

FURTHER TEXTUAL EVIDENCE FOR רֹבֵךְ 'ADVERSARY'

Frank H. Polak

For MT ואת יריבך אנכי אריב (Is. 49:25) the Isaiah scroll (1QIs^a) reads ואת רי/ובך אנכי אריב. The vocable רי/ובך standing for MT יריבך, is rather baffling. Even the reading itself is open to doubt. In the first syllable the scroll has a *yod*, with a *waw* written underneath; in the second syllable the *yod* is suspended between the lines.¹ Barthélemy suggested that the scribe first wrote ריבך, afterwards correcting this to רוביך.²

Kutscher cautiously proposed to derive this form from rabbinic Hebrew רוּבָה, 'youngster'.³ On the face of it, this

¹ M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, I: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven 1950) LXI, 26; M. Martin, *The Scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ii (Louvain 1958) 559 simply reads רוביך.

² D. Barthélemy, "Le grand rouleau d'Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte", *RB* 57 (1950) 540.

³ E.Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of The Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^a)* (Leiden 1974) 384. Kutscher apparently prefers the reading ריבך (see below note 16 on 2 Sam. 22:44, Lam. 3:58).

interpretation is confirmed by the second stich of the verse, in which mention is made of בְּנִיךְ. However, parallelism in this verse is antithetic; the first colon, וְאֵת יְרִיבְךָ (רוֹבִיךָ) אֲנֹכִי אֵרִיב, is the opposite of the second one: וְאֵת בְּנִיךְ אֲנֹכִי אוֹשִׁיעַ. Thus it would be difficult to equate רוֹבִיךָ with בְּנִיךְ. Of course, the scribe may have made this equation by mistake. But although such a misunderstanding tallies rather well with the general character of this scroll, the assumption that we are dealing with an error should not be made without sound evidence. Accordingly, we ought to look for a more acceptable interpretation of רוֹבִיךָ.

In our opinion this vocable may be construed as a noun, רוֹב, meaning 'adversary'; from a morphological point of view it would be a participle from the root רִיב. This would make for another instance of the participle with *ḥolam* (instead of *qamaṣ*) from a verb with a semivowel as second radical (עוֹיִי), as e.g. הַקּוֹמִים (2 Ki. 16:7), הַלּוֹט (Is. 25:7), פְּחֹלָה (Jer. 4:31), בּוֹטִים (Zech. 10:5).⁴ Yalon adduces many

⁴ These and other examples have been mentioned by E. König, *Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache* I (Leipzig 1881) 445 (§38.1); H. Bauer, P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle a. S. 1922) 398 (§56h'). In the Samaritan Pentateuch cp. *aṣṣod* (הַצֹּד, Gn. 27:33), vid. Z. Ben-Hayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*, IV: *The Words of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem, 1977) 377; V: *Grammar of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem, 1977; Hebr., Engl. summ.) 145.

similar examples from rabbinic Hebrew.⁵ Apparently this form is an ancient variant of the standard form with *qamaṣ*.⁶ So *רוּבִיךְ* might well be considered a synonymous variant of MT *יְרִיבֶךָ*.⁷ One should keep in mind how rare the lexeme *יְרִיב* is

⁵ H. Yalon, *Introduction to the Vocalisation of the Mishna* (Jerusalem 1964) 171-175 (Hebr.).

⁶ Because of the Canaanite sound shift $\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{o}$ the allomorph with *holam* is the expected form; vid. C. Rabin, "The Hebrew Development of Proto-Semitic \bar{a} ", *Tarbiz* 30 (1960-61) 99-111 (Hebr., Engl. summ.). The standard form with *qamaṣ* may be explained by analogy with the perfect (the perfect and participle forms are identical in the parallel forms, *ṭōb*, *mēt*); vid. Rabin, *op. cit.* 106; P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome 1923) 166s (§80d).

