

Kalman Schulman's Hebrew Translation of Josephus' *The Jewish War*

Lily Kahn, UCL (l.kahn@ucl.ac.uk)

Introduction

Kalman Schulman's two-volume work *מלחמות היהודים עם הרומאים* (The Wars of the Jews against the Romans), published in Vilna in 1861-2, is the first complete Hebrew translation of Josephus' *The Jewish War*. As was typical of translated Hebrew texts in the maskilic period (Touy 2012: 165-8), Schulman's work was an indirect rendition translated not from the Greek original but rather via Heinrich Paret's German version *Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges* published in Stuttgart in 1855. Schulman's and Paret's versions are very different from each other. Paret's translation is a relatively close rendering of the Greek original, commonly diverging only by the addition of factual information such as bracketed dates according to the Gregorian calendar and footnotes providing clarification of certain historical points. By contrast, Schulman's work is a very loose adaptation: while following Paret's source text comparatively faithfully with regard to maintaining its book, chapter, and section divisions and avoiding the omission or adaptation of entire paragraphs or sections, the Hebrew version contains numerous deviations from its German counterpart ranging from the substitution of individual words to the replacement or addition of sentences.

Some of Schulman's modifications to his source text may reflect practical considerations such as a need to simplify the work in accordance with the constraints of the Maskilic Hebrew idiom of the period. However, in many cases his alterations instead reflect a very particular *Skopos*, or translatorial aim, embodying ideological and cultural concerns about the purpose of the target text that are extremely different from those underpinning the German version (see Pym 2010: 43-50 for elaboration on *Skopos* theory). Paret's work, with its close adherence to the Greek original combined with its dates and factual footnotes, gives the impression of a relatively neutral academic translation designed primarily as a tool for disinterested historical research. This orientation is unsurprising, particularly considering that the translator composed a scholarly article concerning the relationship between Josephus and the Pharisees at around the same time (Paret 1856). By contrast, Schulman explicitly states in the introduction to his work that his aim as a translator is to transfer the story of Josephus, whom he describes as a wise and respected Jewish hero of antiquity, out of the 'unholy vessels' in which it has thus far resided and into the 'holy vessel' of the Hebrew language, where it will serve to enrich Jewish literature and edify the Jewish people. Schulman's motivation, then, is not that of an impartial scholar; rather, his translation is an ideologically loaded enterprise the aim of which is the restoration of what he regards

as a key Jewish narrative to its rightful linguistic and cultural home (see Feiner 2002: 247-73 for discussion of this ideological basis for Schulman's historical translations).

Schulman achieves his goal by employing a number of translation techniques typical of a domesticating strategy, whereby the translator seeks to situate the translated text within a cultural context familiar to the target readership rather than attempting to maintain closeness with the terms, style, and cultural references of the source text (see Venuti [2008] and Pym [2010: 30-3] for further details of domesticating translation).

From the perspective of translation studies, Schulman's work is worthy of examination because it constitutes a very unusual case of domestication. Firstly, the relationship between the Hebrew language and *The Jewish War* is unlike that of many translated texts because, although the original version was not composed in Hebrew, it was written in the closely related Aramaic language and then translated into Greek by the author shortly after the late biblical period. As such, it has close linguistic, stylistic, and thematic connections to the Hebrew Bible. Because the Hebrew Bible was the preferred linguistic model for Hebrew prose composition of the Russian Haskalah (Kutscher 1982: 183-4; Patterson 1988: 5; Agmon-Fruchtman and Allon 1994: 5), a work such as *The Jewish War* is a strikingly fitting subject for translation into Hebrew by a maskilic author as its style and content is more closely linked to the target language than works of nineteenth-century European literature such as Schulman's own very popular Hebrew adaptation of Eugène Sue's French-language novel *Les Mystères de Paris* (1842-3), which was set in the Parisian underworld. (Indeed, as Slutsky [2007: 172] suggests, the fact that Schulman almost always chose to translate works on Jewish historical topics following the publication of his *מסתרי פריז* [The Mysteries of Paris] in 1857-60 may reflect to some degree an attempt to avoid the difficulties and criticism associated with his rendition of a modern European novel into the holy tongue – though conversely as Feiner [2002: 248] has demonstrated, Schulman was always a strong believer in the importance of enriching Hebrew literature with historical writings.)

Secondly, this affinity between Josephus' work and Maskilic Hebrew literary culture means that Schulman's Hebrew target text has the distinction of being culturally and linguistically more closely aligned with the original Greek version, which he did not consult, than with Paret's German version, which was his immediate source text. Significantly, Schulman gives no attribution to Paret's work in his own rendition; this differs from the typical process of Hebrew translation in the maskilic era, in which the German mediating version of foreign source materials was generally regarded as primary and authoritative (Toury 2012: 165-8). This divergence may be attributable at least in part to the unusual content of the text, whose quintessentially Jewish subject matter led

Schulman to regard it not as a foreign literary work but rather as a Jewish text that had been transmitted in non-Jewish languages simply through an accident of history.

Schulman achieves his domesticating aims through repeated utilization of a number of key translation techniques that serve to highlight the Jewish cultural context of his text. These techniques include the modification of personal names, gentilic adjectives, and toponyms; the insertion of Jewish ethnonyms; increased mention of aspects of Jewish religious culture such as the Temple, God, and rituals; the addition of modifiers and clauses in order to highlight the positive character of key Jewish figures and the negative character of their detractors; the omission or alteration of dates on the Gregorian calendar; and the strategic selection of biblical extracts in relevant contexts.

In this paper I shall examine each of these strategies that Schulman employed in order to achieve his goal of creating not only a translation of Josephus in the Hebrew language, but one that strongly reflects Jewish values and is rooted in Jewish tradition. I shall then briefly consider the afterlife of Schulman's translation in post-maskilic Eastern Europe by discussing its reception in the work of Jacob Naftali Herz Simchoni, who produced a Hebrew translation of *The Jewish War* just over sixty years after the publication of *מלחמות היהודים עם הרומאים*.

