Transformation of Poetical Lines in the Song at the Sea (Exod. 15:1–18, 21) in the Targum Onkelos

The translation technique of biblical poetry in the Targums has a unique character: on the one hand, it exhibits a tendency to imitate the original verse structure patterns; on the other hand, it possesses elements of original, distinctive poetical forms which have some resemblance to other poetic traditions of the period of Late Antiquity (e.g., Jewish liturgical poems and early Christian poetry in Syriac). In connection with this specificity a question arises: how does the targumic poetic paraphrase differ from its Hebrew original?

The literary form of targumic paraphrases of the Hebrew poetry is closely connected with their liturgical performance. As it is well known, the Targums (and particularly the Palestinian Targums) were created not just as mere renderings of the sacred text, but as interpretive translations of the Torah. For this reason, exegetical elements and various rhetorical means and devices emerge frequently in the Targums. These include addresses and appeals to the audience, exhortations, threats, insertions of exegetical glosses and complete Haggadic stories inserted into the commented upon text. These changes are more obvious in the Palestinian Targums than in the Onkelos and Jonathan Ben-Uzziel Targums. Thus, biblical metaphors, allegories and poetical means were rhetorically modified. How did these modifi-

1 These include addresses and appeals to the audience, exhortations, threats, insertions of exegetical glosses and complete Haggadic stories inserted into the commented upon text. These changes are more obvious in the Palestinian Targums than in the Onkelos and Jonathan Ben-Uzziel Targums.

2 The rhetorical context of the Targums is closely connected with their songful manner of recitation (Koheleth Rabba 7:5). It is a well known that the meturgemenian cantillated the paraphrases of the sacred text (along with their own commentaries) in a special manner; moreover, they did not read the Targums, but kept the translation in memory. My hypothesis is that this manner of ritual chanting brought about distinct rhythmical structuring of the Targumic text and inclusion of refrains and liturgical poems (such as so called introductory poems). However, these transformations must be further investigated. These introductory poems are very interesting because of their specific poetical form and unique mode of integration into translations of the original text. They were published for the first time in 1865 by L. Zunz (see: Leopold Zunz, Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie (Berlin: L. Gerschel Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1865), 18–22, 74–80, 150–151) and later reprinted by M. Ginsburger and P. Kale (in their edition of the Cairo Genizah manuscripts): Moses Ginsburger, “Aramäische Introduktionen zum Thargumvor-
cations influence upon the structure of Hebrew verse? To answer the question the Targum Onkelos has been chosen, because its text contains a small number of Haggadic episodes and exegetical insertions (in comparison with the Palestinian Targums), and we can retrace the main principles of poetical transformation per se. Besides, the text of the Song at the Sea in the Targum Onkelos is not so burdened with exegetical and rhetorical materials (which are not poetical in most cases). Nevertheless, in this almost literal Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch the poetical texts underwent some changes: additional phrases and even whole poetical lines appeared. Did the meturgemanim follow special rules for rendering of the biblical poems or were their paraphrases spontaneous?

The problem of translation of biblical poetry in the Targums has been considered in recent research. As Evan Staalduine-Sulman has demonstrated in her article, the targumists used very subtle translation techniques for poetry: “They were neither slavishly literal, nor completely focused on the content of the Hebrew original. They made a serious attempt also to reflect its genre.” She has also pointed out that the seeming freedom of the interpreters was in fact “restricted by several theological motives.”

However, these important conclusions must be supported by detailed analysis of the differences between the original Hebrew verse structures and their targumic translations. It seems obvious that some changes in the parallel verse structures are more or less regular. For this reason, only distinctions between the original Hebrew poetry and its targumic paraphrases are discussed in this article.

It is undoubted that the basic principle of translation of biblical poetry in the Targums is emulation. As Jan-Wim Wesselius demonstrates in his article, literal translation of biblical poems is “interspersed with other words and sentences” and is made with the use of “a sophisticated literary technique.” Such an approach to translation was necessary in order to interweave elements of rabbinic exegetics into the text of the translation. Jan-Wim Wesselius has shown clearly that Targumic translation is “the multi-level emulation of the biblical text,” from imitation of the linear order and the charac-
teristics of classical Hebrew poetry to emulation of the historical panorama. To what extent does the emulation principle maintain the poetical structure of the original poems? Imitation does not imply identity. What might we say about a special kind of poetry in the Targums?

In this article, I analyze the transformation of the main structural components of a poetical line (including rhythmic and metrical matters) and the correlation between parallel lines of the Song at the Sea in the Targum Onkelos. This particular task requires concentration mainly on changes such as additional words and supplementary lines: their influence on the verse structure in the Targum Onkelos also must be analyzed. Investigation of changes in the architectonics of the Song is beyond the scopes of the article.

a) The structure of poetical lines in the Song at the Sea

In this section some characteristics of the poetical line structure in the Hebrew text of the Song at the Sea are considered, as well as the main principles of our comparative methodology. It is impossible to analyze the transformation of biblical poetry in the Targums without being aware of the very nature and the unique features of ancient Hebrew poetry in general. It is well known that many criteria traditionally applied to Hebrew poetry are the subject of ongoing debate. Yet, while we must take into account all of these matters for debate, it is necessary to outline the most characteristic features of Hebrew poetry in respect to its transformation in the Targum Onkelos. Since we undertake the task to overview the modifications at the level of poetical lines and parallel correlation between them, our analysis of the poetical forms covers areas such as verse construction and rhythmic/metric structure, which are the most sensitive to the influence of rhetoric.

