

# THE BOOK OF JOB

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

London    Edinburgh    Glasgow    Copenhagen

New York    Toronto    Melbourne    Cape Town

Bombay    Calcutta    Madras    Shanghai

HUMPHREY MILFORD

Publisher to the University

THE BOOK OF  
JOB

A REVISED TEXT AND VERSION

BY

C. J. BALL

---

WITH PREFACE

BY

C. F. BURNEY

---

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1922

## PREFACE

IN responding to Dr. Ball's request that I should write a preface to his commentary on the Book of Job I feel very strongly that I run the risk of appearing lightly to commit an act of intolerable assumption. Dr. Ball was well known as an accomplished Hebrew scholar when I was a child in the nursery. He guided my first steps in the study of Hebrew; and throughout my life I have been and still am his pupil, gaining from him a store of knowledge and inspiration for which it is impossible adequately to express my obligation. All Hebrew scholars who matter are well aware of his pre-eminent gifts, and will joyfully welcome his detailed and critical discussion of the most difficult book in the Old Testament. If, then, I undertake the task which gratitude and affection forbid me to decline, I must be understood to be addressing myself to younger scholars to whom Dr. Ball's reputation may not be so familiar as it is to an older generation.

Perhaps the most striking characteristic of the present commentary is its originality and freshness. The writer does not profess laboriously to have studied and digested the works of all former scholars upon the Book of Job; I suspect indeed that there are many such which he has not troubled to consult. This, in my opinion, is all to the good. Biblical exegesis labours under the burden of volumes which are, mainly if not wholly, commentaries upon other commentaries. Such a Rabbinic method of exegesis, if intelligently performed, has a certain value; yet it can hardly be doubted that it has a serious tendency to stifle originality of thought, and not seldom (we may suspect) it is the mark of the kind of scholarship which is incapable of reaching original conclusions. Dr. Ball is a scholar who has a masterly grasp of Hebrew idiom,



and a knowledge of cognate languages which in breadth and depth is unique; and with this he combines a feeling for literary style and a shrewd common sense such as few scholars can claim. If he be thought to deal somewhat drastically with the text of Job, it must be remembered that this text presents problems which call for drastic treatment by the scholar who possesses the equipment for the task; and it cannot be doubted that Dr. Ball is such a scholar. In this respect his work speaks for itself. Those of us who have worked for many years at the text of the Old Testament may have been responsible for the suggestion of a large number of emendations in corrupt and difficult passages; yet few indeed are the passages in which we can flatter ourselves that we have actually recovered the original, and settled the textual difficulty once and for all. I have read through Dr. Ball's proof-sheets with great care, and have also listened with delight to his verbal discussion of many of the difficulties in the text of Job, and I am convinced that in not a few textual problems he has actually reached finality, whilst in others his criticisms and suggestions rarely fail to illuminate the point at issue. One marked characteristic of his method which has always impressed me is that he carries his hearer or reader with him in such a way that the conclusion can often be divined before it is stated; and this is the best kind of proof of sound reasoning and critical acumen.

Dr. Ball's volume is not merely a commentary on the text of Job. It is a storehouse of material for the enrichment of the Hebrew Lexicon. This results, in the main, from his profound knowledge of the Babylonian language—a knowledge which is essential to progress in Hebrew studies, but in which the great majority of our professed Old Testament students are unfortunately lacking. In the present work the supreme value of such knowledge is illustrated by the writer's masterly translation and discussion of the text of 'the Babylonian Job' on pp. 12 ff.

For myself one of the most interesting and valuable features of the book is the elucidation of the original biliteral forms of Semitic roots by reference to Sumerian. In this Dr. Ball holds the position of a pioneer; and students who have not read his 'Semitic and Sumerian' (*Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, 1909)

and 'Shumer and Shem' (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. vii, 1915) should certainly make themselves acquainted with them, in order that they may understand more clearly the principles of phonetic interchange and of the formation of triliteral roots which the theory presupposes. So far as I have been able, with my limited knowledge, to test and use the theory, I believe it to be fundamentally correct; and it is greatly to be hoped that the present volume will serve to bring this most important line of investigation to the notice of all serious Semitic philologists.

C. F. BURNEY.

OXFORD,

*October, 1921.*

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
REVISED TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK OF JOB .	35
COMMENTARY, CRITICAL, PHILOLOGICAL, AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE HEBREW TEXT AND THE ANCIENT VERSIONS . . . . .	95
APPENDIX.—ALTERNATIVE VERSION OF CHAP. 3	467
GENERAL INDEX .	469
INDEX RERUM .	470
INDEX TO NOTES ON HEBREW WORDS	471
SUMERIAN WITH SEMITIC GLOSSES .	476

## INTRODUCTION

IN this great poetical book, the highest achievement of the Hebrew Muse, which indeed our own Tennyson held to be the greatest poem in the world, we move in a different atmosphere from that of the generality of books which precede it in the Hebrew Canon. Amid all diversities of style and statement, one doctrine appears to have dominated the minds of legalists, historians, prophets, and psalmists alike: the doctrine that material prosperity depends upon, and is the reward of, obedience to the Divine Law, while misfortune of every kind, whether national or individual, is a direct and inevitable consequence and penalty of sin. With this dominant belief was associated a settled conviction that God was the immediate agent in all the phenomena of Nature, and in all the events and vicissitudes of human life and history; secondary causes were hardly recognized at all. And since God was perfectly impartial and absolutely just in dealing out good and evil according to men's deserts, it seemed to follow that there could be no such thing as unmerited suffering; that suffering was always an infallible indication of guilt. Job's three friends and would-be comforters are represented as obsessed by this doctrine; Job himself boldly and vehemently controverts it, as contrary to his own bitter experience and contradicting facts open to the observation of all men. The Prologue gives us what is clearly intended by the author to be the clue to the mystery of Job's unparalleled misfortunes. While affirming his perfect integrity, and tracing all his troubles to the Hand of God, as unquestioningly as both he and his friends do in their long controversy, it reveals a Divine purpose in his sufferings which neither he nor they suspect; a purpose not punitive, but designed to test his motives and to establish beyond all contradiction the sincerity of his goodness and the disinterested nature of his godliness, which had been questioned so persistently by the malevolent cynicism of the Accusing Angel.

The author evidently did not believe that suffering was always retributive. He held that Iahvah might afflict His servants upon other grounds than that of chastisement for sin. And he did not consider that this detracted from the perfect justice of the Divine Arbiter of all events. The infinitely wise and almighty Creator might do what He would with His creature man. It was His absolute right, and, as such,

it involved no infringement of His attribute of Justice. *Shall the clay say to Him who mouldeth it, What makest Thou?* (Is 45<sup>9</sup>; cf. also Ro 9<sup>14-21</sup>). The poet's outlook, moreover, did not extend beyond the present life (see notes on 19<sup>25 ff.</sup>). To him, as to his contemporaries, this earth was the sole field of the Divine dealings with man. All the unmerited calamities of his hero were amply atoned for, and the justice of God was fully vindicated, when Iahvah made good all his losses, giving him 'twice as much as he had before'; a conception of justice which seems to depend on legal ideas of compensation such as we find in Ex 22<sup>1,7,9</sup> (cf. also Is 40<sup>2</sup> 61<sup>7</sup> Zc 9<sup>12</sup>), but which hardly satisfies the modern mind. No matter how great the wisdom and power of Deity is supposed to be, the picture presented to us in the Prologue of a blameless person surrendered, from whatever motive and under whatever restrictions, to the pitiless handling of an evil Angel by the Lord of All, shocks our sense of Justice, and almost suggests the despairing cry of Gloucester in the great tragedy of Lear:

*As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods;  
They kill us for their sport.*

But the poet of Job had no such misgivings. He was apparently altogether satisfied with the *dénouement* of the story in which, after the Divine intervention, Job's fortunes are restored and all goes merrily as a marriage bell. The modern conscience will sympathize far more readily with the innocent sufferer's indignant protests and passionate outcries against the cruel injustice of Heaven than with the explanation of it which satisfied the poet, who seems to classify it with the earthquake and the storm as a lawful if terrible exhibition of irresponsible omnipotence in which the idea of justice is swallowed up and disappears, and about which it is futile to argue from the standpoint of human knowledge which falls hopelessly short of understanding either the works or the counsels of God. He seems to be satisfied with the solution *He reigns*; and the King can do no wrong.

The poetically splendid but scientifically obsolete parade of the wonders of the natural world, inanimate and animate, which constitutes the long-drawn and perhaps later-extended reply of Iahvah to Job's final appeal (31<sup>36</sup>), may appear to us little better than a magnificent irrelevance, but was certainly intended by its author as a complete vindication of the ways of God which had proved so perplexing to Job. It says not a word of the Divine purpose in afflicting Job (see Prol.); and its sole effect upon the sufferer is that he confesses his utter ignorance and impotence in relation to God. It lies open to the obvious objection that, if a man believes himself wronged, the sense and smart of wrong' are hardly relieved by demonstration that the wrongdoer is

incomparably stronger and wiser than he. At most, he may be reduced to the dull and dumb submission of the oriental fatalist by the conviction that resistance is futile; that he is a mere puppet in the hands of an Infinite Power.

Unlike so many thinkers of our own and former times, the poet of this immortal drama never loses faith in the being of God. The question of the existence of Iahvah, the supreme Arbiter of events, the absolute Lord of All ('the Sultan in the skies', as one has called Him), is never raised at all, never even approached or hinted at, within the whole compass of the book. Never, in the very extremity of his sufferings, does Job suggest a doubt that HE IS. Utterly baffled by the mystery of his own misfortunes, and steadfastly maintaining that he has not deserved them, he believes and affirms that the Divine Judge is fully aware of his righteousness, and repeatedly demands to be confronted with Him face to face; certain that he could then establish his contention, and satisfy his all-powerful Adversary. His confidence even reaches the point of solemnly declaring that his Avenger will one day appear on earth, and do him justice before his death (19<sup>25 ff.</sup>). This, accordingly, is what happens when Iahvah answers him 'out of the Stormwind' (38'), rebukes and humiliates his uncharitable friends, and restores him to health, wealth, and peace.

In trying to find exact equivalents in modern speech for the ideas and phraseology of an ancient Hebrew thinker, it is necessary to bear in mind that our best results can only be approximately correct. To appreciate the breadth of the gulf which separates the common knowledge of our own time from the primitive standpoint of the poet and his contemporaries, we have only to glance at many of the questions about the ordinary phenomena of Nature, such as Light and Darkness, Dew and Rain and Hail, Frost, Ice and Snow, Clouds, Thunder and Lightning, which the Deity Himself propounds to Job as mysteries insoluble by human wisdom. In all such matters, thanks to the progress of Physical Science, the child of to-day may be far wiser than the sages of old. The ideas and terminology of the natural sciences are unknown to Biblical Hebrew. Everything is at the stage of the crudest beginnings. Light and Darkness, and other natural phenomena, e. g. the winds (Ps 135<sup>7</sup>), snow and hail, are conceived as substantive and independent entities, existing in separate abodes or storehouses, out of which they are fetched at will by the sovran Disposer of All.

It must indeed be granted that Physical Science, which has thrown so much new light upon the laws and processes of Nature, is still silent upon the question of the Ultimate Cause (or Causes) of things. In numberless instances it has solved or is solving the question of the *How*, but it seems to be as far as ever from determining the *Whence* or the

*Why.* It has failed to divine the final secret; it is baffled when it tries to transcend material bounds, or even to reconcile the antinomies of reason. *Canst thou fathom the nature of God?* remains a question which admits of no answer but an unqualified negative.

Theories of the electrical constitution of matter, theories about the universal ether, chemical analysis pushed to its farthest, leave untouched the age-long and still-persistent problems of Life and Mind. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. We cannot find them at the bottom of a crucible, or inspect them through a microscope, or lay them bare with a dissecting-knife, or exhibit them by help of radioscopy. God is Spirit; and we only recognize His Presence in the marvellous pageant of His works because we also are Spirits—an influx into material conditions of the eternal Spirit Whose offspring we are and in Whom we live and move and have our being.

It may seem strange, at first sight, that Iahvah makes no attempt to explain or justify His treatment of Job. He neither adopts nor even alludes to the edifying suggestions of Eliphaz (5<sup>17</sup>) and Elihu. He simply humbles and silences the sufferer by bringing home to him the fact that he is as profoundly ignorant of God's ways and purposes in the world of Nature as in the moral world. The whole of Creation is a maze of wonders and mysteries: how then can an ephemeral being like Job dare to contend with the Majesty of the Universe, or presume to question the justice of the Divine dealings with the creatures of His Hand?

Thus the main, if not the only, motive of the writer would seem to be to discourage mankind from striving to penetrate the impenetrable secrets of God; to bid them recognize the limits of human understanding and abstain from all attempts to lay down rules for the Divine action even in the name of Justice and Right. Such inquiries are futile and lead nowhere. The subject is 'high as Heaven, deeper than She'ol'. Man must acquiesce in the dealings of Providence, assured that in the end everything will come right (cf. the story of Joseph).

The original work has evidently been much interpolated by later editors who were left unsatisfied by the poet's own solution of the moral difficulties raised by the story, and were doubtless as deeply shocked as many modern readers have been by the angry outcries and protests of Job against the apparent injustice of the Most High. How far the language of the poem has been modified under these influences, we cannot, of course, divine. Individual instances have been pointed out in the notes on particular passages. It is quite possible that ampler details of the Theophany were once given in the text (37<sup>21 ff.</sup> may preserve some traces of them: see notes). However that may be, the somewhat long-winded and mock-modest harangues of Elihu, so unlike the authentic portions of the work, making, as they do, an awkward and

unnatural break between Job's final appeal (31<sup>35 ff.</sup>) and the Divine response (38<sup>1</sup>), and referred to nowhere else throughout the book, are a signal instance of an interpolated section, foreign to the original form of the book, as is now very generally recognized by most competent judges. Emendations, more or less probable, may be considered to have cleared the text of some part of its inconsequence and obscurity; and it seems possible that Elihu's pose as a younger man criticizing his elders is a sort of hint by the author that he himself belonged to a later period than that of the poet upon whose argument he seeks to improve, with no very striking success, at least as it appears to us. His laboured apology for intervention, running through a whole chapter and beyond it, may perhaps point in the same direction. If the great poem was already well known, it might be judged presumptuous to venture upon addition or criticism.

But when all due allowance has been made for manifest inferiority of genius, defects of style, repetition and attempted reinforcement of some of the arguments of the older work, apparent incoherences of thought occasioned or aggravated by corruptions of the text, for which the author is, of course, not responsible, the section as a whole is an interesting record of the criticism provoked by the original work at some date not long subsequent to its publication, and was well worthy of preservation as a fresh endeavour to rehandle the unsolved problem of the elder poet more successfully.

After solemnly affirming his own perfect impartiality (32<sup>21 f.</sup>), and challenging Job to meet his arguments as those of a fellow-mortal, before whom therefore he need not be cowed as he had professed to be before his Divine Adversary (9<sup>34</sup> 13<sup>21 f.</sup>), Elihu proceeds to make objection against Job's assertions of innocence and complaints of God's hostile treatment of him and persistent deafness to his appeals (33<sup>6-13</sup>). Elihu then declares that God does speak to man in several distinct ways; warning him by dreams (a reference to 4<sup>13</sup>), or by the discipline of sickness, or by the voice of a 'Messenger' who interprets the providential meaning of his affliction (which is described in language intentionally recalling the sufferings of Job), and so leads him to repentance and salvation and joyful thanksgiving (33<sup>14-28</sup>).

Here and elsewhere Elihu's exposition of 'the uses of Adversity' is far from valueless as a record of religious experience familiar to every Christian believer. But he travels considerably beyond the scope of the master-poet as defined by the Prologue and Epilogue.

After another rhetorical challenge to Job to answer his arguments, made in a tone which implies that they are unanswerable (Job and his three friends are supposed to be silent listeners throughout the section, in accordance with 31<sup>40</sup> 32<sup>9, 11 ff.</sup>), Elihu appeals to the Wise in general



(34<sup>2,10,34</sup>note), the moral philosophers of the day, to weigh the force of his polemic against Job. He then returns to the subject of Job's self-justification and denial of the Divine justice (34<sup>6f.</sup>; cf. 9<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>6,7</sup> 27<sup>2-8</sup>), which he meets with an accusation of blasphemy and practical agreement with the godless (34<sup>7,8,36f.</sup>), and with reiterated assertions that God is just, in that He rewards men according to their works, having absolute power of life and death, and dealing impartially with all, princes and people, rich and poor alike (34<sup>10-20</sup>); seeing and judging all men, without need of holding a judicial inquiry in particular cases (as Job so eagerly desired in his own case); crushing mighty oppressors at the cry of their helpless victims, and putting down the impious king whom He has set up in His anger, and thus bringing him, it may be, to repentance (34<sup>21-32</sup>). Does Job find fault with all this? can he suggest a better method for the administration of Divine Justice? (v. 33).

Elihu proceeds to combat the idea that righteousness is no advantage to a man (cf. 1<sup>9f.</sup>); ascribing this opinion to Job, doubtless on the ground of passages like 9<sup>22, 28-31</sup> 21<sup>7-15</sup>, although Job has nowhere said it, and it contradicts what he does say, 31<sup>2ff. 14-23</sup>, in reviewing the manner and motives of his past life. In opposition to this fallacious, though natural, deduction from some of Job's tortured utterances, Elihu declares that God in His Heaven is too far exalted above and remote from man to be personally affected by his conduct, good or evil. A man can only hurt or benefit his fellow creatures (35<sup>1-8</sup>). Elihu seems to imply that, however righteous Job may have been, he could not have put the Deity under any obligation to reward him with the continuance of his prosperity. Righteousness establishes no claim upon God, as both he and his friends (v. 4) assumed (cf. Lk 17<sup>10</sup>). God has received nothing from him, and therefore owes him nothing. Men naturally cry out under oppression; but their cries are not necessarily, as they should be, directed heavenwards; and therefore God may disregard them. Such cries are no more evidence of humble turning to God than the instinctive cries of animals. The proper attitude under suffering is not angry exclamation, like Job's, but supplication and patient waiting for God (cf. 33<sup>26ff.</sup> 34<sup>31ff.</sup>). Such may perhaps be the general sense of this obscure and corrupt passage (35<sup>9-16</sup>). As it is, however, Job is voluble against the Divine indifference or injustice, because He does not always pour out His wrath upon the godless (vv. 15, 16; cf. 21<sup>7ff.</sup>).

In what follows (chaps. 36, 37) Elihu varies his language, but adds little or nothing to what he has already urged in justification of God's dealings with Job. It is strange that, like the three friends, he nowhere makes any allusion to the clue afforded by the Prologue; viz. that affliction may be intended as a test of the genuine or disinterested character of a man's religion. He repeats that God is just, all-powerful,

omniscient; and then he harks back to his favourite thesis of the warning and corrective intention of suffering and disaster (36<sup>7-16</sup>; cf. 33<sup>14-30</sup> 34<sup>24-32</sup>); supposing the case of kings brought to repentance by captivity, and then restored to prosperity, like Manasseh (2 C 33<sup>11</sup>, where the language coincides with that of 36<sup>8</sup>: see the note there). (36<sup>11</sup> may be an inference from 2 K 25<sup>29</sup>; and vv. 13, 14, may refer to the untimely fate of Shallum-Jehoahaz, 2 K 23<sup>31</sup> Je 22<sup>11</sup>.) So far Elihu might seem to be more anxious to vindicate the justice of God than to prove that Job's calamities were the consequence of antecedent sin; but in the four verses 36<sup>18-21</sup> he appears to hint (under cover of general precepts couched in proverbial form) that Job may have been guilty of certain sins common at the time among the rich and powerful, e.g. accepting bribes and indulgence in all-night carousals. In this, the author (or possibly an interpolator) not only ignores Job's own protestations of his integrity, but the Divine testimony thereto in the Prologue.

Elihu goes on to affirm that the Lord of All is accountable to none for His doings. His absolute power places Him as far beyond the sphere of human criticism, as the methods of His action in nature are beyond the range of human understanding; e.g. the formation of rain, clouds, thunder and lightning (36<sup>22-37</sup>). (It goes without saying that had the author lived in our day, he would have expressed himself differently on the subject of the phenomena of the natural world. But his gain would have been our loss. Exact science is prosaic; and is apt to palsy the play of poetical imagination.) So also the snow and heavy rains of winter, the hurricane, frost, ice, and hailstorm, and, once more, that wonder of wonders the lightning, are all instruments by which He works His sovereign will on earth (vv. 6-13). The remainder of chap. 37 has suffered much in transmission. It makes a final appeal to Job to 'consider the wonders of El', referring chiefly to the phenomena of cloud and sky; and at the close it seems to declare that the ground of religion is the union of Might with Right in the Supreme. (Vv. 21, 22 appear to prepare the way for the Theophany which follows, chap. 38. Indeed the author probably had his eye on chap. 38 while composing the last section of his work, chaps. 36<sup>26-37</sup>; thinking perhaps to supplement that incomparable utterance of the original poet by the addition of edifying glosses and comments somewhat in the manner of a Targum or Midrash. He is, of course, not responsible for the manifold corruptions and possible interpolations of his text; but, after every allowance on that score, we cannot but feel that as a poet he is far inferior to his glorious model.)

Another manifest instance of later interpolation is the famous monologue in praise of the Divine Wisdom (chap. 28). In the present context this fine piece has no visible connexion either with what precedes or with

what follows it. It presents points of contact with the Divine reply (chap. 38) and with Proverbs (Pr 3<sup>14</sup>f. 8<sup>10</sup>f. 22-31); but, both in tone and substance, it is quite unlike the language ascribed to Job in the rest of the book. It reads more like a practical conclusion drawn from the Divine remonstrance (chaps. 38-41) than a possible utterance of the suffering hero. It denies to man the ultimate knowledge of things: *rerum cognoscere causas* is the sole prerogative of the Creator who has bidden man to content himself with that practical wisdom which consists in *fearing God and departing from evil* (that very wisdom which is ascribed to Job by the Prologue, 1<sup>1</sup>, and which he steadily claims as his own throughout the controversy). If Job had already reached this attitude of complete resignation in the face of mysteries insoluble to him and his contemporaries, not a vestige of which is to be found in his subsequent and final soliloquy (chaps. 30-31), the Divine demonstration of his ignorance in those high matters (which, moreover, had not really been the subject of his complaints and protests) becomes superfluous and irrelevant.

A minor objection to regarding the chapter as a genuine part of the original work may be noticed here. The enumeration of precious stones, to our taste perhaps somewhat overdone, though it faithfully reflects the exaggerated fondness for jewellery characteristic of Orientals down to the present day, is a feature which does not agree with the patriarchal times in which Job was supposed to have flourished. Silver and gold, flocks and herds and slaves, are the only elements of wealth recognized in the rest of the book. (See also the introduction to the chapter, pp. 331f.)

That the Book of Job is an original work in the highest sense of the word is self-evident to every discerning reader. We might as well expect to find Shakespeare as we know him in the pages of Holinshed or Plutarch, or in the plays of Plautus and Seneca, or in the dramas and romances of his Italian contemporaries, as to find the direct source of this extraordinary product of Israel's genius in Babylonian or any other older literature. To say this is not to say that the Hebrew poet invented either the persons or the plot of his drama, though he may be responsible for its religious colouring. The name of Job was known to the prophet Ezekiel as that of a personage famous for exceptional sanctity in the olden time ('Noah, Daniel, and Job,' Ez 14<sup>14, 20</sup>); a fact which, apart from other evidence, might suffice to prove that it is a real personal name, and not, as some have supposed, an artificial figment of the poet, significant of the character or fortunes of his hero. When the Talmud states 'Moses wrote his own book and the section concerning Balaam and Job' (Baba Bathra 14<sup>a</sup>), it merely means that the historian of the Patriarchal age (the author of Genesis) was credited

with the book of Job whose story is laid in that period. The name indeed may be regarded *pro tanto* as a mark of verisimilitude (although the Talmudic writer could hardly have been aware of the fact); inasmuch as the similar or identical A-a-bu (*Ābu* = *Ayabu*) and A-ia-bu (in the compound A-ia-bu-ia-qar = *Āyabu-yaqar*) occur in the lists of personal names of the Hammurabi-period (cf. Amraphel—*Ammurapi*, Gn 14). How far the story itself had its roots in Babylonian legend cannot at present be exactly determined. The cuneiform literature, as we know, has thrown much light upon the Biblical history of Noah; and the name of Daniel, who is also associated with Job by the prophet Ezekiel, and who was a traditional paragon of Wisdom (Ez 28<sup>3</sup>), may perhaps be compared with such names of the Hammurabi-period as Danya, Dan-Adad (?), Dan-URRA (cf. *dannu*, 'strong' > *dānu*, 'judge').

It may be taken for granted that during the Exile, if not before, the Jewish literati became acquainted with much of the religious literature of their conquerors (see 26<sup>12f.</sup> notes); and the new knowledge doubtless exercised no small influence upon their ideas and subsequent writings (cf. Ez 1). It is now some twenty years since attention was first called to the remains of an old Babylonian poem in which many students have recognized a sort of parallel or prototype of the book of Job. The language is unusually difficult of interpretation; a difficulty aggravated for us by the more or less fragmentary condition of the tablets, especially the first, of which only a few lines have been preserved. These tablets, originally four in number and containing perhaps 120 verses apiece, are part of the treasure-trove from Assurbanipal's library at Nineveh; where also was found a commentary which supplies glosses on many of the more obscure words and phrases. Both text and commentary were copied by the royal scribes from originals in E-sag-ila, the great temple of Bel-Merodach at Babylon. The fact that a commentary was necessary to the understanding of the text even in the seventh century B.C. and before it, is significant of the great antiquity of the poem.

The purpose of this venerable relic of ancient piety is to glorify the god Merodach as a healer and saviour, and to attract sufferers to his temple in hope of deliverance. Unlike the book of Job, it is throughout a monologue (cf. Job's soliloquy 29-31), in which a king describes how, in spite of an exemplary attention to the claims of religious duty, by the agency of demons he was stricken with a terrible malady or accumulation of maladies, which baffled the wisdom of his magicians and soothsayers. God and goddess were deaf to his prayers, until at last Merodach relented, accepted his supplications, expelled the evil spirits, and freed the several members and organs of the patient from their manifold ailments, restoring his entire body to perfect health.

Below we give the text, so far as ascertained, and a translation (so far

as we have succeeded in the somewhat arduous attempt to make one). The reader will notice not only a general resemblance in the framework of the two stories, but also many points of coincidence in thought and language. The no less striking differences will also become apparent. They are, for the most part, such as might be expected from the later period and higher theological standpoint of the Hebrew writer, who has the whole historical experience of Israel and the religious teaching of her prophets and psalmists behind him. Naturally there is no mention of a 'goddess' in the appeals and expostulations of Job (though Eliphaz does contemplate a possible appeal to the 'Holy Ones' or Angels—those 'Sons of God' who, in the evolution of Israel's faith, have taken the place of the older Babylonian Pantheon). The supreme Iahvah shares His sovereignty with none; though He has a Court of lesser Powers, from which the sinister figure of the 'Satan', the Angel hostile to Man, is not excluded, since he also apparently is a 'Son of Elohim' (cf. 1 K 22 Zc 3<sup>1,2</sup>). The name of the afflicted Babylonian king, Shubshî-meshrê-Nergal, is no more like the Hebrew Job (Eyob) than the Uta-napishtim of the Babylonian story of the Flood is like the Hebrew Noah. But the outlook on life is much the same in the two poems. In each the present world is all; and, accordingly, in both the hero of the drama of suffering is restored to health and prosperity in the present life. In both, the world of the dead is a land of darkness from which there is no return; a shadowy realm of eternal night, where the souls of the departed abide in a feeble phantom existence. The Babylonian monarch's catalogue of the manifold symptoms of his mysterious malady which brought him to death's door (Tab. II) recalls Job's frequent insistence upon his bodily torments which appeared likely to have a speedy and fatal issue; but whereas the Babylonian poet repeats the long list of his hero's ailments *seriatim*, when he comes to describing their divine cure (Tab. III)—with a view perhaps to suggesting that Merodach knows how to heal every kind of disease—the poet of Job says not a word about his hero's recovery from his grievous plagues. In both works the restoration is wrought by a *Deus ex machina*; but the Babylonian describes the process, step by step; the Hebrew seems almost to imply that the change was an immediate result of the Voice and Vision of God. (The fact that nothing is said of the disappearance of Job's disease may suggest that the author or editor, regarding Job's mysterious malady as a mere vehicle for his moralizings, did not think it worth while to say any more about it when its function in the drama was fulfilled. Or has a reviser abridged the conclusion of the story?)

In both works worship by prayer and sacrifice is presupposed as the normal expression of religion. The purpose of the Hebrew poet is certainly not to disparage the traditional modes of worship. The burnt-

offering is a special feature of Job's piety in the Prologue ; and it is prescribed by Iahvah Himself in the Epilogue as an atonement for the guilt of the three friends. The Babylonian king also dwells at length upon his assiduous devotion : 'Prayer', he says, 'was my rule, Sacrifice my law.' Yet, although his life had been thus blameless, he has to complain (like Job) that Heaven has treated him as if he were a heinous evildoer. Good rulers and bad fare alike ; and the unhappy king's misery inspires a momentary doubt whether religion is of any real advantage. Like Job, he makes no question of the existence of God and the supernatural world. His misgivings are only concerned with the customary worship which he had carefully observed and zealously enjoined upon his people. After a review of what he had done in this way, he exclaims : *I was sure that with God all this was acceptable* ; and he goes on to draw the despairing inference : *What seems good to a man's self is an offence to God ; What in his own thought is suppressed is good before his god*. His sceptical mood culminates in the doubt whether an ephemeral creature like man, whose condition is one of perpetual change and instability, and whose life may be cut short at any moment, can arrive at any certainty about the Mind and Counsel of God. *Who*, he demands, *shall learn the Mind (or Will : fēmu) of the gods in Heaven ? Who shall comprehend the counsel of God, fraught with obscurity(?) ? How did the communities (or mankind) learn the Way of God ?* The reader will see that all this is in essential agreement with much that we find in the Book of Job, and may perhaps exhibit the germ of it. It should also be noted that, as in the case of Job, the poet offers no intellectual solution of the questions which perplexed the mind of his hero. Neither Merodach nor Iahvah deigns to propound any explanation of the anomalies of life, the apparent inequalities of the ways of Providence. The problem is left where it was ; and both the older and the younger poet seem to think it enough that the sufferer was finally restored to his former prosperity.

Towards the end of Tab. III Obv., the poet-priest of Esagil, like Job's friends, appears to assume that the king's affliction was sent as a punishment for sin. He makes the king say that the anger of his Lord (Merodach) was appeased, so that He heard his prayers ; and an isolated line adds : *My sins He caused the wind to carry away*. It would seem therefore that the demons acted as ministers of the wrath of Merodach. The evil Spirit, however, is permitted to afflict Job, not on account of any sins he might have committed (see 7<sup>21</sup> 13<sup>26</sup> 14<sup>17</sup>), but, as we have seen, to make trial of the sincerity of his godliness.

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF 'THE BABYLONIAN JOB'.

## TABLET I.

The first half-line, which gives the title to the whole poem, is preserved in the Colophon of Tab. II. The rest of the Tablet is only known from the Commentary, which once contained some thirty-three lines relating to this Tablet. Unfortunately most of these are broken away; and of the remainder only about six or seven can be made to yield an adequate and connected sense. The commentator naturally cites only those lines which seemed to him to present some special difficulty. (See 5 R 47, where the remains of his work are lithographed.) We cannot, therefore, ascertain how many lines Tab. I of the poem originally contained. The opening words, *Ludlul bél nîmeqi* . . . 'I will worship the Lord of Wisdom!' . . ., and a subsequent line, ingeniously restored by Jastrow, (*Qanî ildlika*) *atammah*, 'I grasp the Staff of Thy Godhead!', seem to indicate that the exordium was occupied with the grateful hero's praise of Bel-Merodach, his divine Deliverer. His relation of the calamities that befell him follows; but the beginning of this is lost, owing to the deplorable state of the document.

(*uznâa usakki*)*ka hašikkîš éme*

'Mine ears He stopped, I became as one deaf.'

The first two words were restored from Tab. III. 51. But 5 R 47 gives *ba-ra*, not *-ka*. The glosses on the line are partly lost. Those which survive are *ha-šik-ku suk-ku-ku* ('stopped', 'blocked', 'deaf'; cf. Arab. سَكَّ), and *e-mu-u ma-ša-lu* ('to be or become like or equal to').

*šarra kîma atur ana rêši*

'A King, when I turned into a slave,'

*rêšu*, lit. 'a head', has the gloss LU URA, i.e. *wardu* or *ardu*, 'a slave'. But perhaps we should read *šar-ra-ku-ma a-tur ana rêši*, 'I was king and I became a slave'.

*nalbubu tappé unamgarannî*

'The fury of a comrade abuseth me'.

Such is the natural construction of the line. Cf. 'das Wüthen, Schnauben des Nächsten hat mich vernichtet (?)', suggested by HWB, s.v. *nakâru*. We do not know whether, in the original text, the line was immediately consecutive to the last or not. (Cf. 2 Sa 16<sup>6-13</sup>.) The gloss on *nalbubu* is *ši-gu-u*, 'to rage, be mad, to howl, lament', 'raging', 'mad'; e.g. *šumma sîsû iššegûma lû tappâšû lû amêlûti unâšak*, 'If a horse go mad and bite either his fellow or a human being' . . .; *šumma kalbu illenîšgû*, 'If a dog show madness' . . . (see MA, p. 1009). The line cannot mean *Wie einen Narren haben mich meine Gefährten misshandelt*

(Landersdorfer). The verb, whatever its precise force may be, is sing., not plur. (*unamgarúni* or *unamgarú'inni*; and the same is true of *eruranni* in the next line (L. *haben sie mich verflucht*). *unamgaranni* = *unangaranni* = *unaggaranni*; II. 1, Pres. 3 s. with Suff. of a root *nagáru*, נָגַר, or *naḡáru* (*naqáru*), נָקַר, or even, as Jastrow supposes, *nakáru*, נָכַר (cf. Meissner, *Gram.* § 15). In the first case, we might compare נִיָּרָא, *bolt, bar*, and נִיָּר, *to shut in, or up* (Jon 2'): 'The violence of a (my?) friend imprisoned me.' Then the following *eruranni* might perhaps be 'he bound me' (see *MA*). It is, however, perhaps more likely that our word involves the root נָקַר, which appears in Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic with the meaning 'to bore', 'pierce', or 'hollow out'. The Arabic uses, in fact, appear to give the clue to the real meaning of our passage; for in that language the root (Med. *a*) is *perfodit, perforavit, excavavit*, and metaph. *fodicavit diceriis vel contumeliis* ('to sting a man with reproaches'): cf. also the same root (Med. *e*) *iratus fuit*. Accordingly, we may render

'The rage of (my) familiar revileth me';

which agrees with the statement of the next line

*ina ḡáṣ puḡri eruranni*

'In the thronging of the assembly he cursed me.'

The gloss that once followed the line is almost entirely effaced.

*ana qáb SAL-SIG-ia pítlássu ḡáštum*

'For him who spake well of me open for him was a pit.'

Or *for him who spake of favour for me*, i.e. from the gods. *qáb* is the St. Constr. of the Ptcp. *qábú*. The Sumerian group should be read *damiḡti* or perhaps *damḡdli*, plur. (SIG-MEŠ): see 4 R 61, no. 2, 20 sq. I have taken *pítlassu* as *pítlát-su*; Pm., 3 fem. s. of *pítá*. For *ḡáštum*, see HWB *šultu, šultatu*, 'hole, pit, or pitfall'. The gloss is *su-u(t-tu?)*.

*úmu šutánuḡu mášu girráni*

'Day was sighing, night was weeping';

*ITU qita-a-a-ulu idirtu MU-AN-NA*

'The month was wailing, the year mourning.'

The gloss on *qi-ta-a-a-u-lu* is *qu-u(lu or lum)*, 'crying'.

## TABLET II.

*KÚR-ud-ma ana baláḡ adanna itiq*

'I had attained to a life which passed the limit' (?)

*asahḡar-ma limun limun-ma*

'I look around, all is evil';



*ṣaburti(tum) ulaṣ(ṣ)apa iṣarti(tum) ul uttū*

'Tyranny increaseth, justice I see not.'

Gloss on *ṣaburtum*: *ru-ub-tum* (*ignotum per ignotius*!).

*DINGIR alsīma ul iddīna pānišu*

'To the god I cried, He vouchsafed not His countenance';

*usallī (DINGIR) Iṣla(tar)ri ul iṣaqqā rīšiša*

'I besought my goddess, she lifted not her head.'

i-ṣaq-qa-a: scribal error for u-ṣaq-qa-a. Cf. *Desc. of Ishtar*, Rev 18.

*LU ĠAL ina bīr (bi-rī) arkāt ul iprus*

'The Seer by vision determined not the future'; (cf. II. 75.)

*ina maššakka(ki) LU EN-ME-LI ul ušāpī dīnī*

'By drink-offering the Soothsayer revealed not my judgement.'

