THE USE OF "7 CLAUSES IN THE LANGUAGE OF
TARGUM ONKELOS

A Contribution to the Study of the Hebrew Vorlage of TO

M. Z. KADARI

0.00 Scholars had, in their studies of the biblical text, long pinned their hopes on the early translations and, through them, had expected to reconstruct the "original" form\(^1\); today, the finding of the pre-Masoretic text having been despaired of, and the coexistence of the MT and the "popular" versions in the days of the Second Temple\(^2\), and apparently even afterwards\(^3\), having been admitted, these translations have gained importance in the reconstruction of the popular versions, in so far as these deviate from the MT.

But their deviation from the Hebrew of the MT is insufficient ground for assuming the existence of a different Hebrew Vorlage. It is generally known that the original is often rendered in an explanatory paraphrase, then accepted by the scholars and translators. Although some agreement can be found between early translations and deviant Hebrew texts (e.g. the Samaritan and Qumran texts), it does not prove that the translations were necessarily based on the deviant text. It is also possible that the source of these deviations was the rabbinical Midrash on the Masoretic version. The translations were made from the Massoretic version, as were the popular revisions, generally under the influence of rabbinical interpretation.

0.01 A few examples will prove the point.\(^4\)

מָדַה כַּמָּה unstable as water

(Gn. xlix, 4), is rendered by some of the early translations as a verb 2 masc. sing. perf. (LXX: ἐμφανίσθης; TO:

עַל דִּבְרַת that you went.)

1 For example, P. Kahle, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes (1915), 404-405.
2 For a summary of the problem of popular texts, see Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll, (Jerusalem 1959), 57 f.
3 As attested by recent manuscripts from Yemen, cf. Y. Razhabi, Ha'areσ of 5.1.62 and S. Morag (ibid.)
4 The examples are taken from the corpus which served as a basis for a description of the language of Onkelos, v. below.
The Samaritan text reads similarly (תַחַם, fa'izta). It seemed reasonable to assume that the common model for all of them was a form different from that of the MT, i.e. תַחַם. It was therefore suggested, in the search for the “original” text, to correct the word to read תַחַם. The more moderate opinion of today is that the model which lay before the translators was a popular edition reading תַחַם, thus differing from the MT. It seems that this is not so certain at least insofar as TO is concerned, for two reasons: 1. It is possible to find the source for the TO version in the rabbinical explanation that תַחַם stands a number of abbreviations of verbs, all in the 2 masc. sing. perf. (e.g.; מַחַם, בָּלִמֹת, בָּלַמְתָּה, בָּלַמְתָּה; B.T. Shabbath 55b), 2. A characteristic of the style of TO is the transformation of non-finite verbs (or words likely to be considered as verbs, such as participles, infinitives, and other verbal nouns, that is to say words with no particular component to indicate person, gender, and number) into finite verbs serving as predicate in a d- clause.

0.02 Another example is: דֶּעְרָא נַחֲשָׁה (Gn. xliv, 10). Many suggested reading נַחֲשָׁה or שָׁלְחֵהוּ “his” on the basis of the early translations, among them TO דֶּעְרָא מְשָׁה מְשָׁה וּרְיִיתוּ דֶּעְרָא מְשָׁה until the Messiah comes, whose the kingdom is.

Again it is apparent that Onkelos (and Pseudo-Jonathan, TY, and Pesh.) did not translate from a different version, but that he interpreted the MT in his translation according to the rabbinical explanations such as “he whose is the reign” (Gen. Rabba, chap. 99).

It is easy to collect many examples of this type, and they are very instructive, even though the rabbinical commentary which served as a basis for the translation is not always demonstrable.10 Were a description of the language of TO available, the deviations from the MT could be investigated as to whether they

---

5 Cf. BH on this verse.
7 Cf. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the fragmentary TY.
8 Cf. below.
9 Although this form, which belongs to Mishnaic Hebrew, seems to be foreign, it appears in early Scriptural poetry, cf. BH ad loc.
10 At times a common tradition of is reflected in the Palestinian Targumim and it is likely that they all drew from Rabbinical teachings e.g. Gn. iv, 23; xliiv, 9, 17, 22. In all these places, Onkelos differs from the other Targumim, and it is not necessary to infer that the additional parts in Onkelos, for which the traditions are unknown to us, are his independent ideas, e.g.: Gn. xliv, 24, and cf. the comment of Rashi: דֶּעְרָא מְשָׁה עַל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל לְעָל L is an addition and is not in the Hebrew text."
stem from the structure of the Aramaic language rather than being necessarily the result of a variant text.

0.10 Since the Aramaic of Onkelos is important in the study of the various dialects of that language, and the need for a description of it has long been recognized, such a description can aid in the clarification of the textual problem. In the case of TO, it is best to start with a description of some elements of syntax, on account of the state of the texts and the state of research in the language and its traditions. Since some of the points of interdependence of nouns and verbs have already been considered, the $d-$ clauses will here be described. These constitute a large part of the sentences in Aramaic and will prove to be the key to many of the deviations in the Targum.

0.11 The Targum of the poetic sections of the Pentateuch forms the basis of the corpus for this study. Also included are those verses which were freely translated for interpretative purposes, such as Ex. xx and Dt. i, 1; and the fragments with Babylonian punctuation discovered in the Cairo Geniza and published by Kahle in *Masoreten des Ostens*. For purposes of control, those translations were compared with the Hebrew text of Genesis in its entirety, and with a random selection of $d-$ clauses of about 150 examples from the TO concordance of Kasovsky. The text of the TO cited is always that of Sperber’s edition.

1.00 When does the $d-$ clause appear in TO? 14a


Gn. xlix, 115; Hebrew י, e.g.

