(Forthcoming in *Vetus Testamentum*)

Is Rewriting Translation?
Chronicles and Jubilees in Light of Intralingual Translation

John Screnock
University of Oxford

Abstract
This study considers the process of rewriting under a lens provided by the field of Translation Studies. One subset of translation, called "intralingual translation," is translation within the same language. This concept provides a new paradigm in which to analyze "rewritten" texts, such as Chronicles and Jubilees. These texts contain changes that can be categorized within the paradigm of intralingual translation, showing that translation overlaps with rewriting and shedding significant light on the latter.

Keywords
Rewriting, rewritten texts, Chronicles, Jubilees, translation, intralingual translation

Introduction

In this study, I consider the process of rewriting under a lens provided by the field of Translation Studies. One subset of translation, called "intralingual translation," is translation within the same language of the source text. This notion of intralingual translation seems particularly apt to describe some of the phenomena we observe in so-called "rewritten" texts. After briefly introducing this type of translation, I will present evidence from two "rewritten" texts—Chronicles and Jubilees—that fits the framework of intralingual translation particularly well. I will argue that translation overlaps with rewriting and sheds significant light on rewriting.

A series of observations and questions has led me to the present investigation. The Dead Sea Scrolls revealed that linguistic changes account for much variation in manuscripts. How are these linguistic changes any different from the linguistic transformation that occurs when Hebrew is rendered into Greek in the Septuagint (hereafter the Old Greek)? After all, there are intralingual translations that only involve transfer within the same language, such as translations of Shakespeare into modern English (see figure 2 for an example). In the field of Translation Studies, these are referred to as "intralingual translation." If intralingual translation is translation in the full sense, as many argue, there would seem to be important implications for several fields, including textual criticism, where versions like the Old Greek are treated differently because they are translations. Translation, however, involves

elements of change beyond mere linguistic updates: additions, omissions, and restructuring of content typify intralingual translation. Intralingual translation, then, appears to be a sort of alter ego to the process of rewriting, much of which involves taking a source text and restating it in the same language. Such observations provoke the question of whether the process of rewriting can be described in terms of intralingual translation. Is rewriting a kind of ancient intralingual translation?

1. Intralingual Translation

The concept of intralingual translation has been used since the inception of Translation Studies. In 1959, Roman Jakobson identified intralingual translation as one of three types of translation, alongside interlingual and intersemiotic translation.[1] Interlingual translation "is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language."[2] Intersemiotic translation "is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems,"[3] occurring when the meaning of a verbal text is communicated by something like "music, dance, cinema, or painting."[4] Finally, intralingual translation "is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language," sometimes called "rewording" or "paraphrasing."[5] Examples of intralingual translation include "expert-to-layman communication,"[6] "précis-writing,"[7] "liturgical texts in modern (as opposed to genuine or fake Tudor) English,"[8] the rewriting of classic texts in the classroom in order to prove comprehension,[9] and Bible translations based on previous translations in the same language.[10] The sole distinction between interlingual and intralingual translation is whether the transfer of meaning occurs between two distinct languages or within the same language. George Steiner and Karen Zethsen note that both types of translation utilize the same tools to overcome the same obstacles.[11] This "family resemblance"[12] suggests to Steiner and Zethsen that the difference between intralingual and interlingual translation is a matter of "degree, not kind."[13] My analysis of features in Chronicles and Jubilees will demonstrate their affinities to intralingual translation.

My work draws primarily on the studies of Karen Zethsen, making modifications

1 Roman Jakobson, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," in *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd edition; ed. Lawrence Venuti; London: Routledge, 2004), first published in 1959.
2 Ibid., 139.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., 143.
5 Ibid., 139.
6 Karen Korning Zethsen, "Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description," *Meta: Translators' Journal* 54/4 (2009), 795.
7 Ibid., 796.
8 John Denton, "Waterlogged Somewhere in Mid-Atlantic: Why American Readers Need Intralingual Translation but Don't Often Get It," *Traduction Terminologie Rédaction* 20/2 (2007), 245.
9 Ibid.
10 This is the primary form of intralingual translation discussed in Zethsen, "Intralingual"; cf. Denton, "Waterlogged," 245.
11 George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), see esp. 28, 261, 416; Zethsen, "Intralingual," 796-798, 807-809.
12 Zethsen, "Intralingual," 808.
13 Ibid., 795.

necessary for dealing with translations and texts beyond her corpus, which consists of Danish translations of the Bible. Intralingual translation involves several types of change made to the source text. The two primary types of change that are made deal either with the *content* or the *linguistic aspects* of the source text.[14] The content changes are *addition*, *restructuring*, and *omission*. The linguistic changes are primarily lexical and syntactic, though morphological and orthographic changes can also occur.

Figure 1 – Types of Change in Intralingual Translation

Content Changes	Linguistic Changes
Additions[15]	Lexical[18]
Restructuring[16]	Syntactic[19]
Omission[17]	

These changes are fairly self-explanatory based on the terms themselves; however, I would make the following points of clarification. Restructuring refers to cases where the order of the source text is changed, not for linguistic reasons (this would fall under syntactic change), but to provide a better (in the translator's opinion) organization or flow to the text. Lexical change, or substitution of "synonymous expressions," can involve individual lexemes or phrases.[20] Within Zethsen's corpus, all of the lexical changes involve "absolute synonyms" from different points in the language's history, spanning a diachronic gap between two stages of a language. We could, however, imagine cases where the synonym used does *not* have exact semantic overlap but is still adequate.[21] Moreover, other types of intralingual translation, such as expert-to-layman communication, would not involve the spanning of a diachronic gap but a (synchronic) register gap.[22] Finally, although the syntactic changes in Zethsen's corpus

14 The distinction between "linguistic" and "content" changes is my own.

15 See Zethsen, "Intralingual," 802. Zethsen further divides additions into "explanations" and "explications," and "objective" versus "subjective" addition (it is unclear whether these two binary pairs correlate). The purpose of objective additions includes "to enhance... understanding of the text"; the purpose of subjective additions includes "to make [the text] come more alive" or to "vent the translator's own views." Although in a perfect world we would be able to tell which additions are objective and which are subjective, Zethsen's distinction between the two would probably be difficult to apply in every situation. Essentially, here we have any sort of addition to the text that, in the translator's view (whether that view is correct or not, i.e., objective or not, does not matter) will help the audience to understand the text better. Thus, I do not use this subdivision.

16 See Zethsen, "Intralingual," 803, for a description; the term "restructuring" is used on 808.

17 Ibid., 803. For Zethsen, one of the purposes of content omissions is to make the text simpler to the audience, by eliminating details that would be confusing to audience-members with less "background knowledge" and lower "ability of comprehension."

18 Ibid., 803-804.

19 Ibid., 804-805. Both lexical and syntactical changes have the purpose of providing "everyday language instead of formal or archaic language" ("Intralingual," 805). In other words, these linguistic changes transfer meaning from different registers (such as formal and non-formal) and different diachronic stages (such as archaic or non-archaic) in a language.

20 Ibid., 803-804, quotation from p. 803.

21 Cf. ibid., 797.

22 For example, when your doctor explains what is wrong in words that *you* can understand.

are aimed at spanning a diachronic gap,[23] synchronic syntactic changes are also possible.

All these types of change can be illustrated in an example intralingual translation, given in figure 2 below.[24]

Figure 2 – SparksNotes "No Fear Shakespeare"

Romeo and Juliet[25]

Original Text	Modern Translation
O Romeo, Romeo! Wherefore art thou Romeo? Deny thy father and refuse thy name. Or, if thou wilt not, be but sworn my love, And I'll no longer be a Capulet.	Oh, Romeo, Romeo, why do you have to be Romeo? Forget about your father and change your name. Or else, if you won't change your name, just swear you love me and I'll stop being a Capulet.