Within the scope of this article we cannot embrace all existing opinions on Hebrew verse structure. However, we have to elaborate the basic methodological approaches for comparative analysis of biblical poetry and its translation in the Targums, which would be based on the most evident and universally recognized distinctive features of Hebrew verse structure. This task is not simple. On the one hand, we can find many similarities

---

6 Jan-Wim Wesselius enumerates 7 different levels (Wesselius, “Completeness and Closure,” 244).
7 It would be better to consider the changes in the architectonics on the material of the Palestinian Targums, where the Song at the Sea was undergone many rhetorical and exegetical modifications (some additional passages were inserted in the targumic text). The Targum Onkelos doesn’t contain any considerable modifications in the text of the Song.
8 For instance, a question of metrics remains unclarified. Is it inherent in biblical Hebrew poetry, or would it be more appropriate to speak rather about rhythm? See Adele Berlin, “Introduction to Hebrew Poetry,” New Interpreter’s Bible 4 (1996): 308. What else should be mentioned as the debatable aspects of Hebrew poetry, are different views on the parallel verse structure and correlation between poetical lines. Some scholars raise the question of the nature of biblical poetry more broadly: is it appropriate to apply to Hebrew poems such terms as “verse” and “versification,” or would it be more logical to use the term “poetry”? A. Berlin argues that “poetry” rather than “verse” is the preferred term for naming what one finds in the Bible. Berlin, “Introduction to Hebrew Poetry,” 301–315.
in the different conceptions concerning the small structural units as well as nature of parallelism; on the other hand, when scholars attempt to define the structure of a poetical line and describe some larger “building blocks” (such as the strophe, the canticle, the sub-canto and the canto), their opinions are divided.

Another area for discussion is rhythmic and metrical structure. Concerning this issue we meet two diametrically opposed positions: on the one hand, O’Connor and Kugel reject any presence of meter in Hebrew verse; on the other hand, there are staunch supporters of the metric nature of Biblical poetry such as Miller, Watson, Garr, Geller and Kurylowicz. As R. L. Giese rightly concluded, in recent years, meter has been “vehemently denied” and “staunchly reaffirmed” as a distinguishing feature of Hebrew verse and we cannot ignore that fact.

It seems obvious that in most models of verse structure a minimal unit of verse coincides with a word and main structure type of a line (or cola) coincides with a clause (or

---


10 For example, there are some discussed opinions on the line structure problem: O’Connor divides the Song into 56 lines; Fokkelman – into 78 lines (hemistich) united in 39 verses of bucolic structure; Freedman also sees 78 divisions in the poem. It means there is not a common opinion on the line structure of the Song at the Sea among scholars, as well as the line structure of Hebrew verse in general. This difference has been caused by diverse approaches to definition of a line – the phonological and the syntactic ones. See Michael P. O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 53; Jan P. Fokkelman, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible at the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis* (Assen: Van Gorum, 1998), 1:26; David N. Freedman, “Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15,” in *A Light Into My Path*, ed. by H. N. Bream et al. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1975), 163–203. Cooper believes that a line of Hebrew verse is composed of one, two or three cola. See Alan M. Cooper, “Biblical Poetics: A Linguistic Approach” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976), 7–8; quoted in O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 52–53. Geller considers a line as composed of two colons which are divided by a caesura. See Stephen A. Geller, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry (Harvard Semitic Monographs)* (Missoula, Montana: Scholar Press, 1979), 7–12.


15 W. Garr asserts that “within a presumed meter, the poet fashions his lines according to generally accepted syntactic rules.” W. Randall Garr, “The Qinah: A Study of Poetic Meter, Syntax and Style,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 95 (1983): 54–75.
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with a syntagma). It means that the syntactic dimension is basic, but not singular. It is also undoubtedly true that rhythm as an integral part of syntactic constructions is closely connected with syllabic structure. It means that the syllabic structure of a line cannot be dimensionless — that is consisting of unlimited number of syllables: extension of quantity of syllables leads to changes in rhythmic structure of the clause. Biblical poetry would be impossible without terseness as a syntactic and rhythmical limitation of discourse. The fact the meter is not regular in biblical poetry does not imply absence of meter at all. So, considering a word as the lowest syntactic unit, we imply implicitly its rhythmical function as a phonetically stressed element of a poetical line; defining the clause (just the clause as a short sentence) as the syntactic basis for a poetical line, we mean its rhythmical-syntactic structure, which is limited with a certain number of rhythmical units.

The most typical example of such different approaches to analysis of Hebrew verse is comparison of two models, which were suggested by M. O’Connor and S. Geller. The last recognizes two colons in the first line of Exod. 15:1 (it corresponds to lines 1a and 1b in O’Connor’s scheme) consisting of two metric units (feet); these colons are divided with a caesura. O’Connor’s dividing of the verse implies that each colon-clause consists of 2 constituents. In fact, in this case foot in Geller’s scheme and constituent in O’Connor’s scheme coincide. The second line of Exod. 15:1 (i.e. in Geller’s scheme)

---

19 For example, such famous supporter of metrical analysis of Hebrew poetry as S. Geller, suggests a formula: one grammatical unit = one metrical unit and applies, in fact, rhythmical and syntactic criteria to definition of line structure (Geller, Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry, 9–12). Compare with the strictly syntactic approach of O’Connor, who identifies units of Hebrew verse with “individual verbs and nouns... along with the particles dependent on them.” He distinguishes another grammatical level — constituents that are “verbs and nouns as they function together in the syntax.” O’Connor also considers line as “the clause” (“third level” in his gradation). See O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 68.