Lit. *caused not my judgement or right to come forth or appear*: cf. II. 74. *ušāpī* = *ušēpī*. III. 1 Pf. of (w)apū = 𐎶𐎶. The reading of B, *ina maššakka u LU EN-ME-LI*, violates both grammar and parallelism; and is obviously a mere scribal error. The Commentary gives the line as follows: *ina maššakki LU EN-ME-LI ul i-ša-me DI*, 'With a drink-offering the Soothsayer doth not settle judgement'. *išāme* = *išām*, Pres. of *šāmu*, 'to settle', 'decide', 'decree'; and *DI* = *dīnu*, *dēnu*, 'judgement', Sb 185. The gloss on *maššakku* (from *šaqqū*, 'to water', 'give to drink') is *sur-ki-nu*, i.e. *surqīnu*, *ša LU EN-ME-LI*, 'libation (or drink-offering) of a Soothsayer'. The Sumerian designation *LU EN-ME-LI* means *man who is master of pure spells*; i.e. a wizard or magician or sorcerer.

*za-ki-qu apulma ul upattī uznī*

'The sorcerer I told, but he opened not mine ear';

*zakiqu* for *zaqiqu*; i.e. *zâqiqu* or else *zaqīqu*. According to Zimmern, a necromancer. For the root, cf. Aram. 𐤐𐤒, 'to bind'; with reference to incantations. 'He opened not mine ear' = revealed nothing to me. Is 50<sup>5</sup>.

*LU MAŠ-MAŠ ina kikiṭṭē kimillī ul iptur*

'The wizard with passes (?) the Wrath on me loosed not.'

For *kikiṭṭē* the *Comm.* gives *AG-AG-ṭe-e*; that is, the Sumerian ideogram *AG*, 'to do', repeated, with the Phonetic Determinative *-ṭe* added to remind the reader that the ideogram must be read *kikiṭṭē*. The gloss *AG-AG-ṭu-ú ni-pi-ši*, 'mode of action, proceedings, ceremonies' (*HWB*), or more simply 'manual acts', is added. *nīpišu* is, of course, 'act', 'something done' (*AG, epēšu*); *kikiṭṭē* may have sprung from a Sumerian *KI-KID*, *KIKKID*, *KID-KID*, 'handling', 'manipulating', or the like, from *GAD*, (*G*)*ID*, 'hand', or else from *KID-KID* (= *SHID-SHID*), 'ways', 'modes of action' (cf. 𐎶𐎶 *SHID, alaktu*; and see *ZA*, i. 183).

*a-a-i-te epšēti šandli mātlan*

'What doings! 'tis an altered world!'

a-a-i-te, A. a-a-it . . . elsewhere a-a-ta (*HWB*, p. 47), seems to be fem. pl. of a-a-u, quis? (so Zimmern, Dhorme, Ungnad). For *epšēti*, 'state', 'condition of things', see *HWB*, p. 118 *ad fin.* We might render: 'What a state of things! the whole world (or country) is changed!' *šandli* = *šanāta*, *šanāt*, Pm. 3 fem. sing. of *šanū*.

*amurma arkat riddli ippiru*

'I looked back, Wrath or Misery was my pursuer.'

The line is difficult; but the general sense can hardly be very different from this. For the connexion of *arkat* (*Comm.* ar-ka-at, with the third sign almost effaced) with *riddli* (*Comm.* ri-ša-a-tum, 'rejoicings'; a mere scribal error for ri-da-a-tum), cf. the common phrases of the Assyr. historical inscription *arkīšu ardī*, *arkīšunu ardedī*, 'I pursued him (them)'. *riddli* may be the Ptcp. fem. sing. I. Suff. 1 pers. for *rēdūli*, 'my pursuer' (cf. *bānāt* = *bānīl*); or, like *šandli* in the preceding line, it may be a Permansive 3 sing. fem. (= *riddāta*, *riddāt*). *riddtum* is apparently the Ptcp. rather than an Abstractum pro Concreto, as Landersdorfer supposes. The gloss on *ippiru* is ip-pi-ri: ma-na-aḥ-tum: GIG; see Tab. IV. 7. (The text of the previous line, as given 5 R 47, is ip-pi-e-ši, which if correctly copied, is a scribal error. But Assyr. e-ši is very like ri.) These glosses need not be exact equivalents of the obscure *ippiru*. If, as we suppose, *ippirī* meant 'my wrath', i. e. the (Divine) wrath against me (cf. l. 9 *supr.*), they are merely exegetical: 'He means his ailment or disease.' Cf. Syr. ܦܝܪܐܢܐ 'to snort', which is used of a man snorting with anger. Then *ippiru* might be an If'āl form, \*impīru, like *ikrību*, *ipīru*, *epīlennu* (Tab. IV. 2) = eptēnu. On the other hand, the ideogram for *ippiru*, which consists of the symbol for *man* followed by the same symbol inverted (cf. my *Chinese and Sumerian*, p. 20), seems rather to suggest overthrow, prostration, or the like. See 2 R 16. 30-33 b c, where we read:

DUG-MU AN-TA-TUM-TUM-MU

al-la-ka bir-ka-a-a

'nimble (are) my knees'

GIR-MU NU-KUŠ-ŠA

la a-ni-ḥa še-pa-a-a

'unresting my feet'

LU SAG DÚ DÚ NU-TUG-A

la ra-aš ta-šim-ti

'not having judgement'

LU-𐎶 MU-UN-UŠ-E

ip-pi-ra ri-dan-ni

'falls (i. e. *casus*, misfortunes) pursue me'.

This close parallel certainly seems to suggest the rendering 'I looked behind; Misfortune was the (my) Pursuer'; since *ippirû* might be plur., and *ridati* (= *rêddti* = *ri-da-a-tum*) fem. plur. of the Ptcp. in concord therewith. The primary meaning of *ippiru*, however, might still be (the Divine) Wrath which, as the ideogram indicates, overthrows a man or casts him down. (If the ideogram existed in the linear period of the writing, it really represents the upright human figure inverted and reversed—a man 'upset', 'turned upside down', or 'topsy-turvy'.) With the Assyr. word we might further compare Syr. ܦܪܘܬܗ *pûrûthô*, 'rage', 'anger'; ܐܬܦܗܝܪ *itlêphîr*, 'to rage', 'be angry'; ܦܘܪ *'to boil'*. (Assyr. *ippiru* may perhaps be a loan from a Sumerian IB-BIR; cf. IB *uggatu*, and BIR, *šarātu*, 'to rend', or BIR, *šapāhu* (= *sapāhu*); *šaqqaštum*: as if 'tearing wrath' or 'destroying anger'.)

*kî šā lamkîttum ana DINGIR lā uklînnu*

'Like one who had appointed no offering for the god',

*u ina mākālê (DINGIR) Ištarri lā zakru*

'And at a meal made no mention of the goddess',

*appi lā ênû šukînni lā amru*

'(Whose) face was not bowed down, (whose) worship was not seen',

*ina pîšu ipparkû suppê taslîli*

'In whose mouth had ceased prayer (and) supplication',

*ibîlû UD-mu DINGIR i-nat-tû eššeši*

'(Who) neglected the god's day, breaking the fasts (?)',

*natû*, Pres. *inaltî*, 'to break in pieces', 'smash'. *eššešu*, a word of doubtful meaning; perhaps connected with *ašāšu*, 'to grieve', 'be sad', or with the Sumerian ISISH, 'lamentation', 'mourning', e. g. for the god Tammuz.

*iddû aḥṣu NU<sup>1</sup>-mišunu imiṣu*

'(Who) was remiss, (who) despised their image',

*paldḥu û i'ûdu lā ušalmedû UN-MEŠ-šu*

'(who) taught not his people to fear and praise (them)',

*DINGIR-šu lā izkur êkul akālṣu*

'His god he named not, ate his food',

*iziḅ D. ištarta-šu maštîm la ubla*

'Forsook his goddess, brought no drink-offering';

*ana šā imḥû EN(bêla)ṣu imšû*

'Unto him who was oppressive, who forgot his Lord'.

The Commentary quotes this line with *be-la-šu* for *EN-šu*; adding the gloss *im-ḥu-û ka-ba-tum* ('to be heavy', 'burdensome', 'oppressive'; cf. 1 Sa 5<sup>11</sup>; 1 K 12<sup>13</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> NU, *çalmu*, 'image'; cf. Chinese ngou, nöü, u, gu, 'image'.

*niš DINGIR-šu kabti galliṣ isqur andku anišal*

'(Who) lightly swear by his mighty god I, even I, was made like!'

*aḥsusma rāmān suppu tasliti(tum)*

'Yet I, for my part, was mindful of prayer (and) supplication';

*tasliti(tum) tašimat(mati, matum) niqū šakkīla*

'Prayer was my rule, sacrifice my law';

Gloss: *šakkīl parçi.*

*UD-mu palāḥ DINGIR-MEŠ tūb ŠAB-bi-ia*

'The day of the worship of the gods was my heart's delight';

*UD-mu ridūti (D.) Ištar nimeli(la) tatturru (tattūru)*

'The day of Procession of the goddess was gain (and) riches';

*ridūtu*, 'marching.' The gods were carried in procession on their festivals. *tatturru, tattūru*, a تَفْعُول form, from the *وَتَر, وَتَر*; 'abundance', 'surplus', 'increase', and so 'wealth'.

*ikribi LUGAL šī hidūti*

'Homage to the King that was my joy',

*ū nigūlašu ana damiqtū šumma*

'And His musical Service my delight was that.'

If *šumma* were Pm. 3 fem. plur. of *šāmu*, II. 1, one would have expected a plur. *nigūtišu*. But, further, the strict parallelism of the preceding and following couplets and the incomplete parallelism of this ('Prayer to the Divine King was my joy, And His music'—harping in His honour, or, 'His musical festival'— . . . .) almost demands here the conclusion 'that was my delight'. *šumma* = *šū-ma*, carelessly written instead of *ši-ma* (since *nigūtu* is fem.); and *damiqtu*, 'brightness', is here used in the sense of 'happiness'. Perhaps, however,

'The king's (appointed) worship was my joy,

And his psalmody became my pleasure.' Cf. Zimmern.

*ušār (ušāri) ana KUR-ia A-MEŠ DINGIR naqāri*

'I taught my country the name of the god to keep';

*ušar*, apocopated form of *ušāri* (C.), is Pf. III. 1, of *arū* = *יָרָה, יָרָה*, Heb. (so Dhorme). A-MEŠ (C. me-e) is an instance of the Phonetic use of a 'Borrowed Character', as the Chinese would call it (see my *Chinese and Sumerian*, p. 23). *Mê*, 'name', is here written with the Sumerian group denoting its homophone *mê*, 'water'.

*šāmi (D.) ištar šāqur UN-MEŠ-ia uštāḥiz*

'The name of the goddess to honour, my people I instructed'.

*tanādāti LUGAL eliṣ (C. recte iliṣ) umaššil*

'The majesty of the king to that of a god I made equal';

ù puluhtu(ti) E-GAL umman ušalmid

'And awe of the Palace I made the multitude learn.'

lā idī kī illi ili itamgur annāti

'I was sure that with God all this was acceptable.'

(Lit. there was accepting of these things.)

ša damqat rāmānuš ana DINGIR gullultum

'What is pleasing to oneself is abomination to God';

ša ina ŠAB-bi-šu mussukat UGU DINGIR-šu damqat

'What in one's own heart is held back, to one's God is pleasing.'

a-a-u tēm DINGIR-MEŠ kirib AN-é ilammad

'Who the mind of the gods in Heaven can learn?'

mīlik ša DINGIR zanun zē<sup>1</sup> iḥakkim mannu

'The counsel of God full of subtlety who can comprehend?'

ēkama ilmadā alakti DINGIR apāti

'How then have mortals learned the Way of God?'

ša ina amšat ibluṭu imūt uddēš

'He who was alive yestereve died on the morrow.'

surriš uštadir zamār iḥtamaš

'In a moment was he troubled, quickly was he crushed.'

ina ṣibit appi izammur elēla

'At a seizure of the nose (a sneeze?) he sings a dirge';

ina pīt purīdi uzarrab lallareš

'In opening the fork he wails like a mourner.'

L. renders the last two lines as follows: *In diesem Augenblick singt und spielt er noch, Im Nu schon heult er wie ein Klagemann*: 'This moment he is still singing and playing; In a trice he is already howling like a wailing-man.' This is excellent sense, if it can be got out of the Assyrian. That *izammur elēla* means he sings (or plays) some kind of music, joyous (cf. *ina e-li-li*, unter Gesang, Abp. x. 95) or mournful (cf. *Desc. of Ishtar, ad fin.*), is certain; and that *uzarrab lallareš* means 'he howls like a (professional) mourner' is virtually certain also (cf. *kī lallari qūbē ušazrab*, 'Like a wailing-man he made him utter shrieks'. 4 R<sup>2</sup> 54. 21 a). *zarābu* must be cognate with *sarbu*, 'grief', 'mourning', 'lamentation' (NE IX. iv. 33-35 *ina sarbi*; cf. *id.* IX. i. 2 *zarbiš ibakkī*). But whether *ina ṣibit appi*, *ina pīt purīdi*, are phrases practically synonymous with *surriš* and *zamar*, is a question not so easy to decide.

<sup>1</sup> *Zā*, *zē* (zi-e), 'wisdom', 'craft', 'subtlety', or the like, may be a loan from Sumerian ZU, 'to know', 'wise', 'wisdom' (*idū*, *lē'ā*, *nimequ*). Counsel and Wisdom are naturally associated: e. g. in the phrase *lā rāš tēme u mīlki*, 'destitute of wisdom and counsel' (Sn. v. 3). Cf. perhaps Br. 10557; 10561. (But Zimmern, *Dunkelheit*, 'darkness'.)

In 2 R 35. 44 c, d *ṣibit appi* renders the Sumerian UĜ-KIR ʔ-DIB, *slime* (mucus)-*nose-seize*; which might mean the attack of a cold or catarrh, or possibly, as HWB. suggests, a sneeze. 'In a sneeze' might perhaps be equivalent to 'suddenly'; and *ina pīt purīdi*, 'in the opening of the legs', 'in a (single) step', might be understood in a similar sense. 'Opening the legs' might mean stepping or walking (cf. *passus* from *pando*). See KB. vi 50.

*kī pītē u katāmi(me) tēnšina šitnī*

'Like the opening and close (of day) their mood changeth.'

or 'With Dawn and Dusk their mood is changed'. Gloss: *kī pītē u katāme*: UD-mu u mu-ši, Day and Night.

*immuṣāma<sup>1</sup> immā šalamtāš*

'When hungry, they are like a corpse';

*išibbāma išanmanā DINGIR-šun*

'When full, they challenge their god!'

*ina tābi itāmd ilē šama'i*

'In weal (gladness) they meditate (or talk of) ascending to heaven';

*ulaššāšāma<sup>2</sup> idibbubā arād irkallu*

'In woe they speak (think) of descending to Hades.'

(Traces of another line appear in 4 R<sup>2</sup>. The five lines following are preserved in the Commentary. How many intervening verses, not noticed by the Commentator, have been lost, we have no means of conjecturing.)

*šūlum limnu ittaṣṣā ina (assukki) šu* (I. 2, Pf. gl. *šūlum ekimmu*)

'An evil Spirit issued from his lurking-place' (*vid.* Tab. iv. 21).

*itti urqūt KI-tum ipiṣṣū lu'ūtum* (gloss: *lu'ūtum*: *murṣu*)

'Like the verdure of the ground the sickness yelloweth (or blancheth).'

*labanī itīku urammū kišādu*

'My nape they bruised, they relaxed the neck';

Cf. SA-TIG = *laban kišādi* (Br. 3099), and SA-TIG(GÚ) BAN-RAĜ = *labanšu itīk*, 'his *laban* he crushed' (RAĜ, RA, *maḥāṣu*, *rapḥsu*); *itīk* Pf. of *tāku* = *dāku* = *dakū*; cf. Targ. *הָרַחֵק* 'to injure'; *הַרְחָקָה* 'injury'. (4 R 29, no. 3, 5 f.) Since SA means *buānu*, *riksu*, 'joint', 'ligament', 'sinew', 'muscle', or the like, SA-TIG may be 'neck-joint', or 'neck-muscles'. The gloss on *itīku* is *ramū*: *šebiru*, 'to loosen', 'to break'; which would seem to be a hyperbole for the effects of disease. But we do not really know the context of the line, nor whether the verbs are sing. or plur.

<sup>1</sup> *יָצַח* Pres. *imnuṣ*, 'to stint', 'confine'; (2) 'hunger.' Gloss *uncu bu bu-tum*

<sup>2</sup> II. 2. *ašāšu*, 'be sad or troubled'.

*galt rapšatu urbatīš ušnillum*

'My ample form like a rush they threw prone';

(so HWB.) Gloss: ur-ba-tu, GIŠ ur-ba-nu, 'rush' (= אורכנא Syr. אֶרְכָּנָא, juncus).

*kī ulillum annabik puppāniš annadī*

'Like an *ulillum* was I overturned (?); on my back (?) I was laid.'

Gloss: *ulillum* su-un-kir-tum (which does not help us. Perhaps = sungir = šimmar in gi-šimmar, 'palm-tree'. Cf. Landesdorfer).

*ašnan TAG-ma (illapit-ma) daddariš alaḥiṣ*

'Bread was turned into stench, into corruption (sourness).'

Gloss: da-da-ru bu-u'-ša-nu.

*appūnāma eterik silēlum*

'Mightily was the malady prolonged.'

Glosses: ap-pu-na-ma ma-'a-diš: si-li-e-tum GIG (i. e. *murṣu*), 'sickness.'

*ina lā(?) mākalē eṣ(bu?) bu(būlī?)*

'For lack of food grass was my fare.'

(?) *muḥa dami issu(-uḥ)* . . . . .

'Die Kraft meines Blutes hat er mir entzogen (?) . . . . .'

(L. nach Martin.) Rather perhaps read *it-mu-ḥa*, 'he took away', and *is-su-ḥa* (libbi-bi), 'wrenched away my understanding'; cf. 4 R 3. 19, 20 a.

*e-ṣiḏ-da? -tum uz-zu-qat a-ri mad-bar* . . . .

'Die Nahrung (Ernte) ward abgeschnitten, der Löwe der Wüste . . .'

(So Landesdorfer; but very doubtfully. The last two words might be a-tal-mad = *attalmad*, 'I was taught'.)

*šīrānūa nuppuḥu u-ri-ik-tum meš* . . . . .

'My joints (or nerves) were set on fire,' . . . . .

ši-ir-a-nu-ū-a; cf. Syr. שְׂרִינָא 'joint', 'nerve', 'membrane', 'vein', 'artery'. Lines 53-59, from the Sippara fragment, are very difficult and doubtful; partly owing to lacunae in the text and uncertainties of reading.

59. *aḥuz iršu mešru mūṣē tanīḥu*<sup>1</sup>

'I took to (my) bed; Pain was a bar to going forth';

*ana kišukkīa itāra bēlu*

'The house (or chamber) became my prison.'

<sup>1</sup> ta-ni-ḥu? = *teniḥu*, 'bed.'

*illurtum širša nadd idda*

'A clog on my body my hands were laid';

*maškan ramnā muqqutu šēpda*

'A fetter of myself my feet were prostrate.'

*niddātla šumruḥd miḥiḥtu dan(nat)*

'Mine overthrow was grievous; the wound was sore.'

*ginazi iddanni malā(+ti) ḥillātum*

'With a scourge he beat me down of many thongs (?)';

*paruššu usaḥḥilanni ziqatum dannat*

'With a staff (lance?) he pierced me whose point was hard.'

*kāl ūmu rīdū iriddanni*

'All day long the driver driveth me';

*ina kašād māši ul unappašanni surriš*

'When night cometh, he allows me not a moment's breath.

*ina itablakkāti<sup>1</sup> puṭṭurā rikšā*

'With racking my joints (sinews) are loosened';

*mešritā suppuḥd iladdd aḥitum(ti)*

'My members (or powers) are dissolved, thrown aside' (awry; distorted?).

*ina rubḥā abit kī alpi*

'In my stable I fell down like an ox';

*ubtallil kī immeri ina tabaštānā*

'I wallowed like a sheep in my own dung.'

## 72. *sakikkā iḥḥutu LU MAŠ-MAŠ*

'The malady in my members distracted (?) the Enchanter',

*u tērītā LU-ĜAL utašši (II<sup>2</sup> ešū, verwirren)*

'And the Seer confused my omens';

*ul ušāpī dšipu šikin murḥā*

'The Sorcerer made not clear the nature of my sickness',

*u adanna sili'tā<sup>2</sup> LU-ĜAL ul iddin*

'And a term to mine infirmity the Seer assigned not.'

*ul irūḥa ilu qātī ul iḥbat*

'The god helped not, my hand He took not';

*ul irīmannī (D.) iḥ-ta-ri idda ul illik*

'My goddess pitied me not, beside me walked not.'

<sup>1</sup> Lit. by being torn or wrenched asunder = convulsed; cf. Mk 9<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> sili'tu, silētum = murḥu.



*pili KIMAG<sup>1</sup> (v. kimaḥi) iršū šukanā*

'Open(ed) was the Tomb; they took in hand my Burial';

*aḏḏ lā mīlālīma bikīli (v. lum) gamrat*

'Ere my death my mourning was over';

*kāl mālīa kī ḥābil<sup>1</sup> iqbāni*

'My whole country said, "He is deceased!"'

*išmēma ḥādūa immerū pānūšū*

'He that rejoiced over me heard of it; his countenance shone';

*ḥādḏli ubassirū kabillašū (v. ša) ippirdu*

'They told the good news to her that rejoiced over me; her spirits rose  
(lit. her liver brightened).'

*idī ūmu ša gimir kimtā*

'I thought of the day when all my family'

*šā kirib šēde ilūtsūn irīm*

'Within the Door-gods adored their deity.'

### TABLET III.

*kabtat qātsu ul ali'i našḏša*

'His hand was heavy; I cannot bear it.'

. . . . .  
. . . . .

(mulmu)lli lutāmiḥ ri(ṭika? . .)

'Let thy hand . . grasp the javelin!'

(Tābi-utul)-(D.)Bēl ašib Nippur (EN-LIL-KI)

'Tābi-utul-Bēl who dwelleth in Nippur'

(ana du)ubbubika išpurā(ni)

'To report to thee hath sent me.'

(pa-a-)na šū ēlī-ia id(din)<sup>2</sup>

'The face He himself hath shown to me'

(napa)-aš balāṭi iddā umašši' baṣ(ka?)

'Extension of life He hath pronounced; He hath taken away  
weeping.'

(ina muši utul)ma šuttu anaṭṭal<sup>3</sup>

('In the night? I lay down) and saw a dream':

<sup>1</sup> Cf. חבל on Palmyrene gravestones.

<sup>2</sup> pānišu nadānu, sich sehen lassen, sich zeigen; pānišu la iddinšu, zeigte sich ihm nicht.

<sup>3</sup> Abp. iii. 119 ina šad muši utulma, &c.

(šá)tu šuttu attulu māšiti

'This is the dream I saw in the night':

(ēpiš) ardati bānū zi(kari)

'The Maker of the maid, the Creator of the man',

(mu-bil?)-la bi-ḥa-ti iliš maš(lat?)

'Who conferreth a realm(?) equal to (that of?) a god',

(Four lines missing.)

17. *eqbīma aḥulāp (aḥulapi) danniš (MA-GAL) šunuḥ-ma*

'Said I. "How long?" heavily sighing':

*aiumma ša ina šat māši ibraḥ bi(i-ri)*

'What was the vision which he saw in the night-time?'

*ina MÀ-MI (D.) UR-DINGIR-NIN-TIN-BÀGGA šu(u-ma?)*

'In the dream it was Ur-Bau himself.'

*idlu darru āpir agāšu LU-MAŠ-MAŠ-ma nāši lu(e-ti?)*

'The stalwart hero had donned his diadem, The Enchanter, Bringer of Victory.'

(D.) *Marduk-ma išpuran(ni)*

'Merodach hath sent me.'

*ana (D.) Šubši-mešrê-DINGIR-GIR ubilla ši(im-ri?)<sup>1</sup>*

'To Shubshi-meshrê-Nergal He hath brought happiness(?)';

*ina SHU-šu AZAG-MESH ubilla ši(im-ri?)<sup>1</sup>*

'With his pure hands He hath brought happiness(?).'

*muttabbilia qatuššu ip(qid)<sup>2</sup>*

'My Ruler to his hands He hath committed.'

(ina?) *munattu išpurā šipir(ta)*

In the morning twilight He sent the message';

. . . *damqāti<sup>3</sup> UN-MESH-ia uktal(lim)*

'(the god?) favours to my people showed.'

(tes?) *litu riku šir-it-( )*

. . . . .

( ) *arḥiš ugamiṛ iḥḥipt (duppi?)*

' . . . quickly he finished, broken in pieces was (my bond?).

( ) *ša bēlia libbašu i(niḥ?)*

' . . . of my Lord His heart was quieted';

( ) *-sinī kabitta ip(šah?)*

' . . . . the temper was appeased.'

<sup>1</sup> ši(ri-ta) = *širrita*, 'the sceptre'?

<sup>2</sup> ip(qid-sa), 'he hath committed it'?

<sup>3</sup> L. *qātū?* but cf. *šarru uktallim rāmu*, 'the king has shown favour'; *uštaklima damigtu, id.*

(šū)u unminni(-a išmēma imḥuru supā'a?)<sup>1</sup>

'He heard my prayer and accepted my supplication.'

..... tību .....  
'..... good .....';

End of Tablet III. Obverse. A gap of unknown extent follows.

ēgātīa ušābil šāru (IM)<sup>2</sup>

'My sins He caused the wind to carry away.'

.....  
.....

(iṭi)ihḥamma tāšu (ella?) .....  
'He drew near and (pronounced) his (pure) incantation';

(išap)par imḥulla ana išid AN-e ana irat irḥitim ubil(šu?)

'He sendeth the ill wind to the foundation of Heaven; Into the bosom of Earth He brought it';

(bī)rit apsāššu šālu lim(nu ulīr?)

'Into the middle of the Abyss He made the evil spirit return.'

utukku lā nību ulūr E-kur-ri

'Demons without number He made return to Ekur';

GISH-KIB labartu šadā ušlēše(ir)

'With vervain the Labart He led to the mountain';

Agi tāmātu šuruppā ušamḥi(i?)

'To the flood of Ocean He made the chill fever go forth.'

išid lu-u-tu<sup>3</sup> ittasaḥ kīma šam(mi)

'The root of the disease He tore out like a plant's.'

šitli lā tābtu riḥā<sup>4</sup> šalā(līa)

'The slumber unhealthy that overflowed my downlying'—

kīma qutru immalū AN-e ušta(ak-ta-mu) (cf. Sanh. iv. 68)

'As with smoke were filled the heavens, they were covered'—

ina ù-u-a-a a-a nī'u nīšēš

'With a Ho! and a Ha! He drove back like a lion';

ušalbi imbariṣ Kī-tim uš(mallī?)

'He let it rise (come on?) like a hurricane (and) fill the earth.'

lazzu GIG-SAG-du ša ZU? u išḥup(pu)<sup>5</sup>

'The clinging ailment, the headsickness, which had confounded the wise',—

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Neb. II. 4.

<sup>2</sup> A line preserved in Comment. 5 R 47. (ēgātī = hiṭātī: Comm.)

<sup>3</sup> lu'ātu: murḥu. Gloss.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. NE. xi. 209 šittum ir-ḥā elia.

<sup>5</sup> Or 'overthrown the strong' (li'ā).

*issuḥ(am ṣ)ma nalši muši(ṣ) UḠU-ia uštez(nun ṣ)*

'He tore out, and the cool shower of night upon me He rained down.'

*te'-a-ti SHI-aa ša uštašbiḥ šibiḥ mu-u(ši)*

'As for mine eyeballs(?) which He had caused a cover of night to cover',—

*ušaṭbī IM rašbu unammir ni(la-sin)<sup>1</sup>*

'He brought on a mighty wind, He (or It) brightened their look.'

*PI-aa ša uṭṭammima (v. me) ussakkika<sup>2</sup> ḥašikkīš*

'Mine ears which were stopped and blocked like a deaf man's',—

*itbal amīrašin iptēti(ē) nišmā-a-a*

'He took away their deafness, He opened Him their hearing.'

*appa ša ina ridi ummi unappiqu ni(ipši-šu)<sup>3</sup>*

'My nose whose breathing He had obstructed with a flow of mucus',—

*nipšu* is 'smell', 'scent', of a herb, in NE (xi. 272). *unappiqu* is difficult. The root cannot be identical with Aram. ܢܦܫ 'to go out'. It may perhaps be another form of ܢܦܫ which we see in Arab. لَفَق 'to sew together', to join'; or we may compare it with Aram. ܢܦܫ tenuit, 'retinuit'; cf. the Syriac phrase ܠܒܢܬܐ ܕܢܫܡܐ *difficulty of breathing*. As to the phrase *ina ridi (ridi) ummi, ridū* 'to flow' is common enough; while *ummu*, which is neither *ummu*, 'mother', nor *ummu*, 'heat', may possibly be related to the Syriac ܐܡܡܐ *emmā*, 'pool', 'conduit', 'ditch', Ne 2<sup>14</sup> (= ܦܪܟܬܐ, ܡܚܠܐ 'channel of water', Eccus 24<sup>14</sup>: cf. ܐܡܡܐ 'amma, 'ditch', Bab. Kam. 50 b, Shab. 128 b. (*appu*, 'nose', plur. *appé*, is masc., like Heb. ܐܢܐ.) My *niribšu* seems quite as probable as Thompson and Landersdorfer's *nipšišu* (l. 53), about the meaning of which the latter is not certain.

*upaššiḥ miḥiṣtašuma anappuṣ (andku)*

'He stilled its outpouring and I, I breathe again.'

*šapṭāa ša illabba ilqā dan(nūtišīna ṣ)*

'My lips which quivered, (whose) strength He had taken away',—

*ikpur pulḥatsīnāma qiṣiršīna ip(šur)*

'He removed their fear, their knot He loosened';

*pāa ša uktattimu šabāriš aš(kun ṣ)*

'My mouth which He had closed, which I set only to whispering',—

*(im)suṣ kīma kī-e rušaṣu uš(nam-mir ṣ)*

'He refined(?) like bronze, its colour He made bright(?)';

<sup>1</sup> Or 'He cleared their sight'.

<sup>2</sup> v. *uissakkira*, 'were barred or closed'.

<sup>3</sup> Or *niribšu*, 'whose entrance'.

*šinnāa ša illaṣbatā šteniš inniqi(id-da)*

'My teeth which were held, which were tied fast together',—

*(i)ple)š birilsināma irdasin uštam(ziz?)*

'He opened the space between them,<sup>1</sup> their foundation He secured';

*(li)šānu ša innibla šutābulu<sup>2</sup> lā i(l'u?)*

'The tongue which was swollen, which could not articulate'—

*(ip-šu-)uš šupuštašama iddād atmū(ša?)*

'He anointed its mass and its speech became clear(?)';

*ur-ū-du ša innisru unappiqu lagabbiš<sup>3</sup>*

'The throat which was bound, whose passage He had obstructed . . .',—

*uštibba iratu(ti) ša malliš ištalliša(la?)*

'He made good the chest which piped like a flute' (BPS 117).

*(ru)ti ša utappiqu lā (i)maḥḥaru (. . .)*

'My spittle which He had obstructed . . . . .',—

*lagā'a ša isirma idillaš ipti*

'The bonds which He bound and its barred door He opened';

(Three broken lines follow.)

#### TABLET IV.

*šammaḥu ša ina unṣi illārū kīma pīr ān zal (ṣal? ṣil?) li rakšu*

'The stomach which quaked with want, which like a prisoner was bound',—

The difficulty of this line has been generally recognized. Landesdorfer renders: 'Dem Wohlhabenden, der dem Hungertode nahe gebracht war, gefesselt wie ein Schuldbeladener (?), (Brachte er Speise, versah ihn mit Getränk).' But we have not yet done with the list of bodily members which are consecutively restored to health and efficiency (cf. *kīšādi*, l. 3; *umāši*, l. 5; *birkāa*, l. 8); and it seems probable that *šammaḥu* denotes some other part or organ of the body. Since it 'quakes' (Hab 3<sup>16</sup>) or trembles 'with hunger' and receives food and drink (l. 2), it can hardly be anything else but the stomach (unless perhaps the gullet be intended). As for the etymology, *šammaḥu* need not be connected with the Assyrian *šamāḥu*, 'to grow luxuriantly', 'to thrive', but is perhaps identical with *šamahḥu*, which is the name of a part of the body in 4 R 22 a, and is directly borrowed from the Sumerian SHA-MAG, 'lofty interior' (see 4 R 22. 34, 35).

<sup>1</sup> Lit. 'their middle' (*birtu*); or perhaps 'their bond' (*birtu*, *biritu*).

<sup>2</sup> *šutābulu*, III. 2 Inf. of *apālu*.

<sup>3</sup> *lagabbiš* = *lagabbišu*: cf. LAGAB, *uštutum*?; IMI LAGAB, *uštutum ša sumri*, Br. 10165; 10204. Vid. HWB. (tiffi).

*imahhar iptenni ubbalā maškita*

'It receiveth food, He bringeth drink.'

*kišādī ša irmā irnama<sup>1</sup> ikkappu*

'My neck which was relaxed, bowed to the root',

*upattin qi-ni-e amališ izgup*

'He made firm (as) a young palm (?), like a cedar He set up';

The verb *patānu*, which here occurs in the Intensive form (Pael), is not apparently connected with its homophone *patānu*, 'to eat', whence comes *iptennu*, 'food', l. 2 (although the uses of סָמַךְ and סָעַר, 'to support', in the sense of sustaining or feeding, suggest a possible connexion). The פָּחַן in the sense here required may be a cognate of פָּחַל 'to twist', and so 'tighten', 'make firm'; cf. Heb. קָוָה, strictly 'twist', whence קֶוֶ 'cord', 'line' = Assyr. *qū*, and Arab. قَوَى 'to be strong', قُوَّة 'strength' and 'strand' (of a rope). The gloss on the next word *qi-ni-e* is *qi-nu-u gin-ú*. Probably the scribe inadvertently wrote *qi-ni-e* for *qi-ni-e-eš* or *qi-ni-eš*. For *qi-nu*, 'a young palm', see ZA xii. 410, 14.

The gloss on *amališ* is *a-ma-lu GIŠ Û-KU*, which is elsewhere equated with *ašūhu*, 'cedar' (5 R 65, 43; cf. *PSBA.*, 1887, p. 127). Is this Assyr. root *amal* (*awal*) identical with אָוַל 'to be high', which appears to be the root of the Heb. tree-names אֵיל, אֵלֶּה, אֵלֶן?

*ana gāmir abāri umdši umaššil*

'To one perfect in strength He made my structure equal.'

On *abāru* the gloss is *a-ba-ri e-mu-qu*, the latter being a common word for 'strength'. The root is, of course, the same as that of the Heb. אַבִּיר 'abbir', 'mighty'. For more obscure *umdšu* the gloss is *ú-ma-ši KAK-MU*, or rather *DÚ-MU*; a Sumerian expression denoting 'my make' or 'build' or 'fabric' or 'structure' (*DÚ*, later *RÚ*, *banā*, *bínātu*, *épēšu*, *patāqu*; Br. 5248 ff.).

*GIM nakimtum šūšī uṣappira ṣupuraa*

'Like (those of) a *she-nākim* or a *šūšū*-demon He had made my finger-nails grow':

The demons called *nakmu* (masc.) and *nakimtu* (fem.), like other evil spirits, entered the bodies of men, so causing disease. See 4 R 28, No. 3, 11 a: *lišēṣī nakma ù nakimti ša SU(MU)*, 'Let him expel the *nākim* and the *nākimt* of my body!' The *nakmu* is described by the Sumerian epithet *LU GISH-GI-KA-SAR*, which perhaps means *amēl hīši*, 'Man of the Reedy Swamp' (חִישַׁת קָנִים, חִישַׁתָּא); indicating his natural haunt or place of origin. (Cf. *GISH-GI*, *abu*, 'a reed-bed', and

<sup>1</sup> *Fort.* *ir-na-šu*. Gl. *e-ri-e-na šur-šū e-ri-nati*.

GI-KA-SAR, *hišu*, *id.*; Br. 2386; 2415f.) An epithet of the *nakimtu*, his female counterpart, seems to indicate her baleful activity. She is called ID-KU(M) or A-KU(M), or A-RI(G). However the Sumerian group was read, the two signs of which it consists are *hand + pound* or *crush* (Br. 4710f.; 6587); so that she grinds or crushes or pounds a man like corn (KUM, *hašdū*), or completely crushes his strength. From the present passage it also appears that, like other demons, she possessed sharp nails or claws (see Handcock, *Mesopotamian Archaeology*, p. 262).

The rare word *šūṣī* is explained by the following gloss: *amelu šū-ṣu-ū ša (ilu) Istar ana IZI UD-DU-A*, which means 'whom Ishtar casts out into Fire'—a suitable destination for a maleficent demon. (We should have expected *GIM nakimtum u šūṣī*, 'like a *nakimtu* or a *šūṣī*-demon'. The conjunction may have been omitted because it was absent in the Sumerian text, of which this is probably a translation.)