Ex. xv, 13, and

12 In a lecture by the present author at the Third Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 1961, a summary of which is due to appear in *Turbiś*.
13 Cf. the summary mentioned in note 12.
13a This work has been completed and published, Jerusalem 1933–40.
14a In the following only linguistic causes will be considered.
15 Additional places are: Ex. xx, 7; Nu. xxi, 15, 20, 30; xxiv, 4; Dt. xxxii, 38; xxxiii, 8, 29.
Ex. xv, 16; and even for Hebrew יכ “that” in noun-clauses, for example:

See now, that I even I, am He,

This likewise occurs in the Geniza fragments (seventy-six examples) and consistently in the other sections of the Targum. Only two deviant translations in TO are found in the concordance; in both cases they can be attributed to motives of interpretation:

as it is said to this day

Gn. xxii, 1417 and

when a ruler sinneth

Lv. iv, 22.18

1.2 Even where the Hebrew has an asyndetic relative clause, TO nearly always has $d$-, for example in the poetic sections:

This is invariably the case in the remainder of the Targum, e.g.

Gn. xxxix, 4. There are seven cases of this type among the examples from the concordance.20

16 Also: Gn. xlix, 10; Dt. xxxii, 36.
17 Onkelos understood the difficult clause, beginning יאשר, as a clause expressing motivation.
18 According to B.T. Horayoth 10b:

Thus in cases with a preposition before a finite verb in Hebrew, e.g.: twice in Ex. xv, 16, and Nu. xxxiii, 24. Also where the interrogative י מי “Who?” is understood as introducing a relative clause: Gn. xlix, 9; Nu. xxiv, 9, 23. Without $d$-

and his lot will produce fruit for which they will give thanks and blessings that giveth goodly words, Gn. xlix, 21.

20 In Gn. xxiv, 22:

we have asyndetic circumstantial clauses.

and two bracelets... of ten shekels weight of gold,
1.30 In the TO the $d$– clause frequently occurs in place of the Hebrew $ha$– prefixed which, outside of poetry, is considered to be a relative pronoun, e.g. in the Geniza fragments:


into the brook that descended out of the mount,

Dt. ix, 21. This occurs a total of twelve times in the Geniza fragments and thirty-five times (out of 150 cases of $d$–) in the examples from the concordance. By the process of analogy, this practice of TO is applied to cases of the particle without the $ha$– prefixed, but made definite in other ways, e.g.:


but everyone that eateth it

Lv. xix, 8. On the other hand, this construction can be found even in cases where there is no trace of definiteness, for example in the poetry:


a God who brought them forth out of Egypt,

Nu. xxiii, 22, xxiv, 8, and in the Geniza fragments:


every one that sought,

Ex. xxxiii, 7.

The expansion of the use of the $d$– clause in place of the various types of participles is the result of the large difference between the verbal tense system of Biblical Hebrew and that of the Aramaic of Onkelos. While Hebrew uses the participle to express various tenses and aspects, in the same way that certain finite forms of the verb could indicate different tenses, moods, and aspects, the Aramaic of Onkelos uses verbs whose forms sharply define their functions, be they past or future (or even present). The substitution is made possible by the $d$– clause, in which the verb in all its forms can serve as a predicate.

1.40 Since the participle also has a fixed place in the paradigm of the verb in the Aramaic of Onkelos, it is not surprising to find a participle as the predicate of a $d$– clause, whether the Hebrew word which served as the base for the translation was a participle, e.g.:


every one that sought

Ex. xxxiii, 7, or


mingled,
Lv. xiv, 21; or whether it was not, as:

ךֶּפֶם דַּקְוִּי

who is singled out among the people

one of the people,

Gn. xxvi, 10. This provides a transition toward a further enlargement of the function of a d– clause. Many participles are understood as adjectives, thus minimizing the difference between the two forms and, therefore, by a process of analogy, many adjectives are rendered by a d– clause\(^\text{21}\), especially when the participle has the generic article, as in the Geniza fragments:

לְעַשְׁיָה וְרִרִית

in doing that which was evil

Dt. ix, 18, and in the remainder of the Targum:

...העָשְׁיָה...וְרִירִית

the rich... and the poor...

Ex. xxx, 15.\(^\text{22}\)

1.50 In many cases, a d– clause appears in TO as translation of a subordinate clause even when there is no relative pronoun to indicate the subordination. It follows then that each לְעַשְׁיָה, פֶּרֶךְ, יְלֵךְ, etc. for the sake of, lest, etc. is translated by a d– clause, for example in the Geniza fragments:

לְעַשְׁיָה וְרִירִית

and that ye may prolong your days

Dt. xi, 9; and in the other parts of the Targum:

בְּדוֹלַת הַנִּבְרָכָה נֶפֶשׁ

that thy soul may bless me

Gn. xxvii, 19, and

לֹא דָמְרוֹת

would that we had died,

לֹא מָתָנָה
twice in Nu. xiv, 2.\(^\text{23}\) The form מִלְּעַשְׁיָה = "lest" is discussed below.

1.60 In the Hebrew text there may be cases where there is no formal indication of subordination, but rather an implied subordination expressed by means of an infinitive construct joined to a preposition. Onkelos translates each of these cases with a d– clause, for example in the Geniza fragments:

בְּשָׁלוֹחַ...ותֶּכֶם

and when the Lord sent you up,

\(^\text{21}\) A similar method exists in Ethiopic and Syriac; cf. Brockelmann, Grundriss, II, 567.

\(^\text{22}\) For additional examples see Gn. xxx, 40; xxxi, 39.