The form *rob* is also mentioned in later sources, viz. the Hispano-Hebrew glossary of Ripoll (10th Century C.E.), vid. S. Morag, "On Processes of Transformation and Transplantation in the Traditions of Hebrew", *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies IV* (Jerusalem 1980) 152 (Hebr.); for a similar form in Hieronymus, see G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (Leipzig 1905) 89. These examples are connected with the late sound shift $a \rightarrow o/u$ near labials and liquids, vid. Kutscher, *op. cit.* 496s.; E. Qimron, *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (diss. Jerusalem 1977) 114s (Hebr., Engl. summ.). They are not related to the morphological problem of the participle.

⁷ On the interchange of synonymous readings, cp. S. Talmon, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961) 352-383; R. Weiss, *Mehqerey Miqra* (Jerusalem 1981) 63-189 (Hebr.).

in biblical Hebrew, and how many difficulties it has caused the translators (cp. Jer. 18:19, Ps. 35:1). In our verse the LXX (τῆν κρίσιν σου) and Targum (פורענותך) have identified it with the infinitive ריב.⁸ The Peshitta has a participle (דיניכי); this rendering is similar to the relative clause offered by the Vulgate (*qui iudicaverunt te*).⁹ The construction implied by these renderings parallels the reading of the scroll.

The very same form רִב has been detected earlier by Gordis in Job 40:2:¹⁰ הָרִב עִם שָׂדֵי יִסּוּר מוֹכִיחַ אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲנֶנָּה.

⁸ Similarly Jer. 18:19 LXX (τοῦ δικάσαστάς μου), Targum (עלבני) and Peshitta (עולבני); Ps. 35:10, Peshitta (דיני).

⁹ By contrast, in Jer. 18:19, Ps. 35:1 the Vulgate has forms of *adversarius*; cp. also the Targum on Ps. 35:1 (במרתי חגרתתי). For the participial construction, cp. LXX Ps. 35 (34):1 (τοῦ δικάσαστάς με) as well as Aq. *ibid.* (אילין דדינין עמי) = τῶν δικάζομένων μου according to the Syrohexapla.

¹⁰ R. Gordis, *The Book of Job* (New York 1978) 440, 464 (without reference to the Isaiah Scroll). He takes יסור as impf. *gal* of יטר (in the meaning 'to teach') with assimilation of the *yod* as first radical (cp. Ps. 94:10; Prov. 9:7; Is. 8:11 [?]; 1 Chron. 15:22); this interpretation is strongly confirmed by the observation that יטר and יכח form a fixed pair (cp. Jer. 2:19; Ps. 6:2; 38:2; 39:12; Prv. 3:11; 6:23 and *passim*).

This analysis of the form יסור is opposed to the opinion that it is a *nomen agentis*, similar to שפיר, גביר (cp. רחוק and קנזא, alternating with קנזא) of the noun class *qittāl* (derived from *qattāl*); cp. i. a. S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (Edinburgh 1921) 325; Kemper Fullerton, "On the Text and Significance of Job 40:2", *AJSLL* 49 (1932-33) 197-211; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob*, KAT (Gütersloh 1963) 491, 493. The lexemes cited, however, do not relate to occupational

For הָרָב Symmachus has a participle (ὁ δὲ ἀκαζόμενος); Targum (דנצי) and Vulgate (*qui contendit*) render it by a relative clause. This construction, based on the parallel colon מוכיח אלוה, is also supported by the prophetic exclamation הוֹי רָב אֵת יִצְרוֹ (Is. 45:9). Hence many scholars have accepted it, reading הָרָב.¹¹ This emendation, however, would not be necessary if the form רָב were taken as a participle with *ḥolam*.

If correct, this analysis of רוב might throw new light on two passages in the LXX of Jeremiah, in which the infinitive construct רִיב with a suffix is rendered as a substantive ἀντιδίκος 'adversary'.

or permanent activity, but to state (שכר) and quality (גבר, קנוא). So this noun class has nothing to do with the *nomen agentis qattāl* (and vid. Rabin, *op. cit.* 106s). Accordingly, interpretation of יסור as a substantive is highly implausible.

¹¹ E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, translated by H. Knight (London 1967) 614s.; M.H. Pope, *Job*, AB (Garden City 1965) 265, 267. They follow Theodotion (ἐκκλινεῖ) in deriving יסור from the root סגר, although the resulting interpretation ('to yield') does not suit the parallel יעננה. Driver, Gray, *loc. cit.*, followed *i. a.* by Fullerton and Fohrer, take רָב as an inf. abs., serving as a verbal predicate. This explanation depends on the analysis of יסור as a noun; see note 10 above.