It will be evident to the reader that a special interest attaches to this line as illustrating the Biblical story of Nebuchadnezzar's madness; one feature of which was that his hair grew 'like eagles' feathers and his nails like birds' claws' (Dan 4<sup>39</sup>). In whatever relation the poem may stand to the book of Job, it seems clear, from the evidence of this and several previous lines, some of which have hitherto been misunderstood, that the familiar story of Daniel can hardly be altogether independent of this far older native Babylonian narration.

(As to the root *nakāmu*, I would compare it with the Arabic لَكَمَ *lakama*, pugno percussit, 'he smote with the fist' (l = n, as often).)

*itbuk manah/ašun GAR(= šikin)-šun uššb*

'He poured forth their ailment, He restored their condition.'

Glosses on this line are '*manah/a*: GIG' (= *murṣu*, 'sickness', elsewhere); and 'GAR-šu (*sic* !): SAG-DU', which is a Sumerian group denoting 'head' (*qaqqādu*), 'top', and here no doubt the 'top' or 'tip' of the nails, now restored to proper length and shape. It is thus an explanatory paraphrase rather than a strict equivalent or synonym of *šiknu*. That *manah/a* is *manah/a* from *nāhu* (not from *anāhu*) is made probable by 2 R 27, 36-38, where apparently three homophones are distinguished, viz. *nāhu ša libbi*, 'to rest or be quieted, of the heart'—common phrase; *nāhu ša murṣi*, '*nāhu*, of sickness', from which doubtless our *manah/a* springs; and *nāhu ša šahē*, 'to be fat, of a swine'.

*birkāa ša uktassā būṣīš . . . .*

(Gl. bu-ṣi: *iṣṣār hurri*, 'bird of holes'.)

'My knees which were fettered like a falcon's (He unbound?)';

*šuklultum pag(ri)ia ištad(dā ṣalam)šū*

'The entire form of my body He heightened its figure';

For *šuklultum* (*ti*) *pagrīa*, see 4 R 57. 53 a; for *šadū*, 'to be high', *ištādī*, 'he made high', see Muss-Arnolt, s.v. Perhaps, however, the mutilated word was *ištaddal*, 'he enlarged, made fine or noble'. Cf. *šalam pagrīšu*, NE. I. col. ii. 2.

*imšuš mammé rūšūš uzakkī*

'He wiped away the rust, he purified its colour';

Glosses on this line are *ma-šá-šu*: *ka-pa-ru*: *ma-am-mu-u*: *šú-uḫ-tu*: *ru-ši-iš*: LU(DIB)-BI. With *kapāru*, cf. *dímšaša ikappar*, 'he wipes away her tears' (Myth of Nergal and Ereškigal; see ME. p. 78, l. 20). *Mammū* is probably a word of Sumerian origin (MAM, MAN?); its equivalent *šūhtu* (= Syr. ܫܘܚܬܐ 'rust', 'verdigris', 'foulness') is one of the Assyrian values of the Sumerian character for copper (CT xii. 7); as is also *qū*, Tab. iii. 58 *supr.*, with which the present line must obviously be compared.

*dūlum ummultum ittapirdī*

'The enfeebled (?) form grew bright.'

Here we have the gloss *du-ú-tu*: *bu-un-na-nu-u* (i. e. 'form', 'appearance'). With *ummulu*, f. *ummultu*, cf. Heb. אַמּלל 'weak', 'feeble'. The Assy. *dūlu*, 'form', 'figure', may be from the *דמה* 'to be like', and thus identical with Heb. דְּמוּת 'likeness'; cf. *Dūzu*, from *Du'ūzu*, from *Dumūzu*, Tammūz.

*ina itē DINGIR-ID ašar dēn UN-MEŠ ibbirru* (I. 1. Pres.)

'On the banks of the divine River where doom passeth on men',

Gloss on *itē DINGIR ID* (i. e. *itē ili Nāri*): *hur-ša-an*. *Huršan* was probably a local name ('eine heilige Landschaft', Hommel, *Grundriss*, 251).

*muttātu ammarīṭ abbuttum appa (te-ir?)*

'I had my long locks plucked, of the fetter I was freed.'

The context points to some rite of lustration or purification, which completes the restoration of the sufferer; and this rite naturally has place on the bank of a sacred stream. Cf. the case of Naaman, 2 K 5<sup>10-14</sup>). With *muttu*, plur. (?) *muttātu*, 'hair' of the temples (?), cf. Syr. ܡܢܬܐ, ܡܢܬܐ, plur. ܡܢܝܢ 'a hair', 'hair' = ܒܝܢܝ ܒܝܢܬܐ, cf. Targ. and Talmud.

(Gap of four lines.)

. . . . . *katru ina piširti ala'*

. . . . . in release I go up (?)'

*ana E-SAG-ILA ēgū<sup>1</sup> ina SHU-ia līmur*

'Unto Esagīla let the sinner through my guidance look!'

<sup>1</sup> Gloss on *egū*: e-gu-u ḫa-ṭu-u.



*ina pí girra KU-ša iddi napsama (il) Mardug*<sup>1</sup>

'In the mouth of the lion devouring me Merodach put a bit';

*(il) Mardug ša mukaššidía ikim aspašu assukkašu usaḥḥar*<sup>2</sup>

'Merodach took away my pursuer's wily work by turning his ambush.'

### THE STORY OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S HUMILIATION AND REINSTATEMENT (Dan 4).

Tantalizing as we find the lacunas and obscurities of the text, this fragment of ancient Babylonian literature throws unexpected light upon another late portion of the Old Testament Canon besides the book of Job. The failure of the king's seers and soothsayers, sorcerers and enchanters, to relieve him of his perplexities (Tab. ii) and to reveal the cause and duration of his malady (Tab. iii) reminds us of the inability of the wise men, enchanters, sorcerers and astrologers, to reveal and interpret the dreams of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2 and 4); and it is by the dream of a seer of Nippur that Shubshî-meshrê-Nergal is warned of his approaching deliverance. But it is Nebuchadnezzar's personal narrative of another dream and its interpretation and issue (Dan 4) which presents the most striking points of contact with the personal narrative of Shubshî-meshrê-Nergal. The tall tree of the Bible story may have been suggested by the statement that the god made the bowed neck of the sick monarch as *firm as a young palm* and *erect as a cedar*; cf. also the earlier lines *My ample form like a reed they* (the demons) *prostrated*; *Like a palm was I overturned, on my back I was thrown*. The idea of Nebuchadnezzar's *heart* or sense being *changed* to that of a beast, so that he dwelt with the beasts of the field and *did eat grass like oxen*, may perhaps be based on the (more or less conjectural) lines *For lack of food grass (ispu, 'sprouts'; or iḥbu or iṣbu?) was my fare*. *He seized my blood, wrenched away my heart* (or *understanding*). *All the day the driver driveth me. . . . In my stable I fell down like an ox*. *I wallowed like a sheep in my own dung*. In the process of cure Merodach *tore out the clinging ailment and the head-sickness, and rained down upon me the cool showers of night*. So Nebuchadnezzar's *body was wet with the dew of heaven*. The lines *Like (those of) a she-swampfiend or a shūḥū-*

<sup>1</sup> Glosses on this line: gir-ra: UR-MAĠ: nap-sa-mu: ma-ak-ḥa-ru ša KA ANSHU KUR-RA, 'bond of the mouth of a horse'.

<sup>2</sup> Glosses. as-suk-ku . . . tu: aṣ-pu uṣ-bu, 'ambush': see HWB. s.v. *aspu*. Delitzsch explains *assukku* as 'a screen', 'stalking-fence', or 'cover for an ambush-cade'. (The commentary preserves the fragments of five lines more; of which, however, little or nothing can be made.)

*demon He had sharpened my nails ; He poured forth their ailment, He made good their state* vividly remind us that Nebuchadnezzar's humiliation continued until his hair had grown long as (*that of*) griffon-vultures, and his nails as (*those of*) birds (Dan 4<sup>30</sup>, AV<sup>33</sup>). So, when Merodach heals him, the old king says: *Of my long hair I was plucked, Of the feller I was freed.*

The Daniel-story makes pride the sin for which Nebuchadnezzar was so severely punished. This was perhaps an inference from the lines

*The Majesty of the King to that of a god I made equal ;  
And awe of the Palace I made the multitude learn.*

The Babylonian sovereign speaks only of his *sins* in general, which his Lord caused the wind to carry away.

The closing words of the Biblical account *Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honour the King of heaven* read almost like a paraphrase of the opening words which constitute the title of the Babylonian poem *Ludlul Bēl nīmeqi*, 'I will worship the Lord of Wisdom'. The line *Šarrākuma atūr ana rēši*, 'I am (was) king, and I became a thrall' (i. e. I was treated like one ; I was abased from my royal dignity and humiliated to the utmost) might be regarded as the key-note to the story of Dan 4, which was written to demonstrate that *the Most High is sovran in the kingdom of men and gives it to whom He will, and appoints over it the lowliest of men* (Dan 4<sup>14(17)</sup>).

Lastly, it may be remarked that the line *In the mouth of the lion devouring me Merodach put a bit* supplies the *motif* of Dan 6.

## DATE OF THE BOOK OF JOB.

The date of the book can only be surmised with any degree of probability from internal evidence, part of which has already been submitted incidentally in the foregoing considerations. Not much stress can be laid upon the social characteristics and conditions of the time as they appear to be reflected in passages like chap. 24 or 29<sup>7-10</sup>, 30<sup>1-8</sup>, which might equally well indicate, so far as we know, any period of the history from the age of Abraham (First Babylonian Dynasty) down to the close of the Jewish monarchy. As we have seen, the moral questions raised by the book grew out of the painful experience of Jewish history. The prophets of the eighth century B. C. are unanimous in regarding the calamities of Israel and Judah as Iahvah's judgement upon the national sins. They are silent on the point which Job found so inconsistent with ordinary ideas of justice, 9<sup>22</sup> ff., that the innocent may be involved in the fate of the guilty. The questions *Will thou even*

sweep away righteous and wicked alike? Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do justice? do not seem to have occurred to Hosea and Amos, Isaiah and Micah (see Gn 18<sup>23-33</sup> J<sup>2</sup> circ. 650 B. C.). It is not before the times of continual disaster, the age of Jeremiah and Ezekiel who witnessed the final tragedy of their country, that we hear voices of agonized entreaty and remonstrance with Iahvah such as meet us in the book of Job. *And I said, Alas, my Lord Iahvah! surely Thou hast altogether misled this people and Jerusalem with a promise of peace, whereas the sword reacheth to the life* (Je 4<sup>10</sup>): *Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?* (ib. 8<sup>22</sup>). *Chastise me, Iahvah, but with justice; not in Thine anger, lest thou make me few* (ib. 10<sup>24</sup>). *Righteous art Thou, Iahvah, though I complain of Thee: yet would I argue the case with Thee. Why does the way of the wicked prosper? why are all treacherous deceivers unmolested? Thou plantest them; they take root: they sprout* (leg. יִחַלְפוּ? cf. Ps 90<sup>5,6</sup>, Ho 14<sup>7</sup>), *they bring forth fruit: Thou art nigh to their mouth, and far from their reins* (ib. 12<sup>1,2</sup>). Cf. Jb 21<sup>7</sup> ff. Jeremiah too is never weary of tracing the calamities of Judah to the national unfaithfulness to Iahvah in religion and breaches of the moral law in the dealings of everyday life. His contemporaries appear to have preferred to account for their misfortunes by the sins of their ancestors (cf. Ex 20<sup>5</sup>). In contradicting this popular view, which they expressed in a proverb current at the time, the prophet foretells happier days when people will no longer say, *The fathers have eaten sour grapes And the teeth of the sons are set on edge*; but a man will die for his own sin, and the eater of the sour grapes will have his own teeth set on edge (Je 31<sup>29 f.</sup>): in other words, the innocent will not be involved in the fate of the guilty, but each will fare according to his personal deserts. As Ezekiel puts it, discussing the same proverb (Ez 18), *The soul that sinneth, it shall die. A son shall bear no part of the guilt of the father, and a father shall bear no part of the guilt of the son* (Ez 18<sup>20</sup>). Ezekiel is combating the assertion that *The way of the Lord is not equitable* (לֹא יִשְׁתָּוֵי מִדְּוַי, scil. by the strict rule of right); which is precisely one of the contentions of Job. Zephaniah (1<sup>12</sup>) denounces coming judgement upon *the men who are settled upon their lees* (like wine left undisturbed to fine); *who think that Iahvah does neither good nor harm*—is indifferent to human conduct, intervening neither to rescue the righteous nor to punish the guilty great ones (temp. Josiah; before 621 B. C.).

But it is in Malachi,<sup>1</sup> the last of the OT prophetic writers (he belongs

<sup>1</sup> It is surely no real objection to the name Malachi = Malachiah מַלְאָכִי that it belongs to no other person in the OT records. The same objection would lie against the name Hachaliah, f. of Nehemiah, or Jedidiah (2 S 12<sup>25</sup>). If the full name was מַלְאָכִי יְהוָה Iahvah's Messenger, it would quite naturally be abridged in colloquial use into מַלְאָכִי, which happens to coincide with the appellative מַלְאָכִי my messenger, which

to the Persian period; cf. 'thy pasha' 1<sup>a</sup>) that we have clear evidence of widespread unbelief in the practical value of the ancient faith and the traditional worship. *Ye have wearied Iahvah with your words and ye say, By what have we wearied Him? By your saying, Every one that doeth evil is pleasing in the eyes of Iahvah, and in them He delighteth: or else, Where is the God of Judgment? (2<sup>17</sup>). Your words have been strong against Me, said Iahvah, and ye say, What have we talked against Thee? Ye have said, It is vain to serve Elohim; and what profit is it that we have observed His observance, and that we have walked as mourners because of Iahvah Sabaoth? And now we call the presumptuous happy; yea, the doers of wickedness are built up; yea, they have tested Elohim and escaped hurt (3<sup>13-15</sup>). Cf. Jb 21<sup>7-15</sup> 34<sup>9</sup> 35<sup>3</sup>. In view of the despairing mood of the pious and the scoffs of apostates, the prophet can only seek to reassure the one and alarm the other class in the community by announcing the intervention of Iahvah; after which they will again see the difference between a righteous one and a wicked, between one who serveth Elohim and one who hath not served Him (3<sup>17</sup> f. 4<sup>1</sup> ff.).*

If we are right in reading מַלְאָךְ instead of מַלְאָךְ in 7<sup>e</sup>, as a royal post or mounted courier (= Gk. ἄγγελος), cf. 9<sup>25</sup>, the word will point us to the Persian period for the book of Job also. But however that may be, the appearance of 'The Satan' in the Prologue as an Angel hostile to man finds its only parallel in Zechariah who prophesied under Darius Hystaspis (520 B. C. onwards): see Zc 3<sup>1,2</sup> where 'The Satan' plays the part of Adversary to Joshua the High Priest before the Angel of Iahvah.

There is certainly some evidence of progress in OT dealing with the problem. Ezekiel is content to deny that children suffer for the sins of their fathers, irrespective of the question of their own guilt or innocence.

occurs 3<sup>1</sup> as an allusive reference to the prophet's personal name (cf. 2 Esdr 1<sup>40</sup>). That מַלְאָךְ, *his messenger*, may only indicate that in the translator's time the existence of the prophet was already forgotten, if it was not due to a common confusion of the two similar letters Waw and Yod. To say that 'the name is not a likely one' (EB) is simply to beg the question. It is true that Malachiah or Malachi does not recur in the OT; neither does Habakkuk (cf. also Jonah, Nahum). But rarity is no argument against the authenticity of a Proper Name; and as regards the meaning, a prophet might as fittingly be named *Iahvah's Messenger as Iahvah's Servant* (Obadiah); cf. the Sumerian LUĜ, *messenger or minister* (also read SHUKKAL, SUKKAL, Assyr. *sukkalu*), which may be in this sense a variation of LAĜ, *to go* (Caus. *to send?*) = לָאֵךְ ✓ of מַלְאָךְ (cf. Eth. *la'aka*, 'to send', *ta'eka*, 'to be sent', 'wait on', 'minister'). The Sum. LUĜ (SHUKKAL) is used of subordinate deities who, like the classical Mercury and Iris, serve as ministers or messengers of the greater gods; and it occurs in personal names such as LUĜ (*Sukkal*)-*Rammân*, 'Rimmon's Messenger' or 'Minister'.

It seems possible that the word הַנְּבִיא, *the prophet*, has fallen out of the text before אֶהְיֶה. If so, the original heading of Malachi was like those of Habakkuk and Haggai (Hab 1<sup>1</sup> Hg 1<sup>1</sup>).

Iahvah is just; His way is equal; every man 'dies' for his own sins. If a sinner turn righteous, he 'lives'; if a righteous man turn sinner, he dies. A later generation was not satisfied with this simple solution which seemed to contradict experience. Malachi makes it clear that in his day many were throwing doubt on the value of the established religion, on the ground of its apparent inefficacy to ensure the prosperity of its adherents or to shield them from adversity. Their openly expressed conclusion was that *It is vain to serve Iahvah, since they who forget God prosper*. The prophet can only meet the difficulty by assuring his fellow-believers that it will not be so always: Iahvah will interpose in His approaching Day. Then the balance will be redressed; the godless will be swept away in fires of judgement, and will become ashes under the feet of the godly; and doubters and waverers will again discern the difference between righteous and wicked, between irreligious and religious. The difference in their fate will make it clear. The doubt, however, was not finally laid by this pronouncement. The Day of Iahvah was delayed. The vicissitudes of history, now favourable, now unfavourable, to the Jewish community, kept the question alive until, in the time of Christ, we hear the disciples asking whether congenital blindness was a punishment for the sufferer's own sins (committed, we must suppose, in a former life) or for those of his parents. Our Lord's answer contradicted both theories of suffering, by declaring (in the spirit of the Prologue of Job) that affliction is not necessarily punishment and, therefore, no presumption of antecedent sin. It may be designed to give scope for the play of Divine forces (Job 9<sup>3</sup>) and so to illustrate the Glory of God. This is surely the Final Cause and End of all permitted evil, as of all created existence—unless indeed we are to cry with the frank sensualist

‘Thou, Nature, art my goddess!’

and surrender ourselves to a base idolatry of appetite, more degrading than the worship of stocks and stones with which, in other stages of human culture, it is usually associated.

*Note on the prosody of the poem.*

Some of the poetical portions of the book are translated into quatrains of triple-stressed lines after the original measures, which are not entirely obscured by the numerous interpolations of the text. Possible interpolations are enclosed in square brackets, thus [     ].

# THE BOOK OF JOB IN ENGLISH

## A TRANSLATION OF THE REVISED TEXT

CHAPTER 1.—1. A man there was in 'Ûç-land, Eyob by name. This man was moral and upright—godfearing and  
2 averse from evil. So there were born to him seven sons  
3 and three daughters; and his livestock came to seven  
thousand sheep and goats, and three thousand camels, and  
five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she-asses, and an  
immense body of slaves: he became, in fact, the greatest of  
all the Eastern tribesmen.

4 Now his sons were wont to go and banquet in each others'  
houses in turn; and they would send and invite their three  
5 sisters to eat and drink with them. But when the round  
of the banquets was complete, Eyob sent and purified them;  
and he would rise early and offer burnt-offerings in proportion  
to their number, for he thought 'Perhaps my sons have sinned  
by cursing God in thought!' so used Eyob to do all the  
year round.

6 But the day came when the Sons of God went in to stand  
in attendance on Iahvah; and the Satan too went in among  
7 them. Said Iahvah to the Satan, 'Whence comest thou?'  
The Satan answered Iahvah, 'From roving on the earth and  
8 roaming about in it.' Said Iahvah to the Satan, 'Hast thou  
noticed my servant Eyob? he has not his like on earth—a  
man moral and upright, godfearing and averse from evil.'  
9 But the Satan answered Iahvah, 'Is it for nothing that Eyob  
10 fears God? hast not Thou Thyself made a fence all round  
him and his household and everything that belongs to him?  
the work of his hands Thou hast blessed, and his livestock  
11 has multiplied in the land. However, only stretch out Thine  
Hand and strike all that belongs to him, and he will assuredly  
12 curse Thee to Thy Face!' Said Iahvah to the Satan, 'There!  
all that belongs to him is in thine hand! only against his

person stretch not out thine hand !' The Satan then withdrew from the presence of Iahvah.

13 And the day came when his sons and his daughters were eating bread and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house, 14 and a messenger went in to Eyob and said : 'The oxen were 15 ploughing, and the she-asses were grazing hard by, when the Sabeans attacked and seized them, but the young men they put to the sword ; and only I scarce escaped alone to tell 16 thee !' He was still speaking when another came in and said : 'The Fire of God hath fallen from Heaven and set fire to the sheep and goats and the young men and devoured them ; 17 and only I have scarce escaped alone to tell thee !' He was still speaking when another came in and said : 'The Chaldeans made three companies and dashed upon the camels and seized them, but the young men they put to the sword ; and only 18 I scarce escaped alone to tell thee !' He was still speaking when another came in and said : 'Thy sons and daughters were eating bread and drinking wine in their eldest brother's 19 house, when lo, a hurricane blew from beyond the wilderness and struck the four corners of the house, and it fell upon the young men, and they perished ; and only I have scarce escaped alone to tell thee !'

20 At that, Eyob started up and tore his mantle and shaved his head, and then threw himself upon the ground and did 21 reverence. Then he said :

'Bare came I forth from my Mother's womb,  
And bare must I thither return !  
'Twas Iahvah who gave, and Iahvah who took—  
Let Iahvah's Name be blest !'

22 In all this Eyob sinned not, nor charged any faultiness to God.

CHAPTER 2.—1. But the day came when the Sons of God went in to stand in attendance on Iahvah ; and the Satan too went in among them.

2 Said Iahvah to the Satan, 'Whence comest thou ?' The Satan answered Iahvah, 'From roving on the earth and roaming about in it.' Said Iahvah to the Satan, 'Hast thou noticed my servant Eyob ? he has not his like on earth—a man moral and upright, god-fearing and averse from evil. He still maintains his virtue, though thou didst incite me against him, 4 that I might swallow him up without cause.' But the Satan

- answered Iahvah, 'One skin for another! and all that the  
 5 man hath will he give for himself. However, only stretch  
 out Thine Hand and strike his bone and his flesh, and he will  
 6 assuredly curse Thee to Thy Face!' Said Iahvah to the Satan,  
 'There! he is in thine hand! yet spare his life!'
- 7 The Satan then withdrew from the presence of Iahvah and  
 smote Eyob with a malignant eczema from the sole of his  
 8 foot to the crown of his head; and he took him a potsherd to  
 scratch himself with. Now he was sitting among the ashes,  
 9 when his wife demanded, 'Art thou still maintaining thy  
 10 virtue? Curse God and die!' But he replied: 'Thou speakest  
 like one of the silly wantons! Are we actually to accept  
 what is good from God, and not to accept what is evil?'  
 In all this Eyob sinned not with his lips.
- 11 And Eyob's Three Friends heard of all this evil which had  
 come upon him; and they came from their respective places—  
 Eliphaz the Temanite and Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the  
 Minean—and met by appointment, to come to condole with  
 12 him and to comfort him. But when they caught sight of him  
 from a distance and failed to recognize him, they burst into  
 loud weeping and tore each of them his mantle and sprinkled  
 13 dust upon their heads, throwing it up into the air. Then they  
 sat down with him on the ground for seven days and seven  
 nights, none of them speaking a word to him, because they  
 saw that the pain was intolerable.

- CHAPTER 3.—1. *Afterwards Eyob opened his mouth and*  
 2 *cursed his day. And Eyob answered and said:*
- 3 Perish the Day I was born,  
 And the Night that said, 'Here is a Man!'  
 4 That Day become Darkness!  
 Light seek it not from Above,  
 Nor Sunlight beam upon it!  
 5 Darkness and Deathshade bedim it!  
 Cloud settle upon it!  
 Benightings of day affright it!
- 6 That Day—utter Gloom seize it!  
 Be it not one in the Days of the Year,  
 Nor be counted in the Days of the Month!  
 8 Day-enchanters ban it,  
 Adept in rousing the Dragon!



- 7 That Night become stone-barren!  
No joyous birthshout enter it!  
9 Darkened be the Stars of its Twilight!  
Let it wait for the Light in vain,  
Nor look on the Eyelids of Dawn!  
10 Because it barred not my door(s),  
Nor hid Trouble from mine eyes.
- 11 Why was I not born dying,—  
Coming forth from the womb but to expire?  
12 O why did knees receive me,  
And breasts that I might suck?  
13 For then had I lain down and were quiet;  
I had slept; then peace were mine!  
14 Like Kings and national Councillors,  
Who rebuilded ruins for their pleasure;  
15 And like Princes who had much gold,—  
Who filled their houses with silver:  
16 Or as a buried abortion I had been,—  
As babes which never saw light.  
17 There the wicked cease from raging;  
And there the weary rest.  
18 Together the prisoners repose;  
They hear not the taskmaster's voice:  
19 Small and great are there;  
And the slave is free from his master.
- 20 Why is light given to the sufferer,  
And life to them that are sorrowful,—  
21 Who wait for Death in vain,  
And dig for it rather than treasure,—  
22 Who are glad beyond gladness,  
And rejoice when they find the grave,—  
23 To the Man whose path is hidden,  
And whom Eloah hath fenced about?  
24 He feedeth me with bread of sighs,  
And I pour out my groans like water.  
25 If I dread a thing, it cometh upon me,  
And what I fear befalleth me.  
26 I have neither ease nor quiet,—  
No rest, and trouble cometh.

CHAPTER 4.—1. *In reply Eliphaz the Temanite said:*

2 Should one address discourse to the sick?

Yet who can withhold speech?

3 Lo, thou hast put many right,

And wouldst strengthen drooping hands:

4 Thy words would raise the stumbler,

And thou madest bowed knees firm.

5 But now it cometh to thyself, thou art overcome;

It reacheth thee, and thou art bewildered.

6 Is not thy piety thine assurance,

And thine hope the perfectness of thy ways?

7 Think now, who that was guiltless ever perished?

And where were the upright wiped out?

8 In my ken, 'tis the plowers of trouble

And the sowers of misery, that reap it:

9 By the breath of Eloah they perish,—

By the blast of His wrath are ended.

10 The fangs of the lion are shattered,

And the teeth of the young lions broken out:

11 The old lion perisheth for lack of prey,

And the she-lion's whelps are scattered.

12 But to me a word stole in,

And mine ear caught a whisper of speech;

13 In thoughts woke by visions of night,

When deep sleep falleth on men.

14 A fear came over me, and trembling,

And every bone of me it shook with fear;

15 And a Breath o'er my face glideth on,—

It raiseth the hairs of my head.

16 And behold, Shaddai is passing!

He stoppeth, but I discern not His form;

A Shape is before mine eyes;

I hear a murmuring sound:

17 'Can a mortal be righteous with Eloah,

Or a man be pure with his Maker?

- 18 Behold, in His Servants He trusteth not,  
And on His Angels He putteth no praise:  
19 Much less in denizens of clay,  
Whose foundation is in the dust;  
Who are crushed at the turn of Dawn,—  
20 Between Morning and Evening are shattered!'  
[For lack of Wit they perish for ever;  
21 They die for want of Wisdom.]

- CHAPTER 5.—1. Call then; is there any to answer thee?  
And to which of the Holy Ones wilt turn?  
2 Nay, impatience slayeth the fool.  
And passion killeth the simple.  
3 I myself have seen the fool uprooted,  
And his home was suddenly plucked up.  
4 His sons are far from welfare;  
They are crushed in the gate without help.  
5 Whose harvest the hungry devour,eth,  
And the thirsty ingathereth their fruitage.  
6 For Affliction issueth not from the dust,  
And Trouble springeth not out of the ground:  
7 [For Man is born to Trouble,  
As the vulture's brood to soaring.]  
8 But I, I would appeal unto El,  
And would set my case before Elohim,  
9 Who doeth great things and unsearchable,  
Wonders beyond all reckoning:  
10 Who giveth rain on the ploughland,  
And sendeth water on the commons;  
11 To set the lowly on high,  
And to raise mourners to wellbeing:  
12 [Who thwarteth the schemes of the wily,  
That their hands achieve nothing real;]

- 13 Who catcheth the wise in their own craft,  
And the plan of the shifty befooleth ;  
14 So that by day they fumble with darkness,  
And grope at high noon as in the night.  
15 So He saveth the humble from the sword,—  
The needy from the hand of the strong ;  
16 And hope is born for the poor,  
And Iniquity shutteth her mouth.  
17 Happy whom Eloah correcteth !  
'Then refuse not Shaddai's chastisement !'  
18 For 'tis His way to hurt and bind up ;  
He smiteth, and His own hands heal.  
19 In six straits He will rescue thee ;  
Yea, in seven no harm shall strike thee ;  
20 In famine will He ransom thee from Death,  
And in war from the grip of the sword ;  
21 When the Pest is abroad, thou shalt be hidden,—  
Shalt be fearless of Havoc when it cometh ;  
22 At the lion and dragon thou shalt laugh,  
And of wild things have no fear ;  
23 [Having league with the children of the field,  
And the wild things being made thy friends.]  
24 And thou shalt know thy tent is safe,—  
Shalt go over thy fold and miss nothing.  
25 Thou shalt know that thine offspring are many,—  
Thine issue as the grass of the earth.  
26 Thou shalt come to the grave in thy vigour,  
As the corn is carried up in its season.  
27 Lo this—we have searched it, thus it is ;  
We have heard it ; know it thou for thyself !

CHAPTER 6.—1. *In reply Eyob said :*

- 2 Would that my 'impatience' were weighed,  
And my misery balanced against it !  
3 For 'tis heavier than the sand of seas ;  
Therefore my words would go up.

- 4 For the arrows of Shaddai are in my flesh,  
Whose venom my spirit drinketh ;  
Eloah's terrors trouble me,  
And the dread of El dismayeth me.
- 5 Doth a wild ass bray over grass,  
Or loweth an ox over fodder ?
- 6 Is tasteless stuff eaten unsalted ?  
Or is there flavour in the sap of mallows ?
- 7 [My appetite declineth it ;  
Loatheth it like vomit of my food.]
- 8 O that my boon might come,—  
That Eloah would grant my hope !
- 9 That Shaddai would will to crush me,—  
Would unloose His hand and cut me off !
- 11 What is my strength, that I should wait,  
And what my end, that I should endure ?
- 12 Is my strength the strength of stones,  
Or my flesh—is it of bronze ?
- 13 Behold, I have no aid,  
And help is driven away from me !
- 14 My friend hath cast off kindness,  
And forsaketh the fear of Shaddai.
- 15 My kin are faithless as a wâdy,—  
As a bed of transitory waters,
- 16 Which were dark with a pall of ice,  
And on which the snow lay piled :
- 17 In the dry season they disappear ;  
When it is hot, they are extinct from their place.
- 19 The caravans of Tema looked forward,—  
The travelling companies of Sheba expected them ;
- 20 They were ashamed for their confidence in them,—  
They reached them and were confounded.
- 18 They turn their way backward ;  
They go up into the desert and perish.

- 21 Such now have ye proven to me ;  
Ye see some scare, and are afraid.  
22 Is it that I have said, ' Give me something,  
[And bribe with your means on my behalf ;  
23 And rescue me from an enemy,]  
And ransom me from robbers ?'  
24 Teach me, and I, I will be mum ;  
Yea, give me to understand mine error !  
25 Why are honest words grievous ?  
And what doth your reproof reprove ?  
26 Mean ye to reprove mere words,  
And to answer windy speech ?  
27 Even upon the blameless will ye fall,  
And concoct words against your friend ?  
28 And now, so please you, face me !  
To your faces I surely shall not lie !  
29 [Pray return ; let there be no unfairness ;  
But hear ye my straightforward pleadings !]  
30 Is there really injustice in my tongue,  
Or cannot my palate distinguish truth ?

CHAPTER 7.—11 I too will not gag my mouth,—  
I will open my lips with Thee ;  
I will speak in the anguish of my spirit,—  
Will complain in the bitterness of my soul :—

- 12 ' Am I the Sea, or the Sea-Dragon,  
That Thou settest a guard over me ?'  
13 When I say, ' My couch will comfort me,—  
My bed ease in part my complaining' ;  
14 Thou scarest me with dreams,  
And with visions dost affright me ;  
15 So that I choose strangling,  
And prefer death to my torments.  
16 I said, I cannot always live ;  
Let me alone, for my days are a breath !  
17 What is a mortal that Thou shouldst make much of him,  
And shouldst set Thy mind upon him ?

18 That Thou shouldst visit him morn by morn,—  
Shouldst try him moment by moment?

19 How long wilt Thou not look away from me,  
Nor give me a moment's respite?

20 If I sin, what do I to Thee,  
Thou that keepest watch on man's heart?  
Why hast Thou made me a butt for Thee,  
So that I am become Thy target?

21 Why dost Thou not forgive my transgression,  
And let my sin pass?  
For soon in the dust I shall lie;  
And if Thou seek me, I shall be no more.

7.—1 Hath not Man a hard service on earth?  
Are not his days like those of a hireling?

2 Like the slave that panteth for the shade,  
And like the hireling who looketh forward to his wages,

3 So have I been assigned delusive days,  
And troubled nights have been allotted me.

4 Should I lie down on my bed, I say,  
'O that it were morning, that I might rise!'

And if I rise, 'O that it were evening!'  
And I am full-fed with tossings until twilight.

5 My flesh is clothed with worms;  
My skin gathers and runs.

6 My time hath passed more swiftly than a post,—  
Hath hopelessly come to an end.

7 Remember then my life is but air;  
Mine eye will no more see good.

8 [The eye of my Beholder will not descry me;  
While Thine eyes are upon me, I shall vanish.]

9 The smoke dissolveth and disappeareth;  
So he who goeth down to Sheol cometh not up:

10 He returneth no more to his home,  
And his place knoweth him no more.

CHAPTER 8.—*1 In reply Bildad the Shuhite said :*

- 2* How long wilt thou utter such things,  
And shall thy mouth multiply windy words?
- 3* Would El wrest judgement,  
Or Shaddai pervert justice?
- 4* Though thy sons did sin against Him,  
And He threw them into the power of their transgression ;
- 5* If thou thyself wilt seek El earnestly,  
And make thy prayer to Shaddai,
- 6* Surely now He will listen to thee,  
And repay thee after thy righteousness :
- 7* And thy first estate shall seem small,  
And thy last shall be very great.
- 8* For ask, I pray, of the first generation,  
And give heed to the findings of the Fathers ;
- 9* [For ourselves are of yesterday, and we know not ;  
And our time upon earth is like a shadow :]
- 10* Will not they teach thee and tell thee,  
And forth of their heart utter words?
- 11* Can papyrus grow tall without mire ?  
Or the Nile-rush wax great without water ?
- 12* Yet budding, if it have no moisture,  
Faster than any herb it withereth.
- 13* Such is the end of all who forget El,  
And the worldling's hope—it perisheth :
- 14* Whose confidence is but a cobweb,  
And his trust a spider's house :
- 15* [If he lean against his house, it standeth not ;  
If he hold on thereby, it is not steady.]
- 16* He is fresh and green before the sun,  
And his suckers spread over his garden ;
- 17* About a cairn his roots he twineth,  
And a stony house he chooseth.
- 18* El swalloweth him up from his place,  
And it disowneth him—' I never saw thee !'
- 19* Thus HE plucketh up his abode,  
And from the ground causeth another to spring.



- 20 Lo El doth not spurn a perfect one,  
 Nor hold the hand of evildoers!  
 21 The mouth of the upright He filleth with laughter,  
 And the lips of the pure with shouting.  
 22 [They who hate Him are clothed with shame;  
 And the tent of the wicked is no more!]

CHAPTER 9.—1 *In reply Eyob said :*

- 2 Ah yes, I know it is so :  
 And how can frail man be right with El?  
 3 If he would fain dispute with Him,  
 He will not answer him one question in a thousand.  
 4 Allwise and Almighty—  
 Who hath ever opposed Him without hurt?  
 5 That removeth mountains, that they are not seen,  
 And from the roots overturneth them in His wrath;  
 6 That shaketh Earth out of her place,  
 And the pillars of Heaven—they tremble:  
 7 That forbiddeth Sol to rise,  
 And sealeth about the stars :  
 8 That spread the heavens, unhelped,  
 And treadeth the summits of the earth :  
 9 That made Kesil and Kîmah,  
 And built the Chambers of the South :  
 10 [That doeth great things beyond search,  
 And wondrous things beyond number.]  
 11 Lo, He passeth by me, but I see Him not,—  
 He glideth on, but I perceive Him not.  
 12 Should He break out, who can turn Him back?  
 Who say to Him, What doest Thou?  
 13 Eloah turneth not back His wrath ;  
 Under Him bowed the Helpers of Rahab!  
 14 Much less could I answer Him,—  
 Could I choose my words with Him :  
 15 [Whom, though I were right, I would not answer ;  
 I would rather beg mine Adversary's mercy.]

