:8.
$n p l$. This renders hlmw only here in Judges although the same Hebrew verb is rendered one other time in Judges by $m h^{\prime}$ at 5:26. The Hebrew substantive hlmwt from the same root is rendered by ' $r z p t t^{\prime}$ in 5:26. In the discussion of the rendering of the Hiphil of $n p l$ by $b s ̣ r$ at 2:19 it was observed that in fifteen of the eighteen places where the Qal of $n p l$ is rendered in Judges, it is rendered by Syriac npl, and that was rated 4. Thus the available evidence does not support a conclusion of consistency but the available evidence is considered inadequate as a basis for evaluating consistency in this case.
' $q b b^{\prime}$. This renders its Hebrew cognate in this verse and the Hebrew is a hapax legomenon in Judges so that the consistency of the rendering cannot be rated.
$r k s ̌ h$. This renders sws, also a hapax legomenon in MT of Judges, and not rated.
$n h m t^{\prime}$ and $d h y l^{\prime}$. These both render the plur. of $d h r h$, the only occurrences of that Hebrew in the Old Testament. They are not consistent but are not rated because of the scarcity of evidence on which to base any rating.
tqypwhy. This renders Hebrew 'byryw, a hapax legomenon in Judges, and therefore not rated for consistency.

Because only one of the words in this verse is rated for consistency, no rating has been calculated for this mode in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Reservations about the semantic accuracy of P at segments 2,4 , and 5 were articulated in the preceding discussion of this verse.

The sing. form at segment 2 may have an explanation. There is evidence that ' $q b{ }^{\prime}$ is singular in other mss, and that may not have been corrected to agree when the seyame was restored in ms 7a1. The added pronominal suffix at segment 3 may have been used to make clear the word is meant to be definite.

At segment 3 and segments 5 to 6 there are two instances of genitive construction b.

RATING OF THE VERSE. The rating of modes 1 and 2 is 5 -. Mode 3 is not part of this evaluation (but the only rendering rated was rated 5).

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Neither A nor B is notably comparable to P. Each takes a different approach to segments 4 and 5 not comparable to P and the same is true as to segment 2. Otherwise they are similar to P and to each other, but for segment 6 A has $\delta v v \alpha \tau \hat{\nu}$ and B has í $\sigma \chi$ vpoì. The two terms could be considered comparable in meaning to P , but the genitive case of A makes it more similar to P .

אורו מרוז אמר מלאך יהוה ארו ארור ישבֵיה כי לא־באו לעזרת יהוה לעזרת יהוה בגבורים: 5:23.


## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as single segment 10 , there are 15 segments is this verse of MT, eight to the athnach, and seven following it. With $m t l d$ counted as segment 9 and $l^{\prime} t w$ counted as segment 10 there are thirteen segments in this verse of P . Segments 1 to 5 of P correspond to segments 1 to 5 of MT and precede the first punctuation point. Segments 6 to 8 of $P$ correspond to segments 6 to 8 of MT and are between the first and second punctuation points. The next four segments of P , segments 9 to 12, correspond to segments 9 to 12 of MT and follow the second punctuation point. After segment 12 of P , the final segment of P follows, $b g b r^{r}$, and corresponds to segment 15 of MT. It will be identified here as segment 15 . Thus there are no segments 13 and 14 counted in this analysis of 5:23 of P .

The first five segments of P can be retroverted to the first five segments of MT (with allowance made for $m r w d$ as a rendering of $m r w z$ ) as segments 6 and 8 can also be retroverted. Segment 7 is surely based on segment 7 of MT but cannot be retroverted to the infinitive absolute. Both A and B use words of the same root to render segments 6 and 7. Segments 9 to 12 and 15 of P can also be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT. Segment 13 but not segment 14 is represented in B. Both segments are represented in A and the Syro-Hexaplar, but in a freer translation. Segment 13 is also represented in the Vulgate without any evidence of segment 14. Thus there is some reason to suspect that segment 14 was not found in Hebrew sources in existence at the time that P was translated. The notes of BHS opine that segment 4 is a probable addition and that segments 13 and 14 should be deleted based on MSS of P . (Although Tg J is not a good source for verifying the text of MT in this chapter, it has an expanded form of what could be based on segments 13 and 14 of MT.) Notwithstanding these opinions, the source of P is considered here to be a source that cannot be distinguished from MT. It seems unlikely that references to "help" and "Lord" in MSS providing evidence for early Greek texts would have been absent from Hebrew sources extant at the time of the translation by P and then later incorporated into Hebrew texts on which MT is based. Any view that the two segments are a later addition would also suggest that some reviser was trying to enhance the poetry rather late in the transmission of this poetic text.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word for word translation by P segments 1 to 6,8 to 12 , and 15 of this verse of MT. Segments 13 and 14 have been subtracted and segment 7 is freely rendered. Segment 6 is made to refer back to $m r w d(z)$ rather than ahead to "her inhabitants." The free rendering of segment 7 and the changing of the object of segment 6 are reckoned here to be a failure
to segment literally two of the thirteen segments of this verse of P and to reduce the literality of this aspect of this mode to a fraction under $85 \%$. The sequence of the segments is not considered to have been impaired, so this mode is rated 4.5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Segments 13 and 14 of MT are not translated in this verse of P and considered subtraction. This reduces the literal quality of this mode to a fraction under $87 \%$ and this mode is rated 4.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
lwtw. This imperative render the imperative of ' $r r$ twice in this verse and the infinitive absolute of the same Hebrew verb once. At 21:18 the participle of this Syriac verb renders the participle of the same Hebrew. These renderings are rated 5 for consistency. $m l^{\prime} k h$. This renders Hebrew $m l^{\prime} k$ (adding a suffix) and the rendering was rated 5- at 2:1. $m r y$. This translates $y h w h$ two of the three times it occurs in this verse of MT, but it is not rendered the third time. The renderings were rated 5 at 1:1.
$y t b y h$. This renders $y$ y̌by $h$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 1:9. $m t l d$. This renders $k y$ used in a causal sense and the consistency of the rendering was rated 4 at 1:19.
' $t w$. This renders $b^{\prime} w$ and the consistency of rendering that Hebrew by this Syriac verb was rated 3 at 3:22.
'wdrnh. With the pronominal suffix this renders 'zrt once in this verse where the Hebrew occurs twice. This is the only verse in Judges in which any word based on the root ${ }^{\text {' } z r}$ is found.
$g b r^{2}$. This plur. renders the plur. of $g b w r$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 4- at 5:13.

The rating of this mode in this verse is 4 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Williams has found that in fourteen of the fifteen occurrences of the infinitive absolute in 1 Kgs "the infinitive absolute is used in imitation of an infinitive absolute in Hebrew." ${ }^{38}$ Williams does not treat a place where an infinitive follows an imperative in MT and is then rendered as an imperative in Syriac. He does cite 2 Kgs 5:10 where a Hebrew infinitive absolute with an imperative sense is rendered by a Syriac imperative. The addition of the waw prefix at segment 7 is probably an indication that P is taking segment 7 as beginning a nonsequential clause. Ordinarily in Hebrew an infinitive absolute with imperative force begins a clause. ${ }^{39}$ Ordinarily when the infinitive follows an imperative of the same verb without the conjunction it heightens the intensity of the command. ${ }^{40}$ This supports a conclusion that P is freely translating segment 7 or filling in some shortcoming in the text used for the translation.

At segment 1 to 2 and segments 7 to 8 there are two instances of direct object construction $e$. At segments 4 to 5 and segments 11 to 12 there are two instances of genitive construction $c$.

RATING OF THE VERSE.
4.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Although B adds $\pi \alpha \varsigma$ between segments 7 and 8 , and translates segment 13 , it is otherwise similar to P and has also omitted кирiov at segment 14 . On the other hand A has recast

[^209]segments 13 to 14 as $\beta$ oŋ $\theta$ ò $\varsigma \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\rho} \nu$ кupíos and rendered segment 15 as $\dot{\varepsilon} v \mu \alpha \chi \eta \tau \alpha i ̂ \varsigma$ סvvatós. Thus B seems based on a text less unlike B than does A.

5:24.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { תברך מנשים יעל אשת חבר הקיגיִ מנשים באהל תברך: }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

There are nine segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and three following it. There are also nine segments in this verse of MT, six to the first punctuation point, and three following it. Although the puzzle presented by earlier renderings like segment 3 recurs here, as also in those places it is not treated here as evidence for a different segment in the Hebrew source of P . There is no other evidence of any source for this verse of P that can be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of a Hebrew source that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT and the segments are in the same sequence in P as they are in MT. This mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions in this verse and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
ttbrk. This Ethpaal renders the Pual of its Hebrew cognate twice in this verse. The consistency of the rendering was rated 4 at 5:2.
$n \check{s}$. This renders nšym twice in this verse. The rendering was rated 5 at 3:6.
'ntth. With the added suffix this renders 'št and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5 at 1:12.
$m s ̌ k n '$. This tranlates ' $h l$ and that was rated 5 in this mode at 4:11.
The rating of this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information.

The imperf. forms at segments 1 and 9 are understood here as having volitive force. At segment 8 the reader sees again the tendency of P to render a prepositional phrase as part of a short verbless relative clause. At segment 4 to 5 there is an instance of genitive construction $c$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE.

5. 

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

The rendering of $m n$ is not consistent between these two Versions: A has $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa$ at segments 2 and 7 while B has $\dot{\varepsilon} v$ at segment 2 and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \mathrm{o}$ at segment 7 . In other respects they are similar except segment 8 is rendered as sing. by A and plur. by B . In this small way A is more comparable to P in this verse.

5:25.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { מים שאל חלב נתננה בספל אדירים הקריבה חמאה: }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

There are eight segments in this verse of MT, four to the athnach and four following it. There are also eight segments in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point and
four following it. Except for segment 5 the segments of P can be retroverted to the samenumbered segments of MT. Segment 5 could be retroverted more easily if the Syriac lqn' had been used here, but even so $k s^{3}$ is probably not based on a different Vorlage since it describes a vessel in which some milk product or coagulated milk product could have been served to Sisera. At segment 7 the Pael of $q r b$ can be retroverted to the Hiphil of its Hebrew cognate. Therefore this verse of P will be evaluated as based on a Vorlage that cannot be distinguished from MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of a verse like this verse of MT. The segments follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT and this mode is rated 5 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are none and this mode is rated 5 .

## 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering

$m y$. This renders $m y m$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 1:15.
$s s^{\prime} l$. This renders its Hebrew cognate consistently in Judges and was rated 5 at 1:1. $h ̣ l b$. This renders Hebrew hāalāb only here and at 4:19 in Judges and thus is not rated for consistency.
$y h b t$. This renders $n t n h$ and the rendering was rated 4 at 1:12.
$k s^{\prime}$. As already noted this renders $s p l$ here; but the only other occurrence of $s p l$ in the Hebrew Scriptures is at $6: 38$ where it is rendered by lqn'. Therefore it is not rated. $g n b r{ }^{\prime}$. This renders ' $d y r{ }^{\prime}$ here and the same Hebrew was rendered by mšbḥw at 5:13. This is quite inconsistent, but since these are the only renderings on which to base an evaluation this rendering is not rated.
qrbt. This renders the Hiphil perf of qrb here. The rendering of the Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at $3: 17$ with caution expressed there about the accuracy of the binyan in some of the renderings.
$h^{\prime} w t^{\prime}$. This renders $h m^{\prime} h$ and it is a hapax legomenon in Judges and not rated.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The matter of the accuracy of segment 5 has already been noted. Segments 1 and 3 are instances of direct object construction $d$ and segment 8 may also have been intended as such. At segments 5 to 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $b$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

In A a pronominal object follows segment 2 and a pronominal indirect object follows segment 4, but not in $B$. This makes $B$ more similar to $P$ than is $A$.