Hamlet[26]

Original Text	Modern Translation
To be, or not to be? That is the question — Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, Or to take arms against a sea of troubles, And, by opposing, end them? … To die, to sleep. To sleep, perchance to dream—ay, there's the rub,	The question is: is it better to be alive or dead? Is it nobler to put up with all the nasty things that luck throws your way, or to fight against all those troubles by simply putting an end to them once and for all? … To die, to sleep—to sleep, maybe to dream. Ah, but there's the catch:

In this intralingual translation, we see additions: for example, in Romeo and Juliet, "if thou wilt not" is glossed by the longer "if you won't change your name" ("your name" is added). We also find restructuring: Hamlet's "To be, or not to be? That is the question" becomes "The question is: is it better to be alive or dead?" (the question and the statement being reversed in order). As for omission, a few lines later the phrase "by opposing" finds no counterpart.[27] Lexical changes abound: for example, "deny" becomes "forget about," "fortune" becomes "luck," and "take arms" becomes "fight."

23 Syntactic changes "[make] the text more contemporary" by creating "more modern and less stilted" syntax (Zethsen, "Intralingual," 804).

24 For further examples of intralingual translation, see Basil Hatim and Jeremy Munday, *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book* (London: Routledge, 2004), 4-5, on the North American Version of Harry Potter.

25 Crowther, John, ed., "No Fear Romeo and Juliet" (SparkNotes LLC, 2005), accessed March 24, 2014, http://nfs.sparknotes.com/romeojuliet/.

26 Crowther, John, ed., "No Fear Hamlet" (SparkNotes LLC, 2005), accessed March 24, 2014, http://nfs.sparknotes.com/hamlet/.

27 Note here that most of the other elements do have counterparts, notwithstanding the freeness of the translation.

Syntactical modifications include the changes from "wherefore art thou Romeo" to "why do you have to be Romeo," and from "be but sworn my love" to "just swear you love me." We also see some morphological change in these passages, for example, "wilt not" to "won't."

Zethsen also identifies several "factors" or "parameters" involved in intralingual translation; these are essentially *motivations* for change.[28] Often, the motivation stems from a gap between the source text and the presumed audience of the target text.[29] Gaps in knowledge, time, and culture create the need for changes in the target text. For Zethsen, *knowledge* is "the target group's general ability to understand a text."[30] If the source text would be less understandable to the target audience because of a lack of knowledge, the intralingual translation would make certain changes to account for this.[31] Gaps in *time* refer specifically to cases where a "diachronic factor... results in the lack of knowledge or cultural understanding."[32] Gaps in *culture* involve a difference between the audience's culture and that of the source text. Such a gap creates a "need to explain cultural references in a text which time or general background knowledge prevent the target group from understanding."[33]

As Zethsen herself notes, there is significant overlap between these gaps.[34] Differences in culture and distance in time both result in a lack of knowledge, and a time gap often entails a cultural gap. The concept of "knowledge" is very general and can serve as a catch-all for several different motivational factors. Based on the work of other scholars in Translation Studies, as well as my own observations from working with translations, I reorganize Zethsen's typology significantly at this point and add several additional categories.

There are four types of motivation involving the target audience's lack or potential lack of requisite knowledge for understanding the text. These include gaps between the audience and text in *culture* and in *time*, as in Zethsen's typology; though conceptually these two motivations are distinct, they often appear in tandem, with the gap in culture caused by a gap in time. In our example translation (figure 2 above), changes motivated by a gap in time—resulting in a gap in culture—include the alteration of the idioms "refuse thy name" and "take arms," and the removal of

28 Zethsen, "Intralingual," 805.

29 Note my use of the term "audience" to include translations in both written and spoken contexts; Zethsen, perhaps because of her corpus, refers to "readers" throughout.

30 Zethsen, "Intralingual," 806.

31 We should also note that, theoretically, a change could occur because the audience has *more* knowledge; for example, if a scholar took an academic talk aimed at a general audience and turned it into a paper presentation aimed at specialists, more technical terminology would be used.

32 Zethsen, "Intralingual," 806.

33 Ibid., 807. Zethsen includes a fourth "factor," *space*, referring to extending or reducing the text because of a lack of knowledge (in other words, additions and omissions of confusing material). This category is somewhat out of place in Zethsen's typology: it does not refer to a reason or motivation for change, but rather a macro-category of types of change including addition and omission. If by "space" Zethsen meant the restrictions of the physical page on which the intralingual translation is written, such that additions or omissions are possible or necessary (e.g., as in a children's picture Bible), then "space" would be on the same plane as the other factors; this is not, however, what Zethsen means by "space."

34 Ibid., 806.

reference to "slings and arrows." The audience, though able to process the separate linguistic elements of these expressions, may not know what they refer to as a whole because they do not belong to the same time and culture of the source text. Two further categories dealing with the audience's knowledge are *logic* and *ambiguity*; if the translator considers the text to contain difficult logic or ambiguity that creates the possibility of misunderstanding, he or she may modify the text to remedy the perceived problem. Changes made because of the latter motivation are often referred to as "explication." There are no cases of these two motivations in our example translation above.

Three motivations for change stem from factors other than the audience's knowledge. The presumed audience's *linguistic competence* often prompts changes. Linguistic competence is not about the content of the audience's knowledge but the audience's innate ability to decode an utterance.[35] Most of the changes noted above are motivated by issues of linguistic competence. A desire for greater *readability*[36] in the text elicits change in places where the text is not incomprehensible but still can be made more accessible.[37] Readability motivates the restructuring of "to be or not to be? That is the question"; the restructuring makes the text more easily processed and understood. Finally, one set of motivations deals not with an absence of knowledge or ability, but with different perceptions of *norms*. These are not illustrated in our examples but found in other intralingual translations, and involve cases where the target audience has differing social, cultural, or religious norms than the source text's audience.[38] Some elements of the source may be changed to reflect stricter norms, or perhaps because of laxer norms some elements could be changed in order to be more communicative.[39]

In summary, intralingual translation is the transfer of meaning from a source text to a target text, utilizing content and linguistic changes, and motivated by the

35 By the "content of the audience's knowledge" I mean, in the terms used in analytic philosophy and epistemology, the *intentional* knowledge of members of the audience, whether *occurrent* or not. Though some might refer to linguistic competence as a kind of knowledge, it is not usually *intentional* knowledge; that is, it does not have some sort of propositional content (unless one is a linguist and constantly analyzes the grammar of the language one hears). I suspect Zethsen would include this motivation under the *time* gap (cf. 808), but different linguistic competencies can exist for reasons other than time; moreover, linguistic competence is qualitatively different from Zethsen's three gaps in that it deals with something that is typically not consciously accessed by the audience (i.e., it is not conscious knowledge).

36 I mean for the broad concept of "readability" to apply to both written *and* oral contexts.

37 Cf. Zethsen, "Intralingual," 803, on "ability of comprehension."

38 Consider, for example, the theological and/or social considerations behind updates to the RSV found in the NRSV (e.g., gendered language) and ESV (e.g., certain theological concepts) versions of the Bible, or a highly theologized retelling of a biblical story by a minister in a confessional context.

39 Rachel Weissbrod's analysis of translation (including intralingual) takes note of these motivations; Rachel Weissbrod, "From Translation to Transfer," *Across Languages and Cultures* 5/1 (2004), 24 and 41 (notes 4 and 6). See also the similar description of translation norms in Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2012), 61-77; Daniel Simeoni, "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus," Target 10/1 (1998); and Tejaswini Niranjana, *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the Colonial Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 1-46, esp. 21.

audience's lack or potential lack of knowledge, their linguistic competence, the text's readability, and the norms of the target community.