- 16 If I summoned Him, and He responded,  
I could not believe He would listen to my plea,
- 17 Who would snatch me away with a blast,  
And give me many wounds for no cause;—
- 18 Would not let me recover my breath,  
But would surfeit me with bitter griefs.
- 19 If I think of Might, He is strong;  
And if of Right—who is to arraign Him?
- 20 Though I were righteous, my own mouth would condemn me,—  
Though perfect, He would find me perverted!
- 21 I am perfect, but regard not my life,—  
Righteous, but loathe my existence;
- 22 Therefore say I, 'Tis all one!  
Perfect and godless alike He endeth!
- 23 [If the Scourge kill suddenly,  
He mocketh at the slaughter of the innocent!
- 24 The land He hath given to a Godless One;  
And the face of her judges He veileth:  
If not He, who else hath done it?]
- 25 My days have been swifter than a runner;  
They have fled without seeing any good;
- 26 They have sped like skiffs of papyrus,—  
Like a vulture that swoopeth on food.
- 27 If I say, 'I will forget my complaining,—  
Relax my looks and be cheerful';
- 28 I am fearful because of my sufferings;  
I know Thou dost not hold me innocent.
- 29 [If 'tis I who am in the wrong,  
Why should I labour in vain?]
- 30 Though I had washed me white as snow,—  
Had cleansed my hands with lye,
- 31 Thou wouldst plunge me then in filth,  
And my clothes would make me abhorred!
- 32 For He is not a man like me,  
That we should come to trial together.

33 Would there were an umpire between us.  
To lay his hand upon us both!

34 Let Him move His Rod from off me,  
And let not the awe of Him appal me!

35 I would speak, and would not fear Him;  
For I, I know Him not right!

CHAPTER 10.—I have taken disgust at life;  
I will give the rein to my complaining:  
2 I will say to Eloah, Treat me not as guilty!  
Let me know why Thou quarrellest with me!  
3 Doth it please Thee to wrong the perfect,—  
To spurn the creature of Thine Hands?  
4 Hast Thou mere human eyes,  
Or dost see as a mortal seeth?  
5 [Are Thy days brief as a mortal's,  
Or Thy years as the days of a man,]  
6 That Thou seekest for my offence,  
And searchest after my sin—  
7 When Thou knowest I am not guilty  
And there is no wrong in my hands?  
8 Thine own Hands framed me and fashioned me;  
And wilt Thou turn round and swallow me up?  
9 [O remember that Thou madest me of clay.  
And to dust wilt make me return!]  
10 Didst Thou not pour me out like milk,  
And curdle me like cheese?  
11 With skin and with flesh Thou didst clothe me,—  
With bones and sinews didst enclose me.  
12 Compassion and kindness Thou showedst me,  
And Thine Oversight guarded my spirit.  
13 But all this Thou didst hide in Thine heart.—  
I know that this was in Thy thought:  
14 Should I sin, Thou wouldst observe me,  
And wouldst not absolve me from my fault;  
15 Were I wicked, woe to me!  
And were I righteous, I might not hold up my head.

- 16 Thou wouldst again deal wondrously with me,  
17 And renew Thy blows upon me;  
[Thou wouldst aggravate Thine anger with me,  
And bring fresh thralldom upon me.]  
18 But why out of the womb didst Thou bring me?  
I might have died, and no eye have seen me:  
19 As though I had never been, I should be,—  
Borne from the belly to the tomb!  
20 Are not the days of my life but few?  
Let me alone, that I may cheer me awhile,  
21 Before I depart, without return,  
To the land of Darkness and Deathshade;  
22 [The land of gloom sans light,  
And daylight shineth not thereon.]

CHAPTER 11.—1 *In reply Zophar the Minaean said:*

- 2 Shall a master of words be unanswered,  
Or a man of ready lips be justified?  
3 At thy babble shall people be silent,  
And thou scoff without rebuke?  
4 [And say, 'I am pure,  
And clean have I been before Him'?]  
5 But Oh that He would speak,  
And open His lips with thee,  
6 And show thee the secrets of Wisdom—  
For It is wonderful in substance!  
7 [Canst thou fathom the nature of Eloah,  
Or exhaust the being of Shaddai?]  
8 'Tis higher than Heaven—what canst thou do?  
Deeper than She'ol—what canst thou know?  
9 Longer than Earth in measure,  
And broader than the Sea.  
11 For HE knoweth the wicked,  
And seeth evil without effort.  
12 But a witless wight will get wit,  
When a wild-ass colt begetteth a man.

- 13 If even thou wilt prepare thine heart,  
And spread forth thine hands towards Him—  
14 If Evil thou banish from thine hand,  
And harbour not Wrong in thy tent;  
15 [Then indeed thou shalt hold up thy face,—  
Thou shalt become steadfast and fearless.]  
16 Then thou, even thou, shalt forget Trouble,—  
Shalt remember it as a flood that is past:  
17 And thy light shall be steady as noontide;  
Thou shalt shine forth, become like the Dawn.  
18 And thou shalt know that there is indeed hope,  
And unafraid shalt lie down in safety:  
19 Thou shalt couch, with none to alarm;  
And many shall pay thee court.  
20 But the eyes of the godless shall fail,  
And refuge be lost to them;  
And their hope is a dying breath,  
For Eloah disdaineth their trust.

CHAPTER 12.—1 *In reply Eyob said:*

- 2 Doubtless ye are the Wise,  
And with you Wisdom will die!  
3 I too have sense like you;  
And who hath not store of such talk?  
4 Laughter to my friends I become;  
They laugh at the just and perfect:  
5 Upon Ruin they pour contempt—  
Dishonour upon him whose foot slippeth.  
6 [Robbers' tents are carefree,  
And provokers of El are secure.]  
7 Ask now the beast, and it will teach thee,—  
The bird of the air, and it will tell thee;  
8 Or contemplate Earth, and she will teach thee,  
And let the fish of the Sea inform thee!  
9 Who knoweth not, by all these creatures,  
That Iahvah's Hand hath done this?  
10 In Whose Hand is the soul of everything living,  
And the spirit of all human flesh.

- 11 Doth not the ear test words,  
As the palate tasteth food?  
12 Do not many years bring Wisdom,  
And length of days Understanding?
- 13 [With Him are Wisdom and Might;  
His are Strength and Understanding.]  
14 Lo, He breaketh down, and there is no rebuilding;  
He prisoneth a man, and there is no release!  
15 Lo, He stoppeth the waters, and they dry up;  
He letteth them go, and they whelm the land!
- 16 With Him are Might and exceeding Power;  
The misled and the misleader are His!  
17 The counsel of Counsellors He maketh folly,  
And the Judges of the land He befooleth.
- 18 The raiment of kings He looseth,  
And removeth the girdle of their loins.  
19 He marcheth Priests away disrobed;  
And the words of Prophets He maketh naught.
- 20 He depriveth the shrewd of speech,  
And the judgement of Elders He taketh away.  
21 He poureth contempt upon nobles,  
And the girdle of magnates He looseth.
- 22 He revealeth deep things out of Darkness,  
And bringeth things hidden forth to Light.  
23 He leadeth nations astray, and destroyeth them;  
He felleth peoples, and wipeth them out.
- 24 He distracteth the heads of a people,  
And maketh them wander in a pathless waste:  
25 They grope in darkness void of light,  
And wander from the way like a drunkard.
- .

CHAPTER 13.—1 Lo, mine eye hath seen it all;  
Mine ear hath heard and perceived it!

- 2 I too have knowledge like yours,  
And I fall not short of you.

- 3 Yet would I speak to Shaddai,  
And to El would fain present my case:  
4 But ye, ye are quack-plasterers—  
Pseudo-physicians are ye all!
- 5 O that ye would keep strict silence!  
It might serve your turn as wisdom.  
6 Hear ye now the reproof of my mouth,  
And listen to the pleading of my lips!
- 7 For El will ye speak unfairly,  
And for Him will ye utter deceit?  
8 Will ye show favour to Shaddai,  
Or be special pleaders for El?
- 9 Will it be well when He searcheth you through?  
Or will ye trick Him like a mere mortal?  
10 Assuredly He will punish you,  
If ye secretly show Him favour.
- 11 Should not the Fear of Him dismay you,  
And His Awe fall upon you?  
12 Pray remember that ye dwell in the dust,  
And your houses are houses of clay!
- 13 Be silent, and I too will speak;  
And let Wrath pass over me!  
14 I will take up my flesh in my teeth,  
And put my life in my hands:
- 15 Though He kill me, I will not wait,  
But my ways to His face will I prove!  
16 Yea, HE must needs deliver me,  
For not before Him am I impious.
- 17 Hear ye still my discourse;  
And let me tell my knowledge in your ears!  
18 Behold now, I have drawn up my case;  
I know it is I will be found right!
- 19 Who is there to contend with me?  
Were there any, I would be silent and die!

- 20 Grant Thou but two things in dealing with me;  
Then from Thy Face I will not hide!
- 21 Put far Thine Hand from off me,  
And let not Thy Terror intimidate me!
- 22 And call Thou, and I will reply;  
Or I will speak, and do Thou answer me!
- 23 How many misdeeds are mine?  
Let me know my transgression and my sin!
- 24 For what dost Thou hide Thy Face,  
And accountest me foe to Thyself?
- 25 Wouldst Thou scare a driven leaf,  
Or chase a withered stalk,
- 26 That Thou decreest bitter things for me,  
And bringest home to me the sins of my youth,
- 27 And puttest my feet in the stocks,  
And settest a bound to my steps?
- 28 (While they are like a fraying brocade—  
Like a garment the moth hath fretted.)

CHAPTER 14.—1 Man, of woman born,  
Is shortlived, and full-fed with trouble.

- 2 Like the flowers he flowereth and fadeth,  
And fleeth like a shadow and stayeth not.

And he is like a decaying waterskin—  
Like a garment the moth hath fretted.

- 5 Also his days are determined,  
And the number of his months is with Thee.

[His bound Thou hast set, and he passeth not.]

- 3 Upon such a being dost Thou open Thine eye,  
And him dost Thou bring into Judgement?
- 4 [Who can purge himself from his uncleanness?  
Of all the sons of man not one.]
- 6 Look away from him and let him alone,  
Till his day, like a hireling's, be done!



- 7 For a tree indeed hath hope,  
If it have its boughs cut off ;  
It may, sprout again and bud,  
And the shoot of it may not fail.
- 8 If its root wax old in the earth,  
And its stock die in the soil ;
- 9 At scent of water it may bud,  
And make wood like a sapling.
- 10 But a man dieth and is powerless—  
The human expireth and is no more !
- 11 [Waters have gone from a sea,  
And a river may parch and dry up ;]
- 12 [And a wight lieth down and riseth not :]  
Till the heavens decay, he will not wake,  
Nor be roused out of his sleep.
- 13 O that Thou wouldst hide me in Hades—  
Wouldst conceal me till Thine Anger turn away,—  
Wouldst set me a term, and then remember me,
- 14 And from Death thereafter wouldst revive me !  
All the days of my hard service must I wait,  
Until my successor cometh.
- 15 Thou wilt call, but I shall not answer Thee ;  
For the creature of Thine Hands Thou wilt yearn.
- 16 For now my very steps Thou countest,  
And passest over none of my sins ;
- 17 Thou hast sealed my transgressions in a bag,  
And set a stamp upon all my misdeeds.
- 18 But the mountain falleth to ruin,  
And the rock removeth from its place ;
- 19 Stones the waters wear away,  
[And a flood may wash away the soil,]  
And the hope of mortal man Thou destroyest.
- 20 [Thou overpowerest him, and for ever he departeth ;  
Thou changest his face and sendest him off.]
- 21 His sons are honoured, but he doth not know,—  
Are reduced, but he doth not observe them :
- 22 Only, his flesh upon him is in pain,  
And his soul upon him mourneth.

CHAPTER 15.—*1 In reply Eliphaz the Temanite said:*

- 2 Should a wise man reply with wind,  
And charge himself full with the East?
- 3 Should he argue with speech that serveth not,  
And with words devoid of profit?
- 4 Thou, moreover, dost violate Reverence,  
And withdrawest prayer before El:
- 5 For thy guilt instructeth thy mouth,  
And thou choosest the tongue of the cunning.
- 6 [Thine own mouth condemneth thee, not I,  
And thine own lips testify against thee!]
- 7 Wast thou born first of mankind,  
And before the hills wast thou yeaned?
- 8 In the Council of Eloah didst thou listen,  
And was Wisdom revealed unto thee?
- 9 What dost thou know, and we know not,—  
Kennest thou, and it is not with us?
- 10 Both greybeard and withered age are among us,  
And one that is older than thy father.
- 11 Are El's consolations a little thing,  
And is Eloah's Word too little for thee?
- 12 [Why do thy feelings carry thee away,  
And why are thy glances haughty?]
- 13 That thou blowest thy breath at El,  
And lettest out words from thy mouth.
- 14 [What is a mortal that *he* should be pure,  
Or one born of woman be righteous?]
- 15 Behold, in His Holy Ones He trusteth not,  
And the Heavens are not pure in His eyes!
- 16 Much less a loathly and stinking one,  
That drinketh in wrong like water.
- 17 I will tell thee what I know; listen to me,  
And what I have seen I will relate!—
- 18 Facts which the Wise declare,  
And which their fathers concealed not from them.

- 19 [To whom alone the land was given,  
And no alien passed over amongst them.]  
20 All his days the wicked is anxious;  
And but few years are the tyrant's:  
21 Dreadful sounds ring in his ears;  
In peace-time the spoiler may assail him.
- 22 Unsure of return out of darkness,  
He expecteth the hands of the sword:  
23 He is the destined food of kites;  
He knows that his ruin is ready.
- 24 [A day of darkness alarmeth him;  
Straits and distress encompass him.]  
25 For he stretched forth his hand against El,  
And would match his might with Shaddai;  
26 He would rush upon Him with a buckler,—  
With a warrior's helmet and shield.
- 24<sup>b</sup> [Like a king ready for the fray.]  
27 For he covered his face with fat,  
And amassed brawn on his loins;  
28 And settled in ruined cities,—  
In houses that none should inhabit.
- 29 Though he be rich, his wealth shall not last;  
Nor shall he strike his roots in the soil.  
30 The sunglare shall wither his shoots,  
And his blossom shall be blown away by the wind.
- 31 [Let him not trust in a gadding vine,  
For naught will its produce be!]  
32 His branch shall be lopped ere its time,  
And his palm-bough shall not be green.  
33 He shall mar like a vine his unripe grapes,  
And will shed his bloom like an olive.
- 34 For the tribe of the impious is stone-barren;  
And fire hath devoured the tents of bribery:  
35 They are big with mischief, and bring forth misery,  
And their womb harboureth delusion.

CHAPTER 16—*1 In reply Eyob said:*

- 2* I have heard many things like those;  
Sorry comforters are ye all!  
*3* [Will windy words have an end?  
Or what aggrieveth thee that thou must answer?]  
*4* I also could talk like you,  
If yourselves were in my place;  
Could compose speeches against you,  
And shake my head over you;  
*5* Could hearten you with the issue of my mouth,  
And with a word of my lips make you strong!  
*6* [Should I speak, my pain will not be checked;  
And if I cease, what will go from me?]  
*7* But now El hath utterly wearied me,—  
He hath wasted and worn out my skin;  
*8* And my ruin for witness riseth against me,  
And my grief maketh answer to my face.  
*9* His wrath hath rent in pieces and slain me;  
He hath gnashed His teeth over me.  
[The shafts of His troops have fallen upon me;  
My foes look daggers at me.  
*10* They have gaped at me with their mouth,—  
In scorn they have smitten my cheeks;  
With fury they are filled against me.]  
*11* El giveth me up to the unjust,  
And into the hands of the wicked He hurleth me.  
*12* Whole was I, and He shattered me;  
He seized me by the nape, and dashed me to pieces.  
He setteth me up for His target;  
*13* His marksmen compass me around.  
He cleaveth my kidneys mercilessly;  
He poureth my gall to the ground.  
*14* He breacheth me, breach upon breach;  
He rusheth upon me like a warrior.  
*15* [Sackcloth have I stitched upon my hide;  
I have thrust my horn into the dust:]  
*16* Mine eyes, they are red with weeping;  
And on mine eyelids is fallen darkness:

- 17 Although there is no violence in my hands,  
And the prayer of my lips is pure.
- 18 O Earth, cover not my blood,  
And let there be no place for my cry!
- 19 Lo, my Witness is in the Heavens,  
And e'en now my Voucher in the Heights!
- 20 My prayer, it reacheth Eloah,  
And before Him mine eye droppeth tears—
- 21 That He may judge for a man with Eloah,  
And between a son of man and his fellow!
- 22 [For, come but a few years more,  
And the way without return I must go.]

- CHAPTER 17.—1 My mind is too disordered for speech;  
Words are extinct to me :
- 2 A pack of sophists is with me,  
And mine eye dwelleth on deceivers.
- 3 O appoint me a surety with Thyself!  
For who is he that will pledge himself for me?
- 4 For Thou hast hidden insight from their heart;  
Therefore Thou wilt not lift up their horn.
- 5 'Tis my lot to pour down tears,  
And mine eyes fail with weeping :
- 6 [And Thou hast made me a byword of peoples,—  
A portent to nations I become.]
- 7 And mine eye is dim with sorrow,  
And my frame is worn to a shadow.
- 8 [Upright men would be confounded at this,  
And an innocent be moved to impiety :
- 9 But the righteous will hold to his way,  
And the guiltless wax more resolute.]
- 10 [But pray you, come on again ;  
And I shall not find a wise man among you.]
- 11 My days, they vanish like chaff;  
Snapt are the cords of my heart :
- 12 Night for day I put ;  
And the light is dim for darkness.

- 13 Yea, I hope for She'ol as my home,—  
In the Darkness have I spread my couch;  
14 To the Pit I cry, 'Thou art my father!',—  
'My Mother and Sister!' to the maggot.  
15 And where then is there hope for me?  
And my good, who can descry it?  
16 Will they descend with me into She'ol?  
Or shall we go down together into the Dust?

CHAPTER 18.—*1 In answer Bildad of Shuah said:*

- 2 How long wilt thou not restrain words?  
Hold! that we too may speak.  
3 Why are we regarded as cattle,—  
Are we like to the brutes in thine eyes?  
4 Shall the Earth be dispeopled for thy sake,  
And the rock remove from his place?  
5 Yea, the light of the wicked goeth out,  
And the flame of his fire doth not shine.  
6 [The light is darkened in his tent,  
And his lamp above him goeth out.]  
7 His footsteps are cramped as he goeth,  
And his own counsel throweth him to the ground.  
8 For he is rushed into the net by his own feet;  
And he walketh himself upon the toils.  
9 The trap catcheth his heel;  
The gin layeth hold upon him:  
10 His snare is hidden in the ground,  
And his springe upon the path.  
11 All around Terrors alarm him,  
And Fearfulness dogs his heels.  
12 Famine consumeth his strength,  
And Ruin is ready to swallow him.  
4<sup>a</sup> He teareth himself in his rage;  
13 For hunger he devoureth his own flesh.  
14 His cords are broken away from his tent;  
Terrors hunt him like a lion.  
15 [The Vampire haunteth his tent;  
Brimstone is sprinkled on his homestead.]

- 16 Beneath, his roots dry up ;  
And above, his branches wither.  
17 His memory perisheth from the land,  
And he hath no name in the street.  
18 God thrusteth him out of light into darkness,  
And maketh him flee out of the world.  
19 Nor chit nor child hath he among his people,  
And there is no survivor in his haunts.  
20 At his Day his juniors are appalled,  
And his elders Horror seizeth.  
21 So fareth the abode of the wrongdoer,  
And so the home of the ungodly.

CHAPTER 19.—*But Eyob answered as follows:*

- 2 How long will ye grieve my soul,  
And crush me with words without knowledge?  
3 Ten times over ye insult me,  
And feel no shame in hurting me.  
4 But even had I in sooth gone astray,  
With myself would my error abide:  
5 But you against me talk big,  
And make my misery proof against me.  
6 Know then, 'tis Eloah that hath bent me,  
And closed his net in upon me:  
7 Lo, I cry 'Murder!', and am not answered;  
I shriek, but there is no justice!  
8 My way He walled up, that I cannot pass;  
And on my paths He setteth darkness:  
9 He hath stript me of my glory,  
And removed the coronal of my head.  
10 He demolished me all round, and I am gone!  
And He pulled up my hope like a tree:  
11 And His anger burned against me,  
And He reckoned me as a foe.  
13 My clansmen He hath put far away from me,  
And my friends are wholly estranged from me:  
14 My neighbours and my acquaintance have ceased (?);  
The guests of my house have forgotten me.

- 15 My bondmaids reckon me a stranger,—  
A foreigner am I become in their eyes:  
16 My slave I called, but he would not answer;  
With my mouth I must needs entreat him.
- 17 My smell is odious to my wife;  
And my stink to the sons of my body (?).  
18 Even the boys despise me;  
Would I rise, they remark upon me.
- 19 All the men of my circle abhor me,  
And they whom I loved have turned against me:  
20 To my skin my bone sticks fast,  
And I escape with my flesh in my teeth.
- 21 Pity me, you my friends,  
For the hand of Eloah hath stricken me!  
22 Why like El run me down,  
And not have enough of slander?
- 23 O that my sayings might be written,—  
My words inscribed in a roll,—  
24 That with stylus of iron and with lead  
They might be graven in rock for ever!
- 25 For I, I know my Avenger;  
At last He will come forward on earth!  
26 I shall see, yet living, El's revenges,  
And in my flesh gaze on Eloah!
- 27 I myself shall behold Him, not Another,—  
Mine eyes will look on Him and no Stranger!  
My vitals are wasted with waiting  
Until my hope shall come.
- 28 If ye muse, 'What shall we say to him,  
That we may find in him the root of the thing?'  
29 Fear ye a Sword for yourselves!  
For Wrath will consume the unjust.

CHAPTER 20.—*In reply Zophar the Minacan said:*

- 2 Not so my thoughts reply to me,  
And within me my heart is hot;  
3 The monition of my reins I hear.  
And my discerning spirit answereth me:



- 4 Knowest thou not from of old,—  
From the placing of Man upon Earth,—  
5 That the joy of the wicked is soon over,  
And the mirth of the impious but momentary?
- 6 Though his height tower to heaven,  
And his head reach the clouds,  
7 In his greatness he perisheth for ever—  
They who saw him ask, 'Where is he?'
- 8 Like a dream that vanisheth, he is not found,  
And he flitteth like a vision of night:  
9 The eye that once glanced at him, doth it not again;  
And his place beholdeth him no more.
- 10 His palms oppress the poor,  
And his hands finger their substance:  
11 His bones are full of perfidy,  
And with himself in the dust it lieth down.
- 12 Though evil be sweet in his mouth,  
Though he hide it under his tongue;  
13 Though he save it, nor let it go down,  
And hold it back in the middle of his palate;
- 14 Into venom in his bowels it turneth,—  
Into poison of asps within him:  
15 He gorgeth riches, and throweth them up;  
El driveth them out of his belly.
- 16 Venom of asps he sucketh;  
The tongue of the viper killeth him:  
17 He shall never look on streams of oil,—  
On rivers of honey and butter!
- 18 He toileth in vain, and profiteth not;  
He hopeth for his increase, and cateth not:  
19 For he breaketh the neck of the poor:  
He seizeth a house that he built not.
- 20 No safety for him in his wealth,  
Nor doth he escape by his treasures.  
21 There is no survivor in his tent;  
Therefore his name endureth not.

- 22 With a full fist, he is in straits;  
 'Mid all his plenty, trouble assaileth him:  
 Iahvah filleth his belly,  
 23 [Looseth against him His hot anger,]  
 And raineth upon him snares.  
  
 24 If he flee from weapons of iron,  
 The bow of bronze pierceth him through;  
 25 And the barb issueth from his back,  
 And the flashing point from his gall.  
  
 26 All darkness is reserved for him;  
 Fire unblown devoureth him:  
 [And consumeth the survivor in his tent]  
 27 The Heavens expose his guilt,  
 And the Earth upriseth against him.  
  
 28 The flood carrieth off his house,—  
 Sweepeth it away in the day of his ruin.  
 29 Such is the lot of the wicked from Iahvah,  
 And his portion assigned by El.

CHAPTER 21.—*In reply Eyob said.*

- 2 Hear attentively my word,  
 And be that your comfort to me!  
 3 Suffer me, and I too will speak;  
 And after my speech ye may jeer!  
  
 4 For me, is my plaint of Man?  
 Or why should I not be impatient?  
 5 Face ye me, and be appalled,  
 And lay hand on mouth!  
  
 6 When I think of it, I am confounded;  
 A shudder seizes my flesh:  
 7 Why do the godless live on,  
 Grow old, yea, are mighty in power?  
  
 8 Their seed is established before them,  
 And their issue before their eyes:  
 9 Their homes are safe from alarm—  
 No rod of Eloah over them!

- 10 Their bull covers, nor fails;  
    Their cow calves, nor miscarries:  
11 Their boys play about like the flock,  
    And their lads skip like the calf.  
12 They sing to tabor and lyre,  
    And are merry at the sound of the pipe:  
13 They end their days in happiness,  
    And in a moment go down to She'ol.  
14 Yet they said unto El, 'Depart from us!  
    We want not knowledge of Thy ways!  
15 What is Shaddai, that we should serve Him?  
    And what should we get by entreating Him?'  
16 [Their weal was not in their own power;  
    The counsel of the godless is far from me.]  
17 How often is the lamp of the godless put out,  
    And cometh their ruin upon them;—  
18 Become they like chaff before wind,  
    And like stubble the storm carries off?  
19 Doth He store his woe for his children?  
    Let Him recompense himself, that he may know!  
20 Let his own eyes see his ruin,  
    And of Shaddai's burning anger let him drink!  
21 For what hath he to do with his house after him,  
    When the sum of his months is cut short?  
22 Shall not El teach knowledge,  
    When it is He that judgeth the Heights?  
23 One man dieth in perfect felicity,  
    Entirely untroubled and at ease:  
24 His belly is full of milk,  
    And the marrow of his bones is moist:  
25 And another dieth in bitter mood,  
    Having never tasted happiness.  
26 Together they lie down in the dust,  
    And worms cover them over.  
27 Behold, I know your thoughts,  
    And the imaginings wherewith ye wrong me!

- 28 For ye say, 'Where is the Great Man's house?  
And where are the dwellings of the godless?'
- 29 Have ye not inquired of travellers,  
And their signs do ye not recognize,  
30 That the bad man is kept from calamity,—  
That in the Day of Wrath he escapeth?
- 31 Who durst expose his way to his face?  
And what he hath done, who requiteth him,  
32 When he to the tomb is borne,  
And above him a mound keepeth guard?
- 33 He is quiet 'mid the clods of the glen;  
And after him all men march.  
34 How then would ye comfort me with breath,  
And answer me with profitless falsehood?

CHAPTER 22.—1 *In reply Eliphaz of Teman said:*

- 2 Can a man benefit El,  
That a learned and wise one should do it?  
3 Is it Shaddai's concern that thou art just,  
Or His profit that thou perfectest thy ways?
- 4 Is it for thy godliness He chideth thee,—  
Entereth into judgement with thee?  
5 Is not thy wickedness manifold,  
And are not thine iniquities endless?
- 6 Doubtless thou distrainest upon thy kin without cause,  
And strippest off the clothes of the naked;  
7 Givest no water to the fainting,  
And from the hungry withholdest bread;
- 9 Widows thou hast sent away emptyhanded,  
And the arms of orphans thou crushest;  
8 But the man of power thou favourest,  
And the person of rank thou treatest well.
- 10 Therefore snares are about thee,  
And a sudden scare alarmeth thee  
11 Thy light is darkened, that thou seest not,  
And a deluge of waters whelmeth thee.

- 12 Look at the Heavens, and see,  
And behold the Stars far aloft !  
13 And sayest thou, What doth El know ?  
Through the mirk of clouds can He judge ?  
14 [The clouds are a cover to Him, that He seeth not,  
And upon the arch of Heaven He walketh.]  
15 Wilt thou keep to the ancient way  
Which men of wickedness have trodden,  
16 Who were snatched away untimely,—  
Whose foundation was washed away as by a stream ?  
17 Who said to El, 'Depart from us !  
What can Shaddai do for us ?'  
18 Yet 'twas He that filled their houses with good ;  
And the counsel of the godless was unheeded by Him.  
19 The righteous see and rejoice,  
And the innocent jeereth at them :  
20 'Verily our adversaries are effaced,  
And their remnant fire hath devoured !'  
21 O be reconciled with Him, and prosper !  
Truly thy gain shall be good !  
22 O receive instruction from His mouth,  
And set His words in thine heart !  
23 If thou repent, and turn unto Shaddai,—  
If thou banish injustice from thy tent ;  
24 Thou shalt make gold as dust,  
And Ophir ore as the rocks of the glen.  
25 [And Shaddai will become thy Refiner ;  
And will make thee shine as refined silver.]  
26 For then thou wilt delight thyself in Shaddai ;  
And wilt lift thy face toward Eloah :  
27 Thou wilt pray unto Him, and He will hear thee ;  
And thou wilt pay unto Him thy vows.  
28 And He will raise thee thy righteous tent ;  
And the light shall shine on thy paths :  
29 For He abaseth the high and haughty ;  
And the lowly-eyed He saveth.  
30 [He letteth the innocent escape from ruin ;  
And he escapeth thro' the purity of his palms.]

CHAPTER 23.—*In reply Eyob said:*

- 2 To-day too my plaint is of Shaddai;  
His Hand, it lies heavy on my sighing.
- 3 O that I knew where to find Him,—  
That I might come to His fixed Abode!
- 4 That I might marshal my case before Him,  
And fill my mouth with proofs!
- 5 That I might know the words He would answer me,  
And understand what He would say to me!
- 6 Would He strive with me in overwhelming strength?  
Or would not HE listen to me?
- 7 There would He wrestle and reason with me,  
And I should escape from my Judge for ever!
- 8 [Behold, I go east, but He is not there,  
And west, but I discern Him not;  
9 North I seek Him, but see Him not;  
I turn south, and perceive Him not!]
- 10 For He knoweth my standing way;  
If He test me, I shall come forth as gold.
- 11 My foot hath held fast to His steps;  
His way have I kept without swerving.
- 12 From the commands of His lips I depart not;  
In my bosom have I treasured His words.
- 13 But HE spoke, and who shall reverse it?  
And what Himself pleased, He hath done:
- 14 I know that He will fulfil His decree,  
And will finish His quarrel with me.
- 15 Therefore am I cowed before Him;  
I consider, and stand in dread of Him:
- 16 Yea, 'tis El that hath softened my heart,  
And Shaddai that hath cowed my soul:
- 17 For I am appalled by the darkness,  
And my face the gloom hath covered.

CHAPTER 24.—*Why are not oppressors annihilated,*

*And the wicked see not their own ruin?*

- 2 They remove their neighbours' landmarks;  
The flock they snatch and shepherd it:
- 3 The ass of orphans they drive off;  
They distrain the widow's ox.

- 4 They thrust the poor aside from justice;  
The humble folk are hidden away together;  
5 Like wild asses, into the steppe go forth,—  
Like ass-colts in quest of forage.  
6 In the villain's field they reap,  
And the vineyard of the godless they glean.  
7 They pass the night naked, for want of clothing,  
And their skin hath no covering in the cold.  
8 They are drenched with the mountain storm,  
And for want of a refuge hug the rock.  
9 [They snatch the orphan from the breast,  
And the poor man's babe they take in pledge.]  
10 Naked they go about without raiment;  
And hungry, they carry the sheaf.  
11 Between the twin rows they press oil;  
They tread the winepresses, and are thirsty.  
12 [From the city the dying groan,  
And the soul of the deadly-wounded crieth for help;  
But Eloah heareth not their prayer.]  
13 [These are rebels against daylight;  
They acknowledge not its ways,  
And abide not in its paths:]  
14 [Ere dawn riseth the murderer;  
He slayeth the poor and needy:  
And at night prowleth the thief.]  
15 [The adulterer's eye watcheth for dusk,—  
He thinks, 'Not an eye will see me!'  
And putteth a veil over his face.]  
16 [They break into houses in the dark,  
And by day they seal up their doors:  
They know not to see the light.]  
17 [For the morning scareth them all,  
But they are used to the terrors of darkness.]  
18 [Accursed are they before Heaven;  
Their portion is accursed on earth:  
They turn not from the way of bloodshed.]  
19 [Heat drieth up waters of snow;  
And She'ol snatcheth the sinner.]  
20 [To-morrow his place will forget him,  
His name shall no more be remembered:

- And Injustice is shattered like a tree ]  
 21 [He hath wronged 'the barren that bare not';  
 And he doeth not good to the widow:  
 And he draggeth off the poor with his hook.]  
 22 [He standeth, 'but is uncertain of life',—  
 23 His trust whereon he leaneth, is not lasting:  
 And the eyes of El are on his ways.]  
 24 [He is exalted awhile, and is no more;  
 He is brought low, and is plucked like the mallow,  
 And cut off like the head of a corn-ear.]  
 25 But if not, then who shall prove me liar,  
 And reduce my word to nothing?

CHAPTER 25.—1 *In reply Bildad of Shuah said:*

- 2 An awful sovranity is with Him;  
 He maketh peace in His Heights.  
 3 Can his troops be numbered?  
 And against whom riseth not His ambush?  
 4 [How then can a man be righteous with El,  
 And the womanborn be pure?]  
 5 Lo, the Moon halteth and shineth not,  
 And the stars are not pure in His eyes!  
 6 Much less, a man—a maggot,  
 And a son of man—a worm!  
 26. 5 Do not the Dead tremble before Him,  
 Whose dwellings are beneath the waters?  
 6 She'ol is naked before Him,  
 And Abaddon hath no covering.  
 7 He stretcheth the North over the Void;  
 He hangeth the Earth over the Abyss.  
 8 He bindeth up water in His clouds,  
 And the bank bursteth not beneath it.  
 9 He hideth the face of the full moon,  
 By spreading His cloudbank over it.  
 10 He drew an arch over the face of the waters,  
 Unto the boundary of Light and Darkness.  
 11 The pillars of Heaven rock,  
 And are astounded at His rebuke.  
 12 By His power He stilled the Sea,  
 And by His craft He shattered Rahab.



- 13 By His Wind He cleared the skies;  
His Hand pierced the Dragon.  
14 Lo, these are the fringes of His Way,  
[And what a whisper we hear in it!]  
And the sum of His feats who perceiveth?

CHAPTER 26.—*In reply Eyob said:*

- 2 How hast thou helped the powerless,—  
How aided the nerveless arm!  
3 [How hast thou counselled the imprudent,  
And plentifully declared sound wisdom!]  
4 Whom hast thou told mere words?  
And whose breath hath issued from thee?

CHAPTER 27.—*And Eyob resumed his mashal and said:*

- 2 As El liveth, Who hath set aside my right,  
And Shaddai, Who hath embittered my soul—  
3 [For 'my breath is still in me entire',  
And Eloah's spirit in my nostrils—]  
4 My lips do not speak wrong,  
Nor my tongue murmur deceit!  
5 Be it far from me to own you right!  
Till I die, I will not disown my perfectness!  
6 My righteousness I hold fast, nor let it go!  
My conscience reproacheth me not.  
11 I will instruct you in the Hand of El;  
What is with Shaddai I will not hide.  
12 Lo, ye all yourselves have seen!  
And why do ye vapour in vain?

[*In reply Zophar the Minaean said:*]

- 7 Let mine enemy be as the godless,  
And mine assailant as the wrongdoer!  
8 For what is the hope of the impious,  
When he lifteth his soul to Eloah?  
9 Will El hear his cry,  
When distress cometh upon him?  
10 Will he take delight in Shaddai,  
And call unto Him continually?  
13 This is the award of the godless from El,  
And the portion of the tyrant from Shaddai.

- 14 His sons grow up for the sword,  
 And his offspring is not satisfied with bread.  
 15 [His survivors perish by the Plague,  
 And his widows do not weep.]  
 16 Though he heap up silver like earth,  
 And provide apparel like clay;  
 17 He may provide, but the just shall wear it,  
 And the innocent share out the silver.  
 18 Like a spider he buildeth his house,  
 And like a booth which a keeper maketh.  
 19 He lieth down, and riseth not again;  
 He openeth his eyes, and is no more!  
 20 Terrors overtake him by day;  
 In the night a storm carrieth him off.  
 21 The Sirocco taketh him up and goeth,—  
 Yea, it whirleth him away from his place.  
 22 El shooteth at him unsparingly;  
 From His Hand he fain would flee.  
 23 The passer-by clappeth his palms at him,  
 And hisseth at his day of disaster.

CHAPTER 28.—[An interpolation.]

