



## THE ARAMAIC, SYRIAC, AND LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW SCRIPTURE VIS-À-VIS THE MASORETIC TEXT

*Emanuel Tov*

### **Background**

Traditionally, text-critical analysis of Hebrew Scripture started with MT, and since 1947 it also covers the Judean Desert texts. The picture must be completed by also consulting the ancient translations, even though the Hebrew texts behind those translations must be reconstructed first, and this procedure often involves an almost impossible enterprise. It is an accepted view that the Hebrew parent text of the LXX needs to be taken into consideration in the textual praxis, but we hear little about the other versions, T S V,<sup>1</sup> because V and T almost always agree with MT. They are less significant for the textual analysis, but remain important for understanding the biblical exegesis in antiquity. Specialists find more variants in S, but they often state that S, also, differs very little from MT.

In this brief paper, we will make some general remarks on these three versions, in an attempt to place them in their right position in the textual praxis. These three versions ought to be recorded in the critical editions of the Hebrew Bible, but in my view their status in the textual descriptions is in need of some refinement.<sup>2</sup> We wish to reiterate that V and T, as well as *kaige*-Th,  $\alpha$ , and  $\sigma$  are identical to MT, and to a great extent this also pertains to S.

At the beginning of the critical inquiry into Hebrew Scripture and its translations, scholars described the wealth of available evidence for the early text of the Bible as sources for the analysis. However, they did not

---

1. The earliest written evidence is available for the fragments of the Targumim from Qumran. Hence the sequence TSV.

2. In this analysis, we exclude the Arabic translation of Saadia (882–942 CE) and the secondary translations made from G : Latin (the *Vetus Latina*), Syriac (the Syro-Palestinian translations), Armenian, Coptic (Sahidic, Bohairic, Akhmimic), Georgian, Old Slavic, Ethiopic, Gothic, and Arabic.



necessarily have the critical insight to realize the different types of contribution made by these sources to our understanding of the ancient Hebrew text. A good example is the influential *Einleitung* of Eichhorn (1780-1823) that devotes 107 pages to the Syriac translations, 98 pages to the Arabic translations, 123 pages to the Targumim, and a “mere” 73 pages to the LXX.<sup>3</sup> Many scholars still follow this egalitarian approach today, although the proportions differ, and the Arabic translations are given very little attention. An egalitarian approach is justifiable in general introductions to Hebrew Scripture since they also discuss the contributions of these versions to biblical exegesis, but their coverage needs to be limited in introductions to textual criticism.

A century ago, a great scholar like Driver realized the correct proportions by focusing on the LXX and paying little attention to the other translations of Samuel in his textual introduction to that book.<sup>4</sup> He was able to follow the intuition of a giant like Wellhausen who, in the introduction to his commentary to Samuel, devoted 33 pages to the LXX, and none at all to the other versions as explained by him in the introduction to that monograph.<sup>5</sup>

In the following pages, we will deal separately with T S V and will return to them in a combined analysis.

3. J. G. EICHORN, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Leipzig : Weidmanns, 1780–1783 ; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. : Leipzig : Weidmanns, 1787 and Reutlingen : Grözingen, 1790 ; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. : Leipzig : Weidmanns, 1803 ; 4<sup>th</sup> ed. : Göttingen : Rosenbusch, 1823). In the 4<sup>th</sup> edition, the Targumim are discussed in II.1–123, the translations from Hebrew and Greek into Syriac, *ibid.*, 123–230, various types of Arabic translations, *ibid.*, 231–329. See further the analysis of the translations into Armenian (329–49), Ethiopic (349–54), “Egyptian” (355–75), Persian (376–83), Slavonic (383–4), Georgian (385–8), and Latin (398–437). The section on the LXX is contained in I.447–520.

4. S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. ; Oxford : Clarendon, 1913). Driver dedicated 24 pages to the LXX (xxxix–li, lv–lxviii) and only 3 pp. to the Targum (li, lxix–lxx), 6 pp. to the Peshitta (li–lii, lxxi–lxxvi), and 5 pp. to the Vulgate (liii–liv, lxxx–lxxxiii). The same proportions are followed in B. J. ROBERTS, *The Old Testament Text and Versions—The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions* (Cardiff : University of Wales Press, 1951) : G 86 pp., T 16 pp., S 15 pp. and V 19 pp. and in my own *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. ; Minneapolis and Assen : Fortress Press/Royal Van Gorcum, 2001), henceforth *TCHB* : G 15 pp., T 3 pp., S 1 p. and V 1 p.

5. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871) 31 : “... der Behandlung der Peshito, des Targums und der Vulgata. Ich habe diese sowohl durch ihren Text als ihre Hermeneutik in engerem Zusammenhange stehenden Versionen mehr benutzt, um an ihnen die LXX zu prüfen, denn als selbständige Zeugen. Als solche sind sie nur nach genauen Einzelstudien zu gebrauchen, welche ich deshalb nicht gemacht habe, weil ich den Gewinn für nicht so bedeutend erachtete, dass es nicht gerathen ware, hinsichtlich der beiden ersteren auf bessere Texte zu warten. »

**Targumim**

The Hebrew text reflected in all the Targumim is identical to the medieval shape of MT. They reflect a few differences from codex L, but the underlying Hebrew texts of the Targumim differ no more from the medieval Hebrew manuscripts than these manuscripts differ from one another.<sup>6</sup> At the same time, the Job Targum from Qumran deviates slightly from all other textual witnesses.<sup>7</sup> Since the Qumran fragments provide the earliest evidence of the Targumim, it is possible that the other Targumim once deviated more from MT, but were subsequently adapted towards that text.<sup>8</sup>

The analyses of the character of the Targumim focus more on exegetical changes than on possible variants, as exemplified among others by Sperber.<sup>9</sup> Sperber noted some 650 very minor differences between MT and T<sup>0</sup> (in the Torah).<sup>10</sup> However, these supposed variants are culled from different manuscripts of T, and many of them reflect contextual harmonizations and changes,<sup>11</sup> and therefore the number of supposed variants is smaller than surmised by Sperber.<sup>12</sup> For T<sup>J</sup> in the Prophets, Sperber provided even fewer examples.<sup>13</sup>

Several scholars indicated the closeness of the various Targumim to MT, usually formulated as “the value <of T> with reference to M is not important to the textual criticism”.<sup>14</sup>

6. Below we refer to the statistical aspects of the deviations from MT in T.

7. See R. WEISS, “Recensional Variations between the Aramaic Translation to Job from Qumran Cave 11 and the Massoretic Text”, *Shnaton* 1 (Heb. with Eng. summ. ; Jerusalem : Israel Bible Company [M. Newman Publishing House], 1975) 123–7 ; ID., *The Aramaic Targum of Job* (Heb. with Eng. summ. ; Tel Aviv : Tel Aviv University, 1979) 27–30, XI ; J. GRAY, “The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum (11QtargJob)”, *ZAW* 86 (1974) 331–50.

8. Alternatively, the milieu that created the Qumran Targumim (not the Qumran community) followed different approaches from those taken in the milieu in which the other Targumim were created.

9. A. SPERBER, “The Targum Onkelos in Its Relation to the Masoretic Hebrew Text”, *PAAJR* 6 (1935) 309–51 ; ID., *The Bible in Aramaic, IVB : The Targum and the Hebrew Bible* (Leiden : Brill, 1973) 265–375.

10. SPERBER, *Bible, IVB*, 265–93.

11. For this criticism, see Y. KOMLOSH, *The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations* (Heb. ; Ramat Gan/Tel Aviv : Bar-Ilan University/Dvir Publishing House, 1973) 121–3.

12. Even if all the examples were correct, these variants would pertain to no more than 0.5 percent of the words of MT in the Torah.

13. SPERBER, *Bible, IVB*, 293–350.

14. Thus P. A. H. DE BOER, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I–XVI, A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel* (Amsterdam : H. J. PARIS : 1938) 21. Likewise,

**Peshitta**

The Hebrew source of S is close to MT, containing far fewer variants than the LXX, but more than the Targumim and V.<sup>15</sup> Probably its greatest deviations from MT are in Chronicles,<sup>16</sup> where clusters of verses are lacking in S, e.g., 1 Chr 2:47-49; 4:16-18, 34-37; 7:34-38; 8:17-22. This translation also contains a few substantial additions and differences (e.g., after 1 Chr 12:1 [doublet?]; 29:18). In several ancient (Jacobite) manuscripts, Job follows the Torah.<sup>17</sup>

In detailed studies of biblical books in S, scholars notice the closeness of S to MT,<sup>18</sup> and in the case of a difference between the two, Maori would first assume exegesis in S and only secondarily consider the possibility of

---

Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis* (above, n. 4); DRIVER, *Samuel*, lxix “The text deviates but rarely from MT.” Komlosch, *Bible*, 121 : “Even though this list <Sperber’s, as quoted in n. 9> is very helpful, it does not provide a basis for proving that T<sup>0</sup> used a text different from our MT. A great part of the changes is based on phenomena that are characteristic of the exegesis of T<sup>0</sup>.”