Modification of proper names and gentilic adjectives

Because the content of *The Jewish War* centres on aspects of Jewish history including figures that were well known to Jews in nineteenth-century Eastern Europe, Schulman often modifies the personal names appearing in Paret's version (which are themselves closely translated from the Greek original) in order to present them in a form that would sound natural and familiar to his Hebrew readership. This practice applies to the names of both Jewish and non-Jewish figures appearing in Josephus' work, though the motivation may be slightly different in each case, as will be discussed below.

Non-Jewish names

Schulman alters the names of non-Jewish figures that played a prominent role in episodes of Jewish history that would have been well known to his target audience by a name different from that used in Paret's version. Such alterations serve the purpose of domesticating the figures in question by giving them a name that would make them instantly recognizable to an Eastern European Jewish readership, in contrast to the names in the German source text, which would lack any connotations. Moreover, in some cases the alterations may have more pointed cultural and ideological motivations. For example, in the beginning of Book 1, Chapter 1 Paret introduces the Selucid Greek king as follows:

Antiochos mit dem Beinamen der Erlauchte (Epiphanes)

Antiochus with the epithet 'the Illustrious One' (Epiphanes) (Paret 1855: 52)

Paret's epithet 'der Erlauchte' is a literal translation of the Greek Ἐπιφανής, which means 'distinguished', 'manifest', or 'remarkable':

Ἀντίοχος ὁ κληθεὶς Ἐπιφανής

Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes (manifest; distinguished; remarkable) (*J.W.* 1.31)

By contrast, Schulman omits the epithet and translates the name as follows:

אנטיוכוס עפיפאנוס

Antiochus Epiphanes (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 1)

As suggested above, Schulman's decision to omit the translation of Epiphanes most likely has a twofold motivation. Firstly, Eastern European Jews knew Antiochus by the name אנטיוכוס עפיפאנוס because of his role in the familiar story of Hanukkah, and therefore would not have required a gloss introducing his title. Secondly, the epithet 'illustrious' is semantically extremely loaded with positive as well as regal associations, and therefore would likely have jarred with Schulman's, and more generally Eastern European Jewish, sensibilities about Antiochus as an oppressor of the Jews. Schulman's Hebrew readers would not have understood the Greek label Epiphanes as a word with a specific meaning, but rather simply as a proper name, in contrast to Paret's version, in which readers' attention is pointedly drawn to the value-laden 'illustrious' rather than to the Greek name Epiphanes.

Jewish names

Schulman employs a similar domesticating technique when translating the names of Jewish figures which would have been well known to his target readership. Thus, in Book 1, Chapter 1, Mattathias is introduced as 'Matthias, der Sohn des Asamonaios' in the German version:

Matthias, der Sohn des Asamonaios, einer der Priester aus einem Dorfe Modein war es

It was Matthias, the son of Asamonaeus, one of the priests from the village of Modi'in (Paret 1855: 54)

Schulman replaces Paret's patronymic with the label by which Mattathias was commonly known among Eastern European Jews, again chiefly from the story of Hanukkah:

ורוח ה' לבשה את מתתיהו החשמונני כהן עיר מודעית

And the spirit of the Lord came over Mattathias the Hasmonean, priest of the town of Modi'in (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 3)

A similar case concerns the name of the biblical King David, who is mentioned in Book 1, Chapter 2. In Paret's version, again modelled on the Greek, the name appears as follows:

die Gruft Dauids

David's grave (Paret 1855: 60)

Schulman inserts the epithet המלך 'King' in his translation, in keeping with the standard Jewish appellation for the monarch:

קבר דוד המלך

the grave of King David (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 9)

Gentilic adjectives

Just as Schulman domesticates personal names appearing in *The Jewish War*, so he substitutes gentilic adjectives appearing in Paret's version with alternatives possessing specifically biblical or Jewish associations. For example, in Book 3, Chapter 2, Paret (following the Greek original) renders the gentilic adjective referring to a location in the Transjordan as Peraite 'Perean':

Niger der Peraite

Niger the Perean (Paret 1855: 355)

Schulman, by contrast, replaces this with גלעדי 'Gileadite'. Gilead and Perea occupy a similar location in the Transjordan but Gilead is the biblical name of the region and the one by which it was always referred to in subsequent Jewish tradition, while Perea is the Roman title and lacks Jewish associations. The change serves to both to transform the geographical context of the narrative from a Roman to a Jewish one and to designate the figure of Niger as a member of the Jewish nation.

ניגער הגלעדי

Niger the Gileadite (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 320)

Toponyms

Schulman's tendency to domesticate proper names extends to toponyms. For example, in Book 1, Chapter 2, Paret's version contains a reference to Philadelphia, on the site of present-day Amman:

[...] dem Tyrannen von Philadelphiea

[...] the tyrant of Philadelphia (Paret 1855: 60)

Schulman domesticates this designation by changing it to 'Rabbah of the Ammonites', the biblical name for the location (appearing in Jeremiah 49:2 and Ezekiel 21:25):

העריץ אשר ברבבת בני עמון

The tyrant in Rabbah of the Ammonites (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 9)

Insertion of Jewish ethnonyms

Another very common domesticating technique that Schulman employs is the insertion of ethnonyms denoting the Jewish nation (most commonly יהודי 'Jew', but also sometimes בני ישראל 'the children of Israel') which are not present in Paret's translation. Like the modification of personal names and toponyms discussed above, this change has the effect of drawing the reader's attention to the Jewish identity of the individuals or groups in question and thereby reinforcing the ethnic link between the historical figures in Josephus' narrative and the nineteenth-century readers of the translated text.