- 12 Wisdom, whence cometh it?  
 And where is the place of Insight?  
 1 For silver hath a source,  
 And the gold they refine hath a place;  
 2 Iron out of dust is taken,  
 And ore is smelted into copper.  
 5 Out of the earth cometh the jacinth (?).  
 And under her are carbuncle and jasper (?);  
 6 The place of sapphire are her stones,  
 And the gleam of the emerald is theirs.  
 3 [A bound man setteth to darkness and deathshade,  
 And the very end of gloom heexploreth.  
 4 A foreign folk breaketh up the glens,  
 Erst untrodden by the foot:  
 Exiled from men and wanderers.]  
 12 But Wisdom, whence cometh it?  
 And where is the place of Insight?  
 7 The path thereto no eagle knoweth,  
 Nor hath eye of hawk descried;

- 8 The Sons of Pride have not trodden it ;  
The Roarer hath not passed over it.  
9 Against flint man stretches forth his hand ;  
Overturneth mountains from the roots :  
10 He divideth the depths of Nile-streams,  
And his eye seeth all things precious.  
11 [The springs of the Rivers he searcheth,  
And bringeth to light what is hidden.]  
12 But Wisdom, whence doth she come ?  
And where is the place of Insight ?  
13 Man knoweth not the way to her,  
Nor is she found in the land of the living.  
14 The Deep saith, She is not in me !  
And the Sea saith, She is not with me !  
15 Fine gold cannot be given for her,  
Nor silver be weighed as her price.  
16 She cannot be poised against Ophir-gold,  
Against precious onyx (?) and sapphire.  
17 [Refined gold is not equal to her,  
Nor are things of beaten gold her worth.]  
18 Coral (?) and Crystal are not to be named,  
And the price of Wisdom is above red coral.  
19 One cannot compare with her the topaz of Cush ;  
Against pure gold she cannot be balanced.  
20 But Wisdom, whence doth she come ?  
And where is the place of Insight ?  
21 It is hid from the eyes of all living,  
And concealed from the birds of the air.  
22 Abaddon and Death declare,  
We have heard mere hearsay thereof.  
23 Elohim, He discerneth the way to her,  
And 'tis He that knoweth her place ;  
24 For 'tis He that looketh to the ends of the Earth,—  
Seeth under the whole of Heaven.  
25 When He made the weight for the Wind,  
And meted out the Waters by measure ;—  
26 [When He made a law for the Rain,  
And a way for the Thunderbolts,—]  
27 Then He saw her and examined her,—  
He discerned her, yea, and proved her.  
28 [*And He said to Mankind:*

Lo, the Fear of the Lord, that is Wisdom;  
And turning away from Evil is Insight!]

CHAPTER 29.—<sup>1</sup> [*And Eyob resumed his mashal and said:*]

- <sup>2</sup> Oh that I were as in months of old,  
As in days when Eloah used to guard me;
- <sup>3</sup> When He made His lamp shine above my head,  
And by its light I could walk amid darkness;—
- <sup>4</sup> As I was in the days of my health,  
When Eloah protected my tent;
- <sup>5</sup> [When Shaddai was still with me,  
And my young men stood around me;]
- <sup>6</sup> When my goings were bathed in curds,  
And my footsteps ran with milk!
- <sup>7</sup> When I went forth to the gate by the city,—  
In the square set up my seat,—
- <sup>8</sup> The young men saw me and retired,  
And the aged arose and stood:
- <sup>9</sup> Princes did stop talking,  
And would lay the palm to their mouth;
- <sup>10</sup> The voice of chiefs was silenced,  
And their tongue clave to their palate.
- <sup>21</sup> To me they listened and were silent,  
And would tarry for my counsel.
- <sup>22</sup> After I spake, they would say no more,  
And upon them my speech I would drop;
- <sup>23</sup> They tarried for me as for rain,  
And opened wide their mouth as for the spring-rain.
- <sup>24</sup> If I smiled on them, they could not credit it;  
The light of my face they durst not expect.
- <sup>25</sup> [I would try their way and examine them,  
And I abode like a king in the host,  
Like a captain of thousands in the camp.]
- <sup>11</sup> The ear heard, and called me happy;  
The eye saw and bare me witness:
- <sup>12</sup> For I would save the poor from the opulent,  
And the orphan who had no helper.
- <sup>13</sup> The blessing of the perishing would come on me,  
And I made the widow's heart shout for joy.
- <sup>14</sup> I put on Righteousness, and it put me on,—  
Justice, like mantle and turban.

- 15 Eyes I became to the blind,  
 And feet to the lame was I.  
 16 A father was I to needy ones,  
 And the cause I knew not I would search out;  
 17 And I broke the grinders of the wronger,  
 And out of his teeth would draw the prey.  
 18 And methought, My stem will grow old,  
 And like the palmtree I shall multiply days:  
 19 My root will sprout toward the water,  
 And the dew will lie all night upon my boughs;  
 20 My palmbranch will renew its leafage,  
 And my suckers will shoot forth again.

- CHAPTER 30.—1 But now they laugh at me;  
 The sons of aliens insult me,  
 Whose fathers I had disdained  
 To set with the dogs of my flock!  
 2 [Yea, the strength of their hands is relaxed,—  
 With them vigour hath perished:  
 3 With want and with famine they are spent;]  
 They who gnaw the roots of the desert,  
 The growth of the desolate wild;—  
 4 Who pluck saltwort beside the bush,  
 And the root of the broom is their bread.  
 5 From sojourn in the city they are driven;  
 Men shout at them as at a thief.  
 6 The caves of the glens must they dwell in,—  
 Holes in the ground and the rocks.  
 7 Among the bushes they bray;  
 Under the scrub they huddle together:  
 8 Sons of the fool and sons of the nameless  
 Whose remembrance is lost from the land.  
 9 But now am I become their song,  
 And I serve them for a byword.  
 10 They loathe me, they stand aloof from me;  
 They refrain not to spit in my face:  
 11 [For their cord they have loosed, and humbled me,  
 And relaxed the bridle of their mouth.]  
 12 The young men arise behind me,  
 And raise their taunts at me:  
 13 They break up my path for my fall;

- They engulf them that are helpless.  
14 Like a broad outburst they come ;  
Like a terrible storm they roll on :  
15 Mine honour fleeteth like the wind,  
And like a cloud my welfare hath passed.  
16 Upon me my soul is outpoured ;  
Days of affliction grip me :  
17 By night my bones are racked,  
And the gnawers of my skin are sleepless :  
18 Like the wings of my raiment they enwrap me ;  
Like the neck of my tunic they encircle me.  
19 *Thou* hast compared me with clay,  
And I am made like dust and ashes.  
20 I cry for help to Thee, and Thou answerest not ;  
I entreat, and Thou dost not heed me :  
21 Thou turnest cruel to me ;  
With the strength of Thine Hand Thou assailest me.  
22 Thou liftest me, dost mount me on the wind,  
And like chaff the storm whirleth me away.  
23 I know that to the Grave Thou wilt make me return,—  
To the House of Assembly for all living.  
24 [If I stretched not forth a hand against the poor,—  
If in his calamity I would help him ;  
25 If I wept for him whose times were hard,—  
If my soul was grieved for the needy :]  
26 I hoped for good, and evil came ;  
I waited for light, and there came darkness.  
27 My bowels boiled, and were not quiet ;  
Days of affliction met me.  
28 A mourner I went about without a comforter ;  
I rose in the Moot, crying for help.  
29 A brother became I to jackals,  
And a comrade to ostriches.  
30 My skin is blackened with disease,  
And my bones are burnt up with fever ;  
31 So that my harp is become lamentation,  
And my pipes the voice of weepers.

CHAPTER 31.—1 A covenant I made for mine eyes ;  
Never would I gaze on a virgin :  
2 And what was Eloah's award from Above,

- And Shaddai's allotment from on High?  
3 Should not Ruin befall the unjust,  
And Misfortune cvildoers?  
4 Could not HE see my ways,  
And take account of all my steps?  
5 If I walked with men of falsehood,  
And my foot hastened toward fraud,—  
6 (Let Him weigh me in true balances,  
And Eløah will know my perfectness!)  
7 If my footsteps would swerve from the way,  
And if my heart have gone after mine eyes;  
8 Let me sow and let another eat,  
And let mine offspring be uprooted from the land!  
9 If my heart have been enticed over a woman,  
And I have lurked at my neighbour's door;  
10 Let my own wife grind for another,  
And over her let others incline!  
11 [For that were wanton villainy;  
And that is a criminal offence:  
12 'Tis a fire that devoureth unto Abaddon;  
And wherever it cometh, it burneth.]  
13 If I slighted the cause of my thrall  
Or my bondmaid in their quarrel with me;  
14 What should I do if El rose up,  
And if He visited what should I answer Him?  
15 [Did not my own Maker make him in the belly,  
And form him in the selfsame womb?]  
16 If I balked the poor of their desire,  
And let the eyes of the widow fail;  
17 And would eat my morsel alone,  
And not feed the orphan therefrom—  
18 [Nay, but from his childhood like a father I reared him  
And from his mother's womb I did guide him!]  
19 If I saw one perishing for lack of clothing,  
And covered not the needy;  
20 If his loins did not bless me,  
Nor was he warmed with the fleece of my lambs;—  
21 If I shook my fist at the orphan,  
When I saw my abettors in the Gate;—  
22 May my shoulder drop from its socket,  
And my arm break off from the joint!

- 23 [For the dread of El came over me,  
And before His Majesty I was powerless.]  
24 If I ever made yellow gold my confidence,  
And called the red gold my stay;  
25 If I joyed that my wealth was great,  
And my hand had come upon much;—  
26 If I looked at the Sun as it shone,  
And the Moon marching in splendour,  
27 And my heart was in secret seduced,  
And my hand kissed my mouth;—  
28 [That also were a criminal offence,  
For I had been false to El above!]  
29 If I rejoiced at the ruin of my foe,  
Elated when Misfortune found him;—  
30 (Nay, I suffered not my palate to sin  
By imprecating his death:)  
31 If the men of my tent have not said,  
'O that we might be satisfied with his flesh!'  
32 [The stranger did not lodge in the street;  
I would open my doors to the traveller.  
33 If I covered my transgressions as with a cloke,  
Concealing my guilt in my bosom;  
34 Because I dreaded the great concourse,  
And the scorn of the clans alarmed me;—  
[So that I kept quiet, nor went out of doors;—]  
38 If my land would cry out against me,  
And its furrows weep together,—  
39 [If I have eaten its produce free,  
And sniffed at its owner's life;]  
40 For wheat let the brier spring up,  
And noisome weeds for barley!
- 35 O that El would hear me,—  
That Shaddai would will to answer me;—  
That mine Adversary would write an indictment,  
And set out His case before me!  
36 Verily, I would carry it on my shoulder,—  
I would bind it as a coronal on my brows:  
37 The sum of my steps would I declare it,—  
As the words of a Prince would I present it!

*The words of Eyob are ended.*



CHAPTER 32.—1 And these three men ceased to answer  
 2 Eyob, because he was right in his own eyes. And the anger  
 of Elihu ben Barak'el, the Buzite of the clan of Râm, was  
 kindled; against Eyob was his anger kindled, on account of  
 his considering himself more righteous than Elohim.

3 Also against his (Eyob's) three friends was his anger kindled;  
 4 because they had found no answer, but let Elohim appear  
 unrighteous.

4 Now Elihu had waited while they were speaking with Eyob,  
 5 because they were his elders in years. And Elihu saw that  
 there was no answer in the mouth of the three men; so his  
 anger was kindled.

Then answered Elihu ben Barak'el, the Buzite, and said:

Young am I in years,  
 And ye are all of you aged;  
 Therefore was I timid and afraid  
 Of showing my knowledge to you.  
 7 Methought, 'Age should speak;  
 And multitude of years should teach wisdom.'  
 8 But the Spirit of El is in Man;  
 And the Breath of Shaddai informeth him.  
 9 'Tis not seniors that are wise,  
 Nor the old that understand judgement:  
 10 Therefore say I, 'Hearken to me;  
 And I too will declare what I know!'  
 11 Behold, I awaited your words,—  
 I pondered, while ye sought what to say;  
 12 And lo, Eyob had none to confute him,  
 To answer his words, among you.  
 13 But say not, 'We encountered wisdom;  
 El may rout him, not a man!'  
 14 He marshalled no words against me;  
 And with your arguments I will not answer him.  
 15 (Dismayed, they answered no longer;  
 The power of speech forsook them:  
 16 And shall I wait, because they speak not,—  
 Because they stopped, and answered no longer?)  
 17 I also will answer with my lore;  
 I too will display my knowledge:  
 18 I will speak, for I am full of words;

- The spirit in my bosom constraineth me.  
 19 Lo, my bosom is as wine unopened;  
 Like wineskins new it will burst:  
 20 I must speak to find relief,—  
 Must open my lips and answer!  
 21 I would show favour to none,  
 And to no man will I be indulgent:  
 22 For I know not showing favour—  
 Soon would my Maker away with me!

- CHAPTER 33.—<sup>1</sup> Hear now, O Eyob, my words;  
 And unto my sayings give ear!  
 2 Lo now, I have opened my mouth,—  
 My tongue in my palate hath spoken!  
 3 There are in my heart words of knowledge;  
 My lips shall speak sincerely.  
 4 'Twas the Spirit of El that made me;  
 And the Breath of Shaddai gave me life.  
 5 If thou canst, reply to me with words;  
 Marshal them before me, take thy stand!  
 6 Lo, I like thee am no god;  
 I too was nipt off from the clay!  
 7 Lo, my 'Terror shall not scare thee,  
 Nor my palm lie heavy upon thee'!  
 8 But this thou saidst in my hearing,  
 And the sound of thy words I heard:  
 9 'I am pure, and without transgression;  
 I am clean, and I have no guilt.  
 10 Behold, He findeth pretexts against me;  
 He accounteth me a foe to Himself:  
 11 He setteth my feet in the stocks;  
 He watcheth all my ways!' <sup>12</sup>  
 How sayest thou, 'I cried and He answereth not?'  
 Should Eloah contend with a mortal?  
 13 Why complainest thou of Him,  
 That he answereth none of thy words?  
 14 For in one mode speaketh El,  
 And in a second He doth not reverse it  
 15 In a dream, in a vision of night,  
 In slumbers upon the bed:

- 16 Then He uncovereth the ear of men,  
And with ghostly Vision alarmeth them ;  
17 To make a mortal depart from wrong,  
And to clear a man of pride.  
18 [To keep back his soul from the Pit,  
And his life from passing into She'ol.]  
19 Or he chideth him with pain on the bed ;  
And the pining of his bones is perpetual :  
20 So that his soul loatheth bread,  
And his appetite dainty fare.  
21 His flesh consumeth with sickness,  
And his bones are dried up for lack of moisture :  
22 And his soul hath drawn nigh to the Pit,  
And his life to the Place of the Dead.  
23 If there be beside him a Messenger,  
An Interpreter, One of a thousand,  
To declare to the man his fault,  
And to make known to him his sin ;  
24 And Eloah show him favour and say,  
' I will redeem him from descent to the Pit !  
[ I have found a ransom for his life ! ]  
25 Let his flesh wax plumper than childhood's,—  
Let him return to the days of his youth !'  
26 Then he prayeth to Eloah, and He is pleased with him ;  
And he seeth His Face with joy ;  
And He restoreth to the man his wellbeing.  
27 He singeth unto men, and saith :  
' I sinned and made crooked my way,  
And He requited me not my misdoing :  
28 He ransomed my soul from the Pit,  
And my life gazeth on the Light.'  
29 Lo, all this El is wont to do,  
Twice, yea thrice, with a man !  
30 [To bring back his soul from the Pit,—  
To let him gaze on the light of life.]  
31 Attend, Eyob ! listen to me !  
Be silent, and I will speak !  
32 If thou hast arguments, answer me ;  
Speak ; for I wish to find thee right !  
33 If thou hast not, listen thou to me ;  
Be silent, and I will teach thee wisdom !

CHAPTER 34.—*And Elihu answered and said:*

- 2 Hear, O ye wise, my words,  
And ye sages, give ear to me!  
3 [For 'the ear, it trieth words,  
As the palate tasteth food.']  
4 Choose we us what is right!  
Let us see between us what is good!  
5 For Eyob hath said, 'I am just,  
And El hath set aside my right:  
6 To me my Judge is false;  
Sore is my wound, sans fault!'  
7 But indeed, what man is like Eyob,  
Who imbibeth scoffing like water;  
8 And is for joining with workers of wickedness,  
And for walking with men of ungodliness?  
9 (For he said, 'A man gaineth nothing  
By being on good terms with Elohim'.)  
10 Therefore, ye wise, give ear!  
Men of mind, listen to me!  
Far be it from El to deal wickedly,  
And from Shaddai to pervert justice!  
11 For after a man's work He rewardeth him,  
And according to one's way He causeth to befall him.  
12 And indeed, El dealeth not wickedly;  
And Shaddai perverteth not right.  
13 Who assigned Him the Earth as His charge?  
And who set Him over the whole world?  
14 Should He recall His Spirit to Himself,  
And gather in His Breath to Him;  
15 All Flesh would expire together,  
And Man would return to the dust.  
16 But if thou hast wit, hear this;  
O give hear to the sound of my words!  
17 Accountest thou El a foe of Right?  
Or impugnest thou the Justice of the Mighty One  
18 Who calleth a king worthless,  
And nobles godless men?  
19 He showeth no favour to princes,  
Nor preferreth a rich to a poor man:  
[For they all are the work of His Hands.]  
20 Suddenly they die, are cut off;

- They perish like moths and pass away.  
 [And He removeth the magnates without hand.]
- 21 For His eyes are upon a man's ways.  
 And all his steps He beholdeth :
- 22 No darkness there is, no deathshade,  
 Where evildoers may hide :
- 23 For He setteth not a man a time  
 To go unto El in judgement.
- 24 He breaketh the mighty without trial,  
 And setteth up others in their 'stead :
- 25 He noteth well their doings,  
 And overthroweth them by night, that they are crushed.
- 26 Therefore He shattereth the godless ;  
 He hurleth them down into the Place of the Dead :
- 27 Because they turned aside from following Him,  
 And considered not all His ways.
- 28 [To cause the cry of the poor to come to Him,  
 And that He might hear the shriek of the oppressed.
- 29 Should HE keep quiet, who shall rouse Him ?  
 If He cover the face, who shall see Him ?]  
 If His wrath be kindled at a nation,
- 30 And He make an infidel king :  
 Who hardeneth himself against Him,  
 And maketh his yoke heavy on the people :
- 31 When unto Eloah he saith,  
 'Forgive me ! I will no more deal corruptly !
- 32 Do THOU show me the way ;  
 And if I did wrong, I will not again !':
- 33 By *thy* standard should Eloah requite him,  
 That thou despisest the chastening of Shaddai ?  
 For thou must choose, and not I ;  
 So what thou knowest, speak !
- 34 Let men of sense give ear to me,  
 And the wise man listen to me !
- 35 Eyob speaketh not with knowledge,  
 And his words are void of insight :
- 36 I will prove Eyob to the end,  
 For answers like men of wickedness ;
- 37 [For he addeth rebellion unto his sin ;]  
 For against Shaddai he clappeth his hands,  
 And multiplieth his words against El.

CHAPTER 35.—1 *And Elihu answered and said :*

- 2 Dost reckon this for right,—  
Dost think it just with El,—
- 3 That thou sayest, 'What profit have I?  
What advantage have I above sinners?'
- 4 'Tis I that will answer thee with proofs,  
And thy three friends along with thee!
- 5 Look at the Heavens and behold,  
And see the Skies far above thee!
- 6 If thou sin, what workest thou against Him?  
If thy revolts be many, what doest thou to Him?
- 7 If thou art righteous, what dost thou give Him,  
Or what receiveth He from thine hand?
- 8 To a man like thyself is thy wickedness,  
And to a son of Adam thy righteousness.
- 9 At abounding oppressions men make outcry,—  
They shriek at the arm of the great ones:
- 10 But they say not, 'Where is Eloah our Maker,  
Who setteth watches in the night,—
- 11 Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth,  
And maketh us wiser than the birds of the air?'
- 12 There they cry, unanswered,  
Because of the pride of the wicked:
- 13 But an idle plaint El heareth not,  
And Shaddai hearkeneth not to vanity:
- 14 Much less when thou sayest thou seest Him not,  
The case is before Him and thou waitest for Him!
- 15 And now, because Eloah hath visited  
And hurt himself sorely for transgression,
- 16 Eyob vainly openeth his mouth,  
And without knowledge multiplieth words.

CHAPTER 36.—1 *And Elihu said besides :*

- 2 Wait me a while, and I will show thee;  
For Elihu hath yet more to say:
- 3 I will lift my thought to Him that is far off,  
And to my Maker ascribe Justice.
- 4 For indeed my words are no lie;  
The Perfect in all Knowledge is with me.
- 5 Lo, El is mighty and fainteth not—

- Strong in Power and wise-hearted.  
6 He letteth not the soul of the godless live,  
And the cause of the oppressed He judgeth.  
7 He letteth kings come to the throne,  
And seateth them in state, that they wax haughty.  
8 And if bound they walk in fetters,  
Caught in the cords of distress,  
9 And He hath shown them their behaviour  
And their transgressions, that they played the tyrant,  
10 And hath opened their ear to correction,  
And bidden them return from wickedness :  
11 If they obey Him and do Him service,  
They fulfil their days in weal,  
And their years in happiness ;  
12 But if not, they pass into She'ol,  
And expire for lack of knowledge.  
13 And the impious, in heart they lay up wrath ;  
And to El they cry not when He chasteneth them.  
14 Their soul must die in childhood,  
And their life pass away in youth.
- 15 He delivereth the oppressed from his oppression,  
And redeemeth the needy from tyranny :  
16 Yea, and He removeth him out of straits,  
And broadeneth his goings under him.  
[His table is filled with fatness.]  
17 But the doom of the godless faileth not ;  
Judgement and Justice lay hold of them.
- 18 See that a bribe seduce thee not,  
Nor let much ransom turn thee !  
19 Is thy weal to be compared with gold,  
Or with all the treasures of wealth ?  
20 Prolong not the night over wine,  
Till the rising of day in its place.  
21 Beware, turn not unto wickedness !  
Because for this thou wast tried with affliction.
- 22 Lo, El is exalted in His Power ;  
And who is a teacher like Him ?  
23 Who imposed on Him His Way ?  
And who shall say, Thou hast done Injustice ?

- 24 Remember that great is His Work  
Beyond what mortals have seen.  
25 All mankind do gaze thereon,  
And a mortal beholdeth it afar off.  
26 [Lo, El is great, beyond knowledge ;  
The number of His years is unsearchable.]  
27 For He collecteth the drops of water,  
And bindeth up the rain in His mist ;  
28 Wherewith the skies flow in its season,—  
They drop on the ground in showers.  
29 Who understandeth the spread of the cloud,—  
The rise of the cloudbank, His covert ?  
30 Lo, He spreadeth the cloud over the light,  
And the sun with the cloudbank He shroudeth :  
31 For through them He nourisheth the nations ;  
He giveth food to all flesh.  
32 With clouds He covereth the light,  
And chargeth it not to shine forth ;  
33 He draweth over it a curtain,—  
The place of the tent of the Storm.

- CHAPTER 37.—1 With terror my heart fluttereth,  
And springeth from its place within me.  
2 Hark to the rumble of His Voice,  
And the mutter that issueth from His Mouth !  
3 Under all Heaven He letteth it go,  
And His light unto the corners of Earth.  
4 After it His Voice roareth ;  
He thundereth with His Voice of Majesty :  
Nor doth He restrain the flood of waters,  
When His Voice of thunder is heard.  
5 El performeth wonders ;  
He doeth great things, we know not how.  
6 For He saith to the snow, Be stored up !  
And to the torrent-rain, Overflow !  
7 Every man He sealeth up,  
That mortals may know His work ;  
8 Wild beasts go into the lair,  
And abide in their dens.  
9 Out of the Storechamber cometh the Cyclone,  
And out of the Garners issueth Cold.



- 10 By the Breath of El it freezeth;  
 And the broad water is like cast-iron.  
 11 Also the Flash putteth the Clouds to flight,—  
 His Light scattereth the cloudmass;  
 12 And it—it compasseth 'Heaven,  
 It turneth about by His guidance,  
 To do whatsoever He biddeth  
 All over His earthly world:  
 13 [Whether for a Rod of Wrath on the tyrant,  
 Or for mercy to His land He send it forth.]  
 14 Give ear to this, O Eyob,  
 And consider the Wonders of El!  
 16 Dost thou teach Him that spreadeth the clouds,  
 And instruct the Perfectly Wise,  
 15 When He maketh the clouds His cloak,  
 And the light of His thundercloud shineth out?  
 17 Thou whose garments are warm  
 When the land is stilled from the South.  
 18 Couldst thou, like Him, beat out the skies  
 Hard as a molten mirrour?  
 19 Teach us what we should say of Him;  
 And from marshalling words we will refrain!  
 20 Will He be angry because I talk?  
 Or will a man be swallowed up because he spoke?  
 21 And now the light is not seen,—  
 Bedimmed it is in the skies;  
 But the stormy wind cleareth them,  
 22 And out of the North a Brightness cometh.  
 Upon Eloah appeareth Splendour;  
 23 But Shaddai is not found therein.  
 He showeth great Might and Justice;  
 And the cause of the righteous He wresteth not:  
 24 Therefore do men fear Him;  
 But none of the Sages can see Him.

CHAPTER 38.—1 *And Iahvah answered Eyob out of the Stormwind, and said:*

- 2 Who here obscureth counsel  
 By words void of knowledge?  
 3 Pray gird up thy loins like a warrior;

- I will ask thee, and do thou let me know!  
4 Where wast thou, when I founded the Earth?  
Declare, if thou knowest Insight!  
5 Who determined her measures, since thou shouldst know;  
Or who stretched the line upon her?  
6 Upon what were her bases planted,—  
Or who laid her cornerstone,—  
7 When the Stars of Morning cheered together,  
And all the Sons of Elohim shouted acclaim?  
8 And who shut in the Sea with the sand,  
When he burst forth, issuing from the womb?  
9 When I made cloud his apparel,  
And thick vapour his swathingband,  
10 And imposed on him a decree,  
And set a bar and doors:  
11 'Thus far thou mayst come, but no farther;  
And here shall thy swell be broken!'  
12 Didst thou order his outgoing to the Morning,  
And appoint the Dawn his place;  
13 To lay hold of the corners of Earth,  
And to kindle flames out of her?  
14 She changeth like clay under seal,  
And standeth in the Light as (in) a garment.  
15 [But their light shall be withheld from the wicked;  
And the high arm shall be broken.]  
16 Hast thou reached the springs of the Sea,  
Or walked the bottom of the Deep?  
17 Have the Gates of Death been discovered to thee,  
And didst thou see the Doors of She'ol?  
18 Hast thou considered the breadth of the Earth?  
Tell, if thou knowest how great it is!  
21 Thou knowest, for then thou wast born,  
And the number of thy days is many.  
19 Where dwelleth the Light,—  
And Darkness, where is his place?  
20 For thou takest him unto his bourn,  
And perceivest the paths to his house.  
22 Hast thou been into the Storechambers of Snow,  
And the Storechambers of Hail canst thou see,  
23 Which I reserved for the time of trouble,—  
For the day of battle and warfare?

- 24 Where is the way to where Light forketh,  
 And scattereth flashes over Earth?  
 25 Who clave a conduit for the downpour,  
 And a way for the thunderbolts;  
 26 To rain on the land unpeopled,  
 On the wild where no man is;—  
 27 To sate the desert waste,  
 And to make grass spring from the dryness?  
 28 Hath the Rain a father?  
 Or who hath begotten the dewdrops?  
 29 Out of whose womb came the Ice?  
 And Heaven's Hoar-frost, who bare it?  
 30 [Like stone the waters stiffen,  
 And the face of the Deep groweth solid.]  
 31 Dost thou fasten the bonds of Kîmah,  
 Or loose the fetters of Kesîl?  
 32 Dost thou make Mazrô rise in his season,  
 And 'Aish with her Sons dost thou lead?  
 33 Didst thou impose the laws of Heaven,  
 Or appointest thou an ordinance for Earth?  
 34 Canst thou lift thy voice to the clouds,  
 That a deluge of water may cover thee?  
 35 Sendest thou the lightnings, that they go,  
 And say to thee, 'Here are we!'  
 36 Who set thee such wisdom in the reins;  
 Or who gave insight to a fool?  
 37 Who telleth the clouds by Wisdom;  
 And who tilteth the waterskins of Heaven,  
 38 When the soil hardeneth into lumps,  
 And the clods cleave fast together?  
 39 Dost thou hunt the prey for the lioness,  
 And dost thou satisfy the young lions,  
 40 When they crouch low in their lairs,  
 And sit in their covert in ambush?  
 41 Who provideth the raven his fare,  
 And who bringeth him prey;  
 When his young ones cry to El,  
 And scream for want of food?

CHAPTER 39.—1 Carest thou for the rock-goats?  
 The travail of the hinds dost thou watch?

- 2 Dost thou reckon the months they fulfil,  
And fix their time of yeaning?
- 3 They bow, they liberate their young,—  
They shoot their burdens forth, and are well.
- 4 Their fawns grow up in the open;  
They go forth, and return not unto them.
- 5 Who let the wild ass go free,  
And who loosed the bonds of the onager,
- 6 Whose home I made the steppe,  
And his haunts the salty waste?
- 7 He laugheth at the uproar of the city;  
He heareth not the shouts of the driver:
- 8 He rangeth the mountains, his pasture;  
And seeketh after everything green.
- 9 Will the wild-ox be willing to serve thee,  
Or would he pass the night at thy manger?
- 10 Canst thou bind him with the cords of thy yoke;  
Or will he harrow the furrows of thy land?
- 11 Wilt thou trust him, because his strength is great,  
And leave to him thy labour?
- 12 Wilt thou rely on him to bring home thy seed,  
And to gather thy wheat into the threshingfloor?
- 13 Dost thou rejoice in the ostrich,  
Or love her that lacketh counsel?
- 14 For she leaveth her eggs to the earth,  
And layeth them on the ground,
- 15 And forgetteth that the foot may press it,  
And the wild beast tread upon it;
- 16 Dealing hardly with her young as not hers,  
For nought hath she toiled without care;
- 17 For Eloah made her forget wisdom,  
And gave her no share in sagacity.
- 18 When she worketh her wings in the race,  
She laugheth at the horse and his rider.
- 19 Givest thou strength to the horse?  
Dost thou clothe his neck with Terror?
- 20 Dost thou make him leap like the locust?  
Dost thou teach him his snort of thunder?
- 21 He paweth and exulteth in his strength;  
He goeth forth into the valley to battle.

- 22 He laugheth at the lance, and quailleth not;  
 And recoileth not from the sword.  
 23 Upon him rattleth the quiver,  
 The flame of spear and dart.  
 24 In his eagerness he scoopeth the ground,  
 And standeth not at sound of trumpet.  
 25 At the sound of it he crieth 'Aha!'  
 And afar he scenteth the fray;  
 The cry of the warriors daunteth him not,—  
 The thunder of the captains and the shouting.  
 26 [Through thy wit doth the hawk ply his wings,  
 And spread his pinions southward?]  
 27 At thy hest doth the vulture soar,  
 And for thee set high his nest?  
 28 On the crag he settleth and dwelleth,—  
 On the tooth of the crag and the fastness;  
 29 And from there he searcheth for food;  
 His eyes see far away.  
 30 His nestlings gorge them with blood,  
 And are glutted with flesh of the slain.

CHAPTER 40.—2 Is Shaddai's opponent corrected,  
 And Eloah's critic answered?

- 3 *And Eyob answered Iahvah and said:*  
 4 Lo, I am little! what can I reply to thee?  
 My hand have I laid to my mouth.  
 5 Once spake I, but I will not repeat it;  
 And twice, but I will not again.  
 6 *And Iahvah answered Eyob out of the Stormwind and said:*  
 7 Pray gird up thy loins like a warrior;  
 I will ask thee, and teach thou Me!  
 8 Wilt thou really abolish my Justice?  
 Wilt condemn Me, that thou mayst be right?  
 9 Hast thou then an Arm like El's,  
 And with a Voice like His canst thou thunder?  
 10 Pray deck thee with Majesty and Grandeur,  
 And put on Glory and Greatness!  
 11 Scatter the overflowings of thy wrath,  
 And bring every proud man low!

- 12 Look at every proud man and humble him ;  
 And crush the godless where they stand !  
 13 Hide them in the dust together,  
 And their faces enshroud in clay !  
 14 For then I also will praise thee,  
 Because thine own right hand can save thee.  
 15 Behold now Behemoth, My work !  
 Grass like the cattle he eateth.  
 16 Behold now his strength is in his loins,—  
 His force in the thews of his belly.  
 17 His tail is as rigid as a cedar ;  
 The muscles of his thighs are close-knit.  
 18 His bones are brazen pipes ;  
 His legs are iron bars.  
 19 He was the prime fruit of His Way ;  
 Eloah made him to sport withal.  
 20 The beasts of the hills stare at him ;  
 And all the live things of the field are astonished.  
 21 Under the deep water he lieth,  
 In covert of reed and fen ;  
 22 The lotus-trees screen him reclining ;  
 The willows of the wâdy environ him.  
 23 [Though the River overflow, he is not flurried ;  
 He is calm, though it burst into his mouth.]  
  
 25 Canst thou draw up Leviathan with a fish-hook,  
 And bind cords on his teeth ?  
 26 Canst thou put a rush-line through his nose,  
 And pierce his jaw with a hook ?  
 24 Canst thou take him alive in a trap,  
 Or with bird-snares catch him by the snout ?  
 31 Canst thou pack his hide with spikes,  
 Or his head with fishing-spears ?  
 27 Will he supplicate thee much,  
 Or address thee in gentle speech ?  
 28 Will he come to terms with thee,  
 That thou take him as a lifelong thrall ?  
 29 Wilt thou play with him like a pet sparrow,  
 Or keep him as a sport for thy maidens ?  
 30 Shall partners bargain about him ?  
 Shall they divide him between the traders ?

- 32 If thou lay thine hand upon him,  
 Thou wilt think of a battle no more!
- CHAPTER 41.—1 Lo, the hope of his assailant proveth vain!  
 Even at sight of him he will be thrown!
- 2 He is fell; who durst arouse him?  
 And who can stand up before him?
- 3 Who hath ever faced him without hurt?  
 Under all Heaven there is none!
- 4 I will not be mute on his array,—  
 His might and the strength of his outfit.
- 5 Who can strip off the surface of his coat?  
 Who can pierce his double mail?
- 6 The doors of his mouth who can open?  
 About his teeth is Terror.
- 7 His back shields encompass;  
 They shut it in as with wall of flint:
- 8 One close upon another,  
 No space cometh between them.
- 9 [Each to his fellow clinging,  
 They hold together inseparably.]
- 10 His snorting flasheth light;  
 And his eyes are like the lids of Dawn.
- 11 Forth of his mouth go flames,  
 And sparks of fire escape.
- 12 From his nostrils issues a smoke,  
 Like a pot blown hot and steaming.
- 13 His breath kindleth coals,  
 And a flare issueth from his mouth.
- 14 [Behind him stalketh Fierceness,  
 And before him boundeth Panic.]
- 15 The folds of his flesh are solid;  
 Firm-set upon him, it shaketh not.
- 16 His heart is firm as a stone,  
 And harder than the nether millstone.
- 17 At his noise heroes are afraid;  
 At his crashing the brave take to flight.
- 18 If the sword reach him, it holdeth not;  
 The spear starteth from his mail.
- 19 He counteth iron as straw,—  
 Bronze as worm-eaten wood.

- 20 The son of the bow cannot rout him ;  
 The stones of the sling become chaff to him.  
 21 The lance counteth to him as chaff ;  
 He laugheth at the hurtling of the javelin.  
 22 Under him are the sharpest of potsherds ;  
 He spreadeth a threshing sledge upon the mire.  
 23 He maketh the Deep boil like a pot ;  
 The broad stream he maketh like a caldron.  
 24 Behind him he whiteneth his track ;  
 The Deep might be thought hoar-haired.  
 25 There is not on earth his like,  
 Who was made a lord of things living.  
 26 Him every high one feareth ;  
 He is King over all the things that creep.

CHAPTER 42.—1 *And Eyob answered Iahvah and said :*

- 2 I know that Thou art all-able,  
 And nothing is unattainable to Thee :  
 3 Therefore hast Thou shown me what I discerned not,—  
 Things too hard for me that I knew not.  
 5 By mere hearsay had I heard of Thee,  
 But now mine own eye hath seen Thee ;  
 6 Therefore I melt where I stand,  
 And become like dust and ashes.

CHAPTER 42. 7-17.—7 Now after speaking these words to Eyob, Iahvah said to Eliphaz of Teman: 'I am incensed against thee and thy two friends, because ye have not spoken right of Me like my servant Eyob. But now take you seven bullocks and seven rams and go to my servant Eyob and offer a burnt-offering on behalf of yourselves, and let my servant Eyob intercede for you ; for his intercession I will accept, that I may not wreak destruction upon you! because ye have not spoken what was right of Me, like my servant Eyob.'

9 Accordingly, Eliphaz of Teman, Bildad of Shuah, and Zophar of Ma'ân, went and did as Iahvah had bidden them ; and 10 Iahvah accepted the intercession of Eyob. Iahvah restored Eyob's exile, when he interceded for his friends ; and Iahvah 11 doubled all Eyob's possessions. Then came to him all his kinsmen and all his kinswomen and all his old acquaintance and feasted with him in his house ; and they condoled with



him and comforted him for all the evil which Iahvah had caused to come upon him, and each of them made him a present of an ingot and each a golden earring.

- 12 Now Iahvah blessed the end of Eyob more than his  
beginning; so that he had fourteen thousand sheep and  
goats, and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen,  
13 and a thousand she-asses. He had also seven sons and three  
14 daughters. He named the first (of the latter) Yemîmah, the  
15 second Keçi'ah, and the third Kèren-happûkh. No women  
were found in all the land as fair as Eyob's daughters; and  
16 their father gave them an estate among their brothers. Eyob  
survived these events a hundred and forty years, and saw his  
sons and his sons' sons (and their sons?), four generations.  
17 So Eyob died, an old man and sated with life.