22 See, for example, the Kugel’s opinion: Kugel, Idea of Biblical Poetry, 72; Aloysius Fitzgerald, “Hebrew Poetry,” New Jerome Biblical Commentary (1990): 201–208; see also the mentioned before research Garr, “Qinah,” 54–75.

23 O’Connor indicates: “No line of poetry contains fewer than one constituent [in our article — colon] or more than four constituents” (O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 313).

24 See an essay of Giese in which he defends the rhythmic dimension of biblical poetry on the level of both the foot and the strophe. Giese, “Strophic Hebrew Verse as Free Verse,” 29–38.

25 See the mentioned before books: Geller, Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry and O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, Freedman, Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15.

26 Hereafter we use the term foot as an equivalent of Geller’s grammatical/metric unit.

27 The term constituent in O’Connor’s scheme is “each verb and nominal phrase, along with the particles dependent on it” (O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 68).
looks identical in both schemes, but Geller regards it as consisting of four feet (as the previous one), whereas O’Connor sees only three constituents. He considers the expression סוס ורכבו as one constituent. But, in accordance with O’Connor’s classification, the line consists of 4 units: 2 nouns and 2 verbs. Since both nouns in the expression have stressed syllables, we can correlate them with two feet. Thus there is not any principal difference for definition of the main structural units between these two approaches.

The main structural units and complexes (feet and colons) look similarly in the different models of Hebrew verse. The main disagreement is on the question of a line structure: in one case a colon coincides with a line, in another — a line consists of two colons. Geller sees Exod. 15:1 as a couplet of two lines, whereas O’Connor — as a triplet of three lines and Fokkelman — as a quadruplet of four lines. Almost all these models consider parallel relations between colons / lines in similar way with some differences which do not influence on fundamental understanding of the nature of Hebrew verse. For example, in accordance with S. Geller, the two colons-clauses of the first line is united by inner parallelism and divided with a caesura, while M. O’Connor considers these two clauses as independent lines / colons having parallel relationship, but their status in a poetical line these scholars regard differently.

The question of the status of these components of a line is very delicate, because the second construction (כי גאה גאה) may be considered as part of a double clause line: the first clause contains the appeal to praise the Lord, and the second describes the causal situation. The terseness of both clauses as well as their rhythmic and syntactic correlation allows us to regard them as components of the same poetical line. Second, the subordinate clause consists of the particle כי and the construction infinitive absolute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geller</th>
<th>O’Connor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אשים לבוהו ויראת נאה</td>
<td>אשים לבוהו כי אוה נאה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סוס ורכבו</td>
<td>סוס ורכבו ותמית</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Ibid., 179, 341.
29 Ibid., 68.
30 One of these verbs is in the form of infinitive absolute (גאה), which O’Connor considers as a “nominal constituent.” See ibid., 311.
31 Geller, Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry, 6 and 174.
32 On the one hand, S. Geller believes that a short line of 2 metric units (2 feet) isn’t inherent in Hebrew verse, and in that case such 2 short lines must be considered not as independent poetical lines, but as 2 colons united in one line. O’Connor ignores this approach and considers these 2 colons as independent clauses-lines. As we see, this discussion doesn’t touch main structural components and basic principles of parallelism of Hebrew verse. O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 328—329.
33 Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 640. M. O’Connor gives some examples of lines which include the particle conjunction כי in the middle of a line, considering them as double clause lines with three constituents (Ps. 106:1b; Ps. 78:35a, 39a) (O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 270—271, 278, 350—351).
Transformation of Poetical Lines in the Song at the Sea...

+ finite form of verb
d and may be regarded as the entire rhythmic-syntactic complex. Similar structures are used in the glorification formulae. Besides, this construction of the line shows parallelism with the last line of the verse, which in both Geller’s and O’Connor models looks equal:

וסר רכובין הה ים

(see below).

Inner parallelism between these two colons-clauses is evident: Yahweh (יהוה) is the object in the first colon, but He is meant as the subject in the second one (in the elliptic clause). Both predicates — the expression אшибה (‘I will sing’ — 1 sing. imperf., cohortative, common, qal) and the construction גאה אovah (‘[He] is highly exalted’ — infinitive absolute + 3 sing. perf., m. qal) — are semantically correlated, since they describe the greatness of Yahweh.

Interlinear parallelism between the verbs גאה גאה is obvious, too. The main verb of the first line in that case גאה (‘exalted’ — 3 sing. perf., m. qal) correlates with the verb גאה (‘hurled’ — 3 sing. perf., m. qal). The acts of Yahweh are described with two different verbs in the same form and the same syntactic function (predicates). The expression סוס ורכובו (‘the horse and its rider’) may be considered as hendiadys; that is, one semantic unit consisting of two nouns and designating the object of Yahweh’s triumph. It is quite acceptable to regard the phrase סוס ורכובו as syntagma, and it means that after the phrase we may expect a little pause within the line. It means that we can regard the phrase as a colon within the clause-line.

Summarizing the above, we can draw the conclusion that there are more or less similar opinions on the matter of the main principals of Hebrew verse structure in different schemes. Whatever scheme we would choose — the couplet or the triplet — the main components of the verse structure as well as their parallel correlation are obvious. Suggesting a generalized scheme, I prefer Geller’s model as reflecting the rhythmic structure in fuller measure:

אшибה ליהוה || מיראה הנאה
וסר רכובין | רמה ים

I will sing to Yahweh, for [He] is highly exalted.
The horse and his rider he has hurled into the sea.