Thus, in Book 3, Chapter 8, in a passage wherein Josephus' Jewish companions threaten him concerning planned surrender to the Romans, Paret's version, like the Greek, refers to unsere Volksehre 'our national honour', without specification of the nation concerned (though the context makes clear that it refers to the Jews).

für unsere Volksehre

for the honour of our people (Paret 1855: 401)

Schulman's adaptation, by contrast, erases any possible ambiguity by making the Jewish identity of the speakers completely explicit:

כל כבוד בית ישראל

all of the honour of the House of Israel (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 4)

In many cases Schulman's changes serve to highlight the Jewish identity of victims of slaughter and conquest. For example, in Book 1, Chapter 1, Paret, following his Greek source text, refers to a group of supporters of Ptolemy killed by Antiochus as Anhänger 'supporters', without any indication of their ethnic identity:

Der König [...] mordete eine große Menge der Anhänger des Ptolemaios

The king [...] murdered a large number of Ptolemy's supporters (Paret 1855: 53)

Schulman, by contrast, highlights the ethnic identity of the supporters by inserting the word יהודים 'Jews' into the sentence:

הָרַג רַב וְאַבְדָן נֹרָא בַיהוּדִים בְּעֲלֵי בְרִית תַּלְמִי

great killing and terrible destruction of the Jews who had made a covenant with Ptolemy (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 1)

Similarly, in Book 3, Chapter 9, while recounting the reception of Vespasian's army in Caesarea, Paret (as usual, closely following his Greek source text) uses the ethnically non-specific label Ueberwundene 'defeated ones' with reference to the city's vanquished Jews:

aus Haß gegen die Ueberwundenen

out of hatred for the defeated ones (Paret 1855: 408)

Again, Schulman transforms this non-specific designation into an unambiguous ethnic label:

בגלל שנאתם אשר שנאו את היהודים האומללים

because of the hatred which they bore the wretched Jews (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 12)

Similarly, in the following extract from Book 6, Chapter 1, Paret makes no reference to any specific group of people when describing the lack of empathy on the part of a group of combatants for the deaths that they have witnessed and the failure to recognize that the same fate may befall them.

Sie aber ergriff, wenn sie auf dieselben traten, weder Schauer noch Mitleiden, noch betrachteten sie diese Beschimpfung der Verschiedenen als ein übles Vorzeichen des Schicksals das sie erwartete

But, when they stepped over these [corpses], they exhibited not even a shiver of sympathy, nor did they regard this outrage against those who were different [from them] as a sinister omen of the destiny that awaited them (Paret 1855: 607)

By contrast, in Schulman's version the victims of slaughter take on an overtly Jewish identity through the insertion of two unambiguous references:

לא נאנחו על שד בת עמם, גם לא שמו על לב כי רעה תבוא עליהם על נבְלָם את נבלות האדם ועל חללם
את כבוד חללי בני ישראל ההם

They did not sigh over the pillaging of the daughter of their people, nor did they notice that evil was going to descend upon them for their destruction of the men's bodies and for violating the honour of those fallen children of Israel (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 266b)

Another example of this technique is shown in the following extract from Book 6, Chapter 1, in which Paret describes the slaughter of a group of ethnically unspecified watchmen guarding the wall (Paret's translation does not make clear that the watchmen were killed, in contrast to the original Greek, in which the verb employed is the unambiguous *ἀποσφάξαντες* 'slaying' [J.W. 6.68]).

[...] stießen die vordersten Posten, welche schliefen, nieder

[...] they knocked down the frontline watchmen, who were sleeping (Paret 1855: 616)

In Schulman's version the guards are specifically identified as Jewish:

ויהרגו את היהודים השומרים את החומה אשר היו עיפים ויגעים ותרדמה גדולה נפלה עליהם

They killed the Jews who were guarding the wall, who were tired and weary and whom a great sleep had overtaken (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 238)

However, Schulman also makes this type of modification in order to highlight the Jewish identity of fighters rather than victims. Thus, in Book 6, Chapter 1, during the description of the Romans' siege of Jerusalem's city walls, Paret's version contains the following statement, which resembles the Greek relatively closely and lacks any indication of the ethnic association of those involved in the action:

[...] gleichwohl wagte Niemand sie zu ersteigen, weil die Vordersten, die es versucht haben würden, einem sichern Tod entgegengingen

[...] nevertheless no one dared to climb up, because those on the front line who had tried it had gone to meet a certain death (Paret 1855: 611)

Conversely, Schulman brings out the Jewish identity of the attackers on the wall, one which is totally unexpressed in the German source text:

בכל אלה לא עָרַב אִישׁ אֶת לְבוֹ לְעֹלוֹת עַל הַחוּמָה הַהִיא, כִּי כָל אֶחָד יָדַע אֶל נֶכּוֹן כִּי הִרְאִשׁוּנִים אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶנוּ
עֹלוֹת עֲלֶיהָ יִרְהוּ יִירוּ בַחֲצִים וְסִקְלֵי וְסִקְלוּ בְּאֲבָנִים בַּתְּגֵרַת יְדֵי הַיְהוּדִים

Among all of them not one man ventured to go up that wall, for everyone knew that the first ones who dared to go up it would be shot with arrows and stoned in the Jews' assault (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 270)

Insertion of Jewish religious and cultural information

Schulman's domesticating strategies extend to the insertion of explicit references to Jewish religious culture that are lacking in the German version. This tendency is in keeping with Schulman's religious outlook and belief in the sanctity of his subject matter (Feiner 2002: 247-52). Such references encompass a variety of concepts and items, to be discussed below.

The Temple and Jerusalem

Schulman systematically alters references to the Temple in Jerusalem appearing in the German text in order to bring them in line with the labels by which it is known in Jewish tradition. Paret invariably employs the term Tempel 'temple', following the original Greek *ναός* or *ἱερόν* 'temple'; the German label and its Greek sources are all nonspecific in their cultural and religious connotations. Paret's convention is illustrated in the following example from Book 1, Chapter 1.

Der König [...] beraubte selbst den Tempel

He himself despoiled the Temple (Paret 1855: 53)

Schulman instead uses the term 'הַיְכָל ה' 'Temple of the LORD', thereby adding an unambiguous indication that the temple in question is not just any sanctuary but rather the epicentre of holiness revered in Jewish tradition.