15. M. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, “Syriac Translations”, *EncBibl* 8 (Heb. ; Jerusalem : Bialik Institute, 1982) 848 states that S is close to the late biblical manuscripts from the Judean Desert and the translation of Aquila. See further M. J. MULDER, “The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism”, in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (ed. N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS ; Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34 ; Madrid : Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985) 37–53 (44–45) ; Y. MAORI, “Methodological Criteria for Distinguishing between Variant *Vorlage* and Exegesis in the Peshitta Pentateuch”, in *The Peshitta as a Translation* (ed. P. B. DIRKSEN and A. VAN DER KOOIJ ; Leiden/New York : Brill, 1995) 103–28 (103–4) : “... several studies... that the Hebrew text upon which P is based generally reflects the state of the Hebrew text in the first century CE, a text which differs from the MT only with respect to minor details.” B. ALBREKTSON, *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations with a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text* (Studia Theologica Lundensia, 21 ; Lund : Gleerup, 1963) 210 stresses the closeness of S to MT.

16. Thus M. P. WEITZMAN, “From Judaism to Christianity : The Syriac Version of the Hebrew Bible”, in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (ed. J. Lieu et al. ; London/New York : Routledge, 1992) 147–73 ; ID., *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament : An Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56 ; Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1999) 111–21.

17. For the data, see R. BECKWITH, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI : Eerdmans, 1985) 196.

18. The following scholars find merely occasional variants in S : DRIVER, *Samuel*, lxxi : “The Hebrew text presupposed by the Peshitta deviates less from the Massoretic text than that which underlies the LXX, though it does not approach it so closely as that on which the Targums are based” ; DE BOER, *Samuel*, 42 : “There is in our part of the work no reason to think of another ‘Vorlage’, than that which M offers as text, neither was this the case with Tg.” M. P. WEITZMAN, “The Peshitta Psalter and Its Hebrew *Vorlage*”, *VT* 35 (1985) 341–54 ; ID., *Introduction* (1999) 52–62 ; A. GELSTON, *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford : Clarendon, 1987) 111–30 ; C. E. MORRISON, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL 11 ; Leiden/Boston/Köln : Brill, 2001) 1–3 ; G. GREENBERG, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta*

a variant.<sup>19</sup> Carbajosa notes 41 cases of extra-Masoretic agreement of S together with other witnesses in Psalms 90–150, and only a single instance of a variant of S not supported by any other source.<sup>20</sup> S does reflect some variants in other books, but the relation of S to G and T complicates any discussion of its text-critical value, since the wording of S may have been influenced by T or G.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, some scholars believe that some distinctive agreements between S and one of the Targumim point to the reliance of S on a written version of T.<sup>22</sup> In other books, the wording of S is close to G in exclusively common elements, but the background of these agreements is not clear. In Isaiah, the two translations may reflect common exegetical traditions,<sup>23</sup> while in Psalms and Proverbs the Syriac translation may have been based on G.<sup>24</sup> Some scholars believe that S often relied on G as a source of lexical information and exegesis.<sup>25</sup>

to *Jeremiah* (MPIL 13 ; Leiden/Boston/Köln : Brill, 2002) 18–20 ; I. CARBAJOSA, *The Character of the Syriac Version of Psalms. A Study of Psalms 90–150 in the Peshitta* (MPIL 17 ; Leiden : Brill, 2008) 303–52 ; H. F. VAN ROOY, “Agreement between LXX and Peshitta versus MT in Ezekiel : Some Important Examples”, in *Translating a Translation : The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (ed. H. Ausloos et al. ; BETL 213 ; Leuven : Peeters, 2008) 213–27.

19. MAORI, “Methodological Criteria”, and *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis* (Heb. ; Jerusalem : Magnes, 1995) 319–24.

20. CARBAJOSA, *Psalms*, 303–52.

21. WEITZMAN, *Introduction*, 129 summarizes as follows : “So far as LXX is concerned, polygenesis and common tradition do not suffice to explain the parallels with P. Some literary dependence of P on LXX must be posited, though not in all books and never systematically.”