The rhythmic and metrical structure of the first line is 2||2: :2||2; that is two colons and each of them contains two feet. The general syllabic symmetry is 5||5 (quantity of syllables in two colons which make the first line); the second line has a similar scheme: 2||2: :2||2 and a general symmetry of 3||4.

34 As it has been mentioned above, O’Connor considers infinitive absolute (גאה) as a “nominal constituent” in the structure of a poetical line (ibid., 311).
35 In the expressions which begin with exclamations and appeals. See Ps. 30:2: ולא שמחת איבי לי || א機會י משמחה יכדרך לי, and 52:11: ואכוה שמט כי ךוב נגד חסידיט || אודט לעלם כי עשית. See also Ps. 56:2; 58:11; 69:17.
36 In the Masoretic text tradition the disjunctive accent sign נפה is used here.
37 Syllables with reduced and very short vowels are not considered as metric units. See Emil Kautzch, ed., Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar (Clarendon Press, 1956), 54–56.
Taking into consideration the metric model that has been suggested by J. Kurilowicz, we admit that each clause (colon) has the main rhythmically highlighted word in the position of antithesis (*accentus domini*). In the first clause this stressed word is יְהֹוָה (‘Yahweh’), in second — the verb גָּאָה (‘[highly] exalted’). In the second line the stressed expressions are והרכב (‘and its rider’) and בֵּית (‘into the Sea’).

Main poetical constituents of the next passage (Exod. 15:2) look similarly in both Geller’s and O’Connor’s schemes:

\[

tוֹרָה
tyוֹדֵי יְשׁוּעַ
\]

ולאֱלֹהֵי אָבִי וּאֱלֹהֵי אָבִי

Yah[weh] is my strength and my song; He has become my salvation.
This [is] my God, and I will praise him,
My father’s God, and I will exalt him.

In accordance with his syntactic approach, O’Connor describes the first poetical line as the single verbless clause line of two constituents; the second as the single independent verbal clause line of three constituents; the third as the double clause line of three constituents; and the fourth as two constituent phrase-clause lines. But the number of units in each line is the same — three (number of nouns, verbs and the stressed expression לי). Geller considers each of these lines as a clause consisting of three stressed words (feet), two clause-lines make a parallel verse (3||3). The quantity of rhythmical and metrical units coincides.

Parallel structure here is obvious and unquestionable in the first pair: ישועה יְהֹוָה; both expressions describe Yahweh. In both clauses we find ellipses: in the first a verb-predicate is omitted, in the second — a subject-pronoun/noun. In each of these parallel lines the main rhythmical stresses (*domini*) fall upon the words יְהֹוָה (‘Yah[weh]’) and יְשׁוּעַ (‘salvation’) respectively, having an additional effect of parallelism: Yahweh || salvation.

Interlinear parallelism is obvious in the next pair too: זה אליו, אלוהי אבי, ואמריוהו. The second line strengthens the meaning of the first line: salvatory actions of Yahweh cover not only the contemporary author’s experience (‘my God’), but also the times of the ancestors (‘my father’s God’); therefore His acts are beyond the scope of a certain time or place. We can consider the phrases זה אליו and אלוהי אבי as verbless co-

---

40 The one-syllable expression לי, in accordance with the Masoretic accentuation, is marked out with the disjunctive accent sign צמח.
lon-clauses, since the following verbal expressions both begin with the particle conjunction י (‘and’), what implies their syntactic highlighting and short pauses before the verbs. The verbal constructions אֶלּוֹ (‘I will praise him’) and אִרְבָּמָה (‘I will exalt him’) are made in the same model: particle conjunction י + 1 sing. imperf. + objective suffix 3rd person masculine.

Common rhythmic/metric structure looks so:

1st line: 3 feet / 5 syllables (one colon);
2nd line: 3 feet / 6 syllables (one colon);
3rd line consists of 2 colons: 2 feet / 3 syllables (the first colon)
   1 foot / 3 syllables (the second colon)
4th line consists of 2 colons: 2 feet / 4 syllables (the first colon)
   1 foot / 4 syllables (the second colon)

It is noteworthy that in all considered above lines we find variation in usage of the same God’s names: יהוה and אלהים (with the pronominal suffix – אלהי) and (with the construct form – אלהים) – the two last are used in parallel lines. It testifies the use of refined poetical devices in the poem. Moreover, we may recognize something like homophones in the endings of the colons in the two last lines. These homophones are made with pairs of pronominal suffixes: -ו and -ו.

The first pronominal suffix has its consonance in the two previous lines: in the first line ‘הו, in the second – יהוהו. This sophisticated use of the phonological devices shows a rhythmically balanced design of the verse.

Accentus domini in two first lines falls on the words יהוה (‘Yahweh’) and ישוע (‘salvation’); and on the expressions יהוהי (‘my God’) and אבי (‘my father’) respectively in the first colons of third and fourth lines; on the pronominal suffix יהוה (‘him’) in the second colons of these two last lines. Such balanced distribution of the main rhythmic stresses testifies a high level of rhythmic structure of the verse.

