FURTHER TEXTUAL EVIDENCE FOR 'ADVERSARY'

Frank H. Polak

For MT רָהַת רְוִינָעַר אֶנְכָּל אֱלֶיָד (Is. 49:25) the Isaiah scroll (1QIs) reads רָהַת רוֹבֵּר אֶנְכָּל אֱלֶיָד. The vocabulary רְוִינָעַר standing for MT רוֹבֵּר, 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 רוֹבֵּר, afterwards correcting this to רוֹבֵּר.²

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


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) (Leiden 1974) 384. Kutscher apparently prefers the reading רוֹבֵּר (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 בֵּיתוֹ. However, parallelism in this verse is antithetic; the first colon, אֱלֹהֶיךָ (רְ יהודהָ) אֲנָכֶּנָּו אָחָוֹת, is the opposite of the second one: אֱלֹהֶיךָ (רְ יהודהָ) אֲנָכֶּנָּו אָחָוֹת. Thus it would be difficult to equate בֵּיתוֹ with בֵּיתוֹ. 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 רְ יהודהָ.

In our opinion this vocable may be construed as a noun, רְ יהודהָ, meaning 'adversary'; from a morphological point of view it would be a participle from the root רוֹדֵב. This would make for another instance of the participle with ḫolam (instead of gamash) from a verb with a semivowel as second radical (ז"א), as e.g. חַכּוֹמָה (2 Ki. 16:7), וֵלֹה (Is. 25:7), קַחַלְתָּה (Jer. 4:31), וְזֶבְעָמָה (Zech. 10:5). Yalon adduces many

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

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

6 Because of the Canaanite sound shift ā → ṭ the allomorph with ṭholam is the expected form; vid. C. Rabin, "The Hebrew Development of Proto-Semitic ā", Tarbīz 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, ṭob, mēt); vid. Rabin, op. cit. 106; P. Joőon, Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique (Rome 1923) 166s (§80d).

The form ṭob 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 → 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.

in biblical Hebrew, and how many difficulties it has caused
the translators (cp. Jer. 18:19, Ps. 35:1). In our verse
the LXX (τοὶς κρίσιν σου) and Targum (اورענוהותיך) have
identified it with the infinitive יידך
(דניכין); this rendering is similar to the
relative clause offered by the Vulgate (qui indicaverunt
te). The Peshitta has a
participle (דניכין); this construction is similar to the
reading of the scroll.

The very same form ניא has been detected earlier by
Gordis in Job 40:2:10

8 Similarly Jer. 18:19 LXX (τοὶς διακατωματὸς σου), Targum
(עבודתך) and Peshitta (ריבון).
9 By contrast, in Jer. 18:19, Ps. 35:1 the Vulgate has
forms of adversarius; cp. also the Targum on Ps. 35:1
(חרב אתנור). For the participial construction, cp. LXX Ps.
35 (34):1 (τοῖς δίδαιντας σε) as well as Aq. ibid.
אלהים דָּבָרֵךְ עִמָּהוּ
(אלהים דָּבָרֵךְ עִמָּהוּ) according to the
Syrohexapla.

(without reference to the Isaiah Scroll). He takes ניא as
impf. gal of נים (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 נים and הָעִי form a fixed pair (cp. Jer. 2:19; Ps. 6:2;
38:2; 39:12; Prov. 3:11; 6:23 and passim).

This analysis of the form ניא is opposed to the opinion
that it is a nomen agentis, similar to יָּדָא, יָּדָא (cp. פִּיא
and נִיאָמָא, alternating with נִיאָמָא) of the noun class qittāl
(derived from qāṭṭāl); 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
[4]
For ἱερὸν Symmachus has a participle (ὁ δικαζόμενος); Targum (דנציון) and Vulgate (qui contendit) render it by a relative clause. This construction, based on the parallel colon מוכלח אלהו והר בר לאפר (Is. 45:9). Hence many scholars have accepted it, reading נֶב. This emendation, however, would not be necessary if the form בַּל were taken as a participle with holam.

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

or permanent activity, but to state (שער) and quality (_wf, לְוִד). So this noun class has nothing to do with the nomen agentis ga干涉 (and vid. Rabin, op. cit. 106s). Accordingly, interpretation of בַּל as a substantive is highly implausible.

11 E. Dhomme, 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 (Ἑκκαλινεῖ) in deriving בַּל from the root בֵּשַׁע, although the resulting interpretation ('to yield') does not suit the parallel דעֵש. Driver, Gray, loc. cit., followed i. a. by Fullerton and Fohrer, take בַּל as an inf. abs., serving as a verbal predicate. This explanation depends on the analysis of בֵּשַׁע as a noun; see note 10 above.
Possibly this interpretation is but another instance of the common interchange of abstract and concrete, as e.g. the Greek rendering οί ἰσχύοντες ὑπῶν for (Is. 3:25); or the doublet ἐκστάσεις offered by LXX at that place. In our verse, however, the parallel colon has an abstract noun, viz. τὴν ἐκστάσεις σου, reflecting γνώμη. Obviously, the translator distinguished between abstract and concrete. We may infer that he did not read Ῥίμα, but rather Ῥίμα, with an interchange of yod/waw (or even Ῥίμα).  

13 Kutscher, op. cit. 370; cp. Targum Jer. 23:10  
14 Cp. 1 Sam. 2:10 (= מַרְכֶּבּ), Is. 41:11 (= נַעֲשֶׁה רִיבֶּך).
A similar dilemma occurs in the LXX version of Jer. 50:34 (27:34).

Jer. 50:34 LXX (27:34)

ריז וריב
κρίσιν κρινεῖ
πρὸς
τοὺς ἀντιδίκους αὐτοῦ

One might argue that the translator simply read בְּרֵי (= MT). Possibly the rendering ἀντιδίκους 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 (= ריבו or בְּרֵי). This problem, however, is not insuperable. The translator could have turned to a synonym, as e. g. δίκη (from the same verbal stem as ἀντιδίκος); Jerome rendered: iudicio defendet causam eorum. 15 Accordingly, we should not discard the possibility that the LXX reflects ריב or בְּרֵי.

15 Cp. the versions on Mich. 7:9; Ps. 43:1, 119:154; Prov. 22:23, 23:11.
(or even "regunta"). Maybe this reading prompted his equation ποδές = מ"א. In short, three different witnesses seem to provide independent evidence for a noun 'adversary'.

Lam. 3:58 reads רָבוֹת אֲדוֹנִי רוּבִּי נֹפֶשׁ. The form לָרִיבִי, though rare, has been rendered literally (as an abstract) by the versions. However, the phrase לָרִיבִי נֹפֶשׁ is rather problematic; apparently it has no parallel (as e. g. לָרִיבִי נֹפֶשׁ, מְשָׁפִּיט נֹפֶשׁ). W. Rudolph, Das Buch Ruth, Das Hohe Lied, Die Klagelieder, KAT (Gütersloh 1962) 233, would read לָרִיבִי, with omission of נֹפֶשׁ as a gloss. But such phrases as פֶּסֶחַ נֹפֶשׁ (Ps. 71:13), עָרְרָה נֹפֶשׁ (Ps. 143:12) might suggest emendation to רוּבִּי נֹפֶשׁ 'my adversaries'. In the Lucianic version of 2 Sam. 22:44 the phrase מַרְבּוֹת עֶמְי (abstr.) has been rendered שֶׁנָּבַע לָעֲדֹי, obviously reflecting (ב)לָרִיבִי עָמִים (cp. the next colon: לָרִיבִי עַלֵּם). Indeed a concrete form is expected; hence one might incline towards the emendation מַרְבּוֹת עֶמְי.