\(^\text{23}\) Thirteen cases appear among the examples from the remaining parts of TO.
Dt. ix, 23,
עד דרמות התנהím
until the death of the priest

Nu. xxxv, 32, and
ディים כר
לעב כר
for thy good,

Dt. x, 13. This is also the case when the infinitive serves as *nomen regens* or *nomen rectum* in a genitive construction, or is joined to a possessive pronoun, 
*e.g.*:
מרים רעם ייחנן
מרים ד럿י אוחככ
from the day that I knew you

Dt. ix, 24;
דרי אוים
זירת אוחככ
that the man should be,

Gn. ii, 18. 
... in the remainder of the T.:  
...מבראשין היה לֵךַ מַדָּאַתְךָ היהת
...וְיִשְׂרָאֵל הָאָזֶן מַדָּאַתְךָ אָזֶן
It is better that I give her to thee, than that I should give her...

Gn. xxix, 19;
בכֶלֶת יִקְרָא דַּרְתֶּם שָֽׁנָא
בכֶלֶת יִשְׁמַע צַא:
whensoever... the flock did conceive

Gn. xxx, 41. Cases containing verbal nouns or nouns considered as such (generally a form of the infinitive which is treated as a noun in Hebrew) are also to be included in this list. In the same way that he treats other infinitive clauses, Onkelos translates these by a *d-* clause. Examples can be found in the Geniza fragments:
מדא לְכַלְכָּא קדֶם ייו... וּמְדַסִּיר יְהוָה
מדא לְכַלְכָּא... וּמְשַׁמֵּא הָאָוָה
because the Lord was not able... and because He hated them,

Dt. ix, 28; in the remainder of the T.:  
בדַּרְדוֹת יִתְּהוּ
בַּאֲבָטְמָת אָוָה
for the love he had to her,

Gn. xxix, 20, and
מַרְרֵדַרְבָּה
אוֹדָרְכָּה
when she was old


24 A total of twenty-seven such passages appear among the examples from the remaining parts of the T.
Onkelos uses a finite verb as the predicate of a relative clause when translating any noun which can be taken as the infinitive of a verb; so even:

על דאוולה
פתוח
Gn. xlix 4; and v. above (0.01)25.

1.70 We have so far dealt with those d—clauses which are based upon written or implied subordination in the Hebrew text. There are also many places where the linguistic basis for the d—clause is non-apparent in the Hebrew. The following are the motives of Onkelos for using it in these cases (this does not include motives of interpretation 26).

1.71 An adverb or a prepositional phrase used attributively in Hebrew, or which was so understood by Onkelos, is rendered by him as a d—clause27, for example in the translations of the poetry:

וברכות עליישב
 Dt. xxxii, 2

and as the showers upon the herb

and in the remaining portions of the T.:

Dt. xxxii, 2

and also in the iniquities of their fathers with them

25 The construction with a d—clause in place of infinitive construct may also appear with ל, e.g.: Nu. xxiii, 9;

it also appears in Biblical Aramaic:

Dt. xxxii, 12.

26 For example in the Geniza fragments:

Dt. x, 12; in the remainder of the T.:

which is included with the passages where (in B.T. Soṭah 16a, —Torah Sī'lemah, by Rabbi M. Kasher on Ex. xxi, 6. A total of seven places like this are listed in the set of examples.

Lv. xxvi, 39, by changing the syntactic function of אָחָת אֶתָּם “with them” from a part of the predicate to that of an attribute (“which they have grasped”),

and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob,

Ex. ii, 24, by changing the function of the prepositional phrase, the preposition being a homograph in Hebrew, to that of an attribute;

and came upon the city unawares,

Gn. xxxiv, 25, by changing the adverb, which modified יָבְאוּ אֶל הָעִיר “and came” to an adjective modifying הָעִיר “the city” i.e. “the city that dwells in safety”.

There are cases, however, where an adverb is used attributively in Hebrew and yet is not rendered by a d– clause, as

the dwelling place of God of ancient times,

Dt. xxxiii, 27, although this is extremely rare.

1.72 Along with the task of changing words and phrases which are syntactically associated with verbs (adverbs and adverbial prepositional phrases) into elements associated with nouns (attributes and adjectival phrases) as described above, the d– clause may serve another function, that of substantivization. In other words, it assigns the position of a noun to adverbial or prepositional phrases when they are no longer related as qualifiers to another noun. Substantivization is most frequently found in conjunction with negative expressions, e.g.:

דוֹלֵא חָיוֹן the blind, Lv. xix, 14,

דוֹלֵא שְׂמָט the deaf, ibid., and

דוֹלֵא פָּלָשָׁה and dry, Lv. vii, 10.

There are cases where the phrase seems to be a circumstantial clause, especially where it does not agree syntactically with the predicate, e.g.:

דוֹלֵא לָדַע childless, Gn. xv, 2,

also translates רָוֵי רָעָה childless, Lv. xx, 20.

28 Additional places in Genesis: Gn. xiv, 5 (three times), 6; xxv, 9; xxxi, 32; xli, 19; xliv, 13; 1, 13.

28a The use of a d– construction was apparently avoided here in order to prevent a long series of d– clauses.
This explains the consistent translation of מְדָלָא, בְּלַי “without” by מְדָלָא, מְדוֹלָא “without” by מְדוֹלָא מְדוֹלָא and מְדוֹלָא מְדוֹלָא (v. the concordance). See also the noun clauses, below, 2. 3.

1.73 There are cases where the $d-$ clause expresses the psychological predicate as though it were the grammatical predicate$^{29}$, e.g. in the poetry:

דְּלַי מְדָלָא דַּהַשׁוּפָהוּ וּמֹר קִרְבּוֹן

and there is no Kingdom that shall rouse him up
who shall rouse him up,

Gn. xlix, 9; in the prose sections:

הַלַי מְדָלָא הָחֵם כָּפָחּ בִּין

there is none so discreet and wise as thou

אֵּרְבֵּנֵנַּו הָהֲמוֹנִים כָּפָחּ

ibid. 24.