On the assumption of the above we can outline the main features of Hebrew poetry which may be used for analysis of its transformation in the Targum Onkelos:

1. The lowest structural unit is a foot — a word hosting at least one stressed syllable. We use this rather metrical term to highlight its role in rhythmical structure of a line, but a foot is both rhythmic and syntactic unit that correlates with a unit and a constituent
in O’Connor’s classification. Also, according to S. Geller, the formula one grammatical unit = one metric unit is applicable to the metric analysis of Hebrew verse structure.

2. The next structural unit is a colon — a clause or syntagma that is aggregated around an intonational accent. A colon may be identical to a clause or a syntagma, but a line may coincide only with a clause. This distinction is based on the fact that only a clause is the rhythmic-syntactic complex, whereas a syntagma is a less rhythmically stressed element, which may function only within a clause. It is acceptable to consider a line both as equivalent to a colon-clause and as a combination of two or three colons, as some scholars do.

3. The basic principle of ancient Hebrew verse is a correlation of two lines/colons, in which parallelism is expressed at several levels (e.g., grammatical, syntactic, lexical and phonological). It is noteworthy to mention J. Kugel’s view that the nature of correlation should be described as intensification and progression rather than synonymy (‘A, what’s more B’), and that the second member of the bi-colon may be linked with its predecessor in “a hundred sorts.” The important component of Hebrew verse is the use of word pairs, which are “called into being” as parallel lines are framed.

4. Every colon (or line which consists of one colon only) may have one common intonational stress. I share J. Kurylowicz’s view that within each colon one can discern two types of word stress: the main (primary) (domini) and the secondary (servi). However, while this pattern is a basic one, it is not the only model in the metrics of biblical poetry, as it is not applicable to all cases.

Since the alteration of stressed and unstressed syllables and the length of vowels do not play an important role in the metrics of biblical poetry, we can parse a poetical line exclusively on the basis of the consonant text. It is necessary to keep in mind the fact that the ancient Hebrew verse possesses such characteristics of syntax as *parataxis*, the word order that

---

47 We consider *nominal lines* (including such their kinds as a phrase-clause and a phrase line) as dependent ones on verbal or verbless clauses. See O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 356.
49 D. Clines elaborates on Kugel’s idea claiming that it is a given in the poetic couplet that line A is affected by its proximity to line B, and line B by its proximity to line A: “The whole is different from the sum of its parts because the parts influence or contaminate each other.” See David J. A. Clines, “The Parallelism of Greater Precision: Notes from Isaiah 40 for a Theory of Hebrew Poetry,” in *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*, ed. by Elaine R. Follis (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987): 77–100.
51 See ft. 17.
Transformation of Poetical Lines in the Song at the Sea...

is less predictable than in prose, the placement of elements before the main verb in verbal sentences as well as ellipsis. Biblical poetry also possesses such inherent characteristic devices as word game, rhyme, assonance, alliteration, use of refrains, acrostic and so forth. All these features should be taken into account in the literary analysis of the Targums, despite of the fact that they are also common to other poetical traditions.

b) The Targumic transformation of the poetical structure

Beginning our comparison of the passages from the Song at the Sea with their translation in the Targum Onkelos, we attempt to divide the targumic text in compliance with the main poetical constituents of the Hebrew text. At first we regard the translation of first verse:

We will give praise and thanks to the Lord, for He is exalted over the proud ones; and it is His [true] exaltedness! The horses and their rider He has hurled into the Sea.

First of all, three striking features arrest our attention: a) alteration of 1st sing. imperf., cohortative into 1st plural imperf., cohortative; b) the emergence of additional words in the first and second lines; c) the appearance of a supplementary line in the verse structure. Other changes in the structure of poetical lines (such as increase in number of syllables and some modifications in syntax) are evident too. Our main task is to analyze the influence of the alterations upon the parallel structure of the verse.

We can’t say definitely that the substitution of the form of 1st sing. imperf., cohortative ‘(אשירה I will sing’) for 1st plural imperf. ‘(נשבח We will praise’) in all the Targums (including the Palestinian ones) was the result of a deliberate rhetorical alteration, but rather the consequence of a contextual exegesis made by the meturgemanim. The same element of the translator’s exegesis is in some ancient versions, such as the Septuagint (ᾔσωμεν – ‘We would sing’), the Vulgata (cantemus – ‘We will sing’) and

53 There are other orthographical variants for גותניא and גיותניא: גאותא and גיותא.
54 In another variant: רר.
55 Taking into account the fact of use of the abbreviation יי or וי for the unutterable divine name יהוה, we translate the abbreviation as ‘the Lord.’
the Peshittah (אשירה — ‘We will praise’). In the Samaritan Pentateuch the expression is transmitted in the form of 3rd plural imperative אשרו — ‘Call fortunate [Yahweh]!’ or ‘Call blessed [Yahweh]!’ It is noteworthy that almost all these translations (apart from LXX) were made on the base of the Proto-Masoretic text. The reading of the expression in plural form might have been caused by harmonization with the 1st line, where בני ישראל (‘the sons of Israel’) are mentioned as singing the Song. Besides, in the variant of the same poetical lines in v. 21 of the Masoretic text the form of 3rd plural imperative is used: שירו ליהוה כי גאה גאותא נзовא נsWith (‘sing to Yahweh, for [He] is highly exalted’). In any case, we do not have good causes to consider the alteration as a form of the meturgeman’s appeal to the audience to participate in the glorification of Yahweh.