As stated above, scholars have noted the similarity of intralingual translation to interlingual translation. Steiner remarks that, "The fundamental epistemological and linguistic problems implicit in interlingual translation are already implicit in all intralingual discourse."[40] Both address the same problems and barriers using the same tools.[41] Further, both intralingual and interlingual translation involve the same "mechanism of transfer" between source and target.[42] This is an important point, and one that I would press even further. According to generative linguists there are no clear linguistic criteria for specifying what makes a language *a language*.[43] We could identify linguistic differences between two particular languages, but we could also identify similar linguistic differences between two dialects of the same language.[44] For the same reason, the distinction between intralingual translation and interlingual translation is, at least linguistically speaking, nonexistent. For Trevor Pateman, the distinction between languages is a social phenomenon;[45] thus, an interlingual translation bridges two sociologically established modes of human language, while intralingual translation occurs within what is perceived to be one language. While most specific cases of intralingual translation will involve less transfer than specific cases of interlingual translation, there are exceptions to that norm.[46]

The point of this discussion is that "intralingual translation" is, linguistically

40 Steiner, *After Babel*, 416.

41 Ibid., 28; Zethsen, "Intralingual," 809. Note that translation technique in both intralingual and interlingual translation can be described along the same cline of source oriented versus target oriented.

42 Zethsen, "Intralingual," 796; cf. this statement of Steiner's, summarizing the essential points:

> The schematic model of translation is one in which a message from a source-language passes into a receptor-language via a transformational process. The barrier is the obvious fact that one language differs from the other, that an interpretive transfer... must occur so that the message 'gets through'. Exactly the same model... is operative within a single language. (*After Babel*, 28)

43 Trevor Pateman, "What is a Language?," *Language & Communication* 3/2 (1983): 101-127; Mark Hale, *Historical Linguistics: Theory and Method* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 3-17. Both defend and expand on positions of Noam Chomsky. Pateman critiques various attempts to define what makes a language a language, finding a purely sociological explanation the only feasible choice. For Hale, the only type of language that is fully consistent and cannot be subdivided further is the internal language or grammar of each person ("I-Language"): a community or group's 'language' is "at best a derivative notion, deducible from a sufficiently rich understanding of the relevant set of I-Languages" *(Historical Linguistics*, 10*)*. Note that Pateman and Hale are necessarily using "language" to refer to two different things—a group's shared external grammar, sociologically defined as *one* language (Pateman), and an individual's internal grammar (Hale). The reason for the difference is not disagreement, but different contexts of discussion.

44 Hale, *Historical Linguistics*, 7.

45 See Pateman, "What is a Language?," 102, and throughout; cf. Hale, *Historical Linguistics*, 7.

46 Consider, for example, intralingual and interlingual versions of the Lord's Prayer:

Intralingual

Old English:	Fæder ūre	þū þe eart on heofonum
Modern English:	Our father, who	is in heaven

Interlingual

French:	Notre Père qui es aux cieux	(Nouvelle Edition de Genève)
Italian:	Padre nostro che sei nei cieli	(Nuova Riveduta)
Latin:	Pater noster qui in caelis es	(Vulgate)

speaking, just translation. Thus, when intralingual translation in Chronicles and Jubilees is identified later in this study, it is translation in general—at least linguistically and textually speaking. Though I will use Zethsen's model of intralingual translation to analyze Chronicles and Jubilees, I will therefore not distinguish conceptually between interlingual and intralingual translation in my conclusions. The features of intralingual illuminate the affinity of rewriting to translation.

2. Rewriting as Translation in Chronicles and Jubilees

Having defined and described intralingual translation and its relationship to translation in general, we can now assess rewriting as a form of translation, without finding correlations at every point. My focus falls on the method and questions we use when approaching the texts, not the specific conclusions we make about the content of the texts. While the *types of change* involved in intralingual translation map easily onto the data from these texts, the *motivations* involved in translation are not always as fitting. They are, however, viable options that should be considered.[47] Whether or not the purpose for change in each particular instance actually stems from the motivations of translation, their applicability is suggestive and illustrates the usefulness of considering these texts in light of translation.

The pair of terms "rewritten" and "rewriting" have been debated at length, with very little consensus emerging.[48] Despite this lack of clarity regarding *what* these terms refer to, the concept of "rewriting" remains important for discussing textual formation. Although an exact definition of rewriting is elusive, for the sake of the present study I will offer a working definition: the essential idea of rewriting involves the use of a base text that is changed in various ways (additions, rearrangements, and omissions), resulting in a text that varies, whether slightly or significantly, from the base text.[49] Importantly, "rewriting" cannot refer to the entire process of creating a

47 Because the notion of translation provides a new perspective for thinking about these texts, the types of explanations of the text derived from it are seldom found in the secondary literature; as such, my explorations of possible motivations derived from translation find little support in the secondary literature.

48 See the helpful reviews of scholarship on "rewritten" texts in Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?," *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196, and Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); see also Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2007); Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011); and Parts 1-2 of József Zsengellér, ed., *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (JSJS 166; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

49 This seems to be the notion of rewriting first proposed by Geza Vermes (see Crawford, *Rewriting*, 2-3); it overlaps in basic ways with the definitions of Emanuel Tov ("Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [eds. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994], 113), Bernstein ("Rewritten Bible," 195), Crawford (*Rewriting*, 13), and Zahn (*Rethinking*, 12, 17-18).

"rewritten" text;[50] rather, rewriting is about the general techniques employed whereby a base text is changed in one particular instance. The general idea of "rewriting" overlaps considerably with intralingual translation, though some elements are clearly not shared, and others are debatable depending on one's notion of translation.[51]

Because Chronicles and Jubilees are recognized as rewritten texts, they provide a good base for measuring the explanatory power of intralingual translation.[52] It should be kept in mind, however, that rewriting is not the sole means by which *all* the parts of each text were created. In the case of Chronicles, for example, Ralph W. Klein cautiously asserts that rewriting "seems somewhat appropriate for what the Chronicler did with the history of the united monarchy and the history of the kings of Judah (1 Chronicles 10—2 Chronicles 36)," although portions within those sections do not fit well at all with rewriting—for example, 1 Chr 10:14 corresponds to all of 1 Samuel 16—2 Samuel 5.[53] Moreover, a good amount of Chronicles, namely chapters 1-9, does not stem from Samuel-Kings, and as such "does not fit well within the category of rewritten Scripture."[54] The same sorts of qualifications could be made about Jubilees and the extent to which it uses rewriting.[55] Nevertheless, the process of rewriting is evident often enough in both of these works that they are considered two of the paradigmatic examples of rewriting.

It is also important to note that some of the changes discussed below may stem not from the creation of Chronicles or Jubilees but from their use of textual witnesses to Samuel-Kings, Genesis, and Exodus that differ from our existing evidence. If this were true of any given example, the processes of change would not belong to the creator of Chronicles or Jubilees, but to the scribe or scribes who produced the variant witness. This would not be surprising, since aspects of intralingual translation can be seen in the transmission of Hebrew manuscripts, and since the processes of text

50 Since rewriting occurs in texts that are generally not considered "rewritten"; see James C. VanderKam, "Questions of Canon Viewed through the DSS," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. Lee M. McDonald and James Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 97, 103; Eugene Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998), 88; Molly M. Zahn, "The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15/3 (2008), 317. Cf. also Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 195, on the distinction between "rewriting" (a verbal idea referring to a process that occurs) and "rewritten" (an adjective describing texts in which "rewriting" has occurred to some extent).

51 The notion of a base text, from which a new text is created via additions and rearrangements, finds close parallels in the concept of translation. However, the idea of a "rewritten" text also involves the inclusion of significantly new elements, such that the "rewritten" text is not merely a restatement of the base text in a new context, which under many definitions is not an aspect of translation.

52 For Chronicles, see Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005), 11; Crawford, *Rewriting*, 3; and Ralph W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 4-5. Regarding Jubilees, see, for example, Berstein, "Rewritten Bible," throughout.

53 Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 4.

54 Ibid., 4. However, the material here is itself based on genealogies in earlier texts; cf. Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 38.

55 Cf. Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 3.

production and text transmission have been shown to overlap significantly. Though this remains a possibility for all of the cases discussed below, it is unlikely that all (or even a majority) stem from a variant source text. Moreover, because my purpose is to analyze the process of rewriting, it makes little difference whether that rewriting occurred in the creation of a rewritten text or in the transmission of the source text.