ידה ליתד תשלחנה וימינה להלמות עמלֵים והלמה סיסרא מחקה ראשו ומחצה וחלפה רקתו: 5:26

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { R } \\
& \text { ancon. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RETROVERSION

There are thirteen segments in this verse of MT, six to the athnach and seven following it. With ' $l$ skt' counted as segment 2 there are also thirteen segments in this verse of P , three to the first punctuation point, three more to the second, four more to the third point, and three more to the last punctuation point. All of the segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT, although prepositions at segments 2 and 5 call for consideration under mode 4. The Vorlage of this verse of P is reckoned to be one that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of the elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of this verse of MT and the segments follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT. The mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
'ydh. This renders $y d h$ and the rendering by this Syriac term of its Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 1:2.
$s k t$. This renders $y t d$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 3 at 4:21.
'wštt. This Aphel renders the Qal of šlh and the rendering was rated 1 at 3:15.
ymyn. This renders Hebrew ymynh and the rendering was rated 5 at $3: 15$.
'rzpt'. This renders hlmwt, and that Hebrew is a hapax legomenon in the Old Testament. $n g r$ '. This renders 'mlyn, a hapax legomenon in Judges.
$m h t$. This Syriac occurs twice in this verse and renders $h l m h$ at segment 7 and $m h s ̣ h$ at segment 11. The only other occurrence of hlm was at 5:22 where it was rendered by npl . The verb $m h s ̣$ is a hapax legomenon in Judges. This Syriac is one of several Syriac verbs that render the Hiphil of $n k h$. Here it cannot be rated for consistency. pkth. With the pronominal suffix added, this renders mhqh, also a hapax legomenon in the Old Testament.
$r y s ̌ h$. This renders $r^{2} s ̌ w$ here and at $5: 30 ; 6: 26 ; 7: 16,19,20,25 ; 8: 28 ; 9: 7,25,34,36,37$, $43,44(2 \mathrm{x}), 53,57 ; 10: 18 ; 11: 8,9,11 ; 13: 5 ; 16: 13,17,19$, and 22 . It is not rendered at 12:3. Thus in all 27 places where the Hebrew is rendered, it is rendered by this its Syriac cognate and thus is rated 5 for consistency.
"brt. This renders hlph, also a hapax legomenon in Judges.
$s d^{c} h$. This renders $r q t w$ and was not rated for consistency at 4:21.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The inconsistent rendering by P of the prefixed preposition $l$ at segments 2 and 5 calls for an explanation. Dirksen's notes show that ms 6 h 7 does harmonize the variant by using $l$ at both places. Weitzman says of the mss of P that "[a]nother combination whose exclusively shared readings are never clearly correct, and are sometimes incorrect, is the pair 6h7 8a1 in Judges, studied by Dirksen. ${ }^{41}$ The Targum, A, B, the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplar all use the same preposition in both places, and that is $l$ for the Syro-Hexaplar. However it happened, this might be viewed as an error and not justifiable on semantic or syntactical grounds. Of course it is a small point and would not affect the meaning of the verse, although the $l$ may be awkward in Syriac for a context where there is motion toward something.

It appears as if the waw prefix at segment 11 in MT has been transferred in P to become a prefix of segment 9 , but in fact this is probably a case where Syriac would add a prefix before segment 9 because it regards segment 9 as non-sequential to the clause made up of segments 7 and 8 . Then the translator has subtracted the waw prefix at segment 11 because it is considered a sequential clause. This particular kind of situation where a waw is omitted is not considered by Williams.

At segments 5 to 6 there is a genitive construction $b$. At segments 7 to 8 and 9 to 10 there are two examples of direct object construction $f$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

[^210]Beginning at segments 5 and 6 A differs from P and MT with $\varepsilon i ́ \varsigma \alpha ́ \pi о \tau о \mu \alpha ̀ \varsigma ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha к о ́ \pi \omega v, ~$
 while B has $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \varphi v \rho о к o ́ \pi \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$ and $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \sigma \varepsilon v$ and at segment 13 A has $\gamma v \alpha \dot{\theta} \mathrm{o} v$ where B has $\kappa \rho o ́ \tau \alpha \varphi o v$. Therefore B is considered more similar to P than A is.

5:27.
ברין רגליה כרע נפל שכב בין רגליה כרע נפל באשר כרע שם נפל שדוד:

## RETROVERSION

There are fourteen segments in this verse of MT, five to the athnach and nine following it. Only ten of those segments are represented in P , and they will be numbered according to the number of the segment of MT that they are reckoned to intend to translate here. Segments 1 to 5 of P precede the first punctuation point and segments 10 to 14 are between the first and second (last) punctuation points. Segments 6 to 9 are not represented in P. The BHS note reports that some ("nonn") mss delete segments 1 to 5 considering the repetition a case of scribal dittography. This opinion cannot be based on P because $\check{s k b}$ is present in P , and it is present after the first four segments. The missing four segments in P follow škkb which the MT editor says should be deleted. In both A and B, segment 5 is rendered by $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa о \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ and follows the first four segments there too. Segments 8 and 9 are missing in A. All four segments can be identified in Tg J and the Syro-Hexaplar. The Vulgate is abbreviated but not good evidence for specific alternatives to the MT. Moore suggests that the words in the second colon are the result of an "accidental" repetition. ${ }^{42}$ Boling explains the verse in harmony with $4: 21$ in response to

[^211]the less poetically sensitive who think that the author of the verse forgot that Sisera was already lying down when Jael drove the tent peg into his temple and thus is making himself say that Sisera fell while lying down. ${ }^{43}$ Thus the evidence is weak for a Vorlage that omits segments 6 through 9 and this verse will be analyzed as one in which the Vorlage was indistinguishable from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of segments 1 to 5 and 10 to 14 of this verse of MT and the segments follow the same sequence in P as they do in MT. This mode is rated 5 . 2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are four segments subtracted in this verse, 6 through 9 , and this mode is rated 3.
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
bynt. This rendering of byn was rated 4- at 4:5.
rglyh. This renders Hebrew rglyh and the consistency of the rendering was rated 3 at 1:6.
brk. This renders the Qal of $k r^{c}$ twice in this verse, but does not render the third occurrence at segment 8 of MT. This Syriac also renders the Qal of $k r^{r}$ at 7:5. Two occurrences of forms of the Hiphil of $k r^{\prime}$ at 11:35 are rendered by forms of shp. The Hiphil is not considered comparable to the Qal here so this rendering is not rated. $n p l$. This renders its Hebrew cognate and the consistency of the rendering was rated 3 at 2:19.
škb. This renders its Hebrew cognate here. At the only other occurrence of the Hebrew in Judges, it is rendered by $d m k$. This is of course inconsistent, but the sample is not large enough for a rating.

[^212]$b d w k t$. This prepositional phrase renders $b$ 'šr. At 17:8 and 9 the Hebrew is rendered by ${ }^{\prime} y k{ }^{\prime}$. Here again there are not enough examples for a rating. tmn. The consistency of this rendering of $\check{s} m$ was rated 5 at $1: 7$. $b z w z^{\prime}$. This renders the Qal participle of $\check{s} d w d$ which is the only occurrence in Judges of any word from the root $\check{s} w d$ or $\check{s} d d$. Therefore it is not rated. See 5:30.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The addition of waw prefixes at segments 1,4 , and 5 may look different at first from other places where waw is added, because the actions described by the verbs at segments 3,4 , and 5 might be understood as sequential. However, the description can be viewed as one describing three occurrences that took place at or between Jael's feet and thus non-sequential because all three have the same site. This view is supported by the colon retained in P: "Where he knelt, there he fell maimed." The point is that in the very place where he lay down to rest with a feeling of security he was lying as an ignobly disfigured corpse.

Segment 10, $b d w k t^{\prime} d$, may not reflect the best Syriac syntax in light of the renderings at 17:8 and 9 and in the Syro-Hexaplar: ' 'yk' dbrk tmn (Syro-Hexaplar); ' $y k{ }^{\prime} d$ (P). Here again it is striking that ' $y k k^{\prime}$ is used in the same verses, notwithstanding the period of about 400 years that separates the two translations from different sources.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 4.

COMPARISON WITH A AND B. In this verse A does not render segments 8 and 9 but B does. At segments 3 and 11, A renders $k r^{r}$ by $\sigma v \gamma \kappa \alpha ́ \mu \psi \alpha \varsigma$ and $\nless \kappa \alpha \mu \psi \varepsilon v$, and this is reckoned more similar to P's brk than is B's катєкv $\bar{i} \sigma \theta \eta$ and $\kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \kappa \lambda i \theta \eta$. Other differences between A and B have not been found to aid in comparing them to P and so A is judged more similar to P in this verse.


## RETROVERSION

There are sixteen segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and eight following it. All sixteen segments appear to be represented in this verse of P with four elements counted as additions. The first eight of those segments plus 'mrt following segment 8 precede the first punctuation point. The next four segments are between the first and second punctuation points with an added $h w$ after $m n^{\prime}$, segment 9 , and an added dbry after segment 11 , mrkbth. The final four segments are between the second and third punctuation points with another added $h w$ after the second $m n^{\prime}$, segment 13 . There are questions about whether segment 4 (wybbt) and segment 8 (ksstrwn) are semantically accurate, but the other fourteen segments of P can be retroverted to the same numbered segments of MT. Since segment 4 of $P$ is from the same root as segment 4 of MT there is little question that P is intended to render a Vorlage with a segment of that root. The only other occurrence of the Hebrew at segment 8 in the Old Testament is at Prov 7:6 and that occurrence is rendered by kswstrwn so there is little doubt that the Hebrew of segment 8 was the Vorlage of segment 8 of P . Accordingly the Vorlage of this verse of P will be assumed to be a text that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. This is a word-for-word translation by P of this verse of MT with the four additions already
specified. The segments that are rendering the segments of MT follow the same sequence in $P$ that they do in MT. The mode is rated 5.
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. Four segments are added: ' $m r t$ after segment 8 ; $h w$ after segments 9 and 13; and $d b r y$ after segment 11. The added segments with $h w$ are not ordinary features with interrogative pronouns including this interrogative pronoun. It appears to mean "What (or why) is this?" The addition does not change the meaning, but it does add a nuance that is not merely a normal syntactical practice. This mode is rated 3 . 3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$k w t$. This renders $h l w n$, a hapax legomenon in Judges and thus not rated for consistency. 'dyqt. This Aphel renders the Niphal of $\check{s} q p$, also a hapax legomenon in Judges. wybbt. This renders wtybb, a hapax legomenon in the Old Testament.
' $m h$. With the added suffix this renders Hebrew ' $m$ and the rendering was rated 5 at 5:7.
ksstrun. This renders 'šnb, found only here in Judges. (As mentioned in discussing retroversion, the same Hebrew also occurs at Prov 7:6 where it is rendered by the same Syriac root.) The rendering is not rated.
$m n^{\prime}$. This renders $m d w^{c}$ twice in this verse and at 9:28 and 11:7. The same Hebrew is rendered by $l m n^{\prime}$ at 11:26 and 12:1. There appears to be no reason for the inconsistency so this rendering is rated 3 .
'š̌wḥr. This renders the Polel of bwš. The only other occurrence of the Hebrew root in Judges is in the Qal at 3:25 and the rendering is not rated there or here.
mrkbth. This renders $r k b w$ once in this verse and renders mrkbwtyw once at segment 16 . The rendering of the former was rated 5 at $1: 19$; the rendering of the latter of the two terms was evaluated at 4:15 and not rated there.
$m^{\prime} t^{\prime}$. This Peal infinitive renders the Qal infinitive of $b w^{\prime}$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 3 at 3:22.
'whr. This Aphel renders of Piel of 'ḥr. The Hebrew verb occurs only here in Judges and so the consistency is not rated.
$z n g^{\prime}$. This renders $p^{\prime} m y$ only here in Judges. The same Hebrew is rendered by zbnt at 6:39 and 16:28 and by zbnyn at 16:15. Three times ${k p^{\prime} m}^{\prime}-b p^{\prime} m$ is rendered by klzbyn at 16:20; 20:30 and 31. At 16:18, it is rendered by mkyl and not rendered at 15:3. The six renderings where a form of $z b n$ is part of the rendering would be rated 4 since only $m k y l$ is reckoned to be inconsistent. In this verse the rendering is of another sense of $p^{c} m$, so the consistency is not rated. Barr chose pcm as his principal illustration of "polysemy." ${ }^{44}$

The rating of this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. Those like Burney ${ }^{45}$ and Boling ${ }^{46}$ who adopt a rendering of wtybb that has something to do with a form of speech are considered here to have the better case as opposed to those like Moore who equivocate but lean toward some form of seeing. ${ }^{47}$ Since what is to follow that verb are the words of Sisera's mother, that meaning introduces the anguished question for which there is no other preparation in MT. (The addition of 'mrt by P might be a bit heavyhanded: another example of P's clarification where no clarification is necessary.)