The appearance of two words (in the hendiads construction נשבח ונודה instead of one (אשרו) cannot be explained with any exegetical aims, but only with the intention to strengthen a poetical expressivity. Probably, in accord with the meturgeman’s intention, the verbs כהה (‘to praise’) and וה (‘to thank’) were found more suitable for expressing the feeling of rapture than the verb שיר (‘to sing’).

Similar tendencies to broadening the poetical expressivity we find in the supplementary line, which is a part of delicate metamorphosis of the original verse: the colon אירה גאותא נגאותא דילה היא (‘for He is highly exalted’) is converted into two independent clauses-lines in the Targum Onkelos: אירא תנמא על גותניא || גאותא דילה היא || (‘for [He] is exalted over the proud ones || and it is His [true] exaltedness’). As it was mentioned above, the verb גאותא (‘to exalt’) used in the Masoretic text in the form of infinitive absolute + finite form (3 sing. perf., m. qal) to highlight the greatness of Yahweh’s triumph. In the Targum Onkelos the expression is reinterpreted poetically: the root גאותא is used here in a complicated homophone construction both as the verb (גא אתגאי על גותניא — ‘for [He] is exalted over the proud ones’) and as the nouns גאותא (pl., determined, גאותא — sing., fem., determined). Three-fold sounding the same root has an effect of homophone and strengthens phonetically the parallel correlation between these two clauses-lines: the third line emphasizes that it is true exaltedness (גאותא) of the Lord what is mentioned in the previous line — He is exalted over the proud ones (גותניא). So the Lord is opposed to “the proud ones” and to “the horses and their rider.”

So we have an example of emulation of the Hebrew poetical parallelism: the supplementary poetical line (which is absent in the original text) is designed as parallel one to the previous line. We can describe the interlinear parallelism between these four lines as follow:

The rhythmic/metric structure of the passage looks as follow:

56 See Mal. 4:12 as an example of the use of the verb אשר in similar meaning. It is quite possible that the final ה was read by some scribes as ה.

57 It is impossible to consider this change as a result of misunderstanding of the original Hebrew text by the translator, but only as a poetical transformation. In some cases the construction infinitive absolute + finite form is translated in the Targum Onkelos literally (see, for example, Gen. 2:17; Num. 15:35; Deut. 6:17 and 21:14). In some cases this construction is changed under the influence of the exegetical tradition (Exod. 34:7).
Transformation of Poetical Lines in the Song at the Sea...

1st line: 4 feet / 7 syllables (one colon);
2nd line: 3 feet / 8 syllables (one colon);
3rd line: 3 feet / 6 syllables (one colon);
4th line consists of 2 colons: 2 feet / 4 syllables (the first colon);
2 feet / 3 syllables (the second colon).

It should be noted that the number of lines and colons in the targumic translation has grown in comparison with the biblical original: 4 lines instead of 2, and 5 colons instead of 4. In addition, the number of syllables in the first two colons of the Hebrew text increased from 5 to 7–8–6 in the corresponding lines in the Targum Onkelos. Such rhythmic/metric transformation is inherent almost in all cases of non-literal translation of biblical poetry.

The Accentus domini falls on the same words when the lines are translated literally (יִהוָה, רָמָה, יָם in the Hebrew text) and on the semantically relative words in the paraphrased lines (גוֹיָה, היא as substitution of נָאָה, הָיָה as relating to). This fact testifies very careful imitation of the original rhythmic structure of the verse.

It is noteworthy that the meturgemanim tried to imitate the original syntactic structure in the literal translation: verbless clauses, as a rule, were translated as verbless ones, verbal clauses — as verbal ones; similarly subordinate clauses were rendered as such ones.

The next passage shows the same tendency in the targumic translation of biblical poetry.

תקפים והשבחתך דחילה
והאמר שמור הוה ולפרך
יד אלוהי ואבורי למדרשא
אלוהי דאמחתי ואפלת כדומתי

My power and my praise [is] the awful Lord!
And [He] said His Word,
And [He] became my salvation!
This [is] my God, and I will build Him the Temple;
The God of my fathers, and I will worship Him.

58 Notable is the fact that the second line of the Song at the Sea was translated literally, and therefore its metric structure remained almost unchanging (with the exception of adding postpositive article ā in the word; in the in the expression the syllabic balance remains the same in spite of adding the postpositive article).
59 Pay attention to the particle conjunction in the Targum as an equivalent of the Hebrew particle כ.
60 Other orthographical variants for and are תקפים and תשמחתך תקפים.
61 Another orthographical variant isپֶרֶךְ.
62 In another variant the definite article is omitted: מָדְשָּׁה.
63 The pronominal suffix may be translated in singular: “the God of my father.”
In comparison with the biblical original, the number of lines and colons increases in the Aramaic translation: instead of four lines emerge five, and six colons turns into seven. The additional elements in this passage are: the epithet 'דחילא ('awful') emerges in the first line; the phrases ‘I will enshrine Him’ (ואנוהו) and ‘I will exalt Him’ (וארממנהו) are rendered in the context of the theological concepts of the Second Temple period — ‘I will build Him the Temple’ (ואבני לה מקדשא) and ‘I will worship Him’ (ואפלח קדמוהי); the supplemental line (‘And He said His Word’) is smoothly fitted into the parallel structure as an imitation of the biblical pattern ויאמר יהוה... נשʉ עון... עליך. The interlinear parallelism between three first lines is: והוה || יי ; ואמר || פרק, and between the two next lines: אלהי || ואבני; אלהא דאבהתי; אלה; ואפלח קדמוהי. This parallel relationship is modeled as imitation of the Hebrew original.