2.1 Chronicles

Even a cursory reading of Chronicles or Jubilees turns up cases that recall the idea of intralingual translation. In these two texts, we find data that fit many of the changes and motivations for change in our typology of intralingual translation. Beginning with examples from Chronicles, in 1 Chr 14:2-3 there is lexical change—מַמְלָכָה is rendered מַלְכוּת—and there is an omission—David's concubines (פִּלַגְשִׁים) are left out in Chronicles' restatement.[56]

2 Sam 5:12-13 [12]וַיֵּדַע דָּוִד כִּי־הֱכִינוֹ יְהוָה לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכִי נִשֵּׂא מַמְלַכְתּוֹ בַּעֲבוּר עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ [13]וַיִּקַּח דָּוִד עוֹד פִּלַגְשִׁים וְנָשִׁים מִירוּשָׁלַם אַחֲרֵי בֹּאוֹ מֵחֶבְרוֹן וַיִּוָּלְדוּ עוֹד לְדָוִד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת׃

[12]David then perceived that the LORD had established him king over Israel, and that he had exalted his kingdom for the sake of his people Israel. [13]In Jerusalem, after he came from Hebron, David took more concubines and wives; and more sons and daughters were born to David. (NRSV)

1 Chr 14:2-3 [2]וַיֵּדַע דָּוִיד כִּי־הֱכִינוֹ יְהוָה לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־נִשֵּׂאת לְמַעְלָה מַלְכוּתוֹ בַּעֲבוּר עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ [3]וַיִּקַּח דָּוִיד עוֹד ___ נָשִׁים בִּירוּשָׁלַם וַיּוֹלֶד דָּוִיד עוֹד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת׃

[2]David then perceived that the LORD had established him as king over Israel, and that his kingdom was highly exalted for the sake of his people Israel. [3]David took more ___ wives in Jerusalem, and David became the father of more sons and daughters. (NRSV)

The lexical change is motivated by the issue of linguistic competence (the audience's innate ability to decode an utterance): because the audience of Chronicles may not have understood the older term מַמְלָכָה, the newer term was used instead.[57] The omission of פִּלַגְשִׁים undoubtedly belongs to the pattern in Chronicles whereby the flaws in David's character are removed.[58] While this sort of change is typically attributed to the author-redactor's desire to say something new about David, in fact it

56 As in the example of "No Fear Shakespeare" (figure 2 above), cases of lexical change are numerous, resulting from a variety of motivations. For example, 1 Chr 10:10 אֱלֹהֵיהֶם ("their gods") for 1 Sam 31:10 עַשְׁתָּרוֹת ("Ashtarot"), reflecting a difference in norms; or 1 Chr 14:10 וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ יְהוָה ("and the LORD said to him") for 2 Sam 5:19 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־דָּוִד ("and the LORD said to David"), a change made to make the text more easily understood (the audience knows the person to whom God is speaking, thus "David" is unnecessary); other syntactical and lexical change occurs as a result, out of linguistic necessity (אל to ל and change in word order).

57 On the diachronic change in use of מלכות and ממלכה, see most recently Bezalel Elan Dresher, "Methodological Issues in the Dating of Linguistic Forms: Considerations from the Perspective of Contemporary Linguistic Theory," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (eds. Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012).

58 Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 340; cf. Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 4.

may reflect and be constrained by the social and religious norms of the target audience, who perhaps would have thought it taboo to include such details or would have bristled at the notion that David had many concubines. This may not be a deliberate attempt to change meaning based on the author-redactor's personal ideology, but something less deliberate, an outworking of the expectations of the author-redactor's social context.[59]

Another fascinating change made to the source text occurs in 2 Chronicles 5:3, where Chronicles omits the phrase "in the month of Ethanim."

1 Ki 8:2 וַיִּקָּהֲלוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה כָּל־אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיֶרַח הָאֵתָנִים בֶּחָג הוּא הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי׃

Every man of Israel assembled to King Solomon at the festival in the month Ethanim (it is the seventh month).

2 Chr 5:3 וַיִּקָּהֲלוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ כָּל־אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל ___ בֶּחָג הוּא הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִעִי׃

Every man of Israel assembled to the king at the festival ___ (it is the seventh month).

This change is motivated by gaps in time and culture. Ethanim is an earlier month name that was replaced by Tishri when the Babylonian Calendar was adopted; as a result, the Second Temple audience may not have understood the reference to Ethanim.[60] To avoid confusion, Chronicles has omitted the phrase. What makes this change so interesting is its effect on the verse as a whole. Without בְּיֶרַח הָאֵתָנִים, the parenthetical statement הוּא הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִעִי ("it is the seventh month") awkwardly refers to חַג, "festival," instead. Of course, it is difficult to see how a חַג can be a month, even metaphorically. Interestingly, a key element in understanding translations is their connection to their source texts, at least in the production stage. In the case of the Old Greek, for example, scholars have noted how the highly isomorphic Greek is often "unintelligible" unless understood in light of the source text.[61] In our case, Chronicles exhibits the same phenomenon: it can only be understood when it is placed in its context as a text dependent on a source text.

An example of syntactic change is found in 1 Chr 13:9. Instead of the sequence of two finite verbs found in 2 Sam 6:6—"Uzzah put out his hand to the ark of God and held it" (וַיִּשְׁלַח עֻזָּא אֶת־יָדוֹ אֶל־אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאחֶז בּוֹ)—Chronicles has an

59 This is one case in which thinking about rewriting as translation provides us with new possibilities for how the text was created. As noted above, my goal here is to test the applicability and usefulness of the concept of translation, not to provide a conclusive argument for the impetus of this change; the argument that this is a deliberate change reflecting the author-redactor's individual mindset is strong and perhaps preferable.

60 Cf. also the omission of "Ziv" in 2 Chr 3:2; Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 71, 75. Alternatively, the omission may result from haplography, given the similarity of בירח and בחג, and given that the phrase was not replaced with "in the month of Tishri" instead of simply omitted. Given the similar change in 2 Chr 3:2, however, the first explanation is preferred.

61 Benjamin G. Wright III, "Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, the Septuagint and Their Audiences," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003), 23.

infinitive: "Uzzah put out his hand to hold the ark" (וַיִּשְׁלַח עֻזָּא אֶת־יָדוֹ לֶאֱחֹז אֶת־הָאָרוֹן).[62] Note here that the new syntax is not merely synonymous: syntactical change in intralingual translation can result in new or different meaning. In multiple instances, Chronicles seems to prefer to use an infinitive when the action of the verb is subservient to the action of the preceding verb.[63] The motivation for this change is the readability of the text. Although the audience would have been able to comprehend the use of parallel finite verbs where the second has a subordinate sense, the change to an infinitive makes the text more accessible and processable.[64]

An example of addition is found in 1 Chr 15:25, where not only David (as in 2 Sam 6:12, וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד) but also "the elders of Israel and the commanders of thousands" go to take the ark to Jerusalem (וַיְהִי דָוִיד וְזִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְשָׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים הַהֹלְכִים). The motivation for this change may be the author-redactor's *own ideological aims*, whether "democratizing" the history of Israel,[65] or highlighting the "support David enjoyed in his campaign" to move the ark,[66] or harmonizing "this account with Solomon's bringing up the ark … to the temple";[67] alternatively, the change may stem from pressure to make the new text understandable, by addressing a logical difficulty in the text—namely that David could not have brought the ark alone.[68] The concept of translation provides the last alternative option, focusing not on the individual, meaning-making activity of the author-redactor, but instead on the author-redactor's context and the changes it would have demanded. Given the pattern of change we see elsewhere in Chronicles,[69] one or several of the former options are probable; this does not rule out, however, that the last motivation was also in play, working in concert

62 I am emending the text of 2 Sam 6:6 as found in MT to align with the evidence in 4QSam^{a}, which preserves the text form on which Chronicles was probably based. 4QSam^{a} has וישלח עזא [את] ידו אל ארון האל[וה]ים followed by a lacuna, whereas MT has וַיִּשְׁלַח עֻזָּא אֶל־אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאחֶז בּוֹ. It is possible that the Samuel-Kings base text used by the Chronicler had an infinitive, as perhaps reflected in the Old Greek (κατασχεῖν), and as reconstructed in the lacuna in 4QSam^{a} in Frank Moore Cross, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1-2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 124, 128. If this were the case, the rewriting would have occurred within the transmission of Samuel-Kings rather than the creation of Chronicles.