It seems unlikely that P thought 'šnb meant "lattice" in light of the Hebrew term rendered by ksstrwn at $3: 23$. There it is the first place Ehud goes after stabbing Eglon. Here it seems to be the place from which Sisera's mother voiced her anguish. If the words

[^213]are those she was thinking to herself when there was still no sign of Sisera's long-delayed arrival, then it was still at the place of that lookout that her despair erupted.

At segments 5 to 6 there is an instance of genitive construction $c$ and at segments 15 to 16 , genitive construction $b$.

RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B.

Alexandrinus has moved segment 4 after segment 6 , and after the displaced segment 4 has added $\varepsilon \pi \pi \grave{̀} \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \varphi o v \tau \alpha \varsigma \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀ \Sigma 1 \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha$. Vaticanus has not rendered either segment 4 or segment 12. There are other differences in vocabulary, but the comparison is based on the changes identified here. Based on those one might say that B is less unlike P than $A$ is.

5:29.
חכמות שרותיה תעניגנה אף־היא תשיב אמריה לה:

## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 4 there are seven segments in this verse of MT, three to the athnach and four following it. With 'p hy counted as segment 4, hkymt and 'lymth counted as segments 1 and 2, and 'nt wmr' lh counted as segments 5,6 , and 7 , there are six segments in this verse of $P$. The segment ' $n t$ is counted as segment 5 somewhat arbitrarily since it is in the position occupied by tšyb, segment 5 of this verse of MT. Segment 3 of MT, t'nynh, is counted as the segment not
represented in P even though the Hebrew verb is cognate to segment 5 of P , on the grounds that it is sing. and that in the confusion created by the recasting of the verse in P the translator is more likely to have preserved the sequence of the elements than to have rendered segment 3 out of order, in the sing., and to have eliminated segment 5 in the process as well. However, this decision does not have a great effect on the analysis of the verse, and results only in a higher rating for the sequence of the segments.

Segments 2, 4, and 7 of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT, and segment 1 could be retroverted to the sing. of segment 1 of MT. Segment 2 of P may not accord the women as high a social position as segment 2 of MT. Segment 5 of P can be retroverted to segments 5 and 6 of MT. Segment 6 of MT cannot be retroverted to any segment of MT, but of course it is deceptively similar to that MT segment 6 , even though it is in effect an addition at the same time that MT segment 6 along with segment 5 has become part of a free translation in segment 5 of P . Both A and B support segments 1 to 3 of MT, and B supports segments 4 to 7 of MT. Even Tg J supports both segments 3 and 5, but does render segment 1 in the sing. as $P$ does, and renders segment 6 by an infinitive that would tend to support P . The Vulgate omits a rendering of segment 3 too and supports a sing. form at segment 1 . The BHS note cites support for the sing. at segment 1, apparently based on P and the Vulgate, and does not refer to Tg J . It is also of interest that Dirksen's notes show that 6h7 and 9al fam have transposed what are counted as segments 4 and 5 of P here. This would mean that segment 5 is actually in the position of segment 3 and it is segment 5 of MT that is not rendered by P . The verse of P would then read: "The wisest one of her women answered, also she, and said to herself . . . ." This may well be the Urtext of P . Thus there is a possibility that P was relying on a source in which segment 1 was sing. If segment 3 was in that source and was still plur., that would have presented a translation problem and the effort to solve that problem could
have led to what is found in 9a1. That still leaves as problematic both the waw prefix added to segment 6 and the recasting of segment 6 as a participle. One cannot exclude the possibility that the plur. of segment 1 seemed awkward: "the wisest ones of her women." (Here the assumption is that hkmwt in MT is plur. based on the view that it is the subject of $t^{t} n y n h$, also plur., which is the position adopted here.) If so, the emendation of the plur. could have led to all the other difficulties and this casts doubt on the emendation found in 9a1. With A, B, and the Syro-Hexaplar all supporting the plur. at segment 1, the more difficult reading, a decision to emend may deserve serious consideration, but probably should then be ruled out in the end. Therefore this verse of P will be evaluated as a free translation of a source that cannot be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. Segment 1 of P is considered to be a kind of emendation of segment 1 of MT, and thus not quite literal and not quite free. Segment 2,4 , and 7 of P are considered to be word-for-word translations of the same-numbered segments of MT. Segment 5 is reckoned to be a free translation of segments 5 and 6 of MT, perhaps driven by the emendation of segment 1. This leaves the absence of a rendering of segment 3 as a subtraction. (Based on MS 9a1, what has been identified above as segment 5 here may be a free translation of segment 3 and segment 5 may be the subtraction. Although it may be true, it is not the basis of this evaluation.) Segment 6 is counted as an addition even though it is semantically close to segment 6 of MT. In fact it is not a rendering of segment 6 and plays a very different role in the reconstituted verse. That leaves segments 2,4 , and 7 of P as word-for-word translations of those segments of MT, segments 1 and 5 of P as free translations of 1 and 5 and 6 of MT. This is calculated as only $50 \%$ literal. Since the segments rendered both literally and freely follow the same sequence in P as in MT, the sequence is rated 5 and the mode is rated 3 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. As discussed above, segment 3 is considered a subtraction and segment 6 is considered an addition here. Therefore this mode is rated 3 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
hkymt. This renders hemwt which is a hapax legomenon in Judges.
'lymth. This renders śrwtyh, also a hapax legomenon in Judges.
' $p$. This renders Hebrew ' $p$ as a conjunction and as such is a hapax legomenon in Judges.
' $n t$. This renders $t$ šyb 'mryh as understood in this verse. The occurrence of a form of ' $n h$ at segment 3 in this verse of MT is understood as not rendered in this verse of P . The rendering of the Qal of $\check{s} w b$ is evaluated at $2: 19$. This is the only rendering of the nine occurrences of the Hiphil that is rendered by ' $n t$, but also the only instance where it is complemented by the substantive ' $m r$. Therefore it is not rated. The other occurrences of the Hiphil are at $9: 56,57 ; 11: 9,13 ; 17: 3(2 x), 4 ;$ and 19:3. If this is reckoned a rendering of the Qal of ' $n h$, it appears that all of those occurrences in Judges are rendered by ' $n$ ': $7: 14 ; 8: 3(2 x) ; 18: 14 ; 19: 28$; and $20: 4$. These would be rated 5 .

There is no rating for this mode in this verse.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactic information. The semantic accuracy of segment 2 as a translation of śrh can be questioned since it is rendered by $h^{\prime} r t^{\prime}$ at 1 Kgs 11:3, by $r w r b n^{\prime}$ at Est 1:18 and Isa 49:23, and by ryš at Lam 1:1.

The rendering of 'mryh by the participle with a waw prefix may be influenced by the convention of narratives to report that someone "answered and said," as can be seen at 7:14 and 20:4. This does not mean that the construction was found in the source. Rather it is a suggestion about how a translator in a moment of weakness might have tried to maintain something that looked like quantitative literalism as well as having the appearance of literal segmentation and sequence.

At segments 1 to 2 there is an instance of genitive construction $a$.

QUALIFIED RATING OF THE VERSE. 3 (based only on modes 1 and 2).

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

One small but significant difference between $A$ and $B$ is at segment 7 where $A$ might be rendering by a genitive making the "words" of segment 6 "her words." (This is probably the pronominal suffix of segment 6 and segment 7 would then be omitted by A.) The same segment is rendered by B as dative and reflexive, making the words "hers" that are directed "to herself." This is also reckoned here to be more similar to P and MT. At
 $\dot{\varepsilon} v \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \mu \sigma \sigma v \alpha \cup ̉ \tau \eta ิ S$ (the final pronoun being the one mentioned above as a possible but improbable segment 7). Although the rendering of segment 5 by A is ostensibly more similar to $P$, the rendition of segment 6 distances it from $P$. On the other hand the literal rendering of both segments 5 and 6 by B is a literal rendering of those segments that is judged here to be translated freely by ' $n t$. Since this verse of P is itself problematic the comparison is more difficult, but the qualified opinion here is that B is more similar to P than A is.

הלא ימצאו יחלקו שלל רחם רחמתים לראש גבר שלל צבעים לסיסרא שלל צבעים רקמֵה צבע . רקמתים לצוארי שלל:


RETROVERSION

Moore comments as to this verse: "In the general disorder of the text of this verse, it is impossible to feel much confidence in any restoration." ${ }^{48}$ There are eighteen segments in this verse of MT, fourteen to the athnach and four following it. No effort will be made here to correct the MT. Instead, comments will be made segment by segment on the relation or apparent lack of relation between each segment of P and what is judged to be (or not to be) the corresponding segment of MT.

The first segment of $\mathrm{P}, k b r$, is a free translation of segment 1 of MT corresponding to "forsitan" in the Vulgate. The second segment of $\mathrm{P},{ }^{~}{ }^{\text {z }}$ l, is an addition which, together with the $w$ prefix of the following segment, expresses continuous action, and might mean here something like "kept on," that is, with the following three segments, "kept on finding much more plunder." The third and fourth segments included in this verse of P , ws šk bzt , correspond to segments 2 and 4 of MT, and the fifth segment, sgy't', rendered by "much" in the illustration in the previous sentence, is an addition. Both verbs, ${ }^{\prime} z l$ (the addition) and 'skh (œsegment 2 of P ) are rendered by P as $3^{\text {rd }}$ person masculine sing. although the Hebrew verb rendered by segment 2 is plur.

The first punctuation point follows the fifth segment, the second addition. Following that punctuation point the sixth segment of P , $p l g$, renders segment 3 of MT, but in the sing. and with a waw prefix. The prefix may tie the term to ' $z l$ so that the idea intended is that the dividing is a continuing action of turning over the subjugated women to all the soldiers. The identical seventh and eighth segments of P appear intended to render segments 5 and 6 of MT. The Hebrew of MT rather clearly implies that these were captured women parceled out to the troops as concubines or some equally or more degrading use. The Syriac from the root $k d n$ is usually rendered "mule," but one wonders why the masculine form is used. Someone might also speculate either that the word refers

[^214]to some status as a subjugated human or that women so treated were referred to derisively by this term, the primary sense of which meant a lowly beast of burden. The ninth and tenth segments of P , lryš $g b r$, do translate accurately the seventh and eighth of MT.

After the second punctuation point in P (that is, after segment 8 in MT) there is a transition in both MT and P to the plunder that goes to Sisera, although P is apparently even more generous to him than MT. The eleventh and twelfth segments of $P$ first render segment 9 of MT by Syriac $b z t^{\prime}$, and then another addition identical to the earlier addition, $s g y^{\prime} t^{\prime}$, following the first occurrence of $b z t^{\prime}$. Then the thirteenth segment of $\mathrm{P}, w s{ }^{\prime} w b^{\prime} n^{\prime}$, translates segment 10 of MT. After that P's fourteenth segment is either adding the plur. $w s ̦ w r t^{\prime}$ or rendering segment 14 of MT, rqmh, out of sequence and turning it into a plur. (The plur. of the same word is segment 16 of MT, to be discussed just ahead here.) The fifteenth segment of P translates segment 11 of MT, sysr ${ }^{\text {. That completes the category of }}$ plunder that went only to Sisera.