Perhaps this will explain another use of the $d-$ clause, that of introducing the contents of a quotation after the introductory word רָאוּ “behold”; a place where a direct quotation is expected, e.g. in the Geniza fragments:

רָאוּ דְּמֶרֶנָה בְּרֵדוֹ יִתְשָׁרוּ

behold, I have given into thy hand
Sihon

רָאוּ נָחָה בָּרֵדוֹ אֶת סְרָפֹן

Dt. ii, 24; in the remaining sections of the T.:

רָאוּ דָּא אָמַר לִי

see, Thou sayest unto me,

רָאוּ אָמַת אֵלָא

Ex. xxxiii, 12. The $d-$ clause is used to begin a direct quotation$^{30}$:

רָאוּ מְשֻׁנֵתָא צַלֶּק לְמִיאָר דָאָמַת הָלָמֵת

and I have heard say of thee, that
thou hearest a dream,

רָאוּ מְשֻׁנֵתָא צַלֶּק אֵלָא לְמִיאָר הָלָמֵת

Gn. xli, 15.

1.80 By way of summary it can be said that most of the $d-$ clauses in TO are translations of relative clauses in Hebrew, in the prose sections (seventy-six, as opposed to thirty $d-$ clauses without such basis in the Geniza fragments), as well as in the translations of poetry which incorporate many new $d-$ clauses (105, as opposed to fourteen which have a foundation of relativity in Hebrew). These “new” $d-$ clauses, whether with explicit or implied justification in the

29 Cf. a similar phenomenon in Jewish Arabic, J. Blau, Grammatical Survey of the Arabic of the Responsa of Maimonides, (Hebr.) in תשובה וחקלאים III; Jerusalem (1962), 108.

30 Cf. use of $di$ for direct quotations in Biblical Aramaic: Dn. ii, 25; v, 7; vi, 6, 14.
text, also play an important part outside of the poetry (24 out of 105 in translations of poetry; 25 out of 30 in the Geniza fragments; 75 out of the 150 representative examples in the concordance). In part of the remaining cases, the d– clause fulfils a specific function, for example the transformation of adverbial into attributive phrases, substantivization, or the identification of the grammatical predicate. Only in a few cases (two in the Geniza fragments and seven in the representative examples from the remainder of the text) is it necessary to consider the explanation for the appearance of the d– clauses to be a desire to interpret the text. In all the above cases, there is no need to assume a different reading to be the basis for the d– clause in TO.

2.00 Types of d– Clauses in the Aramaic of Onkelos

2.10 a) The attributive relative clause.

Most (65 out of 105) of the new d– clauses added in the translations of the poetry, half of those (fifteen out of thirty) in the Geniza fragments, and about half (twenty-one out of forty in all of Genesis) in the other sections of the T., are attributive relative clauses, incorporated into the main clause by means of attachment to a noun or pronoun.

2.11 An attributive relative clause is included in the syntactic unit of its antecedent in the way that a regular adjective is joined to the unit it modifies. This combination of a substantive with its modifying clause can serve as the subject of a sentence:

Beyond the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills

That my fathers, who were coveted by the prominent, blessed me; water shall flow from his branches

Nu. xxiv, 7 = “the king, who will be greater than his sons, will grow greater”; in apposition with the subject:

Do ye this requite...O foolish people and unwise?

...the nation which received the Torah and yet did not become wise”; as the logical subject in cases of extraposition:

Dan shall be a serpent in the way

tu זֶה צֶבָּא עָלָיו דָּרוּן

Gn. xlix, 17 = “let it be that the man, who shall be chosen and will arise from the tribe of Dan, the fear of him shall envelop the nations”; as a vocative:
The well, which the princes digged, which the nobles of the people delved..."

Nu. xxii, 18; as a predicate:

"...Joseph is a fruitful vine, a fruitful vine..."

Gn. xlix, 22 = "Joseph is my son who will grow, my son who is blessed as a vine";

...they are a very froward generation

Dtr. xxxii, 20 = "they are people who changed (their deeds)"; as an object:

Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one.

Dtr. xxxiii, 8 = "you clothed the man who was found righteous before you"; in apposition with the object:

...gods that they knew not,

Dtr. xxxii, 17; as a temporal clause:

...against the time when their foot shall slip

ibid. 35 = "and I shall requite at the time when they will be exiled from their land"; as a comparative clause:

the fountain of Jacob,

Dtr. xxxiii, 28 = "like those blessings with which Jacob, their father, blessed them"; as an attribute:

and he forsook God who made him

Dtr. xxxii, 15 = "he left the worship of the God who created him" and

and underneath are the everlasting arms

Dtr. xxxiii, 27 = "abode of the God of ancient times by whose Mêmrâ the world was created". Such cases are also common in non-poetical passages.

2.12 Attributive relative clauses appear in many types of sentences. Among these are verbal clauses, e.g.:

Gn. xlix, 1731;

31 About thirty (out of sixty-five) attributive relative clauses of this type appear in the T.
participial clauses, e.g.:  

מֹשֵׁל דְּעָשֵׁי דְּבָרָיו דֶּרֶךְ זָאוֹת לְבָנִין  

Gn. xlix, 24;  

ונָסִיף דְּעָשֵׁי תֵּרֶנְא דֶּרֶךְ  

Gn. xlix, 22;  

and noun-clauses, e.g.:  

שְׁמַע דָּרְשָׁרַת אָסָטָרַת  

“whose land is their inheritance”  

Dt. xxxii, 14;  

שְׁמַעְתָּן דֶּרֶךְ  

Dt. xxxiii, 28.

2.13 The formal relationship of the antecedent and its relative clause can be expressed by a retrospective pronoun (independent or attached to a preposition, a noun, or a verb) within the clause and referring to the antecedent. The appearance or suppression of the retrospective pronoun within the relative clause varies between dialects in the Semitic languages. It would be of interest, therefore, to examine this phenomenon in the “new” relative clauses of the TO.