63 Mats Eskhult, "Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew," in *Diggers at the Well* (eds. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000).

64 Many scholars have noticed an increase in use of the infinitive in place of finite verbs in later Hebrew (for example, Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea scrolls* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 70), which suggests the possibility that these changes are due to linguistic competence. If this were the case, the audience would have had difficulty understanding a parallel finite clause having a subordinate sense, and thus the infinitive would have to be used to communicate subordination. It is doubtful, however, that the audience would not have been able to understand a parallel finite clause with subordinate sense; even in English ("Uzzah put out his hand... and held [the ark]") the act of holding the ark is clearly the purpose for the act of putting out a hand.

65 Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 325-326.

66 Gary N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10-29* (Anchor Bible; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 625.

67 Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 355.

68 Cf. Japhet, *Ideology*, 326. Although members of the audience presumably would have understood the involvement of the king's subjects in the movement of the ark, the author-redactor may still have wanted to spell this out very clearly and explicitly in the text.

69 Ibid., 325; Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10-29*, 625.

with one or several of the former options.

Finally, an example of restructuring occurs in 1 Chr 10:9, parallel to 1 Sam 31:9. Although the Old Greek's reading of 1 Sam 31:9 is probably the earliest,[70] reading καὶ ἀποστρέφουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξέδυσαν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ (=וישבהו ויפשיטו את כליו, "and they brought him back and stripped off his armor"), the material in 1 Chr 10:9 appears to be based on the text as it stands in MT 1 Sam 31:9, given the presence of את ראשו.[71]

1 Sam 31:9 (MT) וַיִּכְרְתוּ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וַיְפַשִּׁיטוּ אֶת־כֵּלָיו

And *they cut off his head*, and stripped off his armor. (RSV)

1 Chr 10:9 וַיְפַשִּׁיטֻהוּ וַיִּשְׂאוּ אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְאֶת־כֵּלָיו

And they stripped him and *took his head* and his armor. (RSV)

In the source text, the Philistines first remove the head from Saul's dead body before stripping him, whereas in Chronicles the order is reversed. A gap in time may be responsible for the restructuring: if the armor Saul was wearing was presumed (by the translator [and target audience]) to have a neck-flap,[72] it may have prevented head-removal, and thus the source text would be logically inconsistent unless the actions of stripping and head-removal were reversed. This could make the text more understandable if the type of armor had changed over time.[73]

Though I have focused on small-scale changes in Chronicles (in accord with Zethsen's focus), the paradigm of intralingual translation can also provide insightful possible explanations for large-scale data as well. The addition of various speeches in Chronicles may serve in part to add realism to the text, improving the readability of the text.[74] One of the major restructurings in Chronicles, occurring in the Ark Narrative (1 Chr 13-16 par. 2 Sam 5-6), can also be viewed as resulting from the motivations of translation. In Chronicles, the first half of the story—David's initial attempt and aborting of the plan to take the ark to Jerusalem—is moved forward so that it precedes the establishment of Jerusalem as David's capital and the defeat of the

70 Cf. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10-29*, 518.

71 Were the author-redactor working from a different form of Samuel-Kings, these changes would be located in the transmission history of Samuel-Kings rather than the creation of Chronicles. The changes are still, however, indicative of the processes involved in rewriting.

72 Cf. Çiğdem Maner, "Neo-Hittite Helmets and their depictions," in *SOMA 2007: Proceedings of the XI Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, Istanbul Technical University, 24-29 April 2007* (ed. Çiğdem Özkan Aygün; BAR International Series 1900, 2009), esp. figures 4, 5, 9, and 11.

73 The commentaries address various changes made to the Chronicler's source-text here, but none address the reasons for the restructuring of the text; cf. Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles* (Old Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 226; Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10-29*, 518; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 287. My explanation is admittedly tenuous, but the point is to explore how translation *might* account for the data.

74 On the addition of speeches, see Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 19-20. On the literary importance and value of narrative elements giving the text a more "realistic" feel, see Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (trans. Willard Trask; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 5-19.

Philistines. For Klein, the point of moving this section forward is to make the installment of the ark in Jerusalem "David's first act as king after his coronation."[75] For Sara Japhet, the Chronicler brings the event forward because of the implausibility that the blessing on Obed-edom was enough to convince David to bring the ark a second time (as in 2 Sam 6:11-12); instead, David needed the assurance "that divine favour had not been taken away from him," established in the events of the now intervening narrative (e.g., the defeat of the Philistines).[76] Another possibility, considering Chronicles in light of translation, is that Chronicles improved the flow and readability of 2 Sam 6:1-15. Rather than the abrupt transition in 2 Sam 6:10-12—where David opts not to bring the ark, three months pass, and then David decides again to bring in the ark—Chronicles puts a significant amount of space between David's two decisions, filling out the three months gap with actual events related in the text. I would reiterate here that my goal is merely to explore the ability of translation to describe what happens in rewriting. Whether or not this purpose for the rearrangement is correct, it illustrates how the paradigm of intralingual translation yields different angles on old problems.

2.2 Jubilees

Turning to Jubilees, we also find numerous examples that can be analyzed within the framework of intralingual translation. Where Hebrew evidence is not extant, we must use an interlingual translation to access the original language of Jubilees. My first example, Jub. 28:1-5, is extant only in Ethiopic. In using the Ethiopic text, we must dig through several layers of textual relationship, aiming at the earliest layer, Hebrew Jubilees. The subsequent interlingual translations of Jubilees into several languages are not in mind here, though they are necessarily involved. Although some of the differences may have arisen in translation from Hebrew to other languages, the Scrolls have shown us that the Ethiopic is generally a good witness to the Hebrew. The text of Jub. 28:1-5 is given below alongside its source text, Gen 29:1-25, with the three types of content change—omission, restructuring, and addition—indicated.[77] Because we are working through an interlingual translation of the original, I do not focus on the finer details; the larger differences are apparent.

75 Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 330.

76 Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 284-285.

77 I use the translation in James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium 511; Scriptores Aethiopici 88; Leuven: E. Peeters, 1989).

Genesis 29:1-25 (RSV)	**Jubilees 28:1-5 (VanderKam)**
omission	**restructuring** addition
(verses 1-20 = Jacob is betrothed to Rachel)	[1]He set out on foot and came to the eastern land, to Laban, Rebecca's brother. He remained with him and served him in exchange for his daughter Rachel for one week.
[21]Then Jacob said to Laban, "Give me my wife that I may go in to her, for my time is completed."	[2]During the first year of the third week he said to him: 'Give me my wife for whom I have served you seven years.' Laban said to Jacob: 'I will give you your wife.'
[22]So Laban *gathered together all the men of the place, and* made a feast.	[3a]Laban prepared a banquet,
[23]But in the evening he took his daughter Leah and brought her to Jacob; and he went in to her.	[3b]took his older daughter Leah, and gave (her) to Jacob as a wife. **He gave her Zilpah, his servant girl, as a maid.** Jacob was not aware (of this) because Jacob thought she was Rachel. [4a]He went in to her,
[24]**Laban gave his maid Zilpah to his daughter Leah to be her maid.**	
[25]And *in the morning*, behold, it was Leah; and Jacob said to Laban, "What is this you have done to me? Did I not serve with you for Rachel? Why then have you deceived me?"	[4b]and, to his surprise, she was Leah. Jacob was angry at Laban and said to him: 'Why have you acted this way? Was it not for Rachel that I served you and not for Leah? Why have you wronged me? Take your daughter and I will go because you have done a bad thing to me.' [5]For Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah because Leah's eyes were weak, though her figure was very lovely; but Rachel's eyes were beautiful, her figure was lovely, and she was very pretty.