Then a new category of plunder begins with the sixteenth segment of P , the second occurrence of $w s w b{ }^{\prime} n^{\prime}$, that is understood here as translating segment 13 of MT. However before that segment 13 of MT, ṣbym, and after segment 11 , $l s y s r^{\prime}$, there is a segment 12 of MT, the third occurrence of $\mathfrak{s l l}$, and that is omitted by P. Then the seventeenth segment of P , the second occurrence of $w s w_{r} t^{\prime}$ translates segment 16 of MT. Before that, P has either omitted any rendering of segment 14 of MT or transferred it to the place before $l s y s r^{\circ}$ already mentioned, and then has not rendered segment 15 of MT, the sing. of $s b^{c}$, at all. Next in the sequence the eighteenth segment of $\mathrm{P},{ }^{〔} l s w r$ ' , renders segment 17 of MT. The Hebrew rendered, rqmtym, is a dual and Dirksen's text is sing., but the note to this verse indicates that MSS 12a1 fam renders the term as plur. Finally the nineteenth segment of P renders segment 18 of MT by the plur. $b z w z$ ', the "plunderers," rather than
by the "plunder." ${ }^{49}$ The plur. of P appears to be a means of making clear that the "plunderer" here is a class of persons, not a single plunderer.

None of the versions consulted here, A, B, Tg J, the Vulgate or the Syro-Hexaplar offers any clear evidence for a Vorlage different from MT, but tend to confirm that they were working with a text that was confusing, either in the way that MT is confusing or in a similar way. Therefore no Vorlage of P different from the unpointed MT is proposed here and the verse of P will be evaluated as if a verse like this one of MT was its source not so much because of confidence in MT itself but because of lack of confidence in any alternative texts.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of elements. The segments of P rendering segment 1 of MT (kbr), segment 2 (w̌sh ), segment 4 (bzt'), segment 3 ( wplg), segments 5 and 6 ( $k w d n y$ twice), segment 7 (lryš), segment 8 ( $g b r^{r}$ ), segment 9 ( $w b z t^{\prime}$ ), segment 10 ( $\left.w s ̣ w b^{\prime} n^{\prime}\right)$, segment 11 (lsysr$r^{\prime}$ ), segment 13 ( $\left.w s w b^{\prime} n^{\prime}\right)$, segment 16 ( $w s ̣ w r t^{\prime}$ ), segment 17 ( $\left.l ~ s ̣ w r^{\circ}\right)$, and segment $18\left(b z w z^{\prime}\right)$ are considered to be segmented literally although some might not be literal when regarded in light of other modes of literalism. This is fifteen out of eighteen segments and would ordinarily be rated 4, but the changed sequence of segment 3 is considered to change its function in the segmentation just as the change of segments 9 and 10 from members of a single genitive construction to two items in a list changes the accuracy of the segmentation of those two segments. In a similar way the omission of segment 12 results in leaving segment 13 as an individual element rather than as part of a genitive construction. This is evaluated as reducing the rating of the segmentation to 3 . The sequence of segments 3 and 4 is also considered to impair the literal quality of that aspect of this mode. Uniquely in this verse

[^215]the first occurrence $w s ̣ w r t^{\prime}$ is counted both as a change in the sequence of Hebrew $s b^{c}$ and also as a subtraction of segment 15 of MT. That gives a weaker rating of 4 to this aspect of the mode, but even if it did not the rating of this mode would still be 3 .
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are four additions and two subtractions and so this mode is rated 3 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$k b r$. This renders $h l$ ' here. This is the only place in Judges where this Hebrew is so rendered even though it is rendered at $4: 14 ; 6: 13,14 ; 8: 2 ; 9: 28,38 ; 10: 11 ; 11: 7,24 ; 15: 2$ and 11. It is not rendered at $4: 6$ and $14: 15$. This rendering is rated 1 .
'škḥ. This renders $y m s s^{\prime} w$ here and the rendering was rated 2 at 1:5.
$b z t$ '. This renders the substantive šll twice in this verse. A third occurrence at segment 12 of MT is not rendered and a fourth occurrence at segment 18 is rendered by bzwz. At $8: 24$ and $8: 25$, the Hebrew is also rendered by $b z t$ '. The four renderings by $b z t$ tend to confirm that the rendering by bzwz' from the same root resulted from reading the Qal participle rather than the substantive. Therefore the renderings by $b z t^{\prime}$ will be rated 5 . $k w d n y$. This renders rḥm once in the sing. and once in the dual in this verse and the Hebrew occurs nowhere else in Judges, so it is not rated. $r y s ̌$. This rendering of Hebrew $r \check{s}$ was rated 5 for consistency at 5:26.
$g b r^{2}$. This renders Hebrew $g b r$ which occurs only here in Judges and is not rated. See 5:13 for the rating of $g b w r$.
$s w b^{\prime} n^{\prime}$. This plur. renders $s b^{c} y m$ twice in this verse. The Hebrew sing. is not rendered once in this verse. These are the only occurrences of the Hebrew term in the Hebrew Scriptures and not rated here for consistency.
swrt'. This plur. renders the dual rqmtym and there is another occurrence of this Syriac right before lsysr which may be either an addition or a rendering of the sing. of rqmh out
of sequence. The two occurrences of the Hebrew term are its only occurrences in Judges and therefore the rendering is not rated for consistency.
$s w^{2}$. This renders Hebrew șwry here and at 8:21 and 26, the only other occurrences of that Hebrew in Judges. This is consistent but not sufficiently rendered for a rating. $b z w z^{\prime}$. This is understood as the rating of $\check{s l l}$ pointed as a participle. See the discussion of the rendering by $b z t{ }^{\prime}$ above. On further consideration of the reasons given there this rendering is not rated because there are no other occurrences of the Qal of šll in Judges. If this had been considered a rendering of the substantive, it would be rated 1.

The rating for this mode in this verse is 3 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. It is difficult to express certainty about the semantic accuracy of $k w d n y^{\prime}$ and the assumption that $b z w z^{\prime}$ is based on a Qal participle, but the reasons given for finding those conclusions plausible in the discussion of retroversion are adhered to as the position with regard to this mode. Even though $k b r$ is not a consistent rendering it is considered accurate as a free translation of the source elements.

The addition of ' $z l$ can be accepted as a way of expressing the continuous action implied in the use of the imperf. forms at segments 2 and 3 of MT. In the entry for ${ }^{\circ} z l$ in
 growing, increased more and more. ${ }^{, 50}$ This may also explain the added waw before the two verbs rendering segments 2 and 3 of MT. The repetition of $k w d n y^{\circ}$ is considered a way of rendering the source more accurately even though the semantic value of the Syriac may not be as literal in relation to the source as it might be. There may be some doubt about whether this is mathematically precise, that is, exactly two for each man.

[^216]As at 5:26 there is some inconsistency in rendering Hebrew $l$ as it is rendered here, twice by Syriac $l$ and once by $l$. The first two objects refer to human recipients and the third refers to a part of the human body, the neck, where the human recipient would wear the object. Perhaps the translator saw a difference, but it is doubtful that Syriac usage would preclude consistency.

There are seven instances of direct object construction $d$ at the segments of P representing segments, $4,5-6,9,10,13$ and 16 of MT. There is an instance of genitive construction $a$ at $r y \check{s}^{\prime} g b r^{r}$ and of genitive construction $b$ in the last two segments of this verse of P .

## RATING OF THE VERSE. 3.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

Although A and B differ between themselves, especially in rendering segments 5 and 6 of MT, neither is more nor less comparable to P on that account. The only quite trivial difference in comparison to P may be the addition by B of avitó. The rendering of the final segment as plur. confirms that aspect of P, but both A and B still render by "plunder" rather than "plunderer."

5:31. כן יאבדו כל־אויביך יהוה ואהביו כצאת השמש בגברתו ותשקט הארץ ארבעים שנה:



## RETROVERSION

With the pair of elements joined by maqqēph counted as segment 3 there are twelve segments in this verse of MT, eight to the athnach and four following it. With klhwn $b^{\prime} l d b b y k$ counted as segment 3 and ' $y k m p q$ counted as segment 6 there are also twelve segments in this verse of P , four to the first punctuation point, four more to the second, and the last four to the third punctuation point. All of the segments of P can be retroverted to the same-numbered segments of MT except for the pronominal suffix of segment 5. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ person masculine sing. suffix in P is also found in the Vulgate, but not in A, B, Tg J, or the Syro-Hexaplar. The easier reading of P and the Vulgate would seem to have resulted from a natural desire to harmonize the pronouns and bring them both in line with the vocative of $y h w h$. Thus the preponderance of the evidence follows the more difficult reading of segment 5 and no source for P will be considered that can be distinguished from this verse of MT.

LITERALISM. 1. Division into elements or segments, and sequence of segments. This is a word for word translation by P of this verse of MT except that the suffix of segment 5 of $P$ does not translate the suffix of segment 5 of MT. In another way segment 6 here is more literal than has been the case in earlier verses other than 5:4 where as here there was a preposition plus an infinitive construct plus a genitive of the infinitive as the subject of the infinitive. That will be noted also under mode 4. The altered suffix of segment 5 only reduces the literal quality of the segmentation by about $4 \%$. The literality of the sequence is rated 5 and this mode is rated $5-$
2. Addition or subtraction of elements. There are no additions or subtractions and this mode is rated 5 .
3. Consistency or non-consistency of rendering.
$h k n^{\prime}$. This renders $k n$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 5- at 1:7.
$n^{\prime} b d w n$. This Peal renders the Qal imperf. of ' $b d$ here, but there are no other occurrences of the Hebrew verb in Judges so this rendering is not rated for consistency.
bldbbyk. This renders 'wybyk here and the consistency of the rendering by the Syriac $b^{c} l d b b^{\prime}$ of Hebrew 'wyb was rated 5 at 2:14.
$m r y$. The consistency of this rendering of $y h w h$ was rated 5 at 1:1.
rḥmyk. This Peal participle renders the Qal participle 'hbyw and other forms of the Qal are rendered by this Syriac verb at $14: 16 ; 16: 4$ and 15, so its rating for this mode is 5 .
$m p q$. This Peal of $n p q$ renders the Qal of $y s^{\prime}$ and the consistency of the rendering of $y s^{\prime}$ by $n p q$ was rated 5 at 1:24.
$\check{s} m s \check{s}^{\prime}$. This renders $h \stackrel{s}{s} m s ̌$ here and at $9: 33 ; 19: 14 ; 20: 43$; and 21:19. It is not rendered at 11:18. The consistency of the rendering is rated 5 .
gnbrwth. This renders gbrtw, from gbwrh, here and at $8: 21$. This is consistent, but falls short of the number of renderings needed for a rating.
$\check{s l y t .}$ This renders the Qal narrative of $\check{s} q t+$ and the consistency of the rendering was rated 4 at $3: 11$.
' $r$ '. The consistency of this rendering of its Hebrew cognate was rated 5 at 1:2.
šnyn. This plur. rendering of šnh was rated 5 for consistency at 3:11.
The rating for this mode in this verse is 5 .
4. Accuracy and level of semantic and syntactical information. The imperf. form of segment 2 presents again the problem of whether the Syriac imperf. can have a present meaning. Here it seems clear that the verb has volitive meaning as in KJV, ASV, RSV, and NRSV. This seems the intent of the optative of A and B and the subjunctive of the Vulgate. Smelik renders by "will" which could mean simple future or give the two colons a gnomic sense, ${ }^{51}$ but a volitive sense is probably possible there too.