והוא התפרץ אל היכל ה'

And he broke into the Temple of the LORD (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 1)

Schulman does not replace every appearance of the German ‘Tempel’ with the term היכל 'ה; rather, he employs a range of traditional Jewish designations. For example, in the following extract from Book 2, Chapter 1, he substitutes the German ‘Tempel’ with the Hebrew בית ה' ‘House of the Lord’:

in den Tempel
into the Temple (Paret 1855: 220)

אל בית ה'

to the House of the LORD (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 174)

Schulman’s technique is particularly striking in cases where Paret’s text contains a vague reference to the Temple but does not refer to it specifically by name. For example, in the following extract from Book 1, Chapter 1, the German version reads Platz ‘place’, but the context makes clear that the Temple is the place under discussion:

[...] reinigte den ganzen Platz
[...] he purified the whole place (Paret 1855: 55)

Schulman removes this ambiguity by inserting the unmistakable phrase מקדש ה' ‘the Temple of the LORD’:

ואז טהר את מקדש ה'

And then he purified the Temple of the LORD (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 4)

Just as Schulman modifies Paret’s references to the Temple in order to bring out its divine associations, so he augments descriptions of Jerusalem with explicit indications of its holy nature. An example of this technique can be seen in Book 6, Chapter 1, in a passage describing the aftermath of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Paret describes Jerusalem’s suburbs as prächtig ‘stunning’:

[...] und die prächtigen Vorstädte Jeusalems
[...] and the magnificent suburbs of Jerusalem (Paret 1855: 608)

By contrast, Schulman's equivalent of this phrase presents Jerusalem as holy rather than simply beautiful:

ואת ירושלים שתולה בהדרת קדש

and Jerusalem, rooted in holy glory (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 267)

Divine references

Similarly, Schulman often augments his translation with explicit divine references that are absent from the German version, a technique that has the effect of underscoring the Jewish context of the narrative and the presence of the God of Israel within it. This tendency is illustrated in the following extract from Book 2, Chapter 1 on the subject of Archelaus' visit to the Temple. Paret's version reads as follows:

[...] wo ihn das Volk mit mancherlei Segenswünschen bewillkommnete

[...] where the people welcomed him with many blessings (Paret 1855: 220)

Schulman amends Paret's neutral statement of greeting to include a divine reference:

ויברכוהו בשם ה' פעמים רבות

And they blessed him in the name of the LORD many times (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 174)

Similarly, in the following excerpt from Book 2, Chapter 1 Paret's text presents the following description of a replacement priest, which consists of two culturally non-specific comparative substantival adjectives:

[...] einen frömmeren und reineren zu wählen

[...] to choose a more pious and pure one (Paret 1855: 222)

Schulman replaces Paret's description with one that is unequivocally embedded in Jewish tradition and strongly evocative of positive Jewish religious values, labelling him a צדיק 'righteous man' and inserting a reference to the Torah:

ולקיים תחתיו איש צדיק וישר ההולך בתורת ה'

And to establish in his place a righteous and upright man who walks with the LORD's Torah (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 176)

Similarly, in the extract below from Book 1, Chapter 1, Paret introduces Mattathias' rebellion by means of an equational sentence centred on a form of the verb 'to be' with Mattathias as its subject:

Matthias, der Sohn des Asamoniaios, einer der Priester aus einem Dorfe Modein war es
It was Matthias, the son of Asamonaeus, one of the priests from the village of Modi'in
 (Paret 1855: 54)

Schulman completely transforms this into a transitive verbal sentence with the spirit of the LORD as its subject and Mattathias as its object, leaving no doubt as to the divine source of Mattathias' actions and imbuing the narrative with the miraculous connotations familiar to Jews from the Hanukkah story:

ורוח ה' לבשה את מתתיהו החשמונני כהן עיר מודעית

And the spirit of the LORD came over Matthias the Hasmonean, priest of the town of Modi'in (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 3)

Similarly, just as Schulman highlights the Jewish identity of figures by inserting explicit ethnonyms into the translated text, so he inserts God's name in order to emphasize divine allusions that are implied but not overtly referenced in the German source text. For example, in Book 3, Chapter 8, Josephus utters a prayer to God; in Paret's version (as in the Greek) the deity is not specifically addressed but the second person singular pronoun Du 'you' in the context of the prayer makes the reference clear:

„Da Du beschlossen hast [...]“

'As You decided [...]' (Paret 1855: 401)

Schulman does not leave the prayer's addressee implicit, but rather adds it overtly into Josephus' speech:

אתה ה' אלהים! אתה גזרת אמר

'You, O LORD God! You have decreed' (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 3)

Schulman likewise brings out the specifically Jewish associations of references to Temple sacrifice appearing in Josephus' work. For example, in Book 5, Chapter 1, Paret's text contains a cursory and oblique reference to sacrifice that reads as follows:

[...] sondern auch viele der Opfernden tödtete

[...] but he also killed many of those bringing sacrifices (Paret 1855: 524)

By contrast, in Schulman's version the Jewish religious connotations of the action are brought to the fore through the addition of a phrase indicating that the sacrifice was conducted for the benefit of the LORD and took place at His Temple:

גם הִמִּית עוֹד אֲנָשִׁים רַבִּים מֵאֲנָשֵׁי הַשְּׁלוֹם אֲשֶׁר באוּ לְזִבּוּחַ לַה' בְּבֵית מִקְדָּשׁוֹ

He also killed many men of peace who were coming to sacrifice to the LORD at His Temple (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 176)

Festivals, lifecycle events, and laws

Schulman's domesticating strategy is similarly evidenced in his tendency to supplement his translation with details about aspects of Jewish life that are not present in the German version. For example, in the initial description in Book 1, Chapter 3 of the Jewish revolt against Alexander Jannaeus in the early first century BCE, Paret (in keeping with the Greek) mentions a non-specific festival:

Nach Unterjochung dieser Städte erhob sich gegen ihn eine Empörung der Juden an einem Feste

After the subjugation of these cities, the Jews rose up against him in outrage at a festival (Paret 1855: 69)