The syntactical form of the lines coincides with the original too: the *verbless clauses* are translated as *verbless ones* (the line תכף והבשחת יי; ואנוהו andcolsות), the *verbal clauses* — as *verbal ones* (the line ואבני לה מקדשא andcolsות). The additional line (ואמר בستمرارIan) is built as a verbal clause, too.

The rhythmic/metric structure of the passage looks as follow:

1\(^{st}\) line: 4 feet / 8 syllables (one colon);
2\(^{nd}\) line: 2 feet / 4 syllables (one colon);
3\(^{rd}\) line: 3 feet / 5 syllables (one colon);
4\(^{th}\) line consists of 2 colon: 2 feet / 3 syllables (the first colon);
3 feet / 5 syllables (the second colon);
5\(^{th}\) line consists of 2 colons: 2 feet / 6 syllables (the first colon);
2 feet / 5 syllables (the second colon).

In comparison with the original poetical lines, the targumic verses have more stressed units (feet) and a greater number of syllables: the first line in the original text has three feet, but in the Targum Onkelos becomes four-feet line (because of appearance the additional word דחילא); the supplementary line of two feet emerges between the first and second lines of the Hebrew original. The literally translated second line (the third line in the Targum) saves the same number of feet (three). In the translation of the third and the fourth original lines, (the fourth and the fifth lines of the translation) the number of stressed units increases from three in each line to five and four, respectively. The number of syllables increases in those lines, which have additional words: the first five-syllables line becomes eight-syllables, the third six-syllables line becomes eight-syllables lines, the fourth eight-syllables turns into eleven-syllables. But the second line, which is translated literally, has very little changes: the six-syllables line has in the targumic translation five syllables.

---

64 Probably, the alteration in the fourth line of the passage is connected with similar sounding of the expressions ותשבחתי and ותכלת

65 Compare with Gen. 1:3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27; Ps. 33:6, 9.
As in the previous passage, the *accentus domini* falls here on the same words (i.e. the Aramaic equivalents of the Hebrew words) in the literally translated lines: יִי; מַרְבּוּ, מַרְבּוּ; יִתֵּבֹן, מַרְבּוּ. Only in the case of non-literal translation does the main rhythmic stress fall on the definite noun מקדשא (*the temple*), but the word is connected with the worship semantically.

The main changes in rhythmic structure of poetical lines in the Targum Onkelos are connected mainly with additional words that are inserted into the poetical text. In some cases, these alterations are caused by differences between Hebrew and Aramaic grammatical forms, but such instances are rare. It should be noted that the process of addition happens *in a balanced manner*: to each line may be added *no more than one or two words*. If to retrace the number of additional words in each poetical line, it will be obvious that this regulation works in each case in the Song at the Sea. It is noteworthy that inserted elements appear *not in all* lines of the targumic translation of the Song at the Sea; therefore we should consider the main models of such alterations.

c) The main paradigms of structural alterations of poetical lines in the Targum Onkelos

The main structural modifications of Hebrew verse in the Targum Onkelos (such as emergence of additional words and supplementary lines) are caused by different factors: the use of alternative syntactic constructions, the insertion of short exegetical explanations, and poetical paraphrase. However, in all cases of the structural alterations the author(s) of the Targum tried to follow the principle of emulation of biblical poetry; therefore, there are not any essential deviations from the main principles of Hebrew poetry. We demonstrate these alterations using the material from the rest of the poetical text (vv. 3–18, 21).

*Alternative syntactic constructions.* In some cases the emergence of additional elements in the targumic translation is caused by the rearrangement of a clause or with the use of alternative types of syntactic construction within the clause. There are some examples of such kinds of alteration:

- The verb clause with *qtl-conjugation* is replaced with the verb clause with the periphrastic construction הוה + participle (in the meaning of pluperfect progressive tense): האר אמד ממה (‘the enemy said’) becomes דהוה אמר סנאה (‘the enemy had been saying’) in verse 9.
- The noun ישבי (construct form from ישב – ‘inhabitants’) is rendered by the periphrastic construction with the verb הוה: דהוו יתבין (‘who were living’ or ‘who were inhabitants’) in verses 14 and 15.
- The verbs with objective pronominal suffixes are replaced with the constructions which include verbs and combination of prepositions with pronominal suffixes: the phrase יכסימו (*depths* covered them’) is translated as חפו עליהון (*depths* closed over them’) in v. 5, compare with v. 10; the expression תמלאמה (*depths* filled them’) in v. 18.
(‘[my soul] will be filled with them’) is changed by (‘[my soul] will be satisfied with them’) in v. 9.

In these cases the supplementary elements add one more metrical unit to the poetical line, but the rhythmic balance does not undergo essential changes. We allow that such changes were done not only with a desire of the meturgemanim to use more natural syntax for Aramaic-speaking listeners, but also with a tendency to add a poetical expressiveness to the translation. We can retrace the similar tendency in the use of some exegetical elements, which smoothly interweaved with the poetical text.

**Exegetical insertions.** In some cases exegetical insertions cause the emergence of one or two additional words, but in other cases they replace the original expressions with the phrases that consist of the same number of words and modeled on similar syntactic constructions.

- The phrase (‘you threw down those who opposed you’) is rendered as (‘you smashed those who opposed your people’) in v. 7. In that case instead of the objective pronominal suffix – (‘against you’) the expression (‘against your people’) is used.\(^{66}\) And the phrase (‘the place you made for your dwelling’) in v. 17 becomes (‘the place you made for the House of your Shekhina’).