[^217]It is interesting that the volitive sense is carried into the second colon verblessly, unlike Tg J which adds $y h w n$. This gapping of the modality of the predication is shared with A and B and is a feature of the literalism of the syntax here. This is also true of the use of ' $y k$ plus an infinitive to render $k z^{\prime} t$. The more usual practice has been to render Hebrew $b$ plus the infinitive by $k d$ plus the participle as at $1: 14$ or by $k d$ plus the finite verb as at $2: 4$, as well as to render $k$ plus the infinitive by $k$ plus a finite verb as at 3:27. In this verse and 5:4 P takes a more literal approach. Where Hebrew uses $l$ plus the infinitive, P is more likely to be literal.

As Williams concludes, "the outstanding feature" of $k l$ with a suffix is that the nouns with which they occur "are probably all definite., ${ }^{52}$

The inflection of $m p q$ is assumed to be the same in the construct as in the absolute and thus the construct phrase of segments 6 to 7 is an instance of genitive construction $a$.

## RATING OF THE VERSE. <br> 5.

## COMPARISON WITH A AND B

 and at segment 8 where A has $\delta v v a \sigma \tau \varepsilon i \alpha u s$ and B has $\delta v v \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon$. This is deemed to make B more similar to P , but in neither case is A unlike P .

[^218]
## CHAPTER SEVEN

## CONCLUSION

Several topics will now be covered by proceeding through a summary the foregoing conclusions about the literalism of the translation of these first five chapters of Judges and also by commenting on several issues covered by Weitzman in his important study, The Syriac Versions of the Old Testament, referred to often in the preceding chapters. That commentary will of course be based on the analysis of these five chapters . The matters covered will include some of the conclusions Weitzman advances about the relation between the extant Hebrew and Syriac texts, and about the textual questions he covers in relation to problems encountered in the study of these five chapters.

The first part of the presentation of the conclusions that have been reached is in the form of tables that summarize in an abridged form the matters covered and the conclusions reached. Those tables report on a verse by verse basis the conclusions reached in the course of studying those five chapters. Fifteen columns report these conclusions in successive rows covering each verse in order. The first five columns report the ratings of the first three modes of literalism with the first two columns breaking down the two aspects of mode 1 , segmentation and sequence, and the third, fourth and fifth columns reporting the conclusions for modes 1,2 , and 3 . The sixth and seventh columns report selected aspects of the semantic and syntactical matters dealt with in the respective verses. This is not complete because the space limitation in each box calls for terse comments, but it is intended to give an overview of some of the semantic and syntactical issues identified
and to help the interested reader locate those discussions in the verse by verse analysis of chapters 2 to 6 . A more complete discussion of the matters summarized can then be found in the respective verses. The eighth column reports all of the genitive constructions $a, b$, and $c$ identified in each verse, and the ninth column does the same thing for direct object constructions $d, e$, and $f$. These last two columns are intended to be complete.

In columns 6 and 7 certain abbreviations are used. The plus and minus signs identify elements or segments added or subtracted; "plur." means that a plur. form renders a sing. and the contrary is true for "sing." The diagonal mark (virgule or slash) is used to separate the Syriac word on the left that renders the Hebrew word on the right of the virgule when that rendering is the one that is under consideration. Other abbreviations such as perf., suff., inf., and pron. should be clear. The notation " $+d$ rel" means that some portion of the text, for example a preposition or an adjective used substantively has become part of a relative clause (usually verbless). The indications "+" or "-" waw or other element show the addition or subtraction of such an element.

In columns 8 and 9 the number of times a particular construction occurs in the verse is indicated by a preceding Arabic numeral and then, as to direct objects, the presence or absence of a direct object marker in the Vorlage is noted in parentheses after the letter. Thus $2 d(0)$ means that two direct objects without a prefix in Syriac and without a direct object marker in Hebrew are found in the Syriac verse. (The categories of these constructions are explained in the introductory chapter of this study. Some objects without $l$ are preceded by $m n$ or $d$.) Then $3 e(\mathrm{M})$ would mean that three direct objects prefixed by $l$ in Syriac render three direct objects in MT marked by ${ }^{2} t$ and $f(\mathrm{M})$ would mean that a direct object prefixed by $l$ that is the object of a verb with a pronominal suff. renders a direct object in MT marked by ' $t$. Some $d$ constructions render marked Hebrew objects. The capital letters "PS" refer to pronoun suffixes and "(L)" means that the direct object in MT is prefixed by lamed.

Column 10 records a rating for each verse based on the ratings of modes 1,2 , and 3 for the most part. This is not an arithmetic mean but an estimate made along the lines described in the introductory chapter 1.

Column 11 records the version considered most comparable to P from among the three versions $\mathrm{Tg} \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{A}$, and B for chapters 1 to 4 and as between A and B as to chapter 5 of Judges. In some cases as to chapters 1 to 4 , where Tg J is judged more similar to P , either A or B may have been judged more similar than the other and that will be noted by "Tg J, A" or "Tg J, B." Where two versions are similar to each other that will be noted by an ampersand between the two of them.

Column 12 indicates whether or not there is any substantial change in the meaning of the translation in relation to the meaning of the same verse in MT by noting "unchanged." Where there is clearly a change, that is noted as "changed." Some other notations are made to indicate some of the small changes or some of the places where the conclusion is qualified. In some cases where there is a change in the Leiden Edition the fact that the 9a1 fam MSS are unchanged is noted.

Columns 13 and 14 report the number of renderings studied in each verse and distinguish between the number that receive a rating in each verse and the number that did not. This information is supplied so that a reader can estimate the importance to attach to the mode 3 rating for each verse, but this does not mean that the ratings were weighted based on the number considered in each verse before calculating the arithmetic mean for all the mode 3 ratings in each verse and also in the five chapters as a whole.

For each chapter as to the ratings in modes 1,2 , and 3 , and for the verse as a whole, the arithmetic mean and standard deviation has been calculated. In making that calculation a whole number rating with a minus has been reduced by 0.3 so that $5-=4.7$, etc. In other places where the rating was qualified to an even greater degree as to the line
between one whole number and another, a 0.5 is added or subtracted to show that calculation. In some cases a plus or minus is qualified somewhat more by the addition or subtraction of another 0.15 .

It should be emphasized that this statistical analysis does not add any scientific validity to the estimates made for each mode in each verse. What it does is provide a means for generalizing about what those estimates mean in the aggregate. The mean or average displays the result of the verse by verse calculation and helps to compare the modes with each other. The standard deviation shows to what extent the individual calculations for each mode are more or less variable among themselves. More will be said about these calculations after the following pages containing these tables.
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Judges