Schulman replaces this generic reference with a specific mention of the autumn festival of Sukkot, which serves to situate the event vividly within the Jewish annual cycle:

כִּי בַיָּמֵי חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת קִשְׁרוּ עָלָיו הַיְהוּדִים קֶשֶׁר

For in the days of the festival of Sukkot the Jews conspired against him (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 16)

Similarly, Schulman adapts references to lifecycle events in order to contextualize them as unambiguously Jewish. For example, in the description of Mattathias' death in Book 1, Chapter 1, Paret's text (again, closely following the Greek) consists of a brief mention of Mattathias, followed by a date and reference to the transferral of leadership to his son:

[...] starb er [166 v. Chr.], die Herrschaft seinem ältesten Sohne Judas hinterlassend

[...] he died [166 BC], leaving the leadership to his eldest son Judas (Paret 1855: 54)

In Schulman's version, this description is almost completely transformed. Firstly, Mattathias' death is framed in the conventional style of a biblical description of the death of a patriarch (cf. the death of Abraham in Genesis 25:8 and the death of Isaac in Genesis 35:29, which both contain the similar phrase וַיִּגָּע וַיָּאָסֶף אֶל-עַמּוּיָו [...]'And [...] breathed his last and died, and was gathered to his people'). Secondly, Schulman removes the historical date of the death according to the Gregorian calendar (see below for a fuller discussion of this technique).

ויהי כי קרבו ימיו למות, ויקרא את בניו אליו, וישם את המשרה על שכם יהודה בנו הגדול, ויגע ויאסף אל אבותיו

And when his time to die drew near, he called his sons to him and placed the leadership on the shoulder(s) of his eldest son Judah, and he died and was gathered to his ancestors (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 3)

Likewise, Schulman inserts elements of Jewish ritual law into his translation. Thus, in Book 1, Chapter 2, Paret's version contains the following description of a famine caused by a blockade:

[...] eine solche Hungersnoth, daß sie auch das Ungewohnteste verzehrten
[...] such a famine that they ate even the most unusual things (Paret 1855: 62)

Schulman expands this laconic reference considerably with graphic details of the non-kosher nature of the unusual food that the inhabitants of Samaria were forced to eat:

ויהי רעב נזרא בשומרון, ויושביה אכלו בֶּשֶׂר הַשֶּׁקֶץ וְהַעֲכָבֵר וְכָל רֶמֶשׂ הָאָדָמָה וְנִבְלֹת כָּל תּוֹעֵבָה
And there was a terrible famine in Samaria, and its inhabitants ate unclean meat, and mice, and all [manner of] creeping things, and carcasses, every abomination (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 9-10)

Insertion of intensifying elements

Schulman's domesticating tendencies extend to a proclivity for inserting modifiers with either negative or positive connotations into the translated text in order to heighten the force of narrative portions relating to issues that Jewish readers would likely perceive as significant, including descriptions of Jewish cultural concepts, treatment of the Jews, and noteworthy Jewish figures. This technique has the effect of helping to transform

Josephus' account into what Feiner (2002: 252) describes as 'a fascinating historical novel'.

Negative insertions

Schulman often inserts elements with strong negative associations into his translation in order to highlight the malevolent character of figures who persecuted the Jews or acted against the interests of Jewish unity. In many cases these elements consist of attributive adjectives appended to common and proper nouns appearing in the German version. For example, in Chapter 1, Book 1, Paret's text contains the following description of Antiochus' hatred of the Jews:

Erbe seines Throns und seines Judenhasses ward sein Sohn
His son inherited his Throne and his hatred of the Jews (Paret 1855: 55)

Schulman makes clear the extent of Antiochus' hatred by modifying it with the adjective עזה 'intense', an addition which reinforces the highly negative representation of the king discussed above.

ובנו [...] ירש את כסא מלכותו גם את שנאתו העזה ליהודים

And his son [...] inherited the throne of his kingship and also his intense hatred of the Jews (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 4)

Another example of this technique concerns the description of the Zealots appearing in Book 5, Chapter 1. Paret's text, closely following the Greek original, contains the following statement about the Zealots' attack on Jerusalem:

Das feindliche Auftreten der Zeloten gegen das Volk, welches den eigentlichen Anfang des Endes der Stadt bildete, ist seinem Ursprunge nach und in seinem unheilvollen Fortgang oben genau geschildert worden
The hostile stance of the Zealots against the people, which formed the real beginning of the end of the city, has already been precisely described in its origin and in its disastrous progress (Paret 1855: 522)

Schulman transforms the reference to the Zealots into a much harsher condemnation through the addition of the unmistakably negative attributive adjective רשעים 'wicked', an alteration rooted in his view that the Zealots were fanatics who were ultimately responsible for the destruction of the Temple (Feiner 2002: 250-1).

ואני הנה הודעתי כבר את מעללי הקנאים הרשעים

And indeed I have already made known the deeds of the wicked Zealots (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 174)

Schulman's utilization of negative intensifying elements is not restricted to attributive adjectives. In many cases he augments Paret's text with entire phrases bearing negative connotations. This is clearly illustrated in Book 5, Chapter 1, in which Paret's text contains the following relatively unemotional account of the division of Jerusalem into opposing parties:

[...] drei Parteien, von denen jede sich gegen die andere kehrte, was man im Unglück noch ein Glück und ein Werk der Gerechtigkeit nennen darf

[...] three parties, each of which turned against the others, which one could call fortunateness within misfortune and a work of justice (Paret 1855: 522)

In Schulman's version, the sparse statement cited above is rewritten into a gruesome depiction of the horrific consequences of Jewish disunity through the addition of two vivid phrases.