2.131 The antecedent as the subject of the relative clause: The retrospective pronoun is absent in the majority of cases (from forty-one out of the forty-three cases in the translations of the poetry and from all of the thirteen in the Geniza fragments). In a sentence with a verbal predicate, there is no need for an explicit pronoun, since the grammatical form of the verb already includes a reference to the antecedent, e.g.:  

לַכֵּן מֵלֶךְ מִדֶּנֶּשֶׁנֶּה  

Gn. xlix, 9, but its absence from sentences with a participial or nominal predicate needs to be explained. The deciding factor, apparently, is the position of the antecedent with relation to the expected retrospective pronoun. Where the pronoun, were it used, would follow the d– which immediately follows the substantive itself, the pronoun is omitted. In a case like this, the proximity would be interpreted as unnecessary emphasis. Indeed, in the few cases the pronoun does appear, the intended emphasis is readily felt. Two such cases appear in the poetry. In  

אָפָה לָא כְּכֶרֶבּ דְּבָרָו הַדִּינָהָרָי  

לַמֵּשֶׁכֶּרֶבּ חַבִּרָן מַתְּמָלָכָן  

בְּכֶרֶבּאָּס יַחַנֶּתֶּם  

of the poetry; seven (out of fifteen) in the Geniza fragments; and four (out of twenty-one) in the T. of Genesis.

32 There are about twenty cases in participial clauses in the T. of poetry; seven in the Geniza fragments; and four in the T. of Genesis.

33 There are about ten cases of noun clauses in the T. of the poetry; one in the Geniza fragments, and thirteen in the T. of Genesis.

34 Before the predicate; v. below in the discussion on word order.
Nu. xxiii, 19 = “and not even as the deeds of men, which they decide to do and then are sorry”, the pronoun אֱלֹהִים emphasizes the contrast between man and God, which appears in the preceding statement; or

"and he... he led them... in the Lord alone did he lead them..."

 Dt. xxxii, 12 — “The Lord will settle them in a world which will be renewed”, where the pronoun אֱלֹהִים appears in contrast to “God” in the main clause. There is also a grammatical need for this differentiation, since the predicate of both clauses is "...כַּעֲדֵי...". The only case with a pronoun in the T. of Genesis is מֵקְדֶשָׁתָה דִּדְוָי בֹּרְכֵיה מֶהוֹדָשָׁתָה הוֹדַע בּוֹרְכֵיה..."

The harlot that was at Enaim,

 Dt. xxxii, 17.

Gn. xxxviii, 21, obviously because of the explicit pronoun in the Hebrew.

2.132 The antecedent as the object\textsuperscript{35} of the relative clause. There are not many examples, and it may be said that Onkelos follows the Hebrew in this matter. In any case, there is not one instance of an accusative retrospective pronoun in the T. of the entire Book of Genesis or in the Geniza fragments. In the translations of the poetry the situation is undecided. The pronoun is obviously missing from the following case:

כְּבֵשָׁתָה דַּדְוָי יִחְאָל "as aloes planted of the Lord,"

Nu. xxiv, 6, and it seems that the structure of the Hebrew could be the influencing factor (though not necessarily so). An uncertain case of a suppressed pronoun is the following:

אֲבָכַיָּה דַּחֵר אֵל הָעִבְרִי בּוֹרְכֵיה דַּחֵר עִבְרֵי (cf. 2.11)

Gn. xlix, 26. There seems to be no dependence on the Hebrew text, but rather, the לְעָם is ambiguous in that it could be interpreted as an accusative prefix with the pronoun referring to the antecedent אֲבָכַיָּה or as a dative prefix with the pronoun referring to the subject of the relative clause, “the great” (\textit{dativus ethicus}). There are also instances where the pronoun appears, as in the Hebrew version, joined to the verb, \textit{e.g.}:

כֵּרָי דְּחֵרָה אֲבָכַיָּה בּוֹרְכֵיה דַּחֵר עִבְרֵי סְמָא

Nu. xxi, 18 and

דַּחֵרָי לֵא יִדְמֹתֲךָ

אֲבָכַיָּה לֵא יִדְמֹתֲךָ

Dt. xxxii, 17.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{i.e.} the direct object, cf. my article, mentioned in note 12, on markers of the various types of object in the Aramaic of TO.
In the following cases, where the antecedent is an accusatival pronominal suffix, as is the pronoun referring to it (perhaps because of attraction), it seems that the dependence on the Hebrew is explanatory in nature:

מָה אָלֵינֵי דְּלֵא לַעֲיָה אֵל, מָה אָלֵי נֵי
דַּלְאַ אָלֵי נֵי
מָה אָקֵפֶל לֵא קְהָבֵל אֵל, מָה אָקֵפֶל לֵא קְהָבֵל

How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed? And how shall I excrete whom the Lord hath not excreted?

Nu. xxiii, 8.

2.133 The antecedent as the object of a preposition in the relative clause: The pronoun almost always appears (although the total number of instances is small) joined to a preposition (six cases in the poetry, and a single place in Genesis), e.g.

 Dt. xxxii, 17 = “new ones, with whom your fathers had no dealings”;
 Dt. xxxii, 35 = “until the time (when) they will be exiled from their land”;
 Gn. xxviii, 17 = “a place in which there is favour from before the Lord.”

2.134 The antecedent as an adverb in the relative clause. There is usually no retrospective pronoun. It is absent following an antecedent which is actually a rigid adverbal form, as is the case in all three of the places in the T. of the poetry:

 Dt. xxxii, 36, “at the time (when) their enemy’s blows will overcome them”; and

- גְּלָל שֵׁמַח
- אַרְאֵר דֶּלֶּא מֵא
- מֵא הָדוֹרָה

The n of כֶּם was understood as a pronominal suffix 3rd sing. masc.