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Chapter
TWO \& SEG \& SEQ \& MODE
1 \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { MODE } \\
2
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { MODE } \\
3
\end{gathered}
\] \& SEMANTICS \& SYNTAX \& GENITIVE
CONSTRUCTION \& DIRECT OBJECT
CONSTRUCTION \& VERSE \& TgJ,A, B \& MEANING \& \[
\frac{\mathrm{M}}{\text { \# RAT }}
\] \&  \\
\hline 1 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 3 \& 4 \& \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& +n, \text { seg. } 6, \\
\& +d \text { seg. } 16 \\
\& + \text { rel., seg. } 18
\end{aligned}
\] \& c \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O}), \mathrm{PS}\) \& 4 \& B \& \begin{tabular}{l}
unchanged but \\
pleonastic
\end{tabular} \& 8 \& 2 \\
\hline 2 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& \(l / b\) \& impera./imperf. \& a \& \(2 \mathrm{~d}(\mathrm{O})\) \& 5 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& 9 \& 2 \\
\hline 3 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 3 \& 3 \& \& - waw, \(+d\) \& \& \& 4 \& B, TgJ \& unchanged \& 3 \& 2 \\
\hline 4 \& 4 \& 4 \& 4 \& 3 \& 3 \& \& \[
\begin{array}{|l}
\hline \text { temporal clause, } \\
\hline \text { wyhy }+ \text { prep. }+ \text { inf } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \& c \& 2d(M) \& 3 \& A \& similar, free translatior \& 8 \& 0 \\
\hline 5 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& 4 \& 5 \& \& pseudo-passive \& c \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O})\) \& 4.5 \& B \& unchanged + add \& 5 \& 1 \\
\hline 6 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& \& \& a \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{M}), \mathrm{e}(\mathrm{M})\) \& 5 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& 8 \& 0 \\
\hline 7 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& 4 \& 4 \& \& waw/dalal
use of \(k l\) \& b, c \& d(M) \& 4 \& A \& unchanged, free translatior \& 9 \& 2 \\
\hline 8 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& \& \& a, c \& \& 5 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& 4 \& 1 \\
\hline 9 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& srh/hrs \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& d / 1 \\
\& +d
\end{aligned}
\] \& 3 b \& PS \& 5 \& A \& B \& \(\underset{\text { srb }}{\text { unchanged excep1 }}\) \& 5 \& 0 \\
\hline 10 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& \&  \& \& 2e(M) \& 5 \& B \& unchanged \& 8 \& 1 \\
\hline 11 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& \(q d m / b^{\prime} y n\) \& +d rel. \& a \& e (M) \& 5 \& TgJ, B \& unchanged \& 7 \& 0 \\
\hline 12 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5- \& 5 \& \& \(+d\) rel. \& 3b \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \operatorname{Te}(\mathrm{L}) \\
\& \operatorname{2e}(\mathrm{M}) \\
\& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \& 5 \& A \& unchanged \& 10 \& 1 \\
\hline 13 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& \& \& \& \& \(2 \mathrm{e}(\mathrm{L}), \mathrm{e}(\mathrm{M})\) \& 5 \& A \& unchanged \& 4 \& 1 \\
\hline 14 \& 5- \& 5 \& \(5-\) \& \(5-\) \& 5 \& \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
-p \\
+d \text { rel. } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \& 2b \& \& 5 \& TgJ,A \& unchanged \& 10 \& 3 \\
\hline 15 \& 5 \& 4 \& 4.5 \& 5 \& 4 \& \& - waw \& c \& \& 4.5 \& B \& unchanged \& 8 \& 2 \\
\hline 16 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 3 \& 5 \& \& \& b \& d(O), PS \& 4.5 \& TgJ, A \& unchanged + explanatior \& 5 \& 1 \\
\hline 17 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& \(5-\) \& 4 \& \(t^{2}\) w/znw \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
+b h \\
+ \text { waw } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \& c \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O})^{*}\) \& 5 \& B \& unchanged w/free translatior \& 15 \& 0 \\
\hline 18 \& 3 \& 4 \& 3 \& 5- \& 4 \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { seg. } 14,-k y \\
\& \text { sm } / n h m \\
\& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \& plur., -waw \& a, b \& \& 3 \& A \& changed \& 10 \& 3 \\
\hline 19 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& 5 \& 4 \& by \({ }^{\text {st }}\) '/hqš \({ }^{\text {ch }}\) \& tenses \& \& \(\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{L})\) ? \& 4.5 \& B \& unchanged \(\mathrm{w} /\)
freedom \& 14 \& 1 \\
\hline 20 \& 5- \& 5 \& \(5-\) \& \(5-\) \& 5 \& \& p, b/l \& \& \(\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{M}),{ }^{`} 11 \mathrm{AA}\) \& 5- \& A \& B \& unchanged \& 8 \& 0 \\
\hline 21 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5/5- \& 5 \& "nš/ \({ }^{\prime}\) ¢ \({ }^{\text {ch }}\) \& + waw \& \& e(0) \& 5 \& TgJ, B \& unchanged \& 9 \& 0 \\
\hline 22 \& 3 \& 5 \& 4 \& 3 \& 3 \& \(n / h\) \& \& c \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{M}), \mathrm{e}(\mathrm{M})\) \& 3 \& A \& B \& free translation \& 7 \& 0 \\
\hline 23 \& 5- \& 5 \& \(5-\) \& 4.5 \& 4 \& wl'/blty \& \& b \& f (M) \& 4.5 \& \& unchanged \& 6 \& 1 \\
\hline 17note \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& *possible d.o.e, seg. \& \& \& \& \& \\
\hline MEAN \& \& \& 4.7 \& 4.38478 \& 4.3913 \& \& \& \& \& 4.48697 \& \& \& \& \\
\hline STD. DEV. \& \& \& 0.495486 \& 0.78067 \& 0.70644 \& \& \& \& \& 0.66875 \& \& \& \& \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Chapter \& SEG \& SEQ \& Mode \& Mode \& Mode \& SEmANTICS \& SYNTAX \& GENITIVE \& DIRECT OBJECT| \& VERSE \& Tgl,, , B \& MEANING \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{MODE 3} \\
\hline THREE \& \& \& 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& \& \& CONSTRUCTION \& construction \& \& \& \& \#RATE \& NOT RATED \\
\hline 24 \& 4 \& 4 \& 4 \& 5. \& 3 \& \& hzh/hnh \& 2 b \& d(O) \& 4 \& в \& unchanged \& 6 \& 3 \\
\hline 25 \& 3 \& 5 \& 4 \& 5. \& 4 \& seg.2,3.4\&11 \& \[
\begin{array}{c|}
\hline \text { asyndetic obj. } \\
\text { clause } \\
9 \mathrm{a} 1 \mathrm{fam} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \& b \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{M}), \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O})\) \& 4 \& A, TgJ \& \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\substack{\text { no significant } \\
\text { change }} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \& 9 \& 2 \\
\hline 26 \& 2 \& 1 \& 1.5 \& 3 \& -- \& (additions \& subtractions) \& \(+h w w,+\) copula prep phrase/h \& \& e (M) \& (2) \& TgJ \& \[
\begin{array}{c|}
\hline \text { free } \\
\text { translation }
\end{array}
\] \& 1 \& 3 \\
\hline 27 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 3 \& \& - waw \& a, b \& \& 4.5 \& Tg, A \& unchanged \& 9 \& 0 \\
\hline 28 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& genitlic/PN \& \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline \text { plur. } \\
d / \text { dep. impert. } \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] \& \& 2(3)d(M), e(0) \& 5 \& Tg, A \& unchanged \& 11 \& 3 \\
\hline 29 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& 5. \& 3 \& \[
q t l / n k h
\] \& \(h w\) position \& \& d(O) \& 4 \& Tol A \& unchanged \& 3 \& 2 \\
\hline 30 \& 5 \& 3 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4 \& \& plur. \& b \& \& 4 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& 7 \& 0 \\
\hline 31 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 - \& 3 \& \& plur,mn \& a, b \& e(M) \& 4.5 \& Tgl, B \& unchanged \& 6 \& 2 \\
\hline mean \& \& \& 4.49677 \& 4.53065 \& 3.656257 \& \& \& \& \& 4.222581 \& \& \& \& \\
\hline STD. DEV \& \& \& 0.7477 \& 0.71647 \& 1.32048 \& \& \& \& \& 0.7661 \& \& \& \& \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Chapter FOUR \& SEG \& SEQ \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { MODI } \\
1 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{MODE} \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { MODE } \\
3
\end{gathered}
\] \& SEMANTICS \& SYNTAX \& GENITIVE
CONSTRUCTIOM \& DIRECT OBJECT
CONSTRUCTION \& VERSE \& TgJ,A, B \& MEANING \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
\mathrm{MC} \\
\# \mathrm{RATE}
\end{array}
\] \&  \\
\hline 1 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& 5 \& \(+t w b\), proposed structural analysis \& \(+d\) rel. \& a \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O})\) \& 5 \& TgJ, B \& unchanged \& 7 \& 0 \\
\hline 2 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& nbyn/ybyn \& \[
\begin{gathered}
+h w^{0} \\
\text { +pron. Suff. }
\end{gathered}
\] \& a, 3b \& \& 5 \& A \& B \& unchanged \& 9 \& 0 \\
\hline 3 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 3 \& \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { plur., }+h w^{\circ} \\
\& +^{\circ} y t, h w^{\circ}
\end{aligned}
\] \& 2a, b \& e(M) \& 4.5 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& 7 \& 2 \\
\hline 4 \& 5 \& 4 \& 4.5 \& 5 \& 5 \& lpytwr/lpydwt \& + waw_pref., \(+h w t\),
demonstrative
before. substantive \& a \& e (M) \& 5 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& 3 \& 1 \\
\hline 5 \& 3.5 \& 4 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\hline+d \text { rel. } \\
+h w t
\end{gathered}
\] \& a, b \& \& 4 \& B \& unchanged \& 6 \& 1 \\
\hline 6 \& 5- \& 5 \& 5- \& 5- \& 4.5 \& \(\mathrm{rqm} / \mathrm{qdš}\) \& \begin{tabular}{l}
asyndeton/syndeton \\
\(-h\) prefix (see v 14 \\
below) \(+d\) recitative
\end{tabular} \& 3a, 3b \& \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O})\) \& 5- \& TgJ, B \& unchanged \& 10 \& 1 \\
\hline 7 \& 1+ \& - \& - \& 3 \& 4 \& see discussion of retroversion + segmentation \& retroversion + segmentation \& a, 2b \& \& 2 \& TgJ

- \& unchanged \& 7 \& 1 <br>

\hline 8 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& \& | part./imperf. |
| :--- |
| - waw | \& \& \& 5 \& TgJ \& unchanged \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
4 x^{0} z l \\
1
\end{gathered}
$$
\] \& 0 <br>

\hline 9 \& 5- \& 5- \& 5- \& 5- \& 5 \& \& $$
\begin{gathered}
- \text { waw },+l h \\
\text { part./narr. tense }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& b \& f(M) \& 5- \& TgJ, A \& unchanged \& 9 \& 2 <br>

\hline 10 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5- \& 3 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\hline q d m / b r g l y w \\
\text { rqm/qdšs } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$ \& plur., $+h w^{\circ}$ \& \& 2e(M) \& 4.5 \& A \& unchanged \& 4 \& 1 <br>

\hline 11 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5- \& 5 \& \& $+d$ rel. \& a, c \& $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O})$ \& 5 \& B \& unchanged \& 2 \& 3 <br>

\hline 12 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Seg. 7, prep./adv. acc } \\
\text { or d.o. constr. }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& a,b \& e(O) or prep. phras \& 5 \& TgJ, A \& unchanged \& 4 \& 0 <br>

\hline 13 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 3 \& \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { plur., } k l+\text { suff. } \\
+ \text { waw }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& 3b \& 2d(M) \& 4.5 \& B \& unchanged \& 5 \& 1 <br>

\hline 14 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& ${ }^{c} m /{ }^{\circ} h r y n$ \& $$
\begin{gathered}
h^{\circ} \text {, plur. } \\
+h w
\end{gathered}
$$ \& b \& e (M) \& 5 \& A \& unchanged \& 12 \& 0 <br>

\hline 15 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& $\mathrm{mn} / \mathrm{m}^{c} \mathrm{l}$ \& suffixed $k 1$ \& b \& 3 e (M) \& 5 \& A \& unchanged \& 8 \& 2 <br>

\hline 16 \& 4 \& 5 \& 4.5 \& 5- \& 4 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
k d h y /{ }^{c} d{ }^{\circ} h d \\
{ }^{\circ} \text { tplt/ns }{ }^{\circ} r \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$ \& +pron. suffs. \& 2b, c \& \& 4.5 \& B \& unchanged, (last clause free translation) \& 8 \& 1 <br>

\hline 17 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& 4 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { nbyn/ybyn } \\
& { }^{c} n^{\circ} y l / y^{c}{ }^{c}{ }^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { brgl } \\
+ \text { copulas } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$
\] \& a, 2b \& \& 4.5 \& B \& unchanged w/addition \& 7 \& 0 <br>

\hline 18 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 4 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
{ }^{\circ} w r^{c} / q r{ }^{\circ} \\
{ }^{c} n^{\circ} y l / y^{c}{ }^{2} \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$ \& prep./h directive + waw, part. narr. tens \& c \& \& 5 \& TgJ, B \& unchanged \& 6 \& 2 <br>

\hline 19 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5 \& 5- \& 3 \& qlyl
adj./gen. constr. \& $-n^{0}$ \& b \& $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{O}), \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{M})$ \& 4.5 \& B, TgJ \& unchanged \& 3 \& 6 <br>
\hline 20 \& 4 \& 4 \& 4 \& $5-$ \& 3 \& \& $+l h,+b / \mathrm{adv}$. acc. \& \& \& 4 \& TgJ, B \& unchanged \& 8 \& 1 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Judges

| Chapter FOUR | SEG | SEQ | MODE | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { MODE } \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MODE } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | SEMANTICS | SYNTAX | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { GENITIVE } \\ \text { CONSTRUCTION } \end{array}$ | DIRECT OB CONSTRUC | VERSE | TgJ,A, B | MEANING | \# RATE | $\bar{Q}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | 5- | 5 | $5-$ | 5 | 3 | $d m k /{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\text {t }}$ | $k d / w$ | b, c | 3d(M) | 4.5 | TgJ, B | unchangd except for Seg. 11 | 8 | 5 |
| 22 | 5 | 5- | 5- | 5- | 3 | $\begin{gathered} { }^{c} n{ } y / l^{c}{ }^{c} l \\ b t r \rho^{\circ}{ }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | changed word orde <br> + whz ${ }^{\circ}+$ waw <br> part./narr. tense |  | e (M) | 4.5 | B | unchanged | 12 | 1 |
| 23 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | nbyn/ybyn |  | a, b | e (M) | 5 | TgJ | Seg. 2: different Vorlage, unchanged | d | 1 |
| 24 | 4 | $3+$ | 3.5 | $5-$ | 5 | -hlwk | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{zl}+\mathrm{waw}+\mathrm{verb}$ | a, 4b | $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{M})$ | 4 | TgJ+ B | unchanged | 4 | 3 |
| MEAN |  |  | 4.59583 | 4.72083 | 4.065 |  |  |  |  | 4.55833 |  |  |  |  |
| STD. DEV |  |  | 0.84631 | 0.45367 | 0.78146 |  |  |  |  | 0.6291 |  |  |  |  |

Judges
Chapter


## DISCUSSION OF RATINGS

As shown on the tables in the preceding pages, out of a possible rating of 5, the mean of the ratings for Chapter One of Judges are: mode 1, 4.8; mode 2, 4.75; mode 3, 3.888889; and for the verse as a whole, 4.543056. The standard deviations for each of these modes and the whole verse, in the same order, are $0.422295,0.454911,0.913716$, and 0.579649 . For Chapter Two the arithmetic means are, for mode $1,4.7$, for mode 2 , 4.384783, for mode 3, 4.391304, and for the verse, 4.48697. The standard deviations for Chapter Two were, mode $1,0.495486$, mode $2,0.780668$, mode $3,0.706438$, and for the verse, 0.668746 . For Chapter Three the arithmetic means for modes 1 to 3 are 4.496771, 4.530645 , and 3.656267 ; for the verse as a whole the mean is 4.222581 . The standard deviations for Chapter Three are $0.747698,0.716474,1.032048$, and 0.7661 . For Chapter Four the means for modes 1 to 3 and for the verse as a whole are 4.595833, 4.720833, 4.065, and 4.558333. The standard deviations for Chapter Four in the same order are $0.846305,0.453669,0.781458$, and 0.629098 . The arithmetic means for Chapter Five are $4.403226,4.590323,3.86333$, and 4.177419. The standard deviations are $0.749401,0.681722,1.003108$, and 0.692569 . For all the verses rated the arithmetic means for modes 1,2 , and 3 are $4.625694,4.618621,3.916197$ and for all the verses rated as a whole, 4.39. The corresponding standard deviations are $0.61604,0.6145166$, 0.947468 , and 0.689593 .