ויושביה נפלגו לשלש פלגות וכל אחת השחיתה את רעותה באכזריות חמה, ונהרי דמים בנהרי דמים נגעו
And its inhabitants split into three parties, and each one destroyed its fellow with great (lit: hot) cruelty, and rivers of blood merged with each other (lit: touched rivers of blood) (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 174)

A similar example of this practice appears in Book 1, Chapter 1, in the account of Antiochus' desecration of the Temple. In Paret's version the description is limited to the following short clause:

und Schweine auf dem Altar zu opfern
and to sacrifice pigs on the altar (Paret 1855: 54)

Schulman augments this short description substantially, adding an entire clause to emphasize the extent of the defilement and to highlight the idolatrous nature of Antiochus' actions in the heart of the Temple:

לטמא את מזבח ה' ולהעלות עליו חזרים, ולהציב מצבות שקציו וגלוליו במקדש ה'

To defile the altar of the LORD and sacrifice pigs on it, and to put up statues of his abominations and his idols in the Temple of the LORD (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 2)

Positive insertions

Conversely, Schulman inserts modifiers with positive connotations into his text in order to enhance descriptions of figures and institutions that are well regarded in Jewish traditions. For example, in Book 1, Chapter 1, Paret's version contains the following mention of the wall that Judah Maccabee built around the Temple:

[...] umgab ihn mit einer Mauer
 [...] he surrounded it with a wall (Paret 1855: 55)

Schulman modifies the noun with the attributive adjective נשגבה 'lofty', which transforms Paret's brief and neutral reference into a striking and charged description:

ויקיפהו בחומה נשגבה

And he surrounded it with a lofty wall (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 4)

This practice is likewise evident in Book 1, Chapter 2, in a passage narrating the death of Judah's brother Jonathan at the hands of Antiochus the Younger's ward Trypho. Paret's description reads as follows:

So nahm er auch Jonathan, der mit geringem Gefolge nach Ptolemais zu Antiochos gekommen war, hinterlistig gefangen
 Then he perfidiously captured Jonathan, who had come with a small retinue to Antiochus at Ptolemais (Paret 1855: 58)

Schulman inserts the modifier בר לבב 'pure-hearted' to describe Jonathan, rendering his positive character completely unequivocal, in contrast to the German source text wherein it remains unspecified.

ויהונתן בר הלבב נתפש במזמות העריץ הנוכל הזה

And the pure-hearted Jonathan was captured by the schemes of this deceitful tyrant (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 6)

As in the case of negative insertions, Schulman's positive supplements may consist of entire phrases and clauses in addition to adjectives. An example of this technique can be

seen in Book 1, Chapter 1, in the description of Simon's reign following Jonathan's death. In Paret's version, Simon's rule is described briefly as *trefflich* 'excellent':

Simon selbst regierte [143-135 v. Chr.] *trefflich*

Simon himself ruled [143-135 BC] excellently (Paret 1855: 58)

In Schulman's version, the description is enlarged with an entire clause expanding on the nature of this excellence:

אחרי מות יהונתן, לָבַשׁ שִׁמְעוֹן אֶחָיו עֹז וִיחֹזֵק אֶת רֶסֶן הַמְּמִשְׁלָה בְּרוּחַ חֵכְמָה וּגְבוּרָה

After Jonathan's death, his brother Simon gathered (lit: donned) strength and fortified the reins of government in the spirit of wisdom and might (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 6)

Omission and modification of dates

Another common aspect of Schulman's domesticating strategy concerns his treatment of dates. As mentioned above, one of the chief alterations that Paret makes to his Greek source text is the insertion of bracketed dates according to the Gregorian calendar in order to provide precise information about the historical context of the events under discussion. Schulman adopts several practices when dealing with the dates appearing in the German version, to be discussed below.

In many cases Schulman simply removes Paret's dates. This tendency is illustrated in the following example from Book 1, Chapter 2. In Paret's version the account of Jonathan's succession to Hasmonean rule is accompanied by a precise year:

Judas' Nachfolger ward sein Bruder Jonathan [160 v. Chr.]

Judas' successor was his brother Jonathan [160 BC] (Paret 1855: 57)

By contrast, in Schulman's version this information is absent, as shown below. Strikingly, unlike many of the domesticating techniques discussed above, this practice has the effect of bringing the Hebrew translation closer to the Greek original, which lacks dates. However, as Schulman did not work directly from the Greek version this is unlikely to have been a conscious factor motivating his omissions. Rather, he may have removed the dates because he perceived them as an interruption to the narrative flow of the text that was not particularly necessary for the purposes of his translation, which he envisaged as a literary depiction of ancient Jewish history designed for the enrichment of the modern Hebrew canon and the edification of the Ashkenazi population rather than as a document intended for historians requiring precise information. An additional

consideration may have been a desire to avoid utilizing the Christian calendar where possible (though he does occasionally retain Gregorian dates, as will be seen below).

אחרי מות יהודה, שמו היהודים את יהונתן אחיו אלוף

After Judah's death, the Jews appointed his brother Jonathan [as their] commander (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 5)

In some cases Schulman retains the dates appearing in Paret's text, but adapts them so that they more closely correspond to his biblical linguistic and stylistic model. Thus, in the following extract from Book 3, Chapter 9 Paret glosses the Greek month name Panemos with the German Juli 'July':

am vierten des Monats Panemos [Juli]

on the fourth of the month of Panemos [July] (Paret 1855: 408)

Schulman instead opts for החדש הרביעי 'the fourth month', the designation used in Jeremiah 39:2 to denote the month in which Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians. This alteration has the effect of strengthening the associations between the episodes of Jewish history recounted in Josephus' narrative and those appearing in the Hebrew Bible.