There seems to be no dependence on the Hebrew here because the Hebrew uses an objective pronominal suffix.

The other places are: Nu. xxiii, 10; Dt. xxxii, 4, 17, 20, 37. In the following two cases, which are similar to each other, one is not to infer the use of a prepositional clause with a suppressed retrospective pronoun, but rather an accusative clause indicating an internal object, which, therefore, does not have a retrospective pronoun:

 Dt. xxxii, 28.
ibid. 10 = “a place (where) there is no water”. This is also true in the only instance of this type in the Geniza fragments:

מימרא דרימא תורן

from the day that I knew you

 Dt. ix, 24. However, there is a retrospective pronoun in the case of an ad hoc adverbial form:

מכירה טרימאל קרימה אנתהוות עלה

ברא לה ריא

Gn. xxiv, 6, 2 = “from the well at which appeared an angel of the Everlasting One”.

2.135 The antecedent as the nomen rectum of one of the nouns in the relative clause: The retrospective pronoun appears in all five of the examples in the poetry. It appears as an independent pronoun when the genitive construction is the predicate, e.g.:

משרתא דריליה היא מלכות

שילה

Gn. xlix, 10 39 cf. 0.02;

and as a pronominal suffix in the remaining instances, e.g.:

The Rock, His work is perfect,

זכור תומך משלי

Dt. xxxii, 4 = “the Mighty One Whose works are perfect” 40 41; and in the only case in the Geniza fragments:

...כל בעידא תרמאמת ראשה...

...כל-יהוה מקראת פרשה...

Dt. xiv, 6.

2.136 The conditions for appearance or absence of the retrospective pronoun can be summarized thus: There is no retrospective pronoun for a nominative antecedent unless there is a stylistic reason for strong emphasis or close adherence to the Hebrew text; the pronoun may or may not appear with an accusative antecedent in the poetry, and it does not appear in prose (here the dependence on the Hebrew text may be greater); it may appear with an adverbial antecedent or it may not (in the case of a rigid adverbial form); and it always appears with a genitive antecedent or one which is the object of a preposition.

2.14 It is not necessary in the style of Onkelos that the antecedent be defi-

39 “Whose is the Kingdom”, i.e. the kingdom to come is the kingdom of the Messiah.
40 By changing the Hebrew extrapolation into a relative clause; there is a basis for the retrospective pronoun in the Hebrew also, but there it appears as the pronoun of the logical subject in extrapolation.
41 The additional places in the T. of the poetry are: Dt. xxxii, 14; xxxiii, 26, 29.
nite. The original determinative power of the demonstrative pronoun *d̄* became steadily weaker, and it can already be found with an indefinite substantive in Biblical Aramaic, e.g.: Ḋaḥāqū ḏ d̄ ṭerāqī ṭaḥāa ʿalā yuḥā. Dn. ii, 11. For the way in which Onkelos introduces determination into *d̄*-phrases expressing possession, see my article mentioned in note 12. The situation is similar in the other Semitic languages with the exception of Arabic, cf. Brockelmann, Grundriss II, § 367.

43 Also Gn. xlix, 22, 25; Ex. xv, 16; Nu. xxiv, 6 (twice); Dt. xxxii, 7, 10, 17 (twice), 35, 36: xxxiii, 13, 15, 19.

44 Lv. xi, 24, 25, 26; Nu. xxxv, 30; Dt. x, 12; xiv, 3.

45 There are no examples in the T. of the poetry or in the Geniza fragments.
I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt,

Gn. xlv, 4; and

Am I not thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden all thy life long?

Nu. xxii, 30.

2.16 A demonstrative or interrogative pronoun may serve as a correlative, for example in the translations of the poetry דן:

 naam đen דרשך...

Ex. xv, 13, 16;

in the other parts of the T. הוּדוּךְ:

נַר פְּרֵנַס חֵרֵד בְּכוּרי

נָנַךְ מְשָׁמַכְרוּ.

Gn. xv, 2; מַנוּ:

בִּדְיוֹ מִנָּה וְחָמֵשׁ

בִּרְדֵּסָתָה

Ex. iv, 13 = "by the hand of him whom Thou wilt send,

נְמֵסְמָחְתִּי וְדְרֵיחַ אָמָרָה

ונְשָׂאֵהל אָתֶדֶרִית.

Gn. xxiv, 57 = “and we shall hear that which she says”.

2.17 The position of the retrospective pronominal suffix in the relative clause depends on the position of its “prop”, whether it be joined to the subject (e.g.: דְּרִיָּהלָא מַלְכֵה [Dt. xxxii, 4]), the predicate (e.g. דְּלַא אַחֲטָסִמְךָ בָּהֵן גָּאָרָה [Gn. xlix, 10]), or the object (דְּלַא אַתָּשֶׁסְךָ בָּהֵן גָּאָרָה [Dt. xxxii, 17]).

Only in the case of an independent retrospective pronoun is there a free order. In the two cases of independent pronouns in the translations of the poetry, the pronoun (which serves as the subject of the relative clause) precedes the predicate, according to the regular word-order in noun-clauses (Nu. xxiii, 19; Dt. xxxii, 12).

2.20 b) Substantivized Relative Clause.

In the T. of Genesis there is one substantivized relative clause:

ואַםָהּ הָאָדָם... וַהֲרָעָיוֹ רַפְלַחְתֵלַעַלְכוֹ וּלְשָׁנַה יֵי... and this stone... shall be God’s house

Gn. xxviii, 22 = “and this stone... shall be the one upon which I shall worship before the Lord”.

Cf. below for the order of the words within the relative clause.

The desired emphasis is felt through the use of the retrospective pronoun and not through the word order.
2.30  c) Independent Relative Clause (Noun Clause).