In this passage, two phrases are omitted from the source text,[78] four phrases are added to the target text,[79] and one clause is moved,[80] resulting in significant restructuring of the passage. Besides these smaller changes, there is an extended addition several clauses long at the end of the passage, and an omission of a significant length of material in the first verse, which corresponds to Gen 29:1-20. This passage in Jubilees, then, is full of the types of changes made in intralingual translation. How well can the motivations for change in intralingual translation describe what occurs in this passage?

The addition in Jub. 28:3b makes clear that Jacob went in to Leah because he was unaware that Laban had given him Leah instead of Rachel. In Jub. 28:4b, the first addition ensures that the audience knows Jacob's response is one of anger, only

78 These are in italics on the left side, indicating where they stood in the source text.

79 These are underlined on the right side.

80 This clause is bolded on both sides, with an arrow indicating the direction of movement.

suggested in the source text. The second addition shows Jacob to "take a principled stand against Laban" and what he has done.[81] These three additions perhaps serve the function of ensuring that Jacob is portrayed as the innocent victim in this episode. The target text thereby protects the character of Jacob, possibly because of the social or religious norms of the audience, who held Jacob in high esteem.[82] This is similar to what we find with David in Chronicles, though there the target text excises obvious shortcomings in David's character and here the target text merely tries to circumvent what it views as an incorrect interpretation of the source text. The omission of "in the morning" from Gen 19:25 may be related to the second addition of Jub. 28:4b, if the audience was meant to understand that Jacob realized it was Leah before the morning, though after consummating the marriage.[83] By showing that Jacob had a higher concern for the identity of his spouse, Jacob's character is preserved.

The reduction of Gen 29:1-20 to a single verse (Jub. 28:1) provides interesting evidence, since similar omissions occur elsewhere in Jubilees. Gen 29:1-20, Gen 24:1-67, and Exod 2:15-21, all of which revolve around the type-scene of betrothal at the well, are either briefly summarized or completely removed in Jubilees. A difference in social and religious norms could well have prompted the absence of Moses's betrothal to Zipporah in Exod 2:15-21, which is not found in the corresponding text of Jub. 47-48. For the target audience, exogamous marriage was probably disapproved of;[84] as a result, all mention of Zipporah and her relationship to Moses, including their betrothal, was omitted in Jubilees.[85] This may explain why the similar well-betrothals of Isaac to Rebecca (Gen 24:1-67 par. Jub. 19:10) and Jacob to Rachel (Gen 29:1-20 par. Jub. 28:1) are not entirely omitted but instead summarized, because they reflect endogamous relationships. However, they may have been shortened for similar reasons related to social and religious norms, to avoid any possible misunderstanding that the wife was a foreigner because she resided in a foreign land.[86]

---

81 James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 139.

82 Cf. James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 109-114.

83 Cf. Kugel, *Jubilees*, 139; VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 64. What might *actually* have happened in the ancient world in this sort of circumstance—i.e., the man discovering the identity of the woman at some point *before* or *during* consummation, or not until the morning when there would have been adequate light—is irrelevant. If the point of the text was to make Jacob a more sensitive personality, the only possibility was to move the discovery earlier (not in the morning), but not so early (before consummation) that the entire story would be ruined.

84 See Jubilees 30:11-16, which prohibits intermarriage; VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 115, 117.

85 Karen S. Winslow, "Mixed Marriage in Torah Narratives," in *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Christian Frevel; New York: T&T Clark), 145.

86 Though both stories in Genesis are clear about the endogamous nature of the betrothal, the type-scene of betrothal at the well stresses marriage outside the immediate family and a spouse found in a foreign land; Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (Basic Books, 2011), 62. Jub. 19:10 states simply that Abraham took Rebecca for a wife for Isaac, making no mention of finding her in a distant land. Although Jub. 28:1 says that Jacob "came to the eastern land," it does not relate the details of the story and as a result it can immediately add "to Laban, Rebecca's brother," establishing that the family of Rachel is kin. In both cases the shortening achieves the aim, though in the former there is no mention of a foreign land, while in the latter the brevity allows the kinship

The restructuring in this text also alters the larger story in a significant way, for the benefit of the target audience. The statement about Laban giving a maidservant to Leah is moved from an awkward location to a more logical location, so that Jacob's going in to Leah and his surprise at her *being Leah* is not interrupted. In the source text, the giving of a maid occurs after Jacob goes in to Leah but before the morning discovery. The audience of the source text must ask, "Do these events actually occur chronologically in this order? If not, why was this detail provided at this point?" The target text, sensing these issues, restructures the text and thereby improves its readability and logic.[87]

Even if we confine ourselves to the scattered portions of Jubilees that are extant in Hebrew in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we can still find examples fitting the model of intralingual translation. In Jub. 33:1-13, a passage partially extant in 4QJub^{f},[88] the brief statement about Reuben sleeping with Bilhah in Gen 35:22 is expanded into a short story. The impetus for this addition may be a desire for improved logic and less possible ambiguity: in the source text, the audience is left to wonder why Reuben slept with Jacob's concubine—there is no explanation or surrounding context to even suggest why this occurred—but in the target text, some details and explanation are given.[89] In Jub. 1:1, the spacing evidence in 4QJub^{a} supports the reading found in the Ethiopic text, where the phrase וֶהְיֵה־שָׁם is omitted from Exod 24:12.[90] Exodus reads, "Come up to me on the mountain and be there (וֶהְיֵה־שָׁם) and I will give you the two tablets of stone." By omitting "and be there," Jubilees removes an unnecessary and perhaps confusing element of the story,[91] simplifying the logic of the narrative for the audience.[92]

An example of syntactic change is found in Jub. 32:18 (extant in 4QpapJub^{h}), where two Hifil *weqatal* verbs (והפריתיכה והרביתיכה, "I will make you fruitful and multiply you") are used in place of the Qal imperatives (פרה ורבה, "be fruitful and multiply") found in Gen 35:11.[93] As VanderKam and Milik note, the result of the

---

of Jacob's wife to come through.

87 The clause stating that Zilpah was given as a maid is still somewhat disruptive in its new position in the Jubilees passage, but it seems to me to be *less* disruptive. Omission of this clause may have been a better strategy if only the near context were in consideration; however, considering the larger narrative, Zilpah must be introduced given later references (e.g., 44:19), and thus omission was not a viable option.

88 See H. W. Attridge, T. Elgvin, J. Milik, S. Olyan, J. Strugnell, E. Tov, J. VanderKam, and S. White, in consultation with J. C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 73-75.

89 VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 73. Moreover, the addition serves the purpose of relating the story to biblical law; cf. Segal, *Jubilees*, 73-75. For ideological impetuses that may be involved—perhaps belonging more to the creator of Jubilees and less to his target audience—see VanderKam 2001, 72ff.

90 Although the exact location of the omission is not extant in 4QJub^{a}, there is insufficient room within the lacuna for the entirety of the corresponding text in Exod 24:12, supporting the omission as found in the Ethiopic text; DJD XIII, 5.

91 What does it mean for Moses to "be there" (וֶהְיֵה־שָׁם), and why does God direct Moses to do this?

92 I should again note that here, as elsewhere, it is possible that the Genesis base text used in the making of Jubilees did not contain this phrase; if this were the case, the rewriting would have occurred within the transmission of Genesis rather than the creation of Jubilees.

93 Cf. DJD XIII, 100-101. Although the second verb והרביתיכה is not extant, the reconstruction as a

change is "that God's words are a promise, not a command."[94] One possible explanation for this change is that the permeation of the Jubilees passage with legal material[95] has made it preferable to distinguish God's "multiply" refrain—so common in Genesis[96]—from the legal material in the preceding verses. Though the audience would have recognized that the imperative "be fruitful" was as much a promise as a command, the tradent made the text more readable by clearly marking this statement as different from the legally binding law in the preceding verses.