בחדש פאנימוס [הוא החדש הרביעי] בארבעה לחדש

In the month of Panemos [that is the fourth month], on the fourth of the month (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 11)

By contrast, Schulman also inserts dates from the post-biblical Jewish calendar in contexts dealing with prominent events in Jewish history wherein such references would be instantly recognizable and perhaps even expected by his readers. Although these cases seem to clash with the overtly biblicizing tendencies evident throughout his work, it is possible that Schulman did not explicitly associate these dates with the post-biblical period and perhaps did not consider the fact that they do not appear in the biblical corpus. This tendency to insert post-biblical elements despite an expressed preference for biblical grammar and vocabulary is not restricted to Schulman but is rather a widespread trend visible throughout the Hebrew prose of the Russian Haskalah (see Kahn 2009 for details). An example of this practice can be seen in the following extract from Book 6, Chapter 1. Paret retains the Greek month name Panemos from the original text with reference to the period leading up to the destruction of the Second Temple,

and then inserts the equivalent German month name and the Gregorian year 70 AD in brackets:

am Neumond des Monats Panemos [Juli 70 n. Chr.]

on the new moon of the month of Panemos [July 70 AD] (Paret 1855: 610)

Schulman removes the reference to Panemos, replacing it with the post-biblical Jewish month name Tammuz; this would have had strong immediate resonance for Jewish readers as it is the month marking the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem which led to the destruction of the Temple, commemorated with the fast of 17 Tammuz. Interestingly, in this case Schulman includes the year in the Gregorian calendar, though unsurprisingly he changes Paret's Christian designation n. Chr. 'AD' to the Jewish label 'לספהנ"ו' 'according to the Christian reckoning', i.e. 'CE'. It is possible that Schulman retains the Gregorian year because the date of the destruction of the Second Temple had already become well known in this form in maskilic circles by the time of writing.

בראש חודש תמוז 70 לספהנ"ו

On the first of the month of Tammuz, 70 CE (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 269)

Conversely, Schulman translates Paret's Gregorian dates without modification. This is illustrated in an extract from Book 7, chapter 3, which discusses Titus' brother Domitian's birthday and contains the following bracketed insert:

[Domitian, geb. 24. Oktober 50 n. Chr.]

[Domitian, born 24 October, 50 AD] (Paret 1855: 672)

Schulman translates this insertion literally rather than domesticating or omitting it (though as expected he rephrases Paret's explicitly Christian abbreviation n. Chr. 'AD' with its standard Hebrew equivalent). It is likely that he chose to retain this non-Jewish date because it is used in reference to a non-Jewish figure, and therefore the juxtaposition would not seem jarring to Hebrew readers.

דומיטיאן נולד 24 אקטאבער 50 לספהנ"ו

Domitian was born on 24 October, 50 CE (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 343)

Use of *shibbus*

Shibbus, the practice of inserting fragments of biblical verses into new compositions, is commonly employed by maskilic authors (Patterson 1964: 106-7; Pelli 1993: 99-103), and as such Schulman's utilization of the technique is not remarkable in itself. However, the ways in which he employs *shibbus* often reflect the same drive towards domestication exhibited in other aspects of the translation. This phenomenon is illustrated in Book 1, Chapter 1, in the description of Antiochus Epiphanes' death. In Paret's version the ruler is referred to by his first name only:

So starb Antiochos
Then Antiochus died (Paret 1855: 55)

Schulman, by contrast, inserts the epithet צורר היהודים 'the enemy of the Jews', thereby highlighting the strongly negative associations that Antiochus has in Jewish tradition by linking him explicitly to Haman, the archetypal enemy of the Jewish people described by the same label in Esther 3:10.

מת אנטיוכוס צורר היהודים

Antiochus, the enemy of the Jews, died (Schulman 1861-2, 1: 4)

Another example of Schulman's strategic use of *shibbus* can be seen in the following extract from Book 7, Chapter 1, in which Josephus chronicles the defence of the Temple against the Romans led by John and Simon. Paret describes the rebels' bravery as follows:

[...] wehrten sie sich gegen die Römer gemeinschaftlich mit einem Aufwand von Kraft un Muth, der nicht größer hätte sein können
[...] they turned against the Romans jointly, with a display of power and bravery that could not have been greater (Paret 1855: 616)

Schulman chooses to translate the underlined clause by means of a biblical phrase found in Ezekiel 20:33 and particularly well-known among Jews because of its appearance in the Passover Haggadah. The use of this biblical extract serves to locate the action within a setting familiar to Jews for its associations with divine rescue. This can be contrasted with Paret's version, which, though similar in meaning, does not have the same redemptive connotations.

וביד חזקה וזרוע נטויה ההתיצבו לפני הרומאים וילחמו בהם כגבורים משכילים
And with a strong hand and an outstretched arm they positioned themselves before the
 Romans and fought against them like enlightened warriors (Schulman 1861-2, 2: 276)

A similar use of *shibbus* can be seen in Book 7, Chapter 1 in a description of the
 aftermath of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. The passage reads as follows in
 Paret's version:

Solches Ende hatte dieser herrlichen, weltberühmten Stadt, Jerusalem, die Tollheit der
 Aufrührer zugezogen

The madness of the insurrectionists ensured such an end to this magnificent, world-
famous city, Jerusalem (Paret 1855: 668)

Schulman reworks this description by presenting it as a fusion of mournful and
 laudatory epithets of Jerusalem appearing in two verses from Lamentations describing
 the destruction of the First Temple in 586 BCE. The parallel between Schulman's
 sentence and Lamentations is much closer than that between Schulman's and Paret's
 versions, as comparison with the relevant excerpts from Lamentations (shown below)
 illustrate. Schulman's use of *shibbus* in this context creates a dramatic parallel between
 the biblical account of the destruction of Jerusalem and the one described by Josephus.

הזאת העיר שיאמרו לה רבתי בגוים, שרתי במדינות, כלילת יפי ומשוש כל ארץ הקדם?