Jer. 51:36	LXX (28:36)
הנני	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ
רָב	κρίνω
את ריבך	τὴν ἀντίδικόν σου

Possibly this interpretation is but another instance of the common interchange of abstract and concrete,¹² as e. g. the Greek rendering οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν for וגבורתך (Is. 3:25); or the doublet וגבורתך וגבורתך^a offered by LQIS^a at that place.¹³ In our verse, however, the parallel colon has an abstract noun, viz. τὴν ἐκδίκασίν σου, reflecting נקמתך. Obviously, the translator distinguished between abstract and concrete. We may infer that he did not read ריבך, but rather ריבך, with an interchange of *yod/waw* (or even רבך).¹⁴

¹² W.A. Van der Weijden, "Abstractum pro Concreto: Phaenomenon Stilisticum", *VD* 44 (1966) 43-52.

¹³ Kutscher, *op. cit.* 370; cp. Targum Jer. 23:10
וגבורתם = וגבורתם. Other examples in the LXX of Jeremiah:

7:32 גיא ההרגה = φάραξ τῶν ἀνηρημένων

7:34 קול ששון וקול שמחה = φωνὴν εὐφραينوμένων καὶ φωνὴν
χαιρόντων

8:3 השארית הנשארים = τοῖς καταλοίποις τοῖς καταλειφθεῖσιν

¹⁴ Cp. 1 Sam. 2:10 (= מריבו), Is. 41:11 (= אנשי ריבך).

A similar dilemma occurs in the LXX version of Jer. 50:34 (27:34).

Jer. 50:34

LXX (27:34)

ריב יריב

κρίσιν κρινεῖ

את

πρὸς

ריבם

τοὺς ἀντίδικους αὐτοῦ

One might argue that the translator simply read ריבם (= MT). Possibly the rendering ἀντίδικους recommended itself to him because of the syntactical construction: a literal translation of the Hebrew would have resulted in a double internal object, viz. κρίσιν (= ריב), κρίσιν αὐτοῦ (= ריביו or ריבם). This problem, however, is not insuperable. The translator could have turned to a synonym, as e. g. δίκη (from the same verbal stem as ἀντίδικος); Jerome rendered: *iudicio defendet causam eorum*.¹⁵ Accordingly, we should not discard the possibility that the LXX reflects רוביו or רובם

¹⁵ Cp. the versions on Mich. 7:9; Ps. 43:1, 119:154; Prov. 22:23, 23:11.

(or even רבם).¹⁶ Maybe this reading prompted his equation
 πρός = את.¹⁷

In short, three different witnesses seem to provide
 independent evidence for a noun רוב 'adversary'.

¹⁶ Lam. 3:58 reads רבת אדני ריגלי נפשי. The form ריגלי, though rare, has been rendered literally (as an abstract) by the versions. However, the phrase ריגלי נפשי is rather problematic; apparently it has no parallel (as e. g. *משפטי נפשי*, *דיני נפשי*). W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth, Das Hohe Lied, Die Klagelieder*, KAT (Gütersloh 1962) 233, would read ריגלי, with omission of נפשי as a gloss. But such phrases as שטני נפשי (Ps. 71:13), צררי נפשי (Ps. 143:12) might suggest emendation to רובי נפשי 'my adversaries'. In the Lucianic version of 2 Sam. 22:44 the phrase מריגלי עמי (abstr.) has been rendered ἐκ δυναστῶν λαοῦ, obviously reflecting מריגלי עמי (cp. the next colon: לראשי גוים). Indeed a concrete form is expected; hence one might incline towards the emendation מרובי עמי.

¹⁷ Cp. LXX Jer. 1:16, 4:12, 12:1, 15:11, 21:4; Mich. 6:1. The underlying lexical figuration has been discussed by S. Izre'el, "el = 'to, towards' in Biblical Hebrew", *Shnaton* III (1979) 204-212 (Hebr., Engl. summary).