22. See, among others, S. ISENBERG, *Studies in the Jewish Aramaic Translations of the Pentateuch*, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge 1968 ; ID., “On the Jewish-Palestinian Origins of the Peshitta to the Pentateuch”, *JBL* 90 (1971) 69–81. See also the detailed analysis of P. B. DIRKSEN, “The Old Testament Peshitta”, in *Mikra, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section Two (ed. M. J. MULDER ; Assen–Maastricht and Philadelphia : Fortress Press/Van Gorcum, 1988) I.255–97 (262–96) and the studies included in *Targum Studies, II. Targum and Peshitta* (ed. P. V. M. FLESHER ; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 165 ; Atlanta, GA : Scholars Press, 1992). CARBAJOSA, *Psalms*, 272–303 does not accept the assumption of the influence of T on S in the case of Psalms.

23. Cf. especially L. DELEKAT, “Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta”, *Bib* 38 (1957) 185–99, 321–35 ; ID., “Ein Septuagintatargum”, *VT* 8 (1958) 225–52 ; J. A. LUND, *The Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta—A Re-evaluation of Criteria in Light of Comparative Study of the Versions in Genesis and Psalms*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1988.

24. See especially A. J. BAUMGARTNER, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig : Drugulin, 1890) ; CARBAJOSA, *Psalms*, 3–19, 187–272 for an updated survey of the views expressed and a detailed description of his own views. Similar dependence of the Peshitta on Th-Daniel was noticed by R. A. TAYLOR, *The Peshitta of Daniel* (MPIL 7 ; Leiden/New York/Köln : Brill, 1994) 311–13.

25. For example, P. F. FRANKL, “Studien über die Septuaginta und Peschito zu Jeremia”, *MGWJ* I 21 (1872) 444–56, 497–509, 545–57 ; GREENBERG, *Translation*

## Vulgate

V is important for the history of the exegesis of the Bible, especially when compared with Jerome's commentaries on the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, written between 406 and 420 CE. In these commentaries, Jerome often allowed himself to deviate from his earlier translation. When he wrote the commentaries, Jerome sometimes wondered why his earlier translation in the Vulgate differed from the Hebrew manuscript that was at his disposal years later.<sup>26</sup>

The commentaries, as well as the translation, show that Jerome did not base himself exclusively on MT, but often was guided by G, Symmachus, Aquila, and *kaige*-Th (in this order).<sup>27</sup> Therefore, when V differs from MT, the translation does not necessarily provide independent text-critical evidence (at such a late period, variation from MT would not be expected anyway). However, when V deviates from these sources and from MT, we may suspect variant readings, but such instances are extremely rare.<sup>28</sup> Several detailed studies of biblical books note that V deviates only rarely from MT.<sup>29</sup>

---

*Technique*, 22, 143–68. Clifford, "Observations" (n. 7) : "Apart from OG, each version translated MT with the help of another version. S used LXX and T used S" (61). He further notes that Jerome used G, Symmachus, OL, and S.

26. B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, "Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah", *Textus* 4 (1964) 176–210 (209) suggested that Jerome used a slightly different manuscript for the earlier enterprise.

27. Thus F. STUMMER, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn : Schöningh, 1928) 123 ; J. H. MARKS, *Der textkritische Wert des Psalterium Hieronymi Juxta Hebraeos* (Winterthur : P. G. KELLER, 1956) 24–7 provides detailed proof of Jerome's reliance on the various Greek versions in Psalms. J. A. MONTGOMERY, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC ; New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927) 56 : "It is fatuous to lay any stress upon V as evidence, where it agrees with one or other of the preceding VSS" ; W. MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vols. I–II (ICC ; Edinburgh : T & T Clark, 1986–1996) 1.xxxi–xxxiii. See further R. J. CLIFFORD, "Observations on the Text and Versions of Proverbs", in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister—Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (ed. M. L. BARRÉ, S.S. ; CBQMS 29 (1997) 47–61.

28. See B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, *The Vulgate as a Translation*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1968 ; ID., "The Latin Translations", in Mulder, *Mikra*, 299–338. W. NOWACK, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik* (Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1875) 25–50 gives a list of deviations of V from MT.