Is this the city of which they say [that] she is great among the nations, a princess among
 the provinces, perfection of beauty and the joy of all the land[s] of the east? (Schulman
 1861-2, 2: 338)

איכה | יִשְׁבֶּה בְּדָד הָעִיר רַבְּתִי עִם הָיְתָה כְּאַלְמָנָה רַבְּתִי בְּגוֹיִם שְׂרָתִי בְּמַדִּינֹת הָיְתָה לְמַס:

How lonely sits the city that was full of people, she has become like a widow; she that
 was great among the nations, a princess among the provinces, has become a vassal
 (Lam. 1:1)

הזאת העיר שיאמרו כלילת יפי משוש לכל-הארץ:

Is this the city which they call perfection of beauty, a joy for the whole earth? (Lam.
 2:15)

Simchoni's critique of Schulman's translation

Schulman's domesticating approach to the translation of Josephus is clearly rooted in the ideological aims of the Russian Haskalah, which sought to enrich Ashkenazi society through its literary activity (Patterson 1988: 5-10; Feiner 2002). However, in post-maskilic Eastern Europe the understanding of the role of Josephus' place within Hebrew literature acquired a different character, as evidenced by the work of a translator from a later generation: Jacob Naphtali Herz Simchoni's Hebrew version of *The Jewish War* תולדות מלחמת היהודים עם הרומאים [Account of the War of the Jews against the Romans] was published in Warsaw in 1923 and differs markedly from Schulman's in three significant ways. Firstly, it was translated directly from the Greek; secondly, it constitutes a relatively close rendering of the source text without the domesticating additions and modifications seen in Schulman's work; and thirdly, it contains scholarly apparatus including footnotes with historical information and commentary on difficult or noteworthy aspects of the original. In these respects Simchoni's translation more closely resembles Paret's than Schulman's. In his introduction Simchoni (1923: 6) refers disparagingly to the work of his maskilic predecessor, dismissing Schulman's biblicizing style with its frequent use of *shibbus*; his lack of faithfulness to and misunderstanding of his German source material; and his inability to translate directly from the original Greek. (Ironically, Feldman [1984: 552] criticizes Simchoni's translation for some of these same faults, categorizing it as 'full of inaccuracies' and 'stylistically far from Josephus'; nevertheless, it is indisputably a much closer rendering of the original than Schulman's version.) Simchoni's criticism can be understood as a function of the changes that had taken place in Eastern European Jewish society in the decades following the publication of Schulman's translation, such that Hebrew authors were able to access Greek texts independently and did not deem it important to adapt works like *The Jewish War* so as to reflect contemporary Jewish cultural concerns but rather saw them as historical documents to be translated impartially.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that Kalman Schulman's translation of *The Jewish War* was a strongly ideological exercise designed explicitly to enrich the growing Maskilic Hebrew literary canon and provide Eastern European Jewish readers with an eyewitness account of their own history from the end of the Second Temple period. As such, Schulman viewed his project not as the rendition of a foreign source into Hebrew but rather as the restoration of a quintessentially Jewish story into its true language. This *Skopos* led Schulman to adopt a highly domesticating translation strategy that serves to shape the text in a variety of ways in order to present it to nineteenth-century Hebrew readers as a

narrative strongly rooted in Jewish tradition and told from a Jewish perspective. Schulman employs several different specific techniques in order to achieve this aim; these include the alteration of personal names, gentilic adjectives, and toponyms in order to make them more recognizable or acceptable to Jewish readers; the insertion of Jewish ethnonyms in order to emphasize the Jewish identity of historical figures and groups under discussion; frequent reference to aspects of Jewish religious culture such as the Temple, God, and rituals not explicitly identified as such in Paret's version; intensification of key narrative elements through the use of positive and negative modifiers and clauses; removal or adaptation of non-Jewish dates; and the selection of specific biblical phrases in relevant contexts.

These techniques have the effect of making Schulman's Hebrew translation a strongly partisan narrative explicitly told from a Jewish point of view and steeped in Jewish tradition. The work thus fits in with the overtly expressed ideology of the late Haskalah, according to which works of literature whether translated or original should help strengthen the Jewish consciousness of its readers. It also serves to present Josephus unequivocally as a Jewish sage of old. Interestingly, Schulman's strategy serves not only to distance his version markedly from Paret's German translation, which is itself a relatively close rendering of the Greek source text, but also to produce a work whose Jewish content and viewpoint is much more explicit and striking than that of Josephus' original composition. Schulman's method of translation had significant implications for the perception of the narrated events among maskilic readers and indeed for a time among post-maskilic Eastern European Jews who learned about the events through the filter of Schulman's work (Feiner 2002: 247-8). However, by the 1920s Schulman's domesticating approach seems to have given way to a very different attitude, as evidenced by Simchoni's more literal and scholarly rendition and by the sharp criticism of his forerunner's translation style.

References

- Agmon-Fruchtman, Maya and Immanuel Allon. 1994. פרקים בתולדות הלשון העברית, . יחידה 8: החייאת העברית [History of the Hebrew Language: The Modern Division, Unit 8: The Revival of Hebrew]. Tel Aviv: Open University.
- Feiner, Shmuel. 2002. *Haskalah and History: The Emergence of a Modern Jewish Historical Consciousness*. Translated by Chaya Naor and Sondra Silverston. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.
- Feldman, Louis H. 1984. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Josephus, Flavius. *The Jewish War*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927-8.
- Kahn, Lily. 2009. *The Verbal System in Late Enlightenment Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. 1982. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Ed. Raphael Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Paret, Heinrich. 1855. *Geschichte des jüdischen Krieges*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- . 1856. Über den Pharaïsmus des Josephus. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 29: 809-44.
- Patterson, David. 1988. *A Phoenix in Fetters: Studies in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Hebrew Fiction*. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- . 1964. *The Hebrew Novel in Czarist Russia*. Repr., Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2009.
- Pelli, Moshe. 1993. On the Role of *Melitzah* in the Literature of Hebrew Enlightenment. In *Hebrew in Ashkenaz: A Language in Exile*, ed. Lewis Glinert, 99-110. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
- Schulman, Kalman. 1861-2. *מלחמות היהודים עם הרומאים* [The wars of the Jews against the Romans]. 2 vols. Vilna: R. M. Romm.
- Simchoni (Simchowitz), Jacob Naftali Herz. 1923. *תולדות מלחמת היהודים עם הרומאים* [Account of the War of the Jews against the Romans]. Warsaw: HaSefira.
- Slutsky, Yehuda. 2007. Schulman, Kalman. In *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 2nd ed. Ed. Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik, vol. 18, 172. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Sue, Eugène. 1842-3. *Les Mystères de Paris*. Paris: *Journal des Débats*.
- Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2008. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.