# A COMMENTARY

## CRITICAL, PHILOLOGICAL, AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE HEBREW TEXT AND ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE BOOK

Chapter 1.—*v. 1. A man there was.* The Prologue of the book thus begins in the traditional manner of the story-teller; as we might say, 'There was once a Man' or 'Once upon a time there was a Man'. There is no attempt to put the narrative into relation with history. The time of the events narrated is left quite vague and indefinite. The order of words at once concentrates the reader's attention upon the hero. (For the constr. cf. 2 Sa 12<sup>1</sup>; Es 2<sup>5</sup>.) *In 'Ûç-land*; that is, the country of the tribe or tribal group called 'Ûç (Gn 22<sup>21</sup>). *Θ ἐν χώρῃ τῇ Αὐσίτιδι, in Ausitis*, which implies, as Duhm remarks, the pronunciation 'Ôç (ע״ץ) rather than 'Ûç (עץ). The exact locality is unknown; but the Biblical data seem to require a situation eastward of Palestine and not remote from the north-eastern border of Edom. *See Add. Note.*

*Eyob by name.* Lit. *Eyob* (was) *his name*. The hero's name is given in a way that seems to imply that it was well known in story, as one of the great names of old. Neither parentage nor pedigree is assigned him, as we should expect in an historical narrative—a significant omission. [The author of the Elihu-section proceeds differently (32<sup>2</sup>).] This name is not an artificial invention to suit the story, as has often been taken for granted because of its apparent derivation from אֵיב ('āyāb), 'to be hostile to' (Ex 23<sup>22</sup>), whence the common word אֹיֵב ('ōyēb), 'enemy'; as though אֵיב ('īyōb) meant 'object of enmity', 'one treated hostilely or persecuted', scil. by God, as Eyob appeared to be (*Ges. Thes.*). Ewald suggested a different origin, comparing the Arabic 'awwāb, 'penitent', strictly 'one who frequently returns', scil. to God from his sins (أب = اوب).<sup>1</sup> This, however, hardly seems appropriate, for his need of penitence is precisely what Eyob refuses to admit all through the prolonged controversy with his friends. That the former derivation of the name is correct is virtually proven by the occurrence of such personal designations as Ayabu-waqar (CT vi. 23) and Ahhu-ayabī among proper names of the period of the First Babylonian Dynasty (*see Ranke, Early Babylonian Personal Names*, p. 221). Cf. also the abbreviated form

<sup>1</sup> In the Koran, Sūra 38, David, Solomon, and Eyob successively are so described (أَبْأَبْ).

A-a-bu, i.e. Âbu (Johns, *Doomsday Book*), which agrees with the usual spelling of the Assyrian *âbu*, 'enemy'; for which we also find the spellings a-ia-bu (i.e. *ayabu*), a-ia-a-bu (= *ayâbu*; 1 R 27, 68, No. 2), and ia-a-bu (ZA vi. 190, *rm* 10). Assuming that the Heb. 'Îyôb represents an older 'Ayyâb, as it may do, we can hardly help identifying it with the word so variously written in these Babylonian and Assyrian forms. 'Îyôb ('Ayyâb?) will thus be a shortened theophoric name, like Nathan for Elnathan or Nathanael; and the meaning may be conjectured by comparison with such names as Jacob (shortened from Jacobel = *Ya'qubilu*, a Bab. name) and Israel. The idea embodied in designations of this kind would seem to be, not so much that Deity was hostile to the person so designated (what parent would be likely to choose such a name?), as that the latter would triumph even over more than mortal opposition. Cf. Gn 32<sup>29</sup> Ho 12<sup>4.5</sup>. 'Îyôb-êl might thus mean 'One who durst oppose God', and would overcome Him or bend Him to his will by superior force or cunning. Such ideas, of course, betoken a very early stage of religious thought.

If further proof be needed that Eyob is not an allegorical figment, although like all other Hebrew personal names it must have been originally significant of some definite idea, we may point to the mention of Eyob in Ez 14<sup>14.20</sup>, where he figures along with Noah and Daniel as one whose name was a proverb of sanctity in the prophet's day.

*And that man was good (or moral) and upright (or straightforward).* The Heb. עֲדָרָה (8<sup>20</sup> 9<sup>20.21.22</sup>) does not predicate moral *perfection* of Eyob any more than does its cognate עֲדָרָה (12<sup>4</sup>) of Noah (Gn 6<sup>9</sup>). As Driver remarks, the corresponding substantives (עֲדָרָה 2<sup>3.9</sup> 27<sup>6</sup> 31<sup>6</sup>; עֲדָרָה 4<sup>6</sup>) are rendered *integrity*; and it seems a pity that the Latin adjective *integer* has not been adopted into our language along with *integritas*. Horace's 'Integer vitae scelerisque purus' is about equivalent to the phrase of our text. The terms are those of popular estimation rather than theological precision. What the poet makes of Eyob's goodness may be seen in chaps. 29, 31 especially. It is clear from 7<sup>21</sup> 13<sup>26</sup> al. that he does not suppose his hero absolutely free from sin. ὁ ἀμειπτος, 'blameless'. 'Correct' or 'irreproachable' would be a better rendering of עֲדָרָה than 'perfect', although (in accordance with its etymology) the word also denotes *complete, whole, entire, sound, unblemished* (of sacrificial animals). The ἀληθινός added in ὁ is really an alternative rendering of עֲדָרָה: see 2<sup>3</sup> 4<sup>7</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>.

*Godfearing and avoiding evil.* Omit the connective particle (ו) between this pair of epithets and the preceding one. So ὁ; and מִן v. 8, 2<sup>3</sup> (Du). The first epithet here denotes, not so much ὁ's *θεοσεβής, religious* or *pious*, in the sense of worship, as fearing God as the Avenger of all misdoing, and especially of injustice and oppression (cf. Gn 42<sup>18</sup>). The

plur. אלהים is a vague expression, denoting originally all superhuman agents or spiritual beings; and seems to be used here quite generally, as we might speak of 'the Powers above'. But the author has no doubt of the supremacy of Iahvah over all other invisible potentates (cf. Ps 97 'Worship Him, all ye Gods!'; 136<sup>2</sup>), and, an Israelite himself, he naturally makes Eyob acknowledge the God of Israel (v. 21 al.).

vv. 2, 3. This good man was blessed with offspring—a great token of Divine favour (Ps 127<sup>3</sup> ff. 128<sup>3</sup>). A still happier circumstance in Oriental estimation was that sons outnumbered daughters by more than two to one. The numbers seven and three, repeated in connexion with the sheep and camels (v. 3), are in themselves possible enough and might easily be paralleled in many families; but 42<sup>13</sup>, where Eyob is again the father of seven sons and three daughters, after these had perished, shows that we are not dealing with literal history in this particular feature of the story. These numbers may be got out of the name אֵיב, since א = 1 + 2 = 3, and י = 1 + 6 = 7; while the remaining letter ' = 10, the sum of the two, the perfect number. (' is the numeral-letter for 10, the complete or perfect number, which was therefore assumed to have been the number of Eyob's children; cf. 1 Sa 1<sup>9</sup> Ru 4<sup>15</sup>. But 10 = 7 + 3, and י = 1 + 6 = 7, while א = 1 + 2 = 3.) It will be noticed that the legend or tradition was apparently ignorant of the names of Eyob's original family, or else that the author has not troubled to record them; whereas 42<sup>14</sup> does specify the names of the second trio of daughters. Why are the sons nameless in both passages? The sacred and symbolical numbers are the most prominent feature of vv. 2, 3. Seven is the number of the Seven Heavenly Bodies (Sun, Moon, and Five Planets), while Three is that of the three realms of being, Heaven, Earth, the Deep (She'ol) and their presiding Spirits (the Babylonian Anu, Bel, Aë). Five is the number of the Five Planets and of the Five Inter-calated or extra Days of the solar year (ἐπαγόμεναι ἡμέραι, Diod. i. 50).

The primitive astro-mythological use would doubtless make these numbers popular in all sorts of applications. For the rest, it is obvious that the 7000, 3000, and twice 500 (= 1000) of Eyob's livestock are not likely to be other than 'round' numbers. There is no mention of he-asses (cf. Gn 12<sup>16</sup>), though of course their existence is implied in the mention of the more valuable sex (one female was worth three males). Ⓞ adds νομάδες = רועים grazing (1 C 27<sup>29</sup>); a gloss from v. 14 which may have stood in Ⓞ's Heb. text. Eyob's very considerable flocks and herds imply command of extensive pastures. His possession of numerous camels indicates the neighbourhood of the Syro-Arabian desert. They would be used, as pack-horses were formerly used in England, for trading with distant markets. The oxen are reckoned by the 'yoke', i.e. in

pairs, just as they were used in ploughing and carting (v. 14). The asses were the ordinary beasts of burden about the fields. All this property in land and livestock was naturally served by 'an immense body of slaves' (lit. *a very great service*; cf. the Latin use of *servitium* for *servus* and *opera* for *operarius*). The phrase, which occurs Gn 26<sup>14</sup>, has a double rendering in  $\Theta$ : καὶ ὑπηρεσία πολλὴ σφόδρα, which is quite correct, and καὶ ἔργα μεγάλα (ἦν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), which implies the pointing עֲבָדָה (= ἔργα, Ex 1<sup>14</sup>) instead of the rare עֲבָדָה (Gn 26<sup>14</sup>).

*The man was, in fact, the greatest of all the Benê Kēdem*; i. e. the pastoral tribes of Arab and Aramean stock who lived E. and NE. of Palestine (Gn 29<sup>1</sup> Ju 6<sup>3,39</sup> 1 K 4<sup>30</sup> Is 11<sup>14</sup> Ez 25<sup>4,10</sup>). Benê Kēdem, 'The Sons of the East', 'The Eastlanders', Kadmeans, Kadmites (or Kadmonites? Gn 15<sup>19</sup>), is a gentile designation like Benê Yisrā'ēl, 'The Sons of Israel', Benê 'Ammôn, 'The Sons of Ammon', the Ammonites.

Eyob was the richest and most powerful chief (*amīr*) among all these various tribes of the eastern borderland. [ $\Theta$  curiously: καὶ ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος εὐγενὴς τῶν ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν, *and that man was noble (= noblest?) of them of the East*. Cf. Is 11<sup>14</sup> τοὺς ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν = בְּנֵי קֶדֶם. The word εὐγενὴς is only an unusual rendering of הַנָּדָב.]

vv. 4, 5. *An illustration of Eyob's alert and assiduous piety* (v. 1). His seven sons who, like royal princes (2 Sa 13<sup>7</sup> 14<sup>30,31</sup>), had each an 'establishment' of his own, led a joyous existence of continual feasting; entertaining each other and their three sisters in turn day by day, until the seven days of the week had expired, when the round of revels would begin afresh. The Heb. verbs in v. 4 are all frequentative in sense, as rendered above; describing the customary proceedings of the family. Cf.  $\Theta^A$  ἐποίουν.

*In each others' houses in turn*. Lit. (*in*) *the house of a man (on) his day*. The first day of the week would naturally be 'the day' of the firstborn brother (cf. v. 13); and the others would take their turn in the order of age, so that the seventh day would fall to the youngest. ( $\Theta$  paraphrases בַּיּוֹם by πρὸς ἀλλήλους, connecting it with הָלַכוּ, and turns אִישׁ יוֹמָא by καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν.) A tacit disapproval of these perpetual daylight (vv. 13, 14) revels is perhaps implied by the sequel of the story (cf. Ec 10<sup>16</sup> Is 5<sup>11</sup> 1 Th 5<sup>7</sup>); and the sending home for the three sisters (unmarried, and therefore mere girls) seems also to be mentioned as an unusual if not improper proceeding. We are reminded somehow of Es 1<sup>10f.</sup>, and even of Lk 16<sup>19</sup>. (שָׁשׁוּתָא is a scribal error for שָׁשׁוּתָא.)

v. 5. Lit. *And it was, when the days of feasting had gone the round (or made full circuit)*. Cf. Is 29<sup>1</sup>.

*Eyob sent*; scil. a message bidding them come to him to be purified (or bidding them purify themselves, Gn 35<sup>2</sup>) and to be present at the expiatory sacrifices, 1 Sa 16<sup>6</sup>. The 'hallowing' or 'purifying' was the

ritual qualification for assisting in an act of worship. As the first day began (according to Jewish reckoning) at six in the evening of the seventh day, the ceremonies of purification may then have been performed. Then, rising betimes, at daybreak the father, as spiritual as well as temporal head of the family, 'would offer burnt-offerings (the kind of victim is not stated) according to the number of them all'; i.e. of his sons, for whose possible sin the sacrifice was offered: cf. the words that immediately follow: *Perchance my sons have sinned*, &c. (The daughters, if thought of at all, are included with the sons; but the writer would hardly regard them as responsible.) Doubtless, therefore, the number was again the mystic seven (cf. 42<sup>8</sup>; Nu 23<sup>1,14,29</sup>). Θ, after the quite adequate rendering καὶ προσέφερεν περὶ αὐτῶν θυσίαν (θυσίας A; θυσία = עולה Nu 23<sup>3</sup>) κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν, adds καὶ μόσχον ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν = נִפְרָשׁוֹתָם עַל-נַפְשֹׁתָם cf. Le 8<sup>2</sup>. This gloss, intended to bring Eyob's worship into conformity with the Levitical law, may have stood in Θ's Hebrew text. It cannot be original. (The Israelite father appears to have officiated as his own priest from the earliest period down to the seventh century, when the Deuteronomic legislation began to be enforced.)

For Eyob said (or thought; said in his heart, i.e. to himself: Ps 10<sup>6</sup>), '*Perhaps my sons have sinned by cursing God in thought*' (lit. and blessed God in their heart). The context, both here and in the historical parallel, 1 K 21<sup>10,13</sup>, demands this sense, although in both instances the verb בָּרַךְ 'to bless' has been substituted for קָלַל 'to curse' by some scribe or editor who shrank even from writing the original phrase, so repellent to his piety was the idea it conveyed. It is no objection to this assumption that such a phrase has been suffered to remain in Is 8<sup>21</sup> (Du), where perhaps the meaning is rather *curse* by his King and by his God (cf. 1 Sa 17<sup>43</sup>). In other cases also the scribes have not been thorough in such matters; e.g. the איש-בשת of 2 Sa 2<sup>8ff.</sup> appears in the original and genuine form אִשְׁבָּעַל in 1 C 8<sup>33</sup>, and ירבעל survives in Judges (6<sup>32</sup> al.) although ירבעל has taken its place in 2 Sa 11<sup>21</sup> (but cf. Θ ad loc.). Cursing God (קָלַל אֱלֹהִים) is forbidden by the earlier (Ex 22<sup>27</sup>) as well as the later legislation (Le 24<sup>16</sup>). In the latter the penalty is death, which is naturally absent here, although 2<sup>9</sup> assumes that God would inflict it (cf. Ex 22<sup>27</sup>). Θ paraphrases חָטְאוּ וּבְרָכוּ אֱלֹהִים by κατὰ ἐνένοησάν πρὸς θεόν, *thought evil things against God*; which at least lends no support to an original 'blessed'; while Σ strongly confirms our view by rendering *have sinned and cursed* (or *reviled*) God (קָלַל = קָלַל in 1 Sa 17<sup>43</sup> Is 8<sup>21</sup> Le 24<sup>15</sup> &c.). The qualifying addition בְּלִבָּם *in their heart* seems very improbable. If blasphemous thoughts occurred to a party of revellers, they would probably find an outlet in speech. We therefore suggest בְּרַבְרָם *in their talk* (or perhaps בְּרִבָּם *in their quarrelling*—a not infrequent issue of

drinking-bouts). The stress laid on the heinousness of improper language about God (cf. v. 22, 2<sup>10</sup>, and especially 42<sup>7f.</sup>, where Eyob's three friends are bidden to offer a burnt-offering of seven bullocks and seven rams for this very offence) certainly lends colour to the former emendation.

A simpler and perhaps better way of eliminating the difficulty would be to suppose that בִּלְבָבִים has been altered from בִּלְבָבוֹ (Ps 15<sup>2</sup>), which originally followed אֵיבִי and got misplaced by some accident. Thus is restored the appropriate sense: *For Eyob said in his heart, 'Perhaps my sons have sinned by cursing God.'*

[The notion that בָּרַךְ, which appears to be used in the senses of greeting and taking leave (Gn 47<sup>7,10</sup> 2 K 4<sup>29</sup>), might, like our own phrase 'bid farewell to', have come to mean *give up, renounce, or disown*, has no foundation in actual Hebrew usage. בָּרַךְ, like the Assyrian *karābu*, is used of God blessing men and of men blessing God, but never of renouncing or disowning God; nor is it easy to see why Eyob should have entertained any fears on this score. It is evident also that such a sense is entirely inappropriate in the parallel passage 1 K 21<sup>10,19</sup> ('Naboth hath *renounced* God and King!')—a very unlikely charge against a subject of Ahab). What our story really intends is rather some rash or petulant or even sportive utterance of inebriate folly. If there is 'a noteworthy εὐφημία ἀντιφραστική' (Du) in these passages, the euphemistic antiphrasis belongs to his editors, not to the author. Such a mode of speaking is unknown to the OT writers.]

*So used Eyob to do all the year round*; lit. *all the days*, i.e. *always, or continually*, as in Gn 43<sup>9</sup> 44<sup>32</sup> (AV 'for ever').

The Hebrew of vv. 4, 5 suggests several other questions. Might not the successive banquets be birthday celebrations? And in that case what is the precise meaning of *when the days of (the?) banquet had gone round*? Is it meant that the rejoicings on each occasion were prolonged over several days, after which the anxious father performed his atoning rites? or does the phrase *the days of banquet* = *the banquet-days* as a whole? and in that case does Eyob offer his expiatory sacrifice only once a year, viz. after the celebration of the seventh and last birthday? The idea of birthday celebrations brings the narrative nearer to the bounds of probability; but the picture of a continual round of careless gaiety harmonizes better with the character of the story as a whole. (Free potations appear to have been customary with the ancient Hebrews on occasions of rejoicing.)

vv. 6–12. The motive of Eyob's religion questioned by the Satan at the Court of Heaven. He receives permission to prove it by calamity. The scene that follows (repeated 21<sup>6</sup>), upon which Goethe founded the splendid 'Prologue in Heaven' to his *Faust*, is not of course to be taken as literal history. Even the Talmud can relate that a certain Rabbi

who sat before R. Samuel bar Nachmani said: 'Eyob never was, and was not created, but was a parable' (אֵיּוֹב לֹא הָיָה וְלֹא נִבְרָא אֱלֹהִים מִשָּׁל הָיָה), Baba Bathra, 15 a). The narrative of the celestial levee is not poetry either in form or substance. It reflects the conceptions current in the time of the author, and is essentially similar to the vision of Micaiah ben Imlah, 1 K 22<sup>19ff.</sup>: cf. also Ps 89<sup>5-7</sup>; and for the worship in the Temple-palace of Heaven, Is 6 Ps 29.

v. 6. *But the day came when*, &c. See Driver ad 1 Sa 1<sup>4</sup>. The phrase recurs 2<sup>1</sup> 2 K 4<sup>8,11,18</sup>. Du prefers a different syntax: *And it happened (on) the day* (cas. accus.); scil. on which it happened; the day so well known from the story—a common Hebrew construction.

*The Sons of God.* A very inadequate translation; with which, however, we must content ourselves, unless we choose simply to transcribe the Hebrew into *Bēnē ha'ēlōhīm*, or are bold enough to render 'gods' (cf. Ex 18<sup>11</sup> Ps 97<sup>7</sup> 136<sup>2</sup>), which, after all, comes nearest to the original meaning. The Hebrew אֱלֹהִים ('*Elōhīm*') is a vaguely used generic and collective expression, denoting all superhuman Agents or spiritual Intelligences (apparently including ghosts, 1 Sa 28<sup>13</sup>), as well as the Supreme Spirit, Who is 'the God of (the) gods' (Ps 136<sup>2</sup> Dan 2<sup>47</sup>). As such, it is opposed to אָדָם 'Man', 'Mankind', 'human beings' (cf. Is 31<sup>3</sup>). And as בֶּן אָדָם 'a son of Man', means simply a man (= אָנָשׁ, Dan 7<sup>13</sup>), and the plur. בְּנֵי אָדָם 'the Sons of Man', means either 'men', 'the human race' (Gn 11<sup>5</sup>), or 'human beings' as opposed to Iahvah (1 Sa 26<sup>18</sup>), so בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, which happens not to occur (cf. בֶּן אֱלֹהִים, Dan 3<sup>25</sup>), would naturally mean 'a son of Godkind', i.e. a god, and the plur. בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (ה) is equivalent to '(the) celestial or divine beings', 'the gods'. Cf. Ps 82<sup>6,7</sup>. 'The Sons of (the) *Elōhīm*' are seldom mentioned elsewhere in the OT (Gn 6<sup>2,4</sup> Jb 38<sup>7</sup>). Yet the story evidently assumes that the reader will know who they are without further explanation. In an ancient fragment of Hebrew folk-lore (Gn l.c.) they are represented as enamoured of the beautiful 'daughters of Man' (בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם), who bore them giant offspring; while in the passage of Jb l.c. they, with the 'Stars of Morning', rejoice at the founding of Earth. The designation בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים is probably a fossilized relic of primitive Semitic polytheism; and doubtless the name figured much more largely in popular (Canaanite?) myths of the olden time than would appear from the scanty references of Scripture. It is significant that although the poet of Job has admitted the Benē *Elōhīm* to participate, at least as interested spectators, in the great work of Creation (38<sup>7</sup>), yet they are not mentioned by name in either of the two accounts of Gn 1-3. Their presence, however, may well be implied in 1<sup>26</sup> 3<sup>22</sup> ('one of Us'). In Ps 29<sup>1</sup> 89<sup>7</sup> we have בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים as a (poetical) synonym of אֱלֹהִים (which should perhaps be restored in both places).



The *Benē 'Elohim* here 'came' or 'went in' (scil. into the throne-room of the celestial palace) 'to take their stand by (beside) Iahvah'; i.e. to stand in waiting or attendance on the heavenly King, as His ministers and servants, in readiness to receive His commands and 'do His pleasure' (Ps 103<sup>21</sup>; cf. Zc 6<sup>5</sup>); much as in Micaiah's vision Iahvah was 'seated upon His throne, with *all the Host of Heaven* standing beside Him at His right and at His left' (1 K 22<sup>19</sup>). In the equivalence Sons of Elohim = Host of Heaven = the Stars (38<sup>7</sup> Dt 4<sup>19</sup> Ne 9<sup>6</sup> 'The Host of Heaven worshippeth Thee'; cf. Is 24<sup>21</sup>) we may discern how these ideas are blended in primitive Semitic mythology. Cf. the Babylonian Epic of Creation, Tab. VII. 15-17, where the supreme God is acclaimed as 'ZI-UKKIN, Life of the Host of Heaven, Who established for the gods the shining heavens, Who chose their way and appointed their path'; also ib. 110: 'Of the Stars of Heaven their way may He still uphold! Like sheep may He shepherd the gods all of them!' (cf. Is 40<sup>26</sup> Ps 147<sup>4</sup>). In the same cycle of legends the Assembly of the Gods fulfils an important function. They gather in a place which bears the Sumerian designation UB-SHU-GINA-KI, 'The Regions' Gatheringplace', and there hold council and feast together and determine destinies, appointing Merodach as their champion against Tiāmat, and (if victorious) their supreme Lord and King.

We note a difference of ideas between the picture of Heaven, as the Court of an Oriental monarch, in Jb and 1 K 22<sup>19</sup>, and the later and more spiritual representation of the prophet Isaiah, which conceives of Heaven as an august Temple, where the mystic Seraphim 'raise the Trisagion ever and aye' before the throne of Iahvah Sabaoth. The same general conception seems to be reflected in Ps 29.

As Iahvah's messengers and ministers in relation to man the celestial host are called מְלָאכִים 'messengers' (= ἄγγελοι; cf. Ὁ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ = בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, Gn 6<sup>2</sup> and here); a designation which displaced all others in the ordinary use of the developed theology of the OT (cf. Ho 12<sup>4,5</sup> מְלָאכִים = אֱלֹהִים; Gn 32<sup>28</sup>). In the poetical sections of our book (5<sup>1</sup> 15<sup>16</sup>) we meet with another title of these celestial beings, viz. קְדִישִׁים 'Holy Ones' (cf. Ps 89<sup>6,8</sup>, where their assembly is called קָדֹשׁ and קָדֹשׁ). The original implication of this term, derived from the primitive root *KAD* which we see in יָקַד 'to burn' and other cognates (see *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, p. 48) was *bright, pure*, physically (cf. 15<sup>16b</sup>); but, like its synonyms, the word soon came to include the ideas, first of ritual or ceremonial and then of moral and spiritual purity or 'holiness'.

Among the *Bēnē hā'ēlōhīm* there went in also one who is called הַשָּׁטָן *The Adversary* or *Opposer*; who in the sequel justifies this designation by daring persistently to maintain his own contrary opinion against Iahvah Himself, and by his manifest malignity to Eyob. ᠙, by its

rendering  $\delta$  διάβολος, seems to identify this 'Adversary' at once with the Arch-spirit of Evil, the Enemy of Mankind (cf. Mt 4<sup>1,6,8,10</sup>  $\delta$  διάβολος = Σατανᾶς). It is, however, evident that the Satan of our narrative, with his free access to the Throne of Heaven and direct intercourse with the Supreme, is a very different figure from the outcast and utterly fallen Spirit of the later theology, enemy alike of God and man; although his unfriendly insinuations against Eyob and the alacrity with which he sets about the ruin of an innocent person give us more than a hint of what was to become the salient feature of his character.

It is usual to remark that the presence of the Article in the Hebrew (השטן *the Satan*) shows that the phrase has not yet become a Proper Name. Possibly, however, we have here an instance of that peculiar use of the Article in Hebrew which must be rendered indefinitely in our language (*a Satan* or *an adversary* > *the S., the Adv.*); just as in the parallel passage (1 K 22<sup>21</sup>) הרוח *the spirit* means the spirit who became known from his part in this vision and may be rendered more naturally by *a spirit* in our less vivid and picturesque idiom.

The equivalence שטן = διάβολος = 'مَلِكُ' (© Mt 4<sup>1</sup>) *maligner, slanderer*—a conception of Satan which perhaps depends mainly upon the Prologue of Jb and Zc 3<sup>1</sup>—may be justified by reference to Ezr 4<sup>8</sup>, where the cognate שְׂטָנָה denotes *an accusation* or calumny.

v. 7. Iahvah's question, *Whence comest thou?* (as though the Omniscient required to be informed: Pr 15<sup>3</sup> Ps 139 Je 23<sup>24</sup>) betrays the simplicity of the ancient myth. In the sense of the original legend the question may perhaps indicate surprise. Iahvah does not ask whence 'the Sons of God' in general have come. He knows the stations of the heavenly host. Perhaps also, although as a Spirit-being it is implied that the Satan is himself a *ben-hā'ēlōhīm*, the statement *and the Satan too went in among them* implies that there was something unusual in his attendance at the Divine levee: it was an intrusion; he made his way in with the throng. At all events, his reply *From roving the earth and roaming about therein* may suggest that he was not altogether at home in the celestial sphere, the abode of the Host of Heaven; either he is an earthborn spirit, or at least (like the evil spirits of Babylonian sorcery) his haunt and home is the earth, with its deserts, and caves, and mountains (cf. Mt 4<sup>1</sup> 12<sup>43</sup>). The restlessness of a Babylonian demon, wandering about in search of a victim, may be said to characterize him (cf. also 1 Pe 5<sup>4</sup>). The zest with which he falls to ruining the righteous Eyob bears this out. We can hardly say that, as God's instrument or minister, his 'own moral character does not come into question', or that he is neither a good nor a bad angel (Davidson). How can we conceive of a good spirit as inciting Iahvah to suspect a good man's integrity, and rejoicing in the infliction of unmerited miseries? He is,

in fact, as his name indicates, already the Arch-enemy of man, sceptical of his goodness, disparaging his motives, eager to do him hurt. Why this should be so the story gives no hint. And since the author of the book has no further use for the Satan after the Prologue in Heaven, and neither Eyob nor any of the other speakers makes any reference to his instinctive hostility to man in general or to good men in particular as accounting for the calamities which befell the righteous hero, it is perhaps hardly worth while to lay much stress upon the details of an ancient popular legend, which the author chose for the setting of his great argument simply because it supplied a vivid and dramatic illustration of the truth which he desired to advocate: the truth, namely, that the same effects may be due to different causes, and that human suffering, so far from always being direct evidence of human sin, may sometimes be due to causes which have no relation at all to conduct. Had the author regarded Satan's malignity as the true solution of the riddle of the sufferings of the righteous, his closing Theodicy would hardly have omitted all reference to the fact (*see* 38-42<sup>6</sup>). It has often been pointed out that to press every detail of a parable is to imperil our perception of the lesson it was intended to convey; and it must be admitted that, from the standpoint of an absolute morality, it is as difficult to justify Iahvah's arbitrary dealing with one whose blamelessness He Himself emphatically affirms, as it is to account for the character and conduct of the Satan, if we confine our attention exclusively to OT sources. *Qui facit per alium facit per se*; and although Iahvah charges the Satan with urging Him on against Eyob (2<sup>3</sup>), the Epilogue plainly speaks of *all the evil which Iahvah had caused to come upon him* (Eyob): 42<sup>11</sup>. After all, the story contains no suggestion that the Satan presented himself before Iahvah with the express purpose of disparaging Eyob's piety. It is Iahvah who first mentions the patriarch, challenging the judgement of the Satan upon his unique excellence, eliciting a sarcastic expression of doubt as to its disinterested nature, and then granting permission to the malign spirit to put it to the proof in his own pitiless way.

v. 8, *My servant*; i. e. my worshipper or votary. So in Gn of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: cf. 2 K 9<sup>7</sup>. Very common as an element in Semitic (Aram., Heb., Phoen., Arab.) Personal Names, e. g. Abdallah, *Servant of Allah*, Abdashtart, *Servant of Ashloret*, and the like. Cf. the cognate verb, 21<sup>15</sup> Ex 3<sup>12</sup>. Here, as in v. 21, the author seems to make Eyob a Iahvah-worshipper, that is, an Israelite. This may have been a feature of the popular story. In the speeches, however, he is careful to restrict Eyob and his friends, as non-Israelites, to the more general terms אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִי, and שְׂרִי.

*He has not his like on earth.* Eyob, like Noah, with whom Ezekiel mentions him as a paragon and proverb of righteousness (Ez 14<sup>14.20</sup>), is

the best man alive (Gn 6<sup>9</sup>), whether in the matter of *Cultus* or of conduct. The expression 'My servant' implies also that he is dear to Iahvah. The character of Eyob is repeated from v. 1, just as vv. 6-8 are repeated at 21-3. These and other similar recurrences of set phrases in the narrative are quite in the manner of the professional storyteller, and they remind us of the like repetitions of favourite lines and phrases in epic poetry, whether Semitic (e.g. the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh) or Aryan (Mahâbhârata; the Iliad and Odyssey). Our narrative, however, is not poetic in form, but rhythmic prose.

v. 9. *Is it for nothing that Eyob fears God?* A surprising question in an OT book. Eyob's religious consistency and constancy are admitted, but the question of motive is raised, and doubt is thrown on his disinterestedness. He expects and receives a *quid pro quo* for his piety. Let the recompense cease; and all this calculated goodness will disappear. Such a suggestion is certainly startling, in view of the fact that the moral teaching of the Law and the Prophets is everywhere recommended by the promise of such blessings as Eyob enjoyed. It is the whole burden of the fervid preaching of the Deuteronomist. The idea that an obedience consciously rendered with an eye to material benefits was morally worthless does not seem to have occurred to the authors of the older scriptures. The Satan suggests that Eyob is only apparently devoted to God; he loves the gifts, not the Giver, and his insincerity will be demonstrated the moment the gifts are withdrawn. In much the same way, modern adversaries of the faith have often objected to Christian piety that it really rests on a foundation of selfishness, viz. the hope of reward and the fear of punishment either here or hereafter, and cannot therefore claim to represent the highest ideal of moral excellence. In reply to such carping criticism it is surely enough to point to that lifelong yearning after the beauty of holiness, that hungering and thirsting after righteousness, that unquenchable aspiration to reflect the image of God, which has characterized the genuine saint in every age of the Church.

v. 10. *Made a fence all round him* (or *hedged him about all round*); like a choice vineyard (Is 5<sup>5b</sup> Mt 21<sup>33</sup>), to protect it from thieves and wild beasts (Ps 80<sup>12,13</sup> 89<sup>40,41</sup>). Eyob's own person, his family, and all his belongings, are shielded by the Divine favour from all external attack. As Duhm observes, had there been any hole in the fence, the Satan would certainly have discovered it. We may remember how the evil spirits of old Babylonian myth penetrate everywhere, easily making their way through all obstacles and over all barriers. 'High walls (or fences, *ûrê*), broad walls, like a flood they surmount; From house to house they break thro'; Them the door shuts not out, the bolt turns not back! Thro' the door like a serpent they slip; Thro' the hinge (or by the pivot) like the wind they blow' (*Utukki Limnûti*, Tab. V, 24-35): see

Thompson, *Devils*, p. 52). And we have the repeated prayer of the exorcisms, 'Into my house may they not enter! Into my fence (or palisade, *úría*) may they not break through!' (4 R 1, col. 3, 55-8).

But not only were Eyob and his dependents secure from personal hurt and harm. Iahvah had also hitherto prospered *the work of his hands* (Dt 28<sup>12</sup> Ps 90<sup>17</sup> 104<sup>23</sup> מַעֲשֵׂה), his tillage and his trading enterprises; and as for his livestock, it multiplied (Gn 30<sup>30</sup> J) in the land. ⑥: and his cattle thou didst multiply, &c. (πολλὰ ἐποίησας = פָּרַצְתָּ; פָּרַצְתָּ?). Cf. Dt 28<sup>3</sup> ff.

v. 11. Strike, as in v. 19. And he will assuredly, &c. The constr. is that of an oath. The Satan will take his oath that Eyob will break out into furious blasphemy, reviling Iahvah; much as barbarians have been known to abuse and even beat their idols for failing to avert disaster. (To Thy Face = ⑥ εἰς πρόσωπόν σε εὐλογήσει = אֵל פָּנֶיךָ, as 2<sup>5</sup>. So אֵל should be read for לַע in v. 8, as in 2<sup>3</sup>, although ⑥ has κατὰ in the former case.)

v. 12. Iahvah at once accepts the Satan's challenge, and by way of testing His blameless servant's constancy bids the Adversary work his will upon 'all that belongs to him', sparing only himself. The readiness with which Iahvah surrenders one whose innocence He has Himself asserted to such a merciless probation (cf. 2<sup>8</sup>) is certainly strange. Is it meant that the Satan had succeeded in instilling a doubt of Eyob's disinterestedness into the mind of Iahvah (which would imply that Iahvah did not Himself really know the true state of the case; cf. the question *Whence comest thou?* v. 7, and Gn 18<sup>21</sup> 22<sup>12</sup>), and that He saw no other way of reassuring Himself than the drastic method suggested by the Satan? or is the idea rather that the Lord desires to vindicate His own judgement and the character of His servant in the sight of all the Sons of God (including the Satan) by submitting Eyob to the tests which the Satan proposes, knowing that His servant's loyalty will emerge triumphant from any possible trial? It must always be borne in mind that the manifest import of this parabolic legend is that misfortune does not necessarily presuppose guilt, but that a perfectly good man may become involved in it as a consequence of the activities of Powers above man, and, further, that he will continue steadfast under the most formidable shocks of calamity. But in spite of this lofty moral the hero appears too much like a mere pawn on the chessboard of Heaven; and we are somehow reminded of Gloucester's despairing cry in *Lear*: 'As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods: They kill us for their sport!'

*The Satan then withdrew from the presence of Iahvah.* Confident of success, he does not linger in the Court of Heaven, but hurries forth at once to execute his reluctantly conceded commission. (Iahvah's reluctance is apparently revealed in His anxious prohibition of any attack

upon Eyob himself.) There is an evident reminiscence of the Satan's obtaining leave to make trial of Eyob's sincerity in the words which our Lord addressed to St. Peter respecting the Twelve and himself: 'Simon, Simon, behold the Satan did beg you (*plur.*) for sifting like wheat; but I, I prayed for thee that thy faith fail not. And do thou, once thou hast returned, confirm thy brethren!' (Lk 22<sup>31.32</sup>). That misfortune is a touchstone of character is a fact of universal experience; but so also is prosperity.

*vv. 13-22. The first trial fails to shake Eyob's constancy.* The fixed phrases in which Eyob's successive misfortunes are related, belong, as already noted (v. 8), to the epic style of narration; and the breathless haste with which one messenger of evil tidings follows on the heels of another is profoundly impressive and dramatic. There are four strokes of calamity (cf. Ez 14<sup>21</sup>); and all is accomplished within the compass of a single day—the very day when, secure in the sense of solemn rites of expiation duly performed at dawn (*see* note on v. 5), and wholly unconscious of impending doom, his children were joyously feasting together in the house of the eldest-born. The curtain falls upon the patriarch mourning the loss of all, but bowing to the will of Iahvah in a spirit of pious resignation.