29. B. JACOB, "Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die Psalmen", *ZAW* 16 (1896) 129–81 (156) ; Stummer, *Einführung*, 123 ; Marks, *textkritische Wert*, 144 : "... H auf einem Text beruht, der unserem MT im grossen und ganzen gleich war. » B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, "Isaiah" ; ID., "Textual Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah", *Textus* 7 (1969) 36–58 ; ID., "The Hebrew Text of Joel as Reflected in the Vulgate", *ibid.* 9 (1981) 16–35. See further the remarks by Wellhausen quoted in n. 4. On the basis of his experience of preparing the edition of the Minor Prophets in the HUB Project,

### Analysis

It has often been claimed that T S V reflect a text close to MT, and the present study focuses on the question of how close that relation is. Recent studies by myself have focused on the closeness of the various Hebrew texts from the Judean Desert to the medieval text,<sup>30</sup> making it necessary to expand these studies to the non-Hebrew sources that are close to MT. In our view, the Judean Desert texts from sites other than Qumran represent exactly the same tradition as the medieval texts, with the texts from Qumran being somewhat different.<sup>31</sup>

I suggest that T and V reflect the same text as MT and need to be seen as part of that tradition or family (S needs to be treated separately). They differ from the medieval manuscripts of MT as much as these differ from one another. This view was already voiced by Jacob in 1918.<sup>32</sup> Such a claim is based on the above-mentioned analyses by specialists, as well as on my own findings and the statistical data culled from the critical editions.

We base our remarks on the references to these versions in the *BH* series and the *HUB*. The analysis shows that these three versions are mentioned very infrequently in the apparatuses, and almost always in conjunction with other translations. On the other hand, G is often mentioned with no other sources at its side. The *Three* (Aquila, Symmachus, *kaige*-Theodotion) are also tabulated below.

a. The *HUB* is a good source for such an analysis since it does not provide evaluations of the text-critical value of readings. In my sample examinations of Jeremiah 1–3 and Ezekiel 1–3 in that edition,<sup>33</sup> we exclude several notations from the examination in order to obtain as good a picture as possible of the textual status of the versions:

1. Deviations from MT in translation technique phenomena, described

M. SEGAL, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls”, *Materia giudaica* XII (2007) 5–20 (6, n. 4) notes that V “almost never diverges from the MT.”

30. “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues”, in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran—Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121 ; Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 171–88 ; “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible”, *SBL Congress, 2009, forthcoming*.

31. See the studies quoted in n. 30.

32. B. Jacob, “Beiträge”, 156 : “Denn von Aquila ab (ihn eingeschlossen) haben wir schlechterdings nichts mehr zu erwarten, was für die bibl. Textkritik von irgend welchem Belang ware.”

33. *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (ed. C. Rabin, S. Talmon, and E. Tov ; Jerusalem : Magnes Press, 1997) ; *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel* (ed. M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN and S. TALMON ; Jerusalem : Magnes Press, 2004).

as “recurrent deviations” in the *HUB*,<sup>34</sup> relating to differences in person, number, prepositions, etc.<sup>35</sup>

2. All variants mentioned in the apparatuses of the editions quoted in the *HUB*, diplomatic in the case of S and T, and eclectic in the case of V.<sup>36</sup>

3. Supposed differences in vocalization and sense divisions between MT and the ancient translations.

4. Agreement of the translation with either *Ketiv* or *Qere*.

5. All instances of extra-Masoretic agreements between V = G or the three; S = G because of the great likelihood that V and S were influenced by these versions (see above).<sup>37</sup> Agreements between T and the others were included, but there were no relevant instances.

6. All instances that according to *HUB* are exegetical, including etymological exegesis based on the consonantal framework of MT.

When all these details are disregarded in our subjective reading of the apparatus, few notes are left in *HUB* that require our attention, mainly singular readings of V, T, and S and the Three, listed in Table 1.

34. *The Hebrew University Bible, Jeremiah*, xvi. See also Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged ; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8 ; Jerusalem : Simor, 1997) 154–62.

35. The *HUB* assumes that scholars are unable to express a solid judgment on the text-critical value of these deviations because in most cases the possibility of a variant cannot be excluded as shown by similar changes in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. In spite of these complications the *HUB* believes that most of these instances reflect inner-translational changes void of text-critical value.