It has been shown that – frequently serves to substantivize adverbial or prepositional phrases. This is also the case in the substantivization of clauses. Sixteen noun clauses (out of 105) are added in the poetic translations, two appear (out of thirty) in the Geniza fragments, and twelve (out of forty) in the T. of Genesis. These clauses can best be described and arranged according to their syntactical function.

2.31 Subject clause: in a verbal clause, *e.g.*:

and became a servant under task work

Gn. xlix, 15 = “and those who remain from them shall be as servants unto them”, where the noun-clause appears as the subject, lacking in the Hebrew source;

and as a lioness; who shall rouse him up?

Nu. xxiv, 9 = “and as a lion, there is no one that shall rouse him up”, taking the Hebrew א as a correlative and rendering it as a noun-clause without a correlative. It appears with the passive, *e.g.*:

Blessed be He that enlargeth Gad

Dt. xxxii, 20; and

when He seeth that their stay is gone

Dt. xxxii, 36 = “It is revealed before Him that...”. It can also be found in a participial clause:

and there is none that can deliver out of My hand,

ibid., 39;

and in a nominal clause: 49

and the things that are to come upon them shall make haste,

ibid., 35;

and the good will of Him that dwelt in the bush

48 Here is a nominative clause which includes the grammatical predicate of the sentence within itself, v. above 1.73.

49 The additional places in the T. of Genesis are: Gn. xxix, 19; xxx, 15, 40; xxxi, 42, 53; xxxix, 9; xli, 31, 42; xlvi, 25, 39.
Dt. xxxiii, 16 = “He Whose Divine Presence is in the heavens, has good will toward him...”: and

who is like unto thee?

2.32 Predicate clause:

that shall dwell alone,

Nu. xxiii, 9.50 In a few places (especially with לֶא, לֶא) it is hard to differentiate between subject clause and predicate clause, since the d—clause is apt to perform both tasks at once (v. preceding paragraph).

2.33 Object clause:

for there is no enchantment with

Nu. xxiii, 23 = “because those who divine do not want that the house of Jacob be prosperous”; a construction with anticipatory pronoun51 and objective l—before the noun-clause can also be found, e.g.:

Thou overthrowest them that rise against Thee

Ex. xv, 7 = “You shattered those who rose up against Your people”;

pangs have taken hold on the inhabit-

ants of Philistia,

ibid., 14 = “pangs have taken hold on them who dwelt in Philistia”.52 See above (1.73) for the use of the d— at the beginning of a quotation after יְהוָה or וְ (e.g. Dt. xxxii, 39; and in the Geniza fragments: Dt. ii, 24); and (1.40) for the use of d— before adjectives.

2.34 A clause dependent upon a preposition. In a nominal clause, e.g.:

and his horns are the horns of the wild-ox,

Dt. xxxiii, 17 = “great deeds were done him from before Him to Whom belong the strength and the sublimity”. This clause serves as the agent of a passive verb. In a verbal clause, Dt. i, 1:

in the wilderness, in the Arabah,

“...I reprove them because (of that which) they sinned in the desert, and (that

50 Cf. note 25.

51 On this, cf. my article mentioned in note 12.

52 Objective clauses in the remainder of the T. to Genesis: Gn. xxiv, 57; xxx, 8; xli, 15, 19.
which) they angered [Him] in the Arabah.”\textsuperscript{53} A clause dependent on a preposition appears in the preceding paragraph among objective clauses (Ex. xv, 7) because there the l-serves to introduce the object. A sentence of this type resembles an adverbial clause in form, since it is subordinated by means of a preposition and d-, and cf. below (2.4).

2.35 Genitive clause: It appears in a participial clause, e.g.:

איכר דשתו מעמ כי קדם על, ודויהם במ

The saying of him who heareth the words of God, who seeth the vision of the Almighty,

Nu. xxiv, 4, 16.

d) Adverbial Clause.

2.40 There are instances when the d- alone serves to indicate the subordination of an adverbial clause, but in the majority of cases it appears following a preposition. A total of seventeen adverbial clauses are found in the T. of the poetry, thirteen in the Geniza fragments, and seven in the T. of the Book of Genesis.

2.401 The d- alone introduces a consecutive clause (when a subsequent event, rather than simultaneity, is expressed by the clause), e.g.: for I have slain a man for my wound, and a young man for my bruise,

לא בכרא נדיה להייאוה אאנא סכלי ויבין

וכאם לא כדיהם יבירה להויה יתודותי

וכי איא הורתי לפוץ ילבלי ולברה

Gn. iv, 23

= “I have not slain a man that because of him I should bear guilt, nor a boy, that because of him my children should be lost”;

כדרי מכלכ ילמסי ידנכי ימשבק

יורנ משמךל ינשבק

Dt. xxxiii, 10 = “they are righteous so that they may teach Thy law to Jacob”; and

 Dt. xxxiii, 11 = “he broke the loins of his enemies and of his adversaries, so that they shall not rise”.

\textsuperscript{53} The third member of the sentence is:

ודר תוקן

= “and because they made the golden calf”.

ןכדרי מוכל קמקן

 Dt. xxxiii, 11 = “he broke the loins of his enemies and of his adversaries, so that they shall not rise”.
2.402 The $d$– introduces a causal clause, e.g.:  

**Ex. xv, 9, 10** = “because the enemy said... Thou didst command the sea covered them” (explaining the causal sequence in the text).

2.403 The $d$– introduces a final clause, for example in the Geniza fragments:  

**Dt. x, 13** = “to keep the commandments... that thou prosper”.

2.410 In most cases, the $d$– follows a preposition, and this combination marks the subordination, e.g.:  

**Nu. xxi, 18**;

3.0 $d$– Clauses with parallel members.