- In v. 16 two geographical names (ארנון and ירדנא) appear in the translation of the parallel structure: עד דייעבר עמט יוי ית ארנןו עד דייעבר עמא דנן די פרקתה ית ירדנא (‘While your people crosses over, o Lord, the Arnon || while the people, which You redeemed, crosses over the Jordan’). Although the author of the translation attempted to imitate the original parallelism, the metric structure of each line turned out to be cumbersome enough: 4 feet / 10 syllables || 5 feet / 12 syllables.\(^{67}\)

- But in v. 8 the replacement is made in a different way: the expression of two words (‘by the blast of your nostrils’) is substituted for the similar expression (‘by the word of your mouth’), which is closely connected with the later conception of the God’s Word (מימרא).\(^{68}\) In this case the Aramaic expression is modeled on the same syntactic pattern using the other words only.\(^{69}\) Similarly in v. 16 the expression (‘your arm’) is substituted with (‘your strength’).\(^{70}\)

---

\(^{66}\) Compare with the discussed above case in v. 2 (ואבני לה מקדשא).

\(^{67}\) It is impossible to divide this passage into smaller lines because of their syntactic coherence.


\(^{69}\) Moreover, this targumic expression imitates the biblical poetical pattern, similar to the considered above lines (והוה לי לפריק || ואמר במימרה (v. 2).

\(^{70}\) Another orthographical variant — תוקפט.
Poetical paraphrases and additional lines. In some verses of the targumic translation we find paraphrased poetical lines. In these lines the original content is changed (or rather it is broadened), but the main syntactic constructions are preserved in spite of adding supplementary lines. We have already considered the similar fact in v. 1 (the appearance of two lines instead of the colon-clause). We can consider two types of such alterations: with changes within a line; and a paraphrase that occasions an appearance of two or more lines.

• The first type of a paraphrased line is represented in v. 3: the verbless clause יוהו איש מלחמה ('Yahweh is a warrior,' literally: ‘Yahweh is a man of war’) in the Targum is rendered as the broadened verbless clause: יוהו מרי נצחון קרביא ('Lord is a holder of triumph in the battles').

• The second type we find in v. 18, where a supplementary line emerges. Instead of the biblical verse יוהו ימלט לעלם ועד ('Yahweh will reign for ever and ever') there are two lines: ולעלמי עלמיא ('Lord, his kingdom stands forever') יוהו מלכותה קאם לעלם ('Lord, his kingdom stands forever || and unto ages and ages').

Conclusions

Summarizing the results of the research, it is necessary to observe the main distinctive features of rendering the poetical lines of the Song at the Sea in the Targum Onkelos. As it has been mentioned above, the most significant alterations, which were made in the targumic translation of the Song at the Sea, include: adding the new words and lines (which are absent in the Hebrew original, but appear in the Targum) and poetical paraphrases of some lines. The first category of the alterations resulted in increasing number of stressed units (feet) and changes in the structure of parallel lines; the second category in non-literal translation of the original text. How do these alterations change the structure of the original verse? What conclusion can we draw about the influence of the liturgical context of performance of the Aramaic translations?

1. The supplementary elements are added in a balanced manner. As a rule, the number of additional stressed units in the line does not exceed one or two. This approach enabled the meturgemanim to avoid a significant imbalance in the rhythm, since such difference in the number of feet between two lines was not crucial. We can find different ways to preserve the rhythmic balance in the targumic translation: when an additional word emerges in the first line, another word appears in the second line respectively. There are some examples when two parallel colons transformed into two parallel lines after adding the supplementary elements to them. It is obvious that the meturgemanim tried to imitate the rhythmic structure of the original in their translation of the Hebrew poetry.

2. In some cases, the appearance of the additional words cannot be explained with exegetical reasons but only with the desire of the meturgeman to add poetical ex-

---

71 The second line may be considered as the nominal line which is dependent on the verbal clause (the first line).
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pressiveness to the translation of the Song at the Sea. For the similar reason, some lines underwent poetical paraphrasing. We can consider these kinds of alterations as rhetorically occasioned: the translator(s) wanted to make the poetical text more impressive for the audience.

3. The supplementary lines, as a rule, do not break the parallel structure of the Hebrew verse. They are fitted smoothly into the parallel verse structure of the original poem, and the original syntax is imitated. Sometimes, the supplementary lines reproduce different patterns of biblical parallelism adapting them to the text of the translation. Almost in all cases the parallel structure of the Hebrew verse is reproduced in the Targum Onkelos. This principle is also reflected in the arrangement of the accentus domini in the Aramaic rendering: it falls on the same words in the cases of literal translation and on the semantically correlated words in the supplementary lines and the paraphrases. The meturgemanim made their translation with subtlety.

This approach may be considered as a principal one for the verse structure in the Palestinian Targums, too, since the emulation to the Hebrew parallel verse and its rhythmic structure is an integral part of the technique of the poetical translation in this group of the Targums, too. However, the translation of Hebrew poetry in the Palestinian Targums is more complicated: the carefully rendered original poetical structures combine with such significant alterations as inserting the rhythmic prose, poetical, and quasi-poetical passages into the translated text. For this reason, special research should be done on the translational technique in the Palestinian Targums. The represented above conclusions about the poetical transformation in the Targum Onkelos may serve as the basic (but not exhaustive) methodology for further research.
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