36. When basing ourselves on the text-critical choices of the editions of the ancient translations we make a choice, and it would be presumptuous to go against the specialists' views on these versions in spite of the imperfections of these editions. For the imperfections of the editions of Sperber (diplomatic editions of several manuscripts), see L. DIEZ MERINO, “Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions”, in *The Aramaic Bible—Targums in Their Historical Context* (ed. D. R. G. BEATTIE and M. J. MCNAMARA ; JSOTSup 166 ; Sheffield : JSOT Press, 1994) 51–91 (68–75). Besides, only rarely are manuscripts recorded in the critical editions as the sole witnesses for an assumed variant against the main text of the edition itself.

37. Thus already C. STEUERNAGEL, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit einem Anhang über die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (Tübingen : Mohr [Siebeck], 1912) 72 : “Wo die in Textzeugen den Andern beeinflusst hat (z. B. LXX und Peschito), darf ihr Zeugnis nicht als ein doppeltes gewertet werden.”

TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW SCRIPTURE

**Table 1: References to possible variants in T S V and the Three in the *HUB* apparatus**

Jer 1-3	Small plus	Small minus	Difference	Inversion	Percentage of possible variants compared with total number of words (1188)
V	2:15	1:27; 2:9, 20	2:24 <sup>38</sup>		0.42
T					0
S	1:15, 18; 3:11, 22	1:17, 20; 3:17	2:12, 32; 3:4, 20, 21	2:27; 3:16	1.17
α'		2:6?	3:3		0.17
σ'					0
θ'					0
G <sup>39</sup>	1:1, 4 (2x), 7, 26; 2:7; 3:6, 9, 18, 23	1:3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 24 (2x), 25, 26, 27; 2:3 (2x), 4, 5; 3:1, 2, 13, 14, 18	1:2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 23; 2:1, 3, 6 (2x); 3:1, 2, 3, 15 (2x)	1:4, 24; 3:21	4.12

Ezek 1-3	Small plus	Small minus	Difference <sup>40</sup>	Inversion	Percentage of possible variants compared with total number of words (949)
V		2:9; 3:1	1:18; 2:3		0.42

38. תִּזְחָה – *amoris sui*, possibly read as תִּזְחָה.

39. The statistics also include two large minuses (1 :14, 15).

40. Several of the possible variant readings in V and S in Ezekiel pertain to formulaic expressions that were easily interchanged in Hebrew and in the translation and hence their status as variants is questionable. See *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel*, xvii (§ 31).

## EMANUEL TOV

T					0
S	3:4, 22	3:4	1:8, 19	2:26	0.63
$\alpha'$			2:10		0.10
$\sigma$	1:14		3:18		0.20
$\theta$					0
G <sup>41</sup>	1:9, 14, 15, 18; 2:2, 19, 28, 29, 31; 3:3, 8, 17, 18	1:3, 4, 10 (2x), 11 (2x), 13, 15, 17, 18 (3x); 2:1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 19, 22, 34; 3:1, 7, 8 (2x), 10 (2x), 11, 17 (2x)	1:1, 2, 4; 2:12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26, 31; 3:4, 15, 19, 22	1:1, 4, 16, 19; 2:14, 19, 27, 30, 31; 3:2, 9, 16	7.06

**b.** The examination of the total number of remarks in *BHS* is relatively precise since it is based on the machine-readable apparatus of that edition,<sup>42</sup> although the analysis itself is subjective. The main item analyzed is the number of references to the witnesses in the apparatus. In this way striking differences come to light, but it is realized that the very listing and its analysis depend on the views of the editors in the *BHS* series. The listing includes both meaningful and less meaningful references, such as “cf. V” or “V num.”<sup>43</sup>

41. The statistics also include two large pluses (1 :17 ; 2 :28) and one large minus (2 :1-2a).

42. Module in the *Accordance* computer program.

43. The listing for *BHS* thus includes many references that are irrelevant, and the figures are therefore much inflated (see Table 3).

TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW SCRIPTURE

**Table 2: References to sources in the apparatus of BHS in Hebrew Scripture**

Version	Number of references	Percentage of possible deviation from MT <sup>44</sup>
V	3362	1.10
T	3346	1.10
S	6785	2.22
α'v	300	0.10
σ	415	0.13
<i>kaige</i> -Th (θ')	265	0.08
Three (οι γ', οι λ')	9	0
G	14751	4.83

The data in the next table, Table 3, exclude certain configurations and are therefore more meaningful. The logic of the exclusion of these data is that two translations were very likely influenced by others: Jerome (V) often consulted G and the Three, and S may have been based on either G or T or both.