The expected norm for any group (or population) that has a numerical value assigned to each member is that at least $68 \%$ of the group will be within one standard deviation from the mean for that group. This means that as to mode 1 of Judges One, only three verses fall outside that range (verses 33 to 35 ) and that places almost $92 \%$ of the verses within one standard deviation from the mean. As for mode 2 of Judges One only six verses are outside the range of one standard deviation: $1,10,24,25,34$, and 35 .

That places over $83 \%$ within one standard deviation from the mean. As for the verses in mode 3 of Judges One, there are eleven verses that are more than one standard deviation from the mean: $1,2,3,7,11,16,21,22,24,26$, and 28 . That means over $69 \%$ of the verses are within one standard deviation of the mean as to this mode. Similar calculations can be made as to the rating for each verse as a whole and for modes 1,2 , and 3 in all the verses. Those are all shown on the tables. Thus mode 3 would deviate from the norm if two per cent fewer verses were within one standard deviation of the mean.

If these calculations of the medians are translated into the same form used to state the ratings in the verse by verse analysis of chapters 2 to 6 of this study, modes 1 and 2 would be rated 5- for all of Chapter One of Judges, mode 3 would be rated 3, and the overall rating of all thirty-six verses would be 4 .

There are many other ways of looking at these calculations. Only one more will be shown here now and that is the ranking of modes 1,2 , and 3 by chapters. According to the chapter by chapter calculation of the mean for these modes in Chapter One the rank from highest to lowest was 1, 2, 3. In Chapter Two it was mode 1, mode 3, mode 2 and in Chapter Three it was mode 2, mode 1, mode 3. In Chapter Four it was mode 1, mode 2, mode 3 and in Chapter Five it was mode 2, mode 1, mode 3. When the median for all the verses in Chapters One through Five was calculated the ranking was mode 1, mode 2, mode 3 . Once again mode 3 shows the most deviation from the mean.

Someone might object that these calculations only show what is obvious, namely, that P is characterized by more literalism in segmenting, sequencing, and quantification than it is in the consistency of its choice for the terms of translation. The point of the calculations is to have a more reliable method of generalizing about the conclusions to be drawn from the evaluations made on a mode by mode and verse by verse basis throughout the study. Those evaluations involved some arithmetic calculations, but they also
depended on estimates and somewhat arbitrary establishment of degrees, grades, or rankings of literalism. Those estimates were also motivated by the intention to be consistent in reaching those conclusions from verse to verse and chapter to chapter, but they are still conclusions based to some degree on opinion. Once they have been made, however, these calculations make it possible to make generalizations about the meaning of those individual conclusions that are free from any element involving opinion. Any one or all of the verse by verse, mode by mode calculations can be disputed. What those calculations disclose about the verse as a whole cannot be disputed except by going back to the individual calculations. Here the results of these calculations make possible generalizations that are consistent with some of the generalizations made by Weitzman.

Although Weitzman holds that the "[ $[$ ]he general intelligibility of $P$ suggests that the translators' first concern was to represent the overall sense of each phrase," he concedes that "P usually presents a readily identifiable equivalent to each Hebrew word of MT, in more or less the same order. ${ }^{11}$ Those are the aspects of mode 1 shown in the first two columns under the heading of "Seg" and "Seq." Together they produce mode 1 and those conclusions tend to confirm Weitzman's generalizations. One problem that had to be dealt with in analyzing the segmentation was the fact that some of the segments in P were rather easily identified with a segment in MT, but could not be considered an equivalent or even an accurate representation of the use of that segment in MT. In some cases those were judged free translations and in other places they were judged to be mistakes caused either by the ignorance of the translator or by the state of the available text and thus intended to be literal. This means that a free translation might preserve the meaning of the verse better than one rated literal under this mode even though the one rated literal changed the meaning of the verse.

[^219]Evaluation of the sequence did not pose so great a problem. Usually, whether or not the segment of P accurately represented the segment of MT, it was possible to connect the segment of P to a segment of MT and, very often, the sequence was the same as MT even when the segment was a free translation or a mistake. As to this Weitzman says that "the Syriac text of P usually presents a readily identifiable equivalent to each Hebrew word of MT, in more or less the same order. ${ }^{2}$ 2 Sequences different from those in MT were found in only twenty-two of the 145 verses studied here, and that usually meant that only two segments were misplaced. Based on this one might want to edit Weitzman's conclusion by stating that the sequence is "often in the same order." His "usually" and "more or less" need some clarification when discussing verses like those studied here where almost $85 \%$ of the verses are in the same sequence and some in the other $15 \%$ might still be said to be "more or less" in the same sequence.

Weitzman also says that "[w]here additions occur, P is motivated primarily to clarify the sense of the text itself. ${ }^{" 3}$ Beginning at Judg 1:1 that observation would often apply to additions made in the verses studied here. It could also be said to be true of some of what have been treated as syntactic additions under mode 4 in this study. That is to say, some of the additions of copulas, demonstratives, and pronominal suffixes may not have been absolutely required to make the Syriac understandable to a careful reader, but they are added to make the work of reading easier.

Weitzman also states that "translators did not hesitate to depart from the regular equivalence, e. g., to enhance the clarity or attractiveness of their translation, or to resolve figurative or anthropomorphic language." ${ }^{4}$ For example, he says that "bodily terms in

[^220]relation to God do not in themselves trouble the translators." ${ }^{5}$ However, in studying the consistency of rendering of b'yny yhwh by qdm mry' at 2:11 that Syriac rendering of the same Hebrew was found in eight places in P, but where the eyes are human eyes, the phrase was rendered literally. In only one occurrence at $10: 15$ where it is a question of what is good in the eyes of the Lord is the Hebrew rendered literally as it also is at 6:17 where there is a question of finding favor in the eyes of an angel of the Lord.

What was seen most generally in this study with respect to consistency of rendering is that the most likely of the three modes to show the translator straying from literalism is in mode 3. In four of the five chapters mode 3 was the least literal of the three modes and the other two modes were reckoned at about the same level with respect to each other. The mean for mode 1 in all five chapters was 4.625694 , for mode 2 , 4.618621 , and mode 3 at 3.916197 , or over .7 of a point lower than the other two, a significant gap on a scale of 1 to 5 . As already stated this mode also had the greatest number of examples of ratings more than one standard deviation from the mean.

Of the other calculations consistently reported, the genitive constructions and direct object constructions were the most complete. There are seventy-four instances of genitive construction $a$ in these five chapters: thirty-three, five, seventeen, fifteen, and nine (perhaps eleven), respectively. For the most part they are used for gentilic phrases, personal names (including patronyms, for example, $b r g^{\prime} r^{\prime}$ ) place names and similar constructions of which the participle phrase "inhabitants of," $y$ tby, is a prominent example. At 2:8 br m" w'sr šnyn renders bn m’h w'śr šnym. At 2:18 genitive construction $a$ is used for the "days of the judges," but construction $c$ is used for a similar phrase at 2:7. In Chapter Four there are two examples with ' $t t /$ /' $n t t$ (4:4/4:17) and at 4:7 Sisera is $r b$ hyl'. A number of additional examples occur in Chapter Five: at verses 4 and 31, the unusual

[^221]occurrences of the genitive with the infinitive is part of construction $a$; in verse 6 there is another use of $y w m y$ in construction $a$, this time with ' $n$ ' $y l$; two participles with prepositional phrases as genitive members are in verse 10 and two more constructions whose first members are participles are in verses 15 and 16; hkymt'lymth occurs in verse 29; and $r y \check{s} g b r$ is in verse 30 . One unusual example is found in $5: 12$ where "son of Abinoam" is rendered by construction $c$ even though elsewhere in these five chapters "son of someone" is rendered by construction $a$.

There are one hundred five examples of genitive construction $b$ : Chapter 1, sixteen; Chapter 2, twelve; Chapter 3, twenty-four; Chapter 4, twenty-eight; and Chapter 5, twenty-five. At 1:6 and 8, the phrase is "the thumbs of the hands and the feet" and then at $1: 25$ "the edge(mouth) of the sword;" and in 1:16 "city of palms" and "wilderness of Judah" are found in this construction. Perhaps they are to be distinguished from place names rendered by construction $a$ that are being transliterated. At $1: 19$ construction $b$ renders "chariots of iron," displaying one of the ways of using this construction in an adjectival sense. At verse 24 the construction involves the "entrance of the city" and at verse 27 the "land of the Hittites" occurs in construction $b$. In verse 35 the place name "Har-heres" is not transliterated but rendered by construction $b$, and the "hand of the house of Joseph" involves construction $b$ followed by construction $a$. The two examples of construction $b$ in verse 36 involve boundary descriptions. The examples of construction $b$ in Chapter One are representative of examples in all five chapters.

There are thirty-five instances of genitive construction $c$ : Chapter 1, eleven; Chapter 2, eight; Chapter 3, five; Chapter 4, four; and Chapter 5, seven. In 1:1 there is 'bdh dmry' which is in an addition. In 1:5 it is part of the literal rendering of the proper name of Adoni-bezek as is also the case in the two verses that follow that verse. At verse 10 it renders the Hebrew šm ḥbrwn, and, in a similar way, šm dbyr as well. At 1:13 the
family relation 'hy klb is rendered by this construction and the similar phrase ḥtn mšh employs the same construction at verse 16. At 1:17 there is another example of this construction with the name of the city of Hormah as there also is in verse 23 as to Luz, identified as the former name of Bethel.

Although this is not an exhaustive study of the three genitive constructions, and although construction $b$ is the most common construction, there may be some patterns of consistency that can be identified. At this point the degree of consistency or inconsistency has not been calculated or estimated, but it is possible that there are some categories of consistent patterns. If that is true, it is probably also true that any pattern of consistency will probably not be free of some inconsistency.

There are seventy-nine instances of direct object construction $d$ in these five chapters: nine (M) and eight (0); five (M) and six(0); thirteen (M) and eleven (0); six (M) and four (0); and seventeen (0). There are eighty-eight instances of direct object $e$ divided among the chapters in order as follows: forty (M); nine (M), four (L) and one (0); nineteen (M) and one(0); ten (M); and four (0). The are eleven instances of direct object construction $f$ in the five chapters as follows: five(M); one(M); one( 0 ?); two(M); and two(0). The biggest puzzle as to these constructions may be that some of the renderings are of Hebrew objects marked by ${ } t$ and some are not but that all three constructions render both marked and unmarked Hebrew direct objects. This is illustrated at $1: 15$ where $g l t$ is the direct object three times in MT, the first time indefinite and the next two times definite and with a direct object marker. All three are rendered by $P$ by direct object construction $d$ and there is no clear indication of definiteness as to the two places where MT is definite. (One may determine from the context that it is definite in those two places.) At 1:24 there are also three instances of direct object construction $d$ and two of them lack the marker in MT and one of them has it. At 1:26 there are two more
renderings by construction $d$ where the Hebrew rendered has no direct object marker. The first of these two objects is indefinite and the second is definite.

Williams found that the two verbs in 1 Kgs that most often took their direct objects by construction $d$ were $s y m$ and $s_{l} l .^{6}$ The verb $s_{l} l$ only occurs four times in these five chapters and only at 5:25 is there a direct object. That occurrence is in a direct object construction $d$. There is a pronoun object of $\breve{s}^{\prime} l$ at $4: 20$, the object of a participle and so rendered by $l k y$. At $1: 1 s^{\prime} l$ takes its complement with the preposition $b$ and at $1: 14$ does so by $m n$. Williams also says that the "general tendency is for construction $d$ to be used with common nouns, and construction $e$ and $f$ for proper nouns. ${ }^{" 7}$ That may be the general tendency, but by looking only at Chapter One there are exceptions to be seen, like Hebron at 1:20, a proper noun in construction $d$. On the other hand at $1: 8$ the common noun $q w r y$ is in construction $e$ and there are three instances of common nouns in construction $e$ at 1:25.