*v. 13. And the day came.* *See* note on v. 6. *his sons.* So  $\mathfrak{M}$ , it being obvious from the context that sons of the Satan could not be intended, although he is the nearest subject.  $\mathfrak{G}$  οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰώβ, to prevent misapprehension, which, however, was unlikely in a popular story.

*Were eating bread and drinking wine.*  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  perhaps fell out after  $\text{לֵים}$  ( $\text{אֵם}$ ), which  $\mathfrak{G}^B$  om., giving simply  $\epsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\nu\ \omicron\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ . (But  $\mathfrak{G}^{ANC.a}$  pref.  $\eta\sigma\theta\iota\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ , as  $\mathfrak{M}$ .) On account of the phrase *to eat and drink* in v. 4, Duhm would omit  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  as probably added by a copyist.

*vv. 14, 15. THE FIRST STROKE.* The oxen and she-asses raided by Bedawi marauders of Sabean stock (Heb. Sheba), who massacre the ploughmen and herdsmen. Taken by surprise, the latter, though probably armed, could make little resistance. The Sabeans ( $\Sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$  of the Greek geographers) of Yemen in SW. Arabia were a famous nation in antiquity, whose offshoots may have extended as far north as the borders of Edom (Gn 10<sup>7.28</sup> 25<sup>3</sup>). Their caravans traded in gold, spices, and other costly merchandise (6<sup>10</sup> Is 60<sup>6</sup> Je 6<sup>20</sup> Ez 27<sup>22</sup> 1 K 10<sup>1.10</sup>). In Jo 3<sup>8</sup> (4<sup>8</sup>) they appear as trafficking in slaves. Of late years thousands of inscriptions in the so-called Himyaritic character have been recovered from the ruins of their ancient cities by Dr. Edward Glaser and others.

$\mathfrak{G}$  καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύοντες (var. αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες) =  $\text{וְחָבְאָה}$ ; cf. Gn 14<sup>14</sup> 34<sup>29</sup>. The translator confused  $\text{שָׁבָא}$ , the Nom. Propr. which he did not understand here, with  $\text{שָׁבָה}$ , Aram.  $\text{שָׁבָא}$  *to take captive*.

*v. 16. THE SECOND STROKE.* The flocks and their shepherds blasted by

lightning. That אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים *Fire of God* or *Elohim's Fire* means the lightning is clear from 2 K 1<sup>12</sup>; cf. 1 K 18<sup>38</sup>, where it is called אֵשׁ יְהוָה *Iahvah's Fire*. Besides, it falls from the Heavens. Lightning is called simply Fire (so ⑤ here) in Ex 9<sup>23-24</sup> (cf. Ps 78<sup>48</sup>). In 38<sup>35</sup> we have the ordinary word בָּרָק (in *plur.*). Here the supernatural character of the phenomenon and its effect (it annihilated seven thousand small cattle and their attendants, seemingly with one flash!) are emphasized by the peculiar designation. The Satan appears in a different connexion with lightning, Lk 10<sup>18</sup>: 'I was gazing on the Satan as he fell like a flash of lightning out of Heaven!' Nowhere else in OT (or NT) does the Satan appear as wielding the Lightning, which is Iahvah's own special weapon of war (cf. 28<sup>26</sup> 38<sup>25,36</sup> Ps 18<sup>14</sup> 144<sup>6</sup> Ez 1<sup>13</sup> Hab 3<sup>11</sup> &c.). Having received a permission (which amounts to a commission) from Iahvah, he acts as His minister of evil in the present case.

'And since God suffers him to be,  
He too is God's minister,  
And labours for some good,  
By us not understood'

—nor by him intended. The overruling Power brings good out of evil. Gn 45<sup>8</sup> 50<sup>20</sup> Is 10<sup>7</sup>.

v. 17. THE THIRD STROKE. *Three bands.* The same expression is found in Ju 7<sup>16</sup> 9<sup>43</sup> al. The camels were attacked on three sides at once, as otherwise their swiftness would have given them a good chance of escape.

The 'Chaldeans' (Heb. *Kasdim*; Gn 11<sup>28</sup> 15<sup>7</sup> ⑤ Χαλδαίον), like the 'Sabeans', v. 15, may have been felt as a difficulty by the Greek translator, because of their distance from the supposed scene of action. ⑤ gives οἱ ἵππεῖς, *the horsemen* (= פָּרָשִׁים Gn 50<sup>9</sup> al.). But כַּשְׁדִּים might have become פָּרָשִׁים by transposition of the second and third letters and the common confusion of ד with ר and כ with פ.

The Chaldeans were the people of the extreme south of Babylonia, in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, the *māt Kaldu* of the Assyrian inscriptions (Ashurnāširpal, *Annals*, III, 24 al.). Always a thorn in the side of Assyria, and like Hereward's Saxons difficult of access in their jungle fastnesses, they finally succeeded in erecting the brilliant if short-lived neo-Babylonian monarchy on the ruins of the northern empire. At the earlier period when the story of Eyob may be supposed to have originated, roving bands of freebooters from the Chaldean marshes may have been in the habit of making plundering raids far and near, like the one briefly described in the text. (The language of the Hebrew reminds us of 1 Sa 23<sup>27</sup> 27<sup>8,10</sup> 30<sup>1</sup>: פָּשַׁם *to make a dash or raid*. ⑤ loosely καὶ ἐκύκλωσαν τὰς καμήλους, *and surrounded the camels*.)

vv. 18, 19. THE FOURTH AND FINAL STROKE: the simultaneous death of Eyob's children. The introductory formula is the same as in vv. 16, 17; ער being merely *Scriptio Defectiva* for עור still. The term *wine* (יין) does not appear in ⑥; but see note on v. 12, and cf. 42<sup>11</sup> *eat bread*; Gn 43<sup>25</sup> Lk 14<sup>15</sup> (*eat bread* = feast).

A hurricane (or whirlwind), &c. Lit. *a great wind came from the other side of the wilderness* (or *steppe*, 'veld'); i.e. it blew from the East, across the great Arabian desert (Ju 11<sup>22</sup> Is 21), the western edge of which would be the eastern boundary of 'Ooçland; and struck; i.e. the hurricane struck. (ענע is a scribal error for ותנע, as the subject רוח is feminine.)

vv. 20, 21, 22. *How Eyob took this rain of calamities.* Until the climax was reached with the death of his children, the old sheikh sat in dignified silence on his divan, giving audience to the scared messengers of woe. Now, still apparently without a word, he rises to his feet and performs the customary symbolical actions indicative of mourning, 'rending' or making a slit in his mantle (*mē'il*), cf. 2 Sa 1<sup>11</sup> 3<sup>31</sup> al., and then having his head shaved (doubtless by his usual attendant); the latter a foreign usage, forbidden to Israel, or at least to the priests (Le 19<sup>27</sup> 21<sup>5</sup>; cf. Is 15<sup>2</sup>), and not unknown to the Greeks, who covered the corpse of Patroklos with their shorn locks, as they bore it to the funeral pyre, where Achilles himself also cut off his own 'yellow mane', and devoted it to his dead friend (Iliad 135-51; cf. also Hdt ii. 36; ix. 34). Cf. also Je 7<sup>29</sup> Mi 1<sup>16</sup>. After giving these outward signs of intense grief, Eyob 'fell', i.e. threw himself (נפל) expressing a voluntary act, as in Gn 17<sup>3</sup> 24<sup>64</sup>) on the ground and did reverence (*abs.*); scil. before Iahvah, Whose Hand he recognized in these sudden disasters. It was an act of voiceless submission, all the more impressive because of its silence. Then, speaking to himself in soliloquy, or perhaps in the hearing of those about him, he gives utterance to his pious resignation in that poetical form which is the most natural vehicle of religious emotion, and which popular legend also employs occasionally for the expression of illustrative proverbs, riddles, and other pregnant sayings (cf. Ju 14<sup>14-18</sup> 15<sup>16</sup>). The verse is a quatrain or tetrastich in ③; but between the third and fourth stichus ⑥ interpolates ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ εὐδοξεν, οὕτως ἐγένετο, *As it seemed good to the Lord, so it befell* = הָיָה בְּיָהוָה כִּן הָיָה (or בְּעֵינֵי עַל) (cf. Es<sup>1</sup> 3<sup>9-11</sup> Jos 9<sup>25</sup> Gn 19<sup>8</sup>). Perhaps בְּיָהוָה 5<sup>27</sup>; cf. Gn 44<sup>10</sup>.

We understand the statement *Naked came I out of my mother's womb*, which is obviously true of every human being. But what is the precise meaning of the second stichus *And naked shall (or must) I return thither*? We are reminded of the question of Nicodemus (Joh 3<sup>4</sup>). Clearly the womb to which a man returns at death is not the womb from which he emerges at birth. He returns to the dust (21<sup>26</sup> 34<sup>15</sup> Ec 3<sup>20</sup>) or the ground, out of which man was originally taken (Gn 3<sup>19</sup>) or the earth



(Ec 12<sup>7</sup>): cf. 1 Co 15<sup>47</sup> ἐκ γῆς, said of the first man. The Earth, therefore, would seem to be here regarded as the common Mother of humanity, into whose womb or bosom it returns at death. This idea of the Earth as the Great Mother, common as it is in Aryan myth and poetry (παμμῆτορ τε Γῆ, Aesch. *Prom.* 90), is not found elsewhere in the OT (Ps 139<sup>16</sup> is corrupt). In Babylonian religion, however, the Great Mother of Mankind (cf. NE xi. 123 f.), plays a principal part; and she is the goddess of the Underworld (Shē'ôl; Hades) which was regarded as the 'womb' or 'belly' of the earth (GARASH, *karāṣu*): cf. her title SHAG-TUR or SHA-SUR, 'Heart of the (great) Fold' (= *Inside of the earth*), and Radau's note, *Bab. Exp. Univ. Pennsylvania*, vol. xxx, Pt. 1, p. 52. (The שֹׁאֵל בֶּטֶן or 'womb of Hades' is mentioned, Jon 2<sup>2</sup>.)

'Twas 'Iahvah who gave, and 'Iahvah who took (away). Cf. 1 Sa 2<sup>7</sup>; Ps. 135<sup>6</sup>. The Divine Name is emphatic both times. God deals as He pleases with His creatures; and it is not for man to question His Will, but to acquiesce with all reverence and submission. This, as Duhm observes, might be called the creed and keynote of all Oriental piety. Eyob expresses no hope of restoration (42<sup>10ff.</sup>); at the moment he has none. But he remembers that he had nothing when life began, and that all his good things, enjoyed for many years, were the boon of 'Iahvah. And now that the Supreme has suddenly withdrawn His gifts, He has simply done what He would with His own. Thankful perhaps for the happy past, certainly awed by a vivid sense of the irresistible Power that controls the fortunes of man, he instinctively gives glory to God: *Let 'Iahvah's Name be blest!* This last word (יְבָרֵךְ *blessed*) shows that *he will bless thee* (וְיְבָרֵךְ לָּא) cannot be the original reading in v. 11 (cf. v. 6). Eyob falsifies the Satan's prediction by doing the exact contrary, blessing instead of cursing God as the Author of his ruin. Of course he knows nothing of the Satan's part in the catastrophe. To him all is 'Iahvah's will and work; a point of view which makes his constancy at once more arduous and more admirable.

v. 22. *In all this*; scil. overwhelming trouble: cf. Is 5<sup>25</sup> 9<sup>11.16.20</sup> 10<sup>4</sup>: *amid or in spite of it all, Eyob sinned not*; i.e. as the next clause and 2<sup>10</sup> show, by rash or impious language: *he did not ascribe תִּפְלָא to God.* ¶ paraphrases well ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς πᾶσι τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν αὐτῷ, *In all these things that befell him* (= *In all this*), and continues οὐδὲν ἡμάρτεν Ἰὼβ ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου (= + לֹא־הָיָה Gn 39<sup>9</sup> Ex 10<sup>16</sup>: at least a correct gloss from the margin), καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἀφροσύνην τῷ θεῷ, *and ascribed not folly unto God.* The Heb. תִּפְלָא *tiflā* (4<sup>18</sup>) means the same as Lat. *insulsitas*, 'tastelessness, silliness, folly', from *insulsus*, 'unsalted, unseasoned, tasteless, insipid', of food (= Heb. תִּפְלָא 6<sup>6</sup>; neo-Heb. *unsalted*, of fish; cf. שֶׁמֶץ וְתִפְלָא *falsehood and folly*, La 2<sup>14</sup>). In Ar. *tafala* is 'to spit', and *tuf, taf, tifl*, 'spittle' (as being tasteless?). The primitive biliteral root TAP, DAB,

appears in Talmudic תִּפֵּף *to spit*, Ethiopic *taṣṣa*, id., and perhaps in תִּפֵּחַ *spitting*, 17<sup>6</sup> (✓תוף). The root-meaning is *to flow, to go*: cf. Aram. רוב = Heb. זרב *to flow*; דרבב *to glide, go slowly*, Heb. and Ar.

Duhm thinks that תִּפְלָה here, like גִּבּוֹר, vv. 5, 11, 25<sup>9</sup>, and נִבְלָה 2<sup>10</sup>, 42<sup>8</sup>, is a decent or euphemistic expression for some stronger term of blasphemy. This, however, is hardly necessary. To charge God with unreason in His moral government of man was surely offensive enough. (It seems possible, moreover, that תִּפְלָה may also imply fraud and delusion (cf. Je 23<sup>13</sup> La 2<sup>14</sup> Ez 22<sup>28</sup>), as if events had proved God untrustworthy.) The phrase נתן תִּפְלָה לְאֵל to *give folly to God* is a perfect parallel to יהב ליהוה כבוד *to give* (i. e. ascribe or attribute) *glory and power to Iahvah* (Ps 29<sup>1</sup>). אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ nor blasphemed against God, וְנֶעֻזְנוּ נֶעֻזְנוּ נֶעֻזְנוּ quid contra Deum locutus est, seem to take נתן in the sense of *to utter* (cf. Jos 7<sup>19</sup> Pr 2<sup>3</sup>); but this is less probable.

Duhm well remarks that the lesson of the chapter is that Misfortune is neither always the consequence of Sin, nor—in the case of a really pious man—is it any temptation to Sin.

Chapter 2.—vv. 1–10. *Failure of the Satan's second attempt to break down Eyob's constancy.* vv. 11–13. *Eyob's Three Friends come to condole with him.* The scene in Heaven, vv. 1–7, is cast in the same mould as before (1<sup>6–12</sup>): see the notes on 1<sup>8</sup> and the introductory remarks to 1<sup>13–22</sup>.

v. 1. אֵלֵינוּ adds לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה *to stand in attendance on Iahvah* at the end of the verse. אֵלֵינוּ\* om., but אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ have it, though it is probably dittography from the previous clause.

v. 2. *Where from?* מֵאֵי מְקוֹם; the more prosaic expression = מֵאֵי מְקוֹם *Whence?* (1<sup>7</sup>), which is more poetical and rhetorical.

v. 3. The third clause adds something new in Iahvah's recognition of Eyob's splendid constancy and His implied reproach of the Satan's malevolent intervention. Perhaps, however, the words indicate neither reproach nor indignation; though the tone of a speaker's voice might cause them to convey either. In fact, Iahvah simply renews His challenge to the Satan, pointing out (surely with a feeling of satisfaction rather than of anger) that the latter has so far failed to justify his disparaging estimate of Eyob's piety. Lit. the last words run: *and thou eggedst Me on* (or *didst instigate Me*) *against him, to swallow him up* (metaph. = *to destroy him*) *for naught* (1<sup>9</sup> 9<sup>17</sup> 22<sup>6</sup>) or *without cause, wantonly*. The same verb הִסִּית *to incite, egg on, instigate*, is used with the same construction, 1 C 2<sup>1</sup>, also of 'Satan's' activity.

*to swallow him up* = in order that I might, &c. (cf. 1 C 2<sup>1</sup> 2 C 18<sup>2</sup>). Iahvah takes the responsibility for all that has happened. If Eyob were 'swallowed up', it would really be His doing, not the Satan's.

[The Oxford Lexicon gives no cognates for the root סוּחַ, so that it

appears to be peculiar to Biblical Hebrew. Perhaps it means *to prick* or *goad*, and may be akin to an obscure Assyrian word *sīlu* (spelt *si-i-tum*, 2 R 32, 11 gh), *point* or *pinnacle*; which is the meaning attached to a Sumerian word written SI-BAD, *horn* or *projection of a wall*. In that case, שִׁיחַ *thorns* might be from a (dialectic) variation of the same root: שִׁיחַ = שִׁיחַ, cf. Ju 12<sup>c</sup>.] It is possible that חִנָּם *without cause*, in spite of its position at the end of the verse, really belongs to the principal verb: *and thou eggedst Me on against him* (to destroy him) *for nothing*; that is, your suspicions and suggestions were entirely baseless, as is proved by the event. It does seem to be implied that if the issue had been otherwise, if Eyob had cast off all religious restraint and vented his miseries in blasphemies, his destruction would have been just: cursing God deserved and would entail death (v. 9<sup>b</sup>).

v. 4. The Satan is not yet convinced; the trial has not gone far enough to be conclusive. Eyob has lost his all, but not his life; touch him there, and he will give way. The familiar style of the Satan's reply, with its blunt application of a homely proverb, suggests no consciousness of indignation against himself on the part of Iahvah. He seems to match his own wits, though not his power, against the Lord of Heaven, and is confident of proving Him mistaken, if He will but grant him leave once more to deal with Eyob in his own way. *A skin for a skin* = Θ Δέρμα ὑπὲρ δέρματος, *a hide* (pellis) or *skin* (cutis) *on behalf of a hide* or *skin*. The idea seems to be that of exchanging one thing in ransom for another; cf. 6<sup>22b</sup> בְּעָרִי *on my behalf*. The origin of the proverb, as Davidson observes, is obscure; and so is its precise application in the case before us. In barter like commodities are not always, nor even usually, exchanged for like. The phrase seems to be used like our *Quid pro quo*. X renders אֶמְטִיל אֶחָדָא אֶחָדָא *member for member*, meaning perhaps *one limb* (or *organ*) *for another*; as when a man sacrifices one part of his body to save another (an arm e.g. to save his head; so Driver). But the phrase is *Skin* (or *a skin*) *for skin* (or *a skin*); not *Skin for flesh* or some other portion of the body. And the word עֹר is always either *skin*, *hide*, or *leather* (7<sup>s</sup> 10<sup>11</sup> 18<sup>13</sup> 19<sup>20.26</sup> 30<sup>30</sup> 40<sup>31</sup> 2 K 1<sup>a</sup>). Possibly the term in vulgar use might mean body or person; so that the Satan cries contemptuously, *Carcase for carcase!*, alluding to the death of Eyob's children, and implying that he might naturally be resigned to their loss so long as his own life was spared. We speak of 'saving one's own skin' in the sense of escaping personal harm. Cf. the explanation of St. Jerome: pro corio suo coria obtulit filiorum, *for his own hide he offered the sons' hides*. The Satan's low estimate of human nature is strikingly illustrated by such a suggestion. It is, of course, quite contrary to the common experience, in which men of only average goodness, and even bad men, have often been willing to sacrifice their own lives for

their offspring. But the Satan's ill-grounded scepticism was necessary to the progress of the parabolic story.

The explanation of the phrase *Skin for skin* which makes it mean *The outer skin* (viz. his property, which Eyob has lost) *for the inner skin* (i.e. his real skin, which is still intact) is highly improbable. Where else is property compared with the skin? Duhm considers it most likely that the proverb originated in circles where skins were an important article of exchange and barter, and that its primary sense is, *For a skin people give (or receive) a skin's worth*. He then suggests various other applications; e.g. the Bedawi freebooter might thus have menaced the herdsman with hurt to his own skin, if he would not peaceably surrender a cow; the slave-hunter might have used the phrase in granting permission to a captive to secure his own release by the surrender of a slave or a child; the Avenger of Blood might utter it in attacking the kin of the homicide, &c. These examples, however, favour the interpretation *Skin for skin* = *One skin for another*, rather than Duhm's 'Für eine Haut giebt (oder erhält) man Hauteswert.'

*the man*; מִן אִישׁ, meaning not any man in general, but Eyob in particular. This is the most natural view, as אִישׁ is the antecedent of the pronouns that follow in v. 5, although the statement might well be made of men generally (cf. Mt 16<sup>26</sup> Mk 8<sup>36</sup>): so G<sup>B</sup> ὅσα ὑπάρχει ἀνθρώπων κτλ. (but G<sup>A</sup> τῶ ἀνθρώπῳ), and L נֶפֶשׁ אִישׁ (but S חַיָּה אִישׁ).

*for himself*; מִנְּפִשׁוֹ. Or *for his life* (v. 6) = G ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ. Cf. Mt 16<sup>26</sup>. But נֶפֶשׁ *soul, life*, often corresponds to our reflexive pron. *self* (9<sup>21</sup> 1 Sa 18<sup>1.3</sup>); and v. 5 *strike his bone and his flesh*, that is, himself or his person, indicates that meaning here. The Satan does not suggest the taking of Eyob's life, but only the extreme of bodily affliction.

v. 5. G τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ = אֶל-עַצְמוֹ וְאֶל-בִּשְׁקוֹ (a difference of pointing only). For the plur. forms, cf. Gn 2<sup>23</sup> Pr 14<sup>30</sup>. They are hardly correct here. G stumbled at the collective use of עַצְמוֹ *his bone*. Cf. ποδῶν instead of ποδός, v. 7, because a man has two feet!

*he will curse thee*; see notes on 1<sup>6.11</sup>. G σε εὐλογήσει. The general excellence of this version of Job suggests that the translator may have understood בִּרְכַךְ in an ironical sense (which it cannot have). Field gives βλασφημήσει σε (= בִּרְכַךְ cf. 2 K 19<sup>6.22</sup> or יְבָרַךְ Is 52<sup>5</sup>).

v. 6. *yet (or only) spare his life*. To take it would be to defeat the object of these dealings with Eyob—the thorough testing of his godliness. Iahvah again yields to the force of the Satan's argument; as though it had not occurred to Himself.

G's Ἰδοὺ παραδιδωμί σοι αὐτόν hardly denotes any difference of reading from M. It is merely an elegant paraphrase of a Hebraism.

v. 7. a malignant eczema or virulent eruption; Heb. שָׁחִין *a bad burning or inflammation*. The root is seen in the Assyrian šahānu, *to blaze up, burn, become hot* (Sumerian BI-BI, written *fire + fire*), šuhnu, *daybreak*, as well as in Aram. שָׁחִין *to be or become warm, hot*, and Arab. سَخَنَ *be hot*, and then *to be inflamed* (of the eye). The same term שָׁחִין is used of Hezekiah's boil, 2 K 20<sup>7</sup>; and in Dt 28<sup>35</sup> we have the same phrase, with the same description of the spread of the disease; יִכַּבֵּה יְהוָה בְּשָׁחִין רֶגֶל מִכַּף רִגְלָךְ וְעַד קִדְקֹד: *Iahva will smite thee with a malignant eczema . . . from the sole of thy foot to the crown of thy head*. A שָׁחִין is one of the symptoms of incipient leprosy, according to Le 13<sup>18-20, 23</sup>; and it is generally assumed, partly on this ground, which by itself is certainly far from conclusive, but more especially on the ground of the numerous descriptive allusions in the speeches of Eyob, that his malady was the worst form of leprosy (Elephantiasis, lepra tuberculosa, 'Black Leprosy'). But there seems no reason why, if leprosy were meant, a popular story which makes no pretence to poetical diction, should have preferred to describe this well-known scourge of the East by an ambiguous expression, instead of using the ordinary word (Dt 24<sup>8</sup> Le 13<sup>9-11</sup> 2 K 5<sup>3ff.</sup> צָרַעַת). As we have seen, שָׁחִין is the name of Hezekiah's affection; it is also the designation of the sixth Plague of Egypt, Ex 9<sup>9-11</sup> (Bubonic or Oriental plague?). Perhaps the narrator need not have had any specific disease in his mind. In a moment, as it would seem, the Satan makes his victim a mass of ulcers from head to foot; whereas the supposed malady develops slowly at first, and spreads by degrees over the body. We might almost say that it is left to the imagination of the audience (or the reader) to recall the features of the most hideous disease known to it, whether plague or some form of leprosy.

*from the sole of his foot*; so that the disease, as it would seem, progressed from below upwards, as Elephantiasis is said to do, 'breaking out below the knees, and gradually spreading over the whole body' (Davidson). Cf. Dt 28<sup>35</sup>, quoted above: *Iahvah will smite thee with a malignant eruption upon the knees and upon the legs . . .*

v. 8. An intolerable itching is the frequent accompaniment of skin-diseases. Eyob, in his misery, goes and sits down 'amid the ashes'; i.e. in all probability on the mound outside the village, the *mazbala* (مَزْبَلَة) or Mezbelè, 'the place of dung' (*zibl*), as it is called in modern Arabic: formed in the course of years by accumulations of the droppings of horses, camels, &c., and all the other rubbish of the place. From time to time the dung is burnt, and the ashes are left on the spot. Under the action of the winter rains the whole mass of mixed material is gradually welded into a solid hill of earth, the top of which serves as the village look-out and a place of social intercourse in the sultry evenings.

Children play round it all day long; and there the poor outcasts of disease, expelled from the village, pass their days and nights (Wetzstein *ap. Delitzsch*). That  $\Theta$  took this view of the meaning is evident from its rendering  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\omicron\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ , and he sat on the dunghill outside the town. Cf. 1 Sa 2<sup>s</sup> (where  $\kappa\omicron\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$  = אֲשָׁפֶת, as in Ps 113<sup>7</sup>||).  $\mathfrak{B}$  in sterquilinio.

to scratch or scrape himself with it.  $\mathfrak{M}$  להחנרר, a  $\alpha\pi$ . λεγόμε. The sense is clear from the context, as well as from Aram.  $\text{ܠܚܢܪܪ}$  to scratch ( $\S$  Ju 8<sup>16</sup>), Phoen. מנררים *flesh-scrapers*, CIS 338. 4, Arab. جَرَّ peel bark, &c.  $\Theta^B$  paraphrases  $\text{ἵνα τὸν ἰχῶρα ξύῃ}$ , that he might scrape off the matter ( $\Theta^A$   $\text{ἵνα ἀποξέῃ τὸν ἰχῶρα αὐτοῦ}$ ).

v. 9. As in Gn 3<sup>6</sup> the weaker sex succumbs first to the evil influence, and then tempts the stronger. Cf. also Gn 19<sup>26</sup>. The natural effect of Eyob's fate upon a mind of the common sort is well suggested by the behaviour of Eyob's wife (Duhm). It is not supposed that she is a specially wicked or irreligious woman. Hers is simply a counsel of despair. She has no doubt that blasphemy involves instant death; and she holds that to be a less evil than to die by inches as her husband must—a death of lingering and ever-increasing pain.

Instead of the first member of this verse (v. 9 a)  $\Theta$  puts a speech of considerable length into the mouth of Eyob's wife. We may render the Greek as follows: *Now when much time had passed, his wife said to him, How long wilt thou be steadfast, saying, 'Lo, I will wait (ἀναμενῶ?) yet a little while, Expecting the hope of my salvation?' For lo, thy memorial hath been destroyed from the earth, (Thy) sons and daughters, pangs and throes of my womb, Whom in vain I travailed with in labour! And thou thyself sittest in wormy decay, passing the night out of doors; While I, a wanderer and a hireling, (Go about) from place to place and from house to house, Expecting (i.e. longing for) the sunset, That I may rest from my labours and the sorrows that now oppress me. But speak some word unto (v. against) Iahvah, and die!* The Greek of this curious and interesting interpolation leaves something to be desired in point of accuracy (e.g. the anarthrous nouns and the phrase οὗς . . . ἐκοιτάσα in 9 b and the lack of a finite verb in 9 d). Idioms and ideas alike suggest a writer who was far from being at home in Greek. They may indicate a Hebrew original. The brevity of  $\mathfrak{M}$  is much more impressive; but the fuller text of  $\Theta$  may perhaps preserve an excerpt from a more diffuse recension of the story which anciently existed, and which the author of the book abridged to suit his purpose. The Hebrew may have run somewhat as follows: וַיְהִי כִּמְלֵךְ יָמִים וַתֹּאמֶר לוֹ אִשְׁתּוֹ עַד אֵנָה תַחֲזֹק לֵאמֹר הֲנִי מִקֹּוה (7<sup>s</sup>) עוֹד מַעֲט וַיַּחֲלֵתִי חֲקוֹת יִשְׁעִי: כִּי הִנֵּה זָכַרְךָ אֲבָר מִן הָאָרֶץ (18<sup>17</sup>) בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת חָבֵל בְּטַנִּי וַיִּנְעִי אִשֶּׁר לָרִיק יַנְעִתִי (39<sup>16</sup>) בַּעֲמָל:

ואתה ברמה (7<sup>b</sup>) תשוב ובחזון תלין ואני נודרה וּשְׁכִיבָהּ (7<sup>i</sup>) במקום ומקום  
בבית ובית אשום (17) ויחלתי לשמיט מתי יבוא (7<sup>i</sup>) לנוח מעמל וְיָנוּחַ (עצב)  
אשר יאחזני: ואולם רבר רבר ביהוה ומות:

ו. 10. Θ ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας εἶπεν αὐτῇ = וירא ויאמר אליה *and he looked at her and said to her*. In what follows we might correct the text of וְנָא with Merx, Siegfried, Duhm, so as to get the sense *As one of the silly wantons would speak, wilt thou also speak? Shall we receive, &c.* (To extricate this sense, we must point גַּם־אָתָּה תִּרְבְּרִי and assume that אַתְּ the *Not. Accusat.* has fallen out after אַתְּ *thou*, f.) Besides accounting for the otherwise difficult גַּם, we thus throw Eyob's reply into the metrical form of a tetrastich, as Duhm observes, comparing 1<sup>21</sup>. The metre, however, halts badly, and the diction is prosaic. In the third stichus we must at least read מִיְהוָה for מֵאֵת הָאֱלֹהִים to secure even a semblance of metre. Moreover, the stress laid on the pronoun—'thou also' or 'even thou'—as though Eyob expected his wife to be a paragon of piety, agrees better with modern and Western than with ancient Oriental sentiment in regard to women. Besides, Eyob's wife had spoken as directly and positively as possible: *Curse God and die!* and to such an open incentive to blasphemy a plain and positive rebuke was a far more natural reply (so all the versions) than the indirect remonstrance of a question. But an Interrogative Particle would be eminently in place before the indignant question that follows. We therefore propose אִם *num?* instead of נָא *etiam*. Cf. Gn 38<sup>17</sup> Ju 5<sup>8</sup> chap. 6<sup>12</sup>. Θ (εἰ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐδεξάμεθα καλ.) Σ (Si bona, suscepimus &c.) favour our view (εἰ = אִם, *ut saep.*). Σ omit נָא (אִם); but לָחֹדֶר (‘auch’, Levy), as in 28<sup>27</sup> 30<sup>2</sup>.

*the silly wantons.* The *nabal* (נָבָל Ps 141; fem. נִבְלָה here only) is the fool who is wanting in moral and spiritual insight; a grossly selfish and sensual nature, insensible alike to human and religious obligations; the character of which Nabal (1 Sa 25) is the type, and which is sketched in its essential features by Isaiah (32<sup>6</sup>). Hence the cognate nouns נִבְלָה and נִבְלִיּוֹת came to be used of the most glaring instances of human ‘folly’—offences against sexual righteousness, and of the dishonour and disgrace attending them (Gn 34<sup>7</sup> Ju 19<sup>23</sup> 2 Sa 13<sup>12</sup> Ho 2<sup>12</sup>).

*Are we actually to accept, &c.* See the previous note. The text of וְנָא cannot be rendered *we receive good . . . and shall we not also receive evil?* (Davidson), though such a rendering agrees well enough with the general meaning of the words, which seems to be expressed in the verse of Baxter's noble hymn:

‘Take what He gives  
And praise Him still,  
Through good and ill,  
Who ever lives!’

Our text perhaps breathes more nearly the spirit of Eli's resignation: 'It is Iahvah: let Him do what seemeth Him good!' (1 Sa 3<sup>18</sup>). It is not for man to take exception to the Divine dealings, even when they run counter to his welfare and his wishes. Are we to honour God only in prosperity? (This was exactly what the Satan alleged to be the real character of Eyob's religion.)

*In all this Eyob sinned not with his lips.* ☉ *in all these things that had befallen him, Eyob sinned nothing with his lips before God.* Cf. on 1<sup>22</sup>. It was one of the characteristics of the *nabal* 'to speak error of Iahvah' (Is 32<sup>6</sup>): cf. on 1<sup>5</sup>; 42<sup>7</sup>. ז has the curious addition ברם ברעיוניה הרהר במלין *but in his mind he thought on words*; viz. those which he afterwards uttered in his speeches. According to Baba Bathra, 16 a, 'with his lips he sinned not; in his heart he sinned' (בלבו חטא). That, however, is not the meaning here, where the emphasis on בשפתיו *with his lips* is to be understood otherwise, as explained above, notes on 1<sup>5</sup>. The Targumist was no doubt shocked by the daring language of the speeches, which contrasts so conspicuously with the tone of complete resignation in the Prologue. Hence his harmonistic addition, as if the meaning were *So far Eyob sinned not with his lips, whatever he may have been meditating in his heart.*

vv. 11-13. EYOB'S THREE FRIENDS PAY HIM A VISIT OF CONDOLENCE. *Eliphaz the Temanite.* Eliphaz appears as a 'Son' of Esau, i.e. a tribal division or clan of Edom, Gn 36<sup>4</sup>; while Teman is in like manner a 'Son' or sept of Eliphaz, Gn 36<sup>11</sup>, and the name also of its territory, Am 1<sup>12</sup> Ob<sup>3</sup> Je 49<sup>7</sup> Ez 25<sup>13</sup>. Evidently, therefore, this friend of Eyob's is an Edomite. The wisdom of the Temanites was proverbial; see Ob Je ll. cc.

The name of Eyob's wisest friend is thus seen not to have been coined for the purposes of the story. Like Semitic personal names in general, it is of course significant; but it can hardly mean *God is fine gold* (OL doubtfully). *God crusheth* (cf. Assy. ina qâtika tepéziz, *with thy hand thou didst crush*: MA s.v. pazâzu) is more probable (cf. also Gn 49<sup>24</sup> ויפּוּ זרעֵי ירֵדוּ, or *God leapeth* (Syr. use of the root), with possible reference to a Goat-god.

*Bildad the Shuhite* or Shuchite belonged to the tribe of Shuah (Shuach), which was of Qeṭurean stock, and was located somewhere to the east of Palestine (Gn 25<sup>2-6</sup>). The Sûḥu (mât Sûḥi, land of Sûḥu) of the Assyrian records (TP Cyl. v. 48), an Aramean district on the upper Euphrates, and the gentilic derivative Sûḥâia (Su-ḥa-a-a), Suchite, have been compared. The name Bildad probably involves that of the Storm-god, Hadad, various forms of which are supplied by the cuneiform inscriptions (Adad, Addu, Dadda, Dadi, &c.). It has been identified with Bir-Dadda, an Arab chief mentioned by Assurbanipal (KAT<sup>3</sup> p. 450); but the first element, Bil, perhaps represents the Aram. בֵּל (= Assy. Bēl), *Lord*,



and the Bedad of Gn 36<sup>35</sup> ('Hadad ben Bedad', a king of Edom) certainly looks like Bildad with the *l* accidentally omitted.

*Zophar the Naamathite* (הנעמתי), the reading of מ, can hardly be right. Naamah was a small town in SW. Judah (Jos 15<sup>41</sup>), whereas the other localities mentioned, Uz, Teman, and Shuah, were all situated beyond the eastern border of Palestine. Θ Σωφάρ ὁ Μειναίων βασιλεύς, *Zophar the king of the Minaeans* (Σωφάρ ὁ Μειναῖος, 11<sup>1</sup> 20<sup>1</sup> 42<sup>9</sup>); whence Hommel acutely conjectured המעוני, so that Zophar would belong to the S. Arabian state of Ma'ân, which has become famous through Glaser's discoveries. Another attractive conjecture is that of Dozy, who read הרעמתי *the Raamathite*. Raamah (Ra'mat) was an Arabian trade-centre, which is mentioned along with Ma'ân in one of Glaser's Sabeian inscriptions. Cf. 1 C 4<sup>41</sup> 2 C 26<sup>7</sup> (המעונים); Ez 27<sup>22</sup>; Hommel AHT 240; 252. As for Zophar (צופר, Σωφάρ), it may be the Hebrew transcription of a South Arabian name otherwise unknown; but not improbably it may be regarded as a scribal error for Zippor (צפור), which appears as a Moabite (Nu 22<sup>2</sup>) and, in the fem. form Zipporah (Ex 2<sup>21</sup>), a Midianite name. (Midian was a brother-tribe of Shuah, Gn 25<sup>2</sup>.) In Gn 36<sup>11.15</sup> Θ gives Σωφάρ for צופר, the third 'Son' of Eliphaz ben Esau. If that be the true reading there, Zophar also will have been of Edom.