3.11 In $d$– clauses with parallel members, only the first has $d$–: a) in an attributive relative clause:

**Gn. xlix, 17** = “a man that shall be chosen and rise from Dan”; and

**Dt. xxxiii, 16** = “it pleased Him Whose Shekinah is in heaven and (Who) revealed himself to Moses in the thornbush”.

3.2 There are, however, also cases where $d$– begins both of the parallel members: a) in an attributive relative clause:

**Dt. xxxii 17**, — apparently because of the Hebrew text, which was considered as two independent relative clauses with two different subjects;

**Dt. xxxiii 8, 9** = “Thou didst clothe with them the man who was found pious
before Thee... who had no mercy for his father and his mother...”, because of the ה– which begins the clause in Hebrew;

b) in noun clauses:

א诬ר דָּשָּׁם מִפֵּרָה מִן קְדֻם אָל דְּתוֹרֵי מִן

The saying of him who heareth the words of God, who seeth the vision of the Almighty,

Nu. xxiv, 4, 16;
in order to divide the phrase into two separate units (by way of interpretation);

c) in an adverbal clause:

מִדֶּלֶת יִדְעָה כָּלָה (כָּלָה)... וּמוֹדֵסֵי הָיוֹת

Because the Lord was not able... and because he hated them

אֵס כְּרָא

Dt. ix, 28 — because of the m– which appears twice in the Hebrew.

4.0 The Position of the d– Clause

4.1 An attributive relative d– clause always appears immediately following its antecedent. Only in one example a word (which is also an attribute and perhaps should have been included within the relative clause as well54) separates it from its antecedent:

מדְּרוֹדְּלָה מְלֵמקָהּ מִלְמָכוֹן הַדּוֹקָדִית

 Dt. xxxiii, 27 = “the dwelling of the God of ancient times, by Whose Mēmrā the world was created.”

4.2 The place of a substantival d– clause is not fixed, but depends on its syntactical function. The clause as a subject can appear before the predicate of the main clause (e.g. Gn. xlix, 15), or after it (e.g. Dt. xxxiii, 16). An object clause always appears after the verb (e.g. Nu. xxxiii, 23) and a predicate clause after the subject (e.g. ibid. 9). A genitive clause appears after the nomen regens (e.g. Nu. xxiv, 4, 16).

4.3 The adverbal d– clause generally appears after the predicate of the main clause, whether the subordination is indicated by d– alone, or by d– with a preposition (e.g. Gn. iv, 23, Gn. xlix, 10). However, temporal and causal clauses can appear before the predicate of the main clause, thus with בְּלָדָה (e.g. in the Geniza fragments: Dt. ix, 23), מְדִיר (e.g.: Nu. xxi, 19), הבור דּוֹ (in the Geniza fragments: Nu. xxxx, 28), נְזָר (e.g. Gn. xlix, 4) and causal מֵדִיר (in the Geniza fragments: Dt. ix, 28).

54 Cf. note 28a.
5.0 Word order in d-clause.

The arrangement of the principal parts of the clause will be investigated first (S = subject; V = predicate if it is a finite verb, otherwise P = a participial or nominal predicate), and the order of the various complements and modifiers afterwards.

5.1 V generally precedes S, for example: דָּבְּרֵה יִד (Nu. xxiv, 6), as does the participle, e.g. מֵשָּׁל לֶבַזְיָּתִי (Dt. xxxii, 4). Where the order is reversed, it can be attributed to emphasis, e.g.: ... וְאָמַרְנָה לַעֲמָדִים (Nu. xxxiii, 19) and cf. above, 2.131. In a clause without a finite verb, S generally precedes P, e.g.: בְּדַלַּת מִי (Dt. xxxii, 14); and for emphasis, P S: דָּבְּרֵה יִד (ibid., 10) and רַדְיָלִיתָה נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (Gn. xlix, 10).

5.11 The position of the copula in a nominal clause is between P and S (Gn. xlix, 10), but it can appear after them through the influence of the Hebrew source:

ָדַּנְאָא נַחַל וַעֲלָיו

(1 עלון אֵין דָּבְּרֵה יִד

(1 Dt. xxxii, 39).

5.2 If the verb or nominal predicate has a complement (object, adverb, or prepositional phrase), it appears after P or V, if the clause consists of only one member, e.g.: מִמְשָּׁלַּת כָּלְשִׁים (Dt. xxxii, 35); in the Geniza fragments: דַּבְּרֵה יִד (Dt. x, 12). In most cases, this is the order even in clauses of multiple members, e.g.: אָסָּבָּה נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (Dt. xxxii, 5), where V includes S and the object appears afterwards; דִּירֵם לֶבַזְיָּתִי (Nu. xxiii, 23), with a prepositional phrase after V; דַּנְאָא נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (ibid., 22), with an adverb after V. There are, however, cases where the complement precedes V or a participle (apparently for the sake of emphasis), e.g.: דַּנְאָא נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (Dt. xxxii, 39) and דַּנְאָא נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (Nu. xxiv, 3, 15).

5.21 There is a difference between the order of explicit nominal subject and predicate in verbal clauses and in participial clauses when a complement begins the clause. In a verbal clause V precedes S, but in a participial clause S precedes P, e.g.: לָבָּדָּה נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (Dt. xxxiii, 27), and דַּבְּרֵה יִד (Gn. iv, 23), in verbal clauses; and דַּבְּרֵה יִד (ibid.), and דַּנְאָא נַחַל וַעֲלָיו (Dt. xxxii, 4), in participial clauses.

5.22 The arrangement of the various complements is arbitrary: an object may precede a prepositional phrase (Nu. xxiv, 4, 16), a prepositional phrase may precede an object (in the Geniza fragments: Dt. ii, 24) and an object may precede an adverb (Gn. xlix, 24).

55 Or P, if a participle.