Several linguistic changes are found in Jub. 21:1, paralleling Gen 27:2 and found in 4QJub[d].

Gen 27:2	ויאמר הנה נא זקנתי And he said, "Behold, I am old."
Jub. 21:1	ויצווהו לאמור אני זק]נתי (4QJub[d] 1.12) And he commanded him, saying, "I am old."

It seems clear that these first words in Jub. 21:1 correspond to the first words of Gen 27:2; in both cases, a verb of speaking introduces the statement, the initial statement is that Isaac "is old" (זקנתי), and the next statement has Isaac declare that he does not know when he will die.[97] Regarding syntactic change, לאמר is inserted to frame the direct speech and an explicit subject is added. The insertion of לאמר may result from the issue of linguistic competence: the expression הנה נא appears to be out of use before the creation of Jubilees (the only uses are in the Deuteronomistic History, Genesis, and Job); לאמר as a direct speech indicator, however, is increasing in use as the language develops.[98] Regarding lexical change, the main verb אמר, "to say," is changed to צוה, "to command."[99] Although the initial phrase of Isaac's statement is not a command, when the following verses are considered it is clear that Isaac is commanding his son, not merely saying something to him. The target text makes a lexical change corresponding with the actual events of the story, and in so doing it improves the readability of the text.[100]

Hifil *weqatal* is likely given the preceding word והפריתיכה. The events relayed in Jub. 32 clearly correspond to those in Gen 35 (e.g., the birth of Benjamin, Jacob being renamed Israel, and a passage about the increase of offspring typical of Genesis), though they do not occur in exactly in the same order.

94 Ibid., 101; cf. Kugel, *Jubilees*, 154.

95 On this aspect of change in Jubilees, see section 3 below.

96 E.g., Gen 1:28; 8:17; 13:16; 15:5; 22:17; 26:4, 24; 28:14; 32:12.

97 Although the surrounding context in Jubilees—both preceding and following—does not correspond to the surrounding context of Gen 27:2, the manner in which Gen 27:2 is modified corresponds to modifications made in intralingual translation.

98 Cf. Cynthia L. Miller, *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 206-208.

99 Alternatively, we might analyze the text as having changed the form of finite אמר to infinitive לאמר (syntactic change), with צוה inserted (addition). With this reanalysis of the *changes* involved, however, the *motivations* for each (linguistic competence and readability) would remain the same.

100 "Command" language is used throughout Jubilees at the beginning of testaments; cf. Segal, *Jubilees*, 166. The intention of the change, then, may not be to improve the correspondence between the verb of saying and what is said, though that is certainly the result; however, note that in every

2.3 Summary and Initial Conclusions

In summary, when we consider the evidence found in Chronicles and Jubilees, we see examples of change that can be classified within the framework of intralingual translation. Moreover, the motivations for change in intralingual translation also provide possible explanations for these changes. Although they are sometimes tentative, and alternative explanations are sometimes preferable, the point of the investigation above is to demonstrate the ability of translation to describe what occurs in rewriting, and moreover the value of considering the texts from a different perspective provided by translation.

The fact that we can classify the changes involved in rewriting within a translation paradigm, however, does not necessitate that the process of rewriting, or even part of it, is actually translation. Looking at the model of intralingual translation provided in figure 1 above, we might ask whether the first type of change—the content changes—is not translation at all, but instead involves cases where translations *use rewriting*, especially when large scale changes are in mind. The fact of the matter is that the modern ideas of *translation* and *rewriting* are both frameworks for considering ancient texts. Whether translation is a part of rewriting or rewriting is a part of translation depends largely on the scope we give to translation.[101] Although the most idealistic definitions would limit translation to linguistic changes made as a result of the target audience's linguistic competence, it remains true that translators are sometimes involved in meaning-making and the introduction of new ideas into a text; like pseudepigraphy, translation is a powerful tool for introducing new ideas with an authoritative voice. While many translators do not engage in this sort of activity—the Old Greek and other ancient versions, for example, are for the most part very conservative in how they transfer the ideas of the source text—there remain cases, such Old Greek Proverbs, Isaiah, and Job, where the translator engages in a significant level of meaning-making in the target text. But does the fact that something occurs in a translation make it an aspect of translation? Are these elements basic to translation or merely things that happen to occur in translations? If they are basic to translation, rewriting is translation insofar as it uses these elements. If they merely occur in translations, one would say instead that translations utilize rewriting.

3. Chronicles and Jubilees as Transfer between Two Contexts

Though we cannot definitively decide whether rewriting is translation, there is more that can be said. One helpful way to reframe the issue is to think of translation more broadly, as *transfer* from one context to another. According to Weissbrod, following Itamar Even-Zohar, the heart of translation is transfer, the "re-creation" of a text within a new context, including all the kinds of change this might entail.[102] Using this broader notion related to translation, it seems to me that Chronicles and Jubilees can be heuristically described as transfers analagous to translations. As in section 2 above, my purpose here is not to argue that this perspective is the best or only way of

testament, where "command" language is used, a command is indeed given.

101A classic debate within Translation Studies is how, precisely, to define translation.

102Weissbrod, "From Translation to Transfer," 23.

viewing each text, but that the notion of transfer can apply to each text and provides new insights into its production and purposes. Though transfer is not the only element at work in the creation of these texts, both Chronicles and Jubilees involve significant changes that serve to transfer the base text in some way into a new context.

Chronicles contains large patterns of change that extend throughout the work. Whereas in Samuel-Kings the history of the northern kingdom is included, in Chronicles the focus is entirely on the united monarchy and the southern kingdom as its extension. Numerous speeches are added,[103] as are details throughout that support the temple establishment[104] and the Levites.[105] Large-scale restructuring occurs in several places, for example in the Ark Narrative in 1 Chr 13-16 (par. 2 Sam 5-6).[106] Whereas in Samuel-Kings some of the difficult aspects of David and Solomon's lives are presented, Chronicles goes to great lengths to present these two people and their reigns as ideal.[107] Why were such widespread changes made? Japhet offers an explanation that resembles the motivations for translation:

> [T]here developed a *gap*... between [the] complex reality [of the Second Commonwealth] and the reality they found described in the Bible. A gap of this sort, the inevitable result of *historical development*, undermines the stability of both realities. First, early history becomes *incomprehensible* to the present generation[.] […] Second, present-day institutions, religious tenets, and ritual observance are severed from their origins and lose their authoritative source of legitimation. The book of Chronicles represents a powerful effort to *bridge this gap*."[108]

The new concerns of Chronicles are the result of a new audience, one in which the people have returned from exile and rebuilt the temple.[109] The transformations that occur are there to overcome a gap between two contexts, transferring the source text into a new context.

Jubilees is often called a "retelling" of Genesis and parts of Exodus,[110] and is considered to follow the linear progression of its base text in structure and specific wording.[111] The fact that it is "heavily edited"[112]—"not merely a reproduction of Genesis-Exodus but a rewriting or retelling of them from a particular standpoint and with definite purposes"[113]—does not negate the analogy to translation, since all translation necessarily involves both an element of continuity and an element of

---

103See Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 19-20; cf. section 2.1 above on the large scale changes in Chronicles.

104Klein, *2 Chronicles,* 4; Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 45.

105For example, 1 Chr 15:2.

106Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 32; and see the discussion in section 2.1 above.

107Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 48; Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 4; cf. Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 16-17.

108Japhet, *Ideology*, 403; emphasis mine.

109Cf. Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, where the changes in Chronicles are an attempt "to achieve a new religious balance in the face of a changing world" (44). Similarly, Chronicles perhaps wrote its history in the "literary and cultural conventions of the time" (Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 18), again suggesting that Chronicles is somehow overcoming a gap in time.

110VanderKam, *Jubilees* 1989, V; VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 11; Berstein, "Rewritten Bible," 174.

111VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 11; Segal, *Jubilees*, 4.

112VanderKam, *Jubilees* 1989, V.

113VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 11.

change. For Segal, Jubilees presents a "new worldview" within this retelling.[114] Yet, this new worldview is "not presented as if created *ex nihilo*";[115] even this new paradigm for viewing reality is dependent in some ways on the source text. Jubilees often sets Mosaic laws alongside the stories of Genesis, sometimes to illustrate why a law was created or to support that law,[116] and sometimes to show that the patriarchs followed Mosaic law.[117] The concerns of a 2nd century BCE audience may be evident here: given the increasing awareness of Torah as a central religious element, and the Mosaic law and its observance as the *praxis* of Judaism, perhaps the text of Jubilees is attempting to transfer the narratives occurring before the appearance of Mosaic Law (that is, Genesis 1 – Exodus 18) into a new Law-centric context by permeating the narratives with legal references. For the law-observing Jew of the 2nd century, Jubilees would thereby take the source text and make it more applicable and meaningful. Another indicator of whole-work transfer is the frequent reference to "weeks" and time-keeping in Jubilees.[118] The target audience of Jubilees was, apparently, quite interested in calendrical matters, like the target audiences of many texts from the late Second Temple period. By inserting these time-keeping references throughout the work, Jubilees perhaps attempted to make the source text more relevant to its target audience.

One final way in which Jubilees as a whole resembles a translation involves the issue of authority. Ancient texts garnered authority using such techniques as pseudepigraphy and the framing of a text in a certain narrative voice. In Jubilees, the narrative voice belongs to an angel, whose words come directly from God, thereby giving authority to the work.[119] Translations acquire authority by their attachment to an already authoritative work; any changes to the source text are subsumed within the work as a whole, and thus those changes are given authority as part of the work.[120] The same principle is at work in Jubilees, where "the dependence upon the Torah reflects the author's desire to impart legitimacy and authority to his book."[121] While the use of the angel's voice is an important aspect of the self-presentation of Jubilees, so too is the implicit lineage presumed between Jubilees and the Torah by the use of the very words and sequence of events found in the Torah.[122] As a transfer of these authoritative texts to a new context, Jubilees authorized and legitimized itself in the

114Segal, *Jubilees*, 5.

115Ibid.

116As in Jubilees 33:1-13.

117VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 12; Kugel, *Jubilees*, 207.

118VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 12-13.

119Ibid., 23-24, 86, 91.

120Cf. Benjamin Wright, "Scribes, Translators and the Formation of Authoritative Scripture" (in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*; eds. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström; Leuven/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2014), 14-29.

121Segal, *Jubilees*, 4. Though Jubilees may not have carried the title *Genesis-Exodus*, it clearly contains the same contents and many of the very same words. Thus, readers would have lent it a certain amount of authority given its connection to the Torah, as a version of part of the Torah. Cf. Falk's idea of "extending the Scriptures" in *Parabiblical Texts*, 22 and throughout.

122As Segal notes, "one can almost always identify the biblical passage underlying the reworking" *(Jubilees*, 4).

same way as ancient translations like the Old Greek.[123]

Jubilees did not transfer the *whole* of Genesis and Exodus, though it does cover all of Genesis.[124] However, the fact that Jubilees follows the narrative of the Torah up to the point when the law is given to Moses may actually reinforce the idea that Jubilees transfers its source text into a new context having a greater concern for Mosaic law. The rest of Exodus did not need to be transferred to this new context, since it introduced, assumed, and involved the Mosaic law that was seen as missing in Genesis and the earlier parts of Exodus.

While the widespread changes to Chronicles and Jubilees explored above may serve to transfer the source text into a new context, they nevertheless also introduce significant differences into the text. For example, the reframing of the Genesis-Exodus narrative found in Jubilees 1—where God tells the story rather than "an anonymous narrator"—significantly alters the framework and tone of the entire work.[125] One aspect of Genesis-Exodus, then, is lost in the transfer, while another aspect (the divine source of the story) is introduced. This give-and-take, the presence of both preservation and change, is necessarily involved in all transfer. Moreover, we should note that many changes made in these texts more plausibly stem from the author-redactor's own worldview, rather than a desire to make the base text accessible in a new context. For example, the material in Jubilees 23:8-32 has little to do with the concerns of Genesis-Exodus and functions to communicate new ideas belonging to the author-redactor.[126]

In summary, both Chronicles and Jubilees contain large patterns of change that extend throughout the work. These larger changes, conceivably prompted by the norms and expectations of the tradent's context, result in the movement or transfer of the earlier source text as a whole into a new context. The passages containing these changes may not always fit the idea of translation defined in a strict linguistic sense; however, because of these changes each text as a whole can be conceived of, at least in part, as a transfer or "re-creation" of its source text. The new text meets the expectations and norms of the new context, while preserving the storyline and purposes of the earlier text.

4. Conclusion and Implications

In this study, I attempted to demonstrate the overlap of rewriting and translation in Chronicles and Jubilees. In my consideration of the changes and motivations for change in these texts, the explanations found in the secondary literature sometimes aligned well with the motivations of translation but at other times did not. My goal was to demonstrate the usefulness of considering rewriting through the lens of translation. Noting the explanations given in secondary literature, I suggested the motivations involved in translation as yet another possibility, to show how we might conceive of the text as an intralingual translation, and to show how such a

123Cf. Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 143-144.

124All our evidence suggests that Exodus, in some form similar to the forms we have in the Masoretic Text or the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek, was a defined text at the time of the creation of Jubilees.

125VanderKam, *Jubilees* 2001, 23.

126Cf. ibid., 57-59.

consideration provides alternative possibilities. Though the translational motivations may at times work together with the other motivations noted in the secondary literature, in most cases we would like to determine one most plausible explanation of the data and exclude the alternatives. I suggest that the explanations I explore above are often not found in the secondary literature because they are not looked for. Instead, scholars have considered these texts using the standard notion that the tradent makes intentional and active changes to achieve some purpose(s).

In the end, my purpose is not to provide a definitive answer to the question, *Is rewriting translation*.[127] My purpose is instead to point out that the concept of translation in general—fluid though it is—is helpful for thinking about rewriting in ancient Hebrew texts. Although we cannot say definitively whether rewriting is translation, it is clear that these two processes share a number of tools. There are several implications. First, the notion of translation may provide one helpful way around the stalled issue of defining "rewriting." Even without an agreed upon model of rewriting, we can use clearly defined models from Translation Studies to analyze rewritten texts. Second, the idea of transfer between two contexts could be applied fruitfully to other aspects of scribal activity beyond rewriting, and further research considering activities like transmission and performance would be valuable. Third, thinking of text production from the perspective of translation suggests an answer to a new question being posed about textual development. Our conception of scribes in the Second Temple period has shifted—from the notion of rote-copyists to a fuller picture of creative tradents engaged in a variety of activities. If scribes felt free to rewrite their base texts, whether the end product was a "copy" or a "rewritten text," then why did they not make *more* change to the base texts?[128] Translation provides us with a model where *preservation* of the source has an important place, even while *change* to the text facilitates transfer between two contexts.

127Moreover, none of these texts were *intended* to be intralingual translations, nor did their audiences think of them as such; indeed, most intralingual translation past and present is not intended or identified as such. Because there almost certainly was no concept of intralingual translation in the ancient world, we should expect that none of these works would be conceived of in that way. Though *intent* is an important factor in identifying intralingual translation, it is not the intention to translate that defines translation, but the intention to replace, restate, update, or make relevant an earlier work. Because the intent to translate has to do with the social setting and purposes of the target text, rather than the actual data that we find in the texts themselves, it says nothing about the nature of the data, only the nature of the people who created the data and the ways in which they viewed the documents. Notably, tradents in the ancient world did not think of themselves as "rewriting," either.

128I have heard the question posed in informal settings by both Michael Segal and Harry Fox.