44. Based on a number of 305.490 words in Hebrew Scripture.

**Table 3: References to sources in the apparatus of BHS with select groups excluded**

Reference to translation	Groups excluded <sup>45</sup>	Number of remaining references	Percentage of possible deviation from MT <sup>46</sup>
V	G, $\sigma\iota$ $\gamma'$ , $\sigma\iota$ $\lambda'$ , Aq, Sym, Th	160	0.05
S	G T	1222	0.40
S	G	1742	0.57

The results of the electronic searches in *BHS* run parallel to the manual searches in *HUB* in these apparatuses (Table 1) as well as to the research performed on these translations. V, T, and S are rarely mentioned alone in text-critical analyses. By comparing the data in Table 1 with those in Table 2, we note that V is mentioned altogether 3362 times (variation rate from MT of at most 1.1 percent) in the apparatus of *BHS* (Table 2), but merely 160 times (variation rate 0.05 percent) without G and the Three. These figures show that the evidence of V as recorded in *BHS* is more or less negligible. Likewise, the various Targumim together are mentioned 3346 times together with the other sources (variation rate from MT of at most 1.1 percent). S may reflect a greater deviation from MT with 6785 references in the *BHS* apparatus (variation rate of at most 2.22 percent from MT). However, it is more realistic to take into consideration the possible influence from G and T on S, in which case the percentage drops to 0.40, and if only G is disregarded, the maximum degree of variation of S is 0.57%.

### Conclusions

Since the Hebrew text underlying T S V was identical to the unvocalized medieval MT and the ancient proto-Masoretic text, scholarly analyses and

45. A reference to V or S was excluded if that translation is mentioned in the apparatus in conjunction with one or more of the sources mentioned in this column. The logic followed in the search is that the additional translations are mentioned within ten positions of the translation that is the topic of the search. This type of search occasionally creates an imprecision when the search contains data mentioned in the next lemma, but this imprecision occurs across the board and therefore does not shew the results.

46. Each note usually refers to a single word in the text. When the total number of references to a translation is compared with the total number of words in Hebrew Scripture (305.490), we obtain a percentage of possible variation of that translation in relation to MT. This figure is very general since not every note records a variant reading.

critical editions only rarely mention deviations from MT in these versions. The small number of references to these versions must be contrasted with the large number of references to G and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

We consider T S V to be within the realm of MT because of the small number of differences from codex L. The low level of deviation of T S V from codex L is similar to that of the differences between codex L and the other medieval manuscripts. The level of deviation of T S V in the critical editions can be expressed statistically, but we realize that the automatically gathered information merely gives an impression of the relations between the sources. T S V differ as much from the medieval manuscripts of MT as these manuscripts differ from one another.

All these remarks also pertain to the three, mentioned together or individually in the sources. The three are actually revisions of the LXX, but since they are mentioned separately in the textual apparatus, we treat them accordingly.

We have referred to T S V in the chronological sequence in which these translations were put into final writing.<sup>47</sup> When taking into consideration the late dates of all these sources, we would not have expected any other relation between the sources. When studying the development of Hebrew Scripture in Judaism, we simply do not find any Hebrew or translated sources after 70 CE or 100 CE that differ significantly from MT. As a result, translations of Hebrew Scripture made after that date necessarily reflect MT. Jerome himself said that he obtained manuscripts of Hebrew Scripture from a rabbi and at that time, around 400, we know of no sources that deviate from MT. T and S were finalized after that date.

If our analysis is correct, we can safely assume that V and T and the three, and probably also S, reflect the medieval shape of MT. The earliest representatives of MT were found in the Judean Desert: Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir, Nahal Hever, Nahal Arugot, and Nahal Se'elim, dating to the period of the Bar-Kochba Revolt in 132–135 CE (texts written between 20 CE and 115 CE), while similar texts were found at Qumran dating to an earlier period, from 250 BCE onwards. The Judean Desert texts differ as much from the medieval manuscripts as they differ from one another. Since the proto-Masoretic text was the only text used in Judaism after a certain time, definitely from 70 CE onwards, it was to be expected that T S V and the three would reflect that text. The mentioned texts count as one together with MT.

---

47. The earlier stages of T and S were partially oral and partially written (see the Qumran evidence for T). The Targum of Job from Qumran cave 11 dates to the middle of the first century CE.