Thus a preliminary examination of these constructions is not sufficient to establish whether there are any consistent patterns to be discerned in these five chapters.

The evaluation of the comparability between P in relation to the other versions Tg J, A, and B did not go into such great detail in the verse by verse analysis as did the comparison made between P and MT. Often the version that was least comparable was so judged because of additions. The Targum was included in the comparisons only for Chapters One to Four because of the many additions it makes in Chapter Five. The summary of conclusions for all three is made only for those four chapters. Where all three were judged similarly comparable no credit for comparability is shown in the results for that verse. Where two were judged about equally comparable they are shown joined by an

[^222]ampersand, and are both counted in calculating the number of times a version is considered most comparable. Where one of the three is considered the second most comparable, it follows a comma after the one considered most comparable, and only the one counted most comparable is included in the calculations.

Based on these calculations, in the first four chapters, Tg J was judged most comparable fifty-nine times, B, twenty-eight times, and A twenty-six times. In Chapter Five, B was found more comparable eighteen times and A , nine times.

In this study comparisons were made with the Syro-Hexaplar version in the analysis of Judges 4 and to some extent in Judges 5. That comparison suggests that a comparison of the Syro-Hexaplar with MT as well as with P and the other three versions compared here could be profitable. These observations will be developed in discussing briefly below the text of Judges in the Leiden Peshitta and the faithfulness of the meaning of the verses analyzed to the meaning of those verses in MT.

Before turning to that discussion a brief comment will be made on the last two columns of the tables where a record is made of the number of words that were rated in each verse and the number of words that were analyzed but not rated because there was not enough evidence for a reliable calculation of the consistency of rendering. In all of the verses analyzed there was at least one word that could be rated, but those verses where only one word could be rated were not included in mode 3 and thus had no effect on the over-all rating for the verse, the chapter, or all five chapters. Those verses are 3:26; 4:8 (actually four occurrences of ${ }^{\prime} z l$ ); and 5:22. However where there were at least two words rated for consistency mode 3 was rated and included in all the other calculations. That happened in $1: 18 ; 1: 23 ; 1: 28 ; 4: 11 ; 5: 1$; and $5: 21$. These are not considered to have distorted any of the calculations of which they are a part.

## CHANGED VERSES AND TEXT OF LEIDEN PESHITTA

The verses that are considered to have been changed will now be discussed and the discussion will include consideration of the text of the Leiden Peshitta. Verses will not be considered to have been changed in meaning where there is an addition that does not change the meaning of the portion of the translation that deals with the verse of the MT. The first verse of the first chapter is a good example of this where there is additional description of Joshua. Then too, where an element, segment or phrase is considered a free translation which does not change the meaning of what it is freely translating that will not be considered a change either. Such a conclusion may be disputed but the standard attempted to be applied here is like the principle of Probablism so that a solidly probable opinion that the meaning is unchanged could be accepted. A subtraction may or may not have the effect of changing the meaning of a verse. Instances of rendering of proper names like the rendering of Adoni-bezek at 1:5, 6 , and 7, reš-dalat confusion, or the literal rendering of "Sela" as "crag" at 1:36 will not be considered changes either.

The first change met is at $1: 8$. There ' $y r$ is rendered by $q w r y h$ and that changes the place that was burned from Jerusalem itself to some of its dependent settlements. Neither Tg J, A, B, the Vulgate, nor the Syro-Hexapla support this change. In fact the Vulgate says it was the cunctam, the city. The notes of the Leiden Edition report no alternatives. This points to a conclusion that this was a feature of the translation or, less likely, a change introduced at a comparatively early stage in the transmission of the text. The possibility of the influence from an interpretation like that of Josephus referred to in the discussion of the verse is clearly a possibility. This would make the change a likely characteristic of the translation of P and also a distinctive one among the ancient versions.

Then at $1: 10$ there is an addition at the end of the verse of P , bny gnbr ${ }^{\text {r }}$, adding information based on Jos 15:14 or Judg 1:20, or both. If accurate, it does not change the
meaning of the verse, because that could be pieced together based on those other sources. What is interesting is that the addition is not found in the MSS 9a1 fam. That could mean it is based on a Greek source since it is found in both A and the Syro-Hexaplar. It does bear on the question of the significance of readings based on MS 9a1 which will be discussed later.

At 1:14 there is the small matter of the addition of btry at the end of the verse which does not change the meaning of the verse, and there is also the larger question of the rendering of segment 3 , wtsythw (active voice) where Achsah is the subject and Othniel is the object. It is rendered by the Ethpalpal of $r g g$, possibly a mistake for $g r r$. In discussing the verse in the analysis of Chapter One it was not reported that the Hiphil of $s w t$ is rendered by the Pael of $h p t$ with a $3^{\text {rd }}$ feminine obj. suff. in the Syro-Hexaplar adding that evidence to the evidence from A, B, and the Vulgate for emendation of MT. The addition of brty is not supported by MS 9a1.

In addition to all the other versions cited at 1:17 the reversal of the order of Judah and Simeon is not supported by the Syro-Hexaplar and that adds support to the conclusion already reached that P is in error. This phenomenon is reported by Taylor.

In 1:23 the initial verb was misunderstood by P , but there is no evidence of a corrected Syriac text and the Syro-Hexaplar has a lacuna at this verse. The explanation given in the discussion of this verse was that the Hiphil of $t w r$ was mistaken for the Hiphil of $y t r$. That explanation is weak since the unpointed MT of the Hiphil of $t w r$ would probably be somewhat different from that of $y t r$, but the Hiphil of $y t r$ could be rendered by $p w s ̌$. No new consideration will be added here now.

In 1:33, the segmentation was based on the Leiden Peshitta and it is not clear whether segments 12 to 15 are the end of the previous clause or the beginning of the next one. In MT those segments are part of the following clause. In the Syro-Hexaplar they
are also the subject of the following clause and that clause renders the last three segments of the verse more literally in relation to MT: hww lhwn lmd't. Thus it seems possible that at some stage in the transmission of the text segments 12 to 15 of P were omitted and the waw prefix was attached to segment $16, h w w$. Then, probably, when Dirksen restored the missing segments the waw was left at segment 16 .

In the following verse 34 , the Amorites who are the subject of the verb in MT become the object in P at the same time that the Danites, the object in MT, become the subject in $P$. As noted in discussion 1:34, the operation, effected by the transfer of a single $l$ prefix, does not occur in MS 9a1. Neither does it occur in the Syro-Hexaplar. The resulting word order, direct object-subject, may not be expected either. Thus another change in the text being studied here may not represent the Urtext of P.

In 2:18 the problem segment 14 of $\mathrm{P}, \stackrel{s m^{c} h}{ } h w^{\nu}$, that fills the place occupied by $k y$ $n h \not m$ is not solved by resort to the other text cited by Dirksen or by the Syro-Hexaplar that renders segment 14 by $m t t l d{ }^{\top} t t p y s . ~ T h a t ~ l a s t ~ r e n d e r i n g ~ c a n ~ b e ~ m o r e ~ e a s i l y ~ r e l a t e d ~ t o ~ M T, ~$ but it does not help to explain P .

At 3:2 the two significant problems are the rendering of 'šr lpnym by $q d m y$ and the apparent rendering of the Piel of 'lp by the Peal of its Syriac cognate. The Syro-Hexaplar tends to confirm MT, but gives no real help in explaining the differences. There are no textual notes to the verse of P .

As already stated in the discussion of 3:17 the problem in the text of the Leiden Edition is somewhat clarified by the text of the 9 a 1 fam MSS. That provides evidence of an earlier stage at which Eglon was described as both šmyn and bryr, and thus helps to explain the presence of both adjectives and the survival of the latter in the MS on which the Leiden Edition is based. Here the Syro-Hexaplar does not help to solve the remaining problems between MT and P.

At 4:5 the palm of Deborah becomes merely a palm in P and Deborah is expressly named as the subject of the verb meaning "sit," and her name changes its place and role in the verse. As already stated there, no alternatives are cited in Dirksen's notes and the Syro-Hexaplar has also adopted the changed location of the name "Deborah" in its text. Thus this addition cannot be explained here any more than it already has been.

At 4:7 in MT the verse begins in the middle of Deborah's citation of the Lord's command where the Lord is saying: "I will draw out Sisera, etc." In P however, the 10,000 men are the subject of the verb that begins the verse and other changes are made as well. In the previous discussion of this verse in this study it was observed that there was no help toward the solution of the problem in any alternative text cited by Dirksen nor in any of the other versions consulted including the Syro-Hexaplar. That remains the conclusion here and suggests that this change was part of the Urtext of P .

Chapter Five was found to have more changes than any other chapter studied. Only selected examples of those will be discussed here. In verse 5 P has substituted qdyš̌ for 'lhy of MT, but neither MS 9a1 nor the Syro-Hexaplar have done so and this makes it reasonable to suspect that the Urtext of P did have ' $/ h^{\prime}$ '. In verse 19 the text of the Leiden Edition shows the first instance of the Niphal of lhwm being rendered by the Ethpaal of kť̌ which is the normal translation term in P. But then the second instance of the Hebrew verb is rendered by the Pael of knš and, to complicate the verse even more, the same form of $k n s ̌$ is added after "Taanach." That problem is compounded then by the fact that Dirksen reports that the 9 a 1 fam MSS have turned the first of the three instances of $k t \check{s}$ into knš. The Greek Versions render the first occurrence by $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \sigma \omega$ and the second by $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$. There is no addition after "Taanach." The Syro-Hexaplar has wstdrw bqrb" for the first instance of the Niphal of $l h m$ and ' $q r b w$ for the second. It make no addition of a third verb after the second one. The Syro-Hexaplar might support the sequence of the

Ethpaal of $k n s ̌$ first and the Ethpaal of $k t s ̌$ second, but it does not support either the text of the Leiden Peshitta or the text of 9a1 as reported in the notes. It also is in harmony with $A$ and $B$. The A and $B$ renderings may be under the influence of interpretation since they show a desire to explain that there was first a lining up for battle and then the actual battle. Of course the poetry of the Hebrew probably was seeking repetition at that point and the translators missed that element of the text. Whatever their motive, the Syro-Hexaplar picked it up. Somehow or another the text used by Dirksen must have transposed the two, and then repeated what it had put in second place. If Dirksen's note is correct, MS 9a1 brought the first instance of $l h m$ in line with the Greek, but then repeated the form of the $k n s ̌$ and added a third for good (or bad) measure. One can imagine an Urtext like MT or one like A, B, and the Syro-Hexaplar, but one cannot imagine one like the Leiden Peshitta or the 9a1 fam mss, except as a mistake.

This review shows that some of the ancient Peshitta mss as well as the SyroHexaplar may be a source for solving some of the textual problems in P (and as a result help in understanding the translation technique), but they do not lead to a solution for all of them.

Weitzman argues at some length that the MSS that agree with MT are presumptively closer to the Urtext than are the majority readings found in those ancient texts. ${ }^{8}$ He also cites Brock for the view that correction of the LXX after the Hebrew "was probably the main purpose of Origen's Hexaplar. ${ }^{9}$

Many of the differences between MT and the text that is the basis of this study seem to have resulted from a damaged text or a confusion or garbling of an Urtext that had been corrupted in transmission. What the agreement between MSS like 9a1 fam and

[^223]the Syro-Hexaplar point to is the possibility of a text of P that is closer to MT as well as more literal and freer of errors than is the majority text which has been the basis for comparing P to MT and other versions in this study. Such a text would allow concentration on questions that are purely, or at least somewhat more purely, questions of translation technique, but the development of such a text would be aided by efforts to understand translation technique even as such a text is being developed.
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