*Had come . . . came . . . to come.* Not so much 'unbehilflich' (Du) as a trace of the natural simplicity of an oral narrative. *to condole with him* or *lament for him*, RV *bemoan him*, as if he were dead (Je 22<sup>10</sup>). Strictly, לָנוּד is *to move to and fro*, to shake the head or rock the body in token of grief, as mourners do. When we read (42<sup>11</sup>) that, after the tide had turned, all Eyob's kinsfolk and acquaintance 'came . . . and condoled with him and comforted him', it certainly looks as if the popular story must have represented Eyob's second trial as of brief duration. (In 7<sup>3</sup> the parallelism and entire context seem to require ימי *days* instead of ירחי *months*. Contr. Driver, *Intro.*, p. xiii.) The author of the book may have supposed a period of a lunar month from the arrival of the Friends to the close of the argument. (The seven days of silent mourning are followed by twenty-one speeches, each of which might be regarded as requiring a day for its delivery and subsequent consideration.)

v. 12. Lit. *And they lifted up their eyes afar off and recognized him not.* They could see him from some distance, because he was sitting on the mound, v. 8. They did not know him, because of the visible ravages of his malady.

*They burst, &c.* Lit. as AV *throwing it up into the air*; lit. *heavenward*. The idea underlying this symbolical action was perhaps that of darkening the air, since darkness is a natural symbol of sorrow and distress (Is 8<sup>22</sup> al.). Cf. Jos 7<sup>8</sup> 1 Sa 4<sup>12</sup> (*earth on his head*; so 2 Sa 1<sup>2</sup>) 2 Sa 13<sup>19</sup> (*ashes on her head*) Ne 9<sup>1</sup> (*earth on them*). As a funeral custom,

the primitive Semitic meaning may have been that of being buried with the dear departed.

v. 13. Sitting on the ground was a natural posture of humiliation and mourning (Is 3<sup>26</sup> La 2<sup>10</sup> Ez 26<sup>16</sup>). Seven days was the usual time of mourning for the dead: see Gn 50<sup>10</sup> 1 Sa 31<sup>13</sup> Eccus 22<sup>12</sup>. The Friends mourn for Eyob as for a dead man, knowing that his disease is mortal.

Chapter 3. EYOB IS THE FIRST TO SPEAK. HE CURSES THE DAY OF HIS BIRTH. As others have noticed, Eyob speaks at the 'psychological' moment. He could answer his wife with dignified restraint, but the sympathy of his friends was more than he could bear. So he relieves his pent-up emotion by this passionate outcry (*see* Davidson). Whether this effect was intended by the author we can hardly say for certain. What does seem to be fairly certain is that he did not consider that, by such an utterance, Eyob was declining at all from the high level of his own piety. Christian sentiment may well be shocked by the violence of the language; but it must always be remembered that we are dealing with a pre-Christian writer. The historical instance of the prophet Jeremiah, who did not hesitate to express his despairing mood in precisely similar language (Je 20<sup>14-18</sup>), proves that such a mode of bemoaning oneself was not regarded as at all reprehensible within the circle of Old Testament ideas. To us there may seem to be something irrational in cursing (imprecating evil on) a day, and that a day long past. How could a day be affected by either blessing or cursing? Was it supposed that the wish, good or evil, would affect the character of the particular day of the month, so that henceforth it would be either a lucky or an unlucky day, according to the nature of the wish? Whatever the original significance of the practice, in the olden times when magic was a dominant note in religion, we cannot suppose that either Jeremiah or the author of our book intended more than a lyrical expression of the wish, *Would that I had never been born!* (vv. 1-10). (The parallel in Je l. c. is not strictly poetry, but prophetic prose, which is often more rhythmical in structure, because more emotional and elevated in substance, than ordinary prose. The mythical and magical allusions of v. 8 find no place in the prophet.)

An example of cursing a day, which demonstrates that it was a custom not unknown to the primitive ages of Semitic (and probably Sumerian) antiquity, may be recognized in the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh, in the famous episode of the Flood, where Ishtar, the Mother of Mankind, indignant at their destruction, exclaims: 'O that that day had perished (lit. *returned to dust*), when I in the Assembly of Gods decreed an evil thing!' (ûmu ullû ana ãtãti lû-itûr-ma aššû anâku îna puhur ilâni aqbû limutta! NE xi. 119).

After the introductory formulas, vv. 1-2, the chapter falls naturally into three divisions, which may be summarized by the headings—

- (1) *O that I had never been born!* (vv. 3-10);  
 (2) *O that I had died at birth!* (vv. 11-19);  
 (3) *Why do the wretches live on, who long only to die?* (vv. 20-26).

v. 1. *his day*; i.e. *the day of his birth*, rather than his birthday, which usually denotes the commemoration or anniversary of one's birth. Cf. on 1<sup>4</sup>. *Opened his mouth* = began to speak (Mt 5<sup>2</sup>). Cf. the equivalent phrase of the Babylonian Epics *pāšu êpuš-ma iqabbî, his mouth he opened and speaketh*.

v. 2. Lit. *And Eyob answered and said*; a frequent formula, from Gn 18<sup>27</sup> onwards. As no one had spoken, the vb. ענה (ייען) appears to be used here idiomatically in the sense of responded to the occasion, spoke in view of the circumstances (cf. Ju 18<sup>14</sup> 1 Sa 9<sup>17</sup> Is 14<sup>10</sup>). 𐤁𐤏 has simply λέγων for this verse, for the sake of style and to avoid what seemed a needless prolixity (but 𐤁𐤏 pr. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη 'Ιωβ).

v. 3. The day is poetically regarded as a real being or substantive entity, which holds its place and always returns in the yearly cycle. Cf. Gn 1<sup>3-5</sup> Ps 19<sup>3</sup> chap. 38<sup>19</sup>. In what sense could it 'perish'? Only by being made the perpetual prey of clouds and darkness (Jo 2<sup>2</sup>), as the sequel indicates. Cf. also Am 4<sup>13</sup> 5<sup>8</sup>. Henceforth, he cries, let it always be a day of sunless gloom, lost in eternal night! Nay more, as a *dies funestus*, a hopelessly unlucky day, let it find no place in the calendar (v. 6), but be erased from the list of the days of the month!

*the day I was born* = יוֹם אֲוִלָּדִי בּוֹ; with elliptical Relative Clause, as often in poetry. Je 20<sup>14</sup> has the more prosaic construction הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר יֵלְדֵנִי בּוֹ *the day on which I was born* (Pf.). Our אֲוִלָּדִי (Impf.) *I begin to be born, come to birth*, is much more lively. *and the Night (that) said* = וַהֲלֵילָה אָמַר; again with Ellipsis of the Relative, as in the parallel stichus. (So 𐤁) וַהֲלֵילָה אָמַר *and the Night which was saying* is not so likely, לֵילָה being the form in Job passim (v. 7; 17<sup>12</sup> et al. novies), and לֵיל (Is 16<sup>3</sup>) being of very rare occurrence. הָאָמַר (late use of ה as Relat., cf. perhaps 2<sup>11</sup> Jos 10<sup>24</sup>) is too prosy, though better than הָאָמַר. The cry 'Behold a Man!' would be momentary, not continuous. The Night speaks, because personified (cf. Ps 19<sup>2</sup>). According to 𐤁𐤏 it said הָרָה נָכַר = 𐤁𐤏 Conceptus est homo! הָרָה being intended for Pual Pf. of הָרָה *to conceive* (so 𐤁 𐤁). But a reference to the time of conception, which would necessarily be unknown, seems out of place, and is a strange ὑστερον πρότερον here, where being born is the dominant idea (cf. v. 10). Otherwise we might read אִמִּי *my mother*, instead of אָמַר, and taking הָרָה (= הוֹרָה) as Ptcp. Qal, render the whole stichus *And the Night (when) my Mother was conceiving a Man!* But 𐤁 𐤏δὸν ἄρσεν, *Behold a Male!* (= הנה נבר) is decidedly preferable. The הנה may have been wrongly transferred from the margin here to v. 7, where it spoils the metre, and is not required by the sense. (הָרָה was perhaps rather a

scribal corruption of this word than of the doubtful *הִנֵּה* Behold!) There is no reason why *נָבַר* should not have been used as a poetical equivalent of the purely prose-word *זָכַר* *male* (Je 20<sup>15</sup>).

(The Targum *וְלַיְלָא דִּי אָמַר אֲתַבְּרָא נָבַר* and the Night which said, A man is created clearly supports וַיֵּצֵא. <sup>B</sup>καὶ ἡ νύξ ἐκείνη [om. ἐκ· <sup>A</sup>εἰπὼν] <sup>A</sup>εἶπεν [εἶπον <sup>A</sup>] and that [the] Night in which they said takes אָמַר as Impers. and implies בּוֹ after it, which is probably wrong, though supplied by <sup>C</sup>וַלַּיְלָא דִּרְחֵמָא בָּהּ and the Night in which it was said.)

v. 4. *That Day become Darkness!* Bickell omits, and Duhm prefers <sup>C</sup>וְלַיְלָא דִּי אָמַר אֲתַבְּרָא נָבַר (so Beer). But surely darkness is already the essential characteristic of Night (Gn 1<sup>5</sup>). As I understand the first section, vv. 3-10, after an introductory couplet cursing the Day and the Night successively, we have first the development of the curse on the Day in three triplets followed by a closing couplet, and then that of the curse on the Night in a couplet followed by a triplet and a couplet. The stichus *That Day become Darkness!* (cf. Am 4<sup>13</sup> 5<sup>8</sup> Is 13<sup>10</sup> Je 13<sup>16</sup>) corresponds in form to the opening stichus of the curse on the Night: *That Night become stone-barren!* (v. 7).

*Light (or the Dawn) seek it not from above!* reading אֹר instead of וַיֵּצֵא, אֲלֹהִים, <sup>C</sup>ὁ κύριος, as in 4<sup>17</sup> 5<sup>17</sup> 6<sup>8</sup> al. אֹר agrees better with the || נִהְרָה = Aram. נְהִירָא *light* in the next stichus. Further, instead of וַיֵּצֵא יִרְשָׁו *seek it*, which does not seem very appropriate here, even if we keep וַיֵּצֵא and render *God regard it not* (or *care not for it*), Dt 11<sup>12</sup>, we may perhaps restore יִפְרֹשׁ (cf. 36<sup>30</sup>) and make the stichus אֲלֵיפְרֹשׁ אֹר *Light spread not over it!*

v. 5. *Deathshade.* A compound like צִלְמוֹת *shade of death*, in which the two elements are clearly discernible at sight (צֶל *shade* + מוֹת *death*), is rare, if not unparalleled. How can מוֹת *death*, that is, *the state or place of the dead* (28<sup>22</sup> 38<sup>17</sup>), be supposed to cast a shadow, especially as צֶל is usually a metaphor of protection and grateful refreshment rather than darkness (cf. 7<sup>2</sup>)? The idea of Death as a dread angel (see on 18<sup>14</sup>), who casts a dark shadow on his victim, will not do. Death is not so personified in the OT, though the place (or city; cf. 38<sup>17</sup>) of the dead may be personified like any city or country of the living, e.g. Jerusalem or Babylon. The analysis of צִלְמוֹת seems to depend, therefore, on popular etymology or perhaps on a mere fancy of the Massoretes; and the word should probably be pointed צִלְמוֹת *blackness, pitch-darkness*, as Ewald long ago maintained. Cf. Assyr. çalmu (צִלְמוֹ), *black*, and the corresponding Arab. root ظَلَمَ *to be dark*, whence ظُلْمَةٌ *darkness*. (Cf. Am 5<sup>8</sup> where צִלְמוֹת, as here, has no reference to Death or She'ol, but means simply the darkness of night.)

*bedim it.* וַיִּגְאֹלֶהוּ *redeem it, or claim it* (as next of kin), RV *claim it*

for their own; a meaning which does not really harmonize with the context. AV *stain it* derives the word from נָאֵל to defile. In that case we must point יִנְאֵלְהוּ Pi. (cf. Is 63<sup>3</sup>): cf. יִטְנֵנִי יְחִיָּה pollute it = Aq. μολύναι αὐτήν. Ⓢ ἐλάβου (δε) αὐτήν, seize it (and carry it off), suggests a possible Aramaism יִפְלֵהוּ *darken it* (Tg Am 5<sup>8</sup> 8<sup>9</sup>), mispointed יִפְלֵהוּ *take it*; cf. Ⓢ Obscure eum tenebrae. Ⓢ נִסְתָּוֶיהָ cover it. We might also conjecture an אפ. λεγόμε. יִפְלֵהוּ *darken it*; cf. אפל, v. 6. (Of course, Ⓢ may have misread יִקְהוּ = λάβου here from v. 6.)

*Benightings of day.* Or *Eclipses of day.* Lit., as it would seem, *Blacknesses* or *Gloominesses*; אפ. λεγ. plur. tant. (כמר vb., La 5<sup>10</sup>†). Possibly an Intensive Plur. *Dunkest gloom*; otherwise the various causes of darkness in the daytime, such as eclipses, storms, &c., may be intended. The root is seen in Syr. حَقَسَ black, dark, gloomy, of a cloud, a glen, night, the face. (Ⓢ καταραθείη ἡ ἡμέρα, *Accursed be the Day!* as if Ⓢ מֵאָרֶר! instead of Ⓢ מְרִירִי יוֹם, omitting יִבְעָתָהּ. Text prob. imperfect. Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ wrongly connect with מרר *bitter*; either neglecting the כ, or making it the Particle of Comparison; e.g. Ⓢ מְרִירִי יוֹמָא.)

*Affright it.* יִבְעָתָהּ. It is gratuitous to alter this to יִתְעַכְּהוּ. The verb בעת occurs in Job eight times out of a total of sixteen in OT.

v. 6. The text of this and the following verses is disordered: see on v. 4. *That Day.* Ⓢ הלילה *That Night*; and so the Versions. Sense and context demand היום. It was his 'Day' that Eyob wished might be expunged from the calendar. *Be it not one in or among the Days.* Point יִחַר, fr. יָחַר to be united or one (with). So AV. The || Gn 49<sup>6</sup> (where both verbs אֶל־יָחַר and אֶל־תֵּבֵא with בְּ occur as here) proves that this is correct. So Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ. RV *Let it not rejoice among the days*, &c., pointing יִתֵּן from יָחַד to rejoice (so OL); but this does not suit the parallel stichus, and, parallelism apart, where are days (or months or years) said to 'rejoice' elsewhere in OT?

*Nor be counted in the Days of the Month*; lit. *Into the number of the months let it not come!* (cf. Gn 49<sup>6a</sup>): i. e. Let it not be reckoned as a day of the month. We might read: במספר ימיריח אל־יבא *Into the number of the month's days let it not come!* Ⓢ εἰς ἡμέρας μηνῶν = יְחִיָּהּ אֶל־יִמְנָה gives the sense, and may even be original, or at least represent another recension of the Hebrew text.

v. 7. This verse evidently introduces the special curse on the Night, continued in vv. 9, 10; whereas v. 8 as evidently refers to the Day. We have therefore transposed vv. 7, 8. (Possibly v. 8 originally preceded v. 6<sup>b</sup>, which might be considered a more appropriate climax to the curse on the Day.) *That Night be stone-barren.* The הנה *Lo* of Ⓢ overloads the line, giving four stresses for three, and must be omitted here with Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ. See note on v. 3<sup>b</sup>. The quadriliteral נִלְמַד, which recurs at 15<sup>34</sup> (but prob. not at 30<sup>3</sup>: see the note there) and Is 49<sup>21</sup> in the fem.

גְּלִמְרָה, is akin to Ar. جَلْدٌ and جُلُودٌ *rock*, جَلْدَةٌ *stony*, of ground; which explains the metaphorical use in Hebrew, stony ground being naturally barren. Cf. the Chinese phrases shih nü, *stone* (= barren) *woman*; shih tai, *a stone* (= barren) *womb*. (⊗ ὀδύνη *pain*; = 𐤀 𐤍𐤁 id. (also *disgrace*); but 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 *deprived, bereaved, childless, lonely, barren* (of land); 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 *lacking, wanting*; 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 = μεμονωμένη *al.*; Σ ἐκβλητος, *outcast*.

*joyous birthshout*; 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 *a ringing cry* of joy or triumph (20<sup>6</sup>). The context gives the precise application; cf. also Je 20<sup>15</sup>. The gloss of 𐤀 is different: 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 *Let not the cry of the wild cock* (𐤀 39<sup>13</sup>) *enter it to praise!* (See 𐤀 38<sup>36</sup> also. The 'Cock of the Wild' is a fabulous bird; 𐤀 Ps 50<sup>11</sup>: but 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃, Syr. 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃, is the Sumerian DAR-LUGÁLA, gallus, 'King of the Fowls').

v. 8. *Day-enchanters*; lit. *cursters of day*: i.e. sorcerers who by their spells professed to be able to darken the sky with storm and eclipse; who were always 'ready' (𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃) to rouse from his slumber the great celestial dragon who causes darkness and tempest. Obviously we are here on mythological ground. The ideas, however, are not specially Babylonian, but belong to the circle of primitive Asiatic beliefs, which were the common heritage of the Semitic nations. There is no trace of the word or quasi-proper name (always anarthrous) 𐤀 𐤍𐤁𐤀𐤃 Leviathan ('ΑΣ Λευιαθάν here and 40<sup>20</sup>) in Assyrio-Babylonian literature, where eclipses and obscurations of the moon and storms are ascribed to the agency of the Seven Evil Spirits. Of these the second is described as 'a Dragon open-mouthed' (USHUM-GAL, Great Worm; KA-GÁL, mouth-open), and the fourth as another kind of serpent, perhaps the fabled 'basilisk' (MUSH-MIR, serpent + crown or crest?); while the first is the South Wind, so destructive in Babylonia (IM-GALLU), the seventh another stormy wind or hurricane (IM-MIRRA IM-ĠULA), the third a fierce leopard, and the fifth and sixth other savage beasts at present undetermined.

'These Seven are Messengers of Anu the King;  
Town after town in twilight they put;  
Hurricanes, over Heaven madly they hunt;  
Thick clouds, over Heaven rain and darkness they put;  
Rushing blasts, bright Day darkness they make.'

(It is noteworthy that the Seven Evil Spirits are 'Messengers', LU KIN-GÁ, *mār šipri*, of the King of Heaven. They are 'Evil Angels', מלאכים רעים: cf. Ps 78<sup>49</sup>). Further on in the same tablet we read: DUB-SAG-TA UD-SAR (D.) EN-ZUNA SHUR-BI BAN-DIBBESH, 'Confronting the Crescent, (*the god*) Sîn they wrathfully surrounded' (*iltanawwû*; cf. Heb. *Liwyatan* fr. *lawah*). Then the god Enlil (Bêl) 'the hero Sîn's darkening in Heaven beheld', and sent the ill news to En-ki

(Ea) in the Deep: 'My Son Sîn in Heaven his Darkness is sore!' (DU-MU D. EN-ZUNA ANNA SU-MUGGA-BI GIGGA). Ea, as usual, commissions his Son Mardug (Merodach) to intervene: 'Go, my Son Merodach! the Prince's Son, the New Moon, (*the god*) Sîn, in Heaven his Darkness is sore; His Darkness Heaven pervadeth!' (GINNA DU-MU D. ASARI DU-KU UD-SAR D. EN-ZUNA ANNA SU-MUGGA-BI GIGGA SU-MUGGA-BI ANNA DALLA-MUN-EA). Merodach, as usual, puts things to rights. Lastly, in a subsequent spell or exorcism, it is said of the same Evil Spirits: 'Sîn in Heaven's heart to Darkness they turned!' (D. EN-ZUNA ANNA-SHAB-TA SU-MUGGA GI-ESH). See *Utukki Limnûti*, Tab. XVI (CT xvi, Pl. 19); and cf. Thompson, *Devils*, p. 89 sqq.

The agents in these old Sumerian texts are, as we see, superhuman; but our verse as evidently contemplates human agency like that of the 'Lapland witches', famous in European folk-lore for raising winds and storms. The name Leviathan or Livyātān (H. לִיְיָתָן) is as pure Hebrew (Canaanite) as נְחֻשְׁטָן *Nehušṭān*; another word which has elicited considerable difference of opinion. Formally, however, נְחֻשְׁטָן may be a contracted dual = נְחֻשְׁתַּיִם (Ju 16<sup>21</sup> al.), *brazen fetters* (2 Sa 3<sup>34</sup>); cf. רִתְיָן, רִתְיָנָה, Gn 37<sup>17</sup>. Hezekiah's contemptuous nickname for the Brazen Serpent (נֶחֱשׁ הַנְּחֻשֶׁת) might rest on a real or fanciful resemblance of the serpent coiled in two rings round its standard to a pair of bronze fetters (two rings with a cross-piece linking them together); such as we see in the Assyrian sculptures. Similarly, לִיְיָתָן may be dual of לִיָּה (archaic *liyāṭ*), something round, e.g. a wreath (Pr 1<sup>9</sup>), from לָוָה = Assy. *lamû* (*lawû*), *to go round, surround*; hence perhaps also a *ring*, or *coil*, so that Livyātān = *Double-Coil*, a suitable designation of a serpentine monster. But another interpretation suggests itself. Taking לִיְיָתָן in the sense in which it actually occurs twice in Proverbs, we may explain לִיְיָתָן *Two Wreaths* as denoting a Two-crested or Two-headed serpent or hydra; cf. Ps 74<sup>14</sup>, 'Twas Thou that didst crush Leviathan's heads', a reference to another myth about the Storm-serpent. From 26<sup>13</sup>, compared with Is 27<sup>1</sup>, we learn that Livyathan was also known as 'the Fugitive or Fleeing Serpent', and the cause of darkness in the sky. It is the mythical aspect of the long trailing clouds that obscure the light before and during a storm. In the prophets (Is 27<sup>1</sup>; cf. 51<sup>9</sup> Ez 29<sup>3</sup> 32<sup>2</sup>) such allusions are merely symbolical of the contemporary world-powers, and need not imply belief in the popular mythology; but our passage (3<sup>8</sup>) has a more original aspect, being a direct reference to the practices of contemporary magic, and apparently implying a belief in the primitive explanation of the phenomena of storm and eclipse. Iahvah, however, has the final control (26<sup>13</sup>). The Chinese say that, in an eclipse, the Moon is devoured by the Hia-ma (or Ha-ma) yu, 'The Toad-fish' (Morrison: Devil-fish).

Eclipse is shih, 'devour', written with the characters for *eating* and *serpent*, *reptile* (see my *Comp. Sign-list*, no. 91; ap. *Chinese and Sumerian*). In Ps 104<sup>26</sup> the Liwyatan figures as a monster of the Deep—perhaps the great 'Sea Serpent' (cf. 7<sup>12</sup>). Among the monsters created by Tiāmat (תַּמַּת) to help her in her war against the gods of light were MUSH-MAĠ, *erect* (or *huge*) *serpents*, USHUM-GAL, *great worms* (vid. supr.), and several other kinds of snaky or dragon forms (Bab. Creation Epic): cf. 9<sup>13</sup> 'Helpers of Rahab'. Since the Liwyatan is a water-monster, it is not very surprising to find the crocodile poetically described under this name, 40<sup>25</sup> 599. (= 41<sup>1</sup> 599.). Ophidians and Saurians were hardly distinguished with any exactness in ancient nomenclature; and Mythology has always displayed a strong predilection for blending the salient features of different classes of animals. And, in any case, a Hebrew poet might call a crocodile a 'Leviathan', much as a modern Englishman may call a strong man a Hercules, or a beautiful woman a Venus, without implying the identity of the objects compared or any belief in the mythical deities.

v. 9. *Its twilight*. עֶשְׂרָה is usually the evening twilight (24<sup>16</sup>). Here that of morning (7<sup>1</sup>) agrees better with the parallelism, and the stars are those which usher in the dawn. Otherwise, we might think of both twilights (*crepusculum* as well as *diluculum*) and both evening and morning stars. (עֶשְׂרָה is str. the *blowing*-time; i.e. the time when the evening or morning breeze springs up: Gn 3<sup>8</sup>. The root is shap, shab, seen also in נָשַׁב to *blow*, and נָשַׁף to *fant*. Cf. the Sumerian ZIB, ZIG, SUB, *evening, dusk, twilight*.) וְ inexactly: τῆς νυκτὸς ἐκείνης.

*the eyelids of dawn*. 16<sup>16</sup> 41<sup>10</sup>. A beautiful figure from the quivering and trembling of light on the arch of the horizon, which is as it were the Eye of Day. (In 16<sup>16</sup> ὁ βλεφάρους recte. Here it paraphrases καὶ μὴ ἴδοι ἑωσφόρον ἀνατέλλοντα, and *may it not see Lucifer rising!* עֶשְׂרָה = ἑωσφόρος, also 38<sup>12</sup> 41<sup>10</sup>.)

v. 10. וְ כִּי לֹא סָגַר דְּלָתַי בְּטֵנִי Because it closed not the doors of my womb. Apart from the strangeness of the expression *my womb* instead of *my mother's womb*, the line is metrically redundant (4 stresses for 3, the normal number). Pointing דְּלָתַי *my doors* and omitting בְּטֵנִי *my womb* as a marginal explanation (or variant?), we restore the metre and get a pregnant poetical phrase. וְ πύλας γαστρὸς μητρός μου: so וְ אֶמְצָא (ostia ventris qui portavit me): דְּלָתַי בְּטֵנִי *doors of my belly*, which it explains of Eyob's own organs, the navel, &c. (!)

The rhyme דְּלָתַי . . . עֵינַי suitably emphasizes the close of the first strophe. הִיד: וְ נִסְתָּר. וְ ἀπήλλαξεν = וְ נִסְתָּר removed, as 9<sup>34</sup> 27<sup>6</sup> al.

Strophe II. O THAT I HAD DIED AT OR BEFORE BIRTH! vv. 11-19. There does not seem to be any idea of a conscious existence, however feeble and shadowy, such as we find in Is 14<sup>9</sup> 599., expressed in these



pathetic verses. The grave is a place of perfect rest and unbroken peace.

v. 11. **Ⓢ** *For why died I not in the womb?* (ἐν κοιλίᾳ). Cf. v. 16. But this spoils the parallelism, and hardly agrees with the tense of the verb: lit. *Why not from the womb did I begin to die?* (*Why*) *did I (not) come forth . . . and begin to expire?* Duhm would transfer v. 16 to follow this, translating *Oder warum war ich nicht wie eine verscharrte Fehlgeburt, Wie Kinder, die das Licht nicht sahen?* But while this appears to be a gain in symmetry, it makes the Particle of Comparison seem superfluous and the Disjunctive 'Or' needless; whereas both are in place in the present position of the distich.

v. 12. *receive me*; lit. *meet or confront me*. The allusion seems to be to a custom like that which prevailed in ancient Rome. A newborn babe was laid by the nurse on the father's knees for his decision whether it was to be reared or exposed. Cf. Gn 50<sup>23</sup> (of Joseph recognizing the offspring of Machir) and Gn 30<sup>3</sup> (of Rachel adopting her maid's progeny). Duhm pronounces the verse to be 'a younger addition'. It is, he observes, 'interesting enough, but does not suit the connexion, as according to it not God, to whom the "Wherefore" is addressed, but men would have been the cause of the premature death of Hiob.' But Eyob is not yet addressing God; he is only bewailing his unhappy lot with his Friends (cf. Je 20<sup>14ff.</sup>).

v. 13. The language is hardly appropriate, on Duhm's theory of the sense: *Denn dann* (wenn ich verscharrt wäre als Fehlgeburt) *läge ich*, &c. How could a babe that had never lived be said to 'lie down' and 'rest' and 'sleep', even by the farthest stretch of poetic license? Only a babe that had actually been born and nursed (v. 12) could do so. We therefore leave v. 16 where it is.

v. 14. *Like*; lit. *with* (עִם). Cf. Ec 2<sup>16</sup>: *How dieth the Wise Man?* with (i. e. *like*) *the Fool*. Cf. also 9<sup>26</sup> 37<sup>18</sup>.

*national counsellors*: lit. *counsellors of the earth or land*. *Who rebuilt ruins for their pleasure* (lit. *for themselves*). The Heb. phrase בָּנֵה הָרִבּוֹת occurs in the sense of rebuilding ruins, Is 58<sup>12</sup> 61<sup>1</sup> Ez 36<sup>10,33</sup> Ma 1<sup>4</sup>. In the present context it reminds us of the numerous inscriptions of the kings of Assyria and Babylonia, recording their restoration of crumbling temples and palaces and decayed cities. Cf. Dan 4<sup>30</sup>. The glory of these monarchs as builders must have been famous throughout the East. And if the author lived in Babylonia, he had many impressive examples of the glory of departed greatness before his eyes. A difficulty has been made of the line because commentators desiderated something more definite and specific, which the kings built 'for themselves', that is, for their own occupation, either palaces or tombs. Hence it has been proposed to read אֲרָמְנוֹת *castles* or הִיבָלוֹת *palaces* instead of הָרִבּוֹת. After what has

been said above, there is no need to discuss either of these; but Duhm thinks there must have been mention of the rest of the grave in this line, and accepts Ewald's conjecture that *חרבות* is really a disguise or distortion of the Arabic 'hiram or ahram', the Pyramids. This is, to say the least, highly precarious. What evidence is there that the Arabs called the Pyramids *أحرام* in ancient times? Duhm, indeed, in answer to Dillmann, suggests that the Arabs chose this word (a common one in their language, denoting *forbidden ground, sanctuary*) because it came nearest to the sound of the Egyptian name; but the Egyptian for pyramid is *mer*.

The next couplet (v. 15), in construction and sense so closely connected with this one, almost demonstrates that the reference is not to the peace of the grave, but to the former greatness of those with whom, had Eyob died, he would have shared it; and at the same time it is implied that neither rank, nor renown, nor riches, exempt any from the common doom. *Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas, Regumque tures.* Hor.

(*Θ* οἱ ἡγεμῶνες ἐπὶ ξίφεσιν *who used to pride themselves on swords* = *הַרְנִים עַל-חֶרְבוֹת*; cf. 39<sup>23</sup>. *Ⲭⲓⲛⲓ* = *ⲙⲓ*.)

v. 15. Duhm translates: *Or with Princes who possess Gold, Who filled their (Grave-)houses with Silver.* It is true that *בית* *house* has been supposed to mean *tomb* in Is 14<sup>18</sup> and perhaps 53<sup>9</sup>, and we know that in Egypt especially the sepulchres of the great were constructed and decorated to resemble their former abodes. And, of course, *וְהָב לָהֶם* may mean either *who possess* or *who possessed gold*, according to the context. But it is questionable whether *בית* alone ever denotes a grave (see Box, *Isaiah*, p. 78, n. e, for the reading of Is 14<sup>18</sup>), although *בית עולם* *eternal house*, AV 'long home', Ec 12<sup>5</sup> (cf. the Palmyr. *בת עלמא*), very naturally may. To say of the dead that 'they possess gold' is a curious way of suggesting that treasure was buried with them; and if it be objected that it was an Egyptian custom to do so in the case of kings and queens (as we know from recent discoveries, e.g. that of the jewellery of the great queen Hatshepsu), it must be observed that it was not the monarchs themselves, but their survivors, who honoured the departed in this way: not to insist on the fact that the couplet speaks of 'princes', not 'kings'. Silver and gold are mentioned merely as tokens of wealth (so in 22<sup>24,25</sup>; and cf. esp. 27<sup>16,17</sup>; 31<sup>24,27</sup> 36<sup>10</sup> Pr 1<sup>13</sup> Is 2<sup>7</sup> Gn 13<sup>2</sup>). The phrase *fill their houses* (*מלא בתיהם*) actually recurs, 22<sup>18</sup>, in much the same sense as here: cf. also Dt 6<sup>11</sup> Pr 1<sup>13</sup>.

v. 16. There seems to be something wrong with the first stichus. The whole verse looks like an abridgement of 10<sup>18,19</sup>: *And why broughtest Thou me forth from the womb? I should have died and no eye seen me! As though I had never been should I have been,—Carried from the belly to*

*the grave!* Ec 6<sup>3-5</sup> moralizes quite in the tone of the present passage: *If a man beget a hundred, and live many years, and the days of his years be many, but his soul be not satisfied with good, and also he be left unburied; methinks the nēfel is better off than he. For into nothingness it came, and into the dark it departeth, and with darkness its name is covered. Also it hath not seen the sun nor been conscious: its rest is more perfect than the other's.* And Ec 4<sup>3</sup> tells us that better off or in happier state than either dead or living is *he who hath never yet existed* (לֹא אִשָּׁר עַדְנָא הָיָה); that is to say, non-being is better than being; which is about the deepest depth of Pessimism. (The reading לֹא הָיָה, suggested by Driver, is simple and attractive, as making a better parallel with the second stichus: *Or as a stillbirth, which never had being* . . .)

From 10<sup>19</sup> we may infer that the לֹא in the first stichus is an insertion, perhaps due to the scribe's memory of the לֹא הָיָה there; cf. Θ ὥσπερ ἔκτρωμα ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς, which also omits the Neg. Particle and implies בָּטָן instead of טָמֵן; an easy confusion. No doubt Θ's Heb. copy was imperfect here, and טָמֵן hidden in the ground (cf. Ex 2<sup>12</sup>), buried out of sight at once, is right: cf. 10<sup>19b</sup> Ec 6<sup>1</sup> (the nēfel at least has burial). The omission of לֹא gives a better connexion with the preceding verses, although ⓈⓉⓂ retain it. (Ⓢ makes the verse interrogative: *Or with buried abortions why have I not been, And as babes which have not seen the light?* Ⓣ: *Or as the nifā that is hidden in its mother's womb* (cf. Je 20<sup>17</sup>), *I could not possibly exist, &c.* Ⓜ: *Aut sicut abortivum absconditum non subsisterem, &c.*)

v. 17. *There; where the dead, alike the most famous and the least regarded, are—in the grave; which is all the more vividly present to thought, because the poet does not expressly name it before the next strophe* (v. 22). 'The wicked are the disturbers of peace, as contrasted with the good, the quiet in the land: cf. 9<sup>24</sup>' (Duhm). The word רָשָׁע, rare before the Exile and found chiefly in Ezekiel, the Psalms, and the Wisdom-Literature, seems to include within its scope the ideas of irreligion, lawlessness, unscrupulous injustice, and violence. Cf. Is 14<sup>5</sup>. The root-idea seems to be that of breaking or crushing, the primitive root being RAŠ, RAŠ, RAS, which we see also in רָשַׁע Po. *beat down* or *shatter*, Syr. *bray* or *pound*, *husk* corn, *crush*; רָצַץ *crush* = Ar. رَضَّ *bruise, bray, crush*; Aram. רָסַס *break, crush* = רָסַס in Heb. רָסַס *fragment*; רָצַח *murder* = Ar. رَضَعَ, رَضَعَ *break, bruise, bray, crush*; and with Internal Trilateralization רָצַץ *shatter* = Aram. רָצַץ *smite, shatter, &c., &c.* (OL says 'cf. Ar. رَسَعَ *be loose of limbs, whence perhaps disjointed, ill-regulated*', &c. But according to Lane رَسَعَ—not رَسَعَ, which is a *vox nihili*—means *to tether a camel by the forelegs*, and رَسَعَ is a *laxness in the legs of a camel*; which does not help us much.)

For  $\text{הָיָה}$  *excitement, disquiet, rage, or turbulence*, see 39<sup>24</sup> and the vb. Is 37<sup>28, 29</sup>. With the meaning here cf. Is 57<sup>20f.</sup> All sorts and conditions of men are lulled in a common repose in the grave. 'Even the wicked there are no more agitated by the turbulence of their passions' (Da). There is here no hint of retribution in a life beyond the grave; nor indeed of any continued existence of the soul or spirit after death.

May these vivid allusions to the grandeur and lavish display (Is 27) of kings and princes, to the ungovernable passions of the 'Wicked' ( $\text{ὁ ἀσεβὴς}$ ; cf. the use of the word in 1 Macc), to the miseries of forced labour and bond-service, be taken to reflect the social conditions under which the poet lived? Their simplicity, directness, and deep feeling have all the air of truth and the colour of personal experience. They certainly do not suggest the idyllic peace of a patriarchal age. ( $\text{חֲרָלוֹ רָגוֹ}$  :  $\text{Θ}^B$ ,  $\text{ἐξέκασσαν θυμὸν ὀργῆς}$ . The vb. must be a scribal error in the Greek for  $\text{ἐξέπασσαν}$  :  $\text{Θ}^A$   $\text{ἐπασσαν}$  *recte.*) *the weary* : lit. *the weary in strength*; i. e. those worn out with bodily toil =  $\text{Θ}$   $\text{κατάκοποι τῷ σώματι}$ .

v. 18. *prisoners* : or *bondmen*. Prisoners of war and other captives, such as condemned criminals, debtors handed over to their creditors, refractory slaves, forced labourers in mines and quarries, and the like. See Gn 39<sup>20, 22</sup> Ju 16<sup>21</sup> (Samson grinding in the prison at Gaza) Ps 107<sup>10</sup> Is 14<sup>17</sup> 2 K 25<sup>27</sup>. *taskmaster* :  $\text{נִגְשֵׁי}$ , as in Ex 3<sup>11</sup> : the overseers of forced labour, represented in the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments as flourishing whips and rods over their unhappy gangs of toilers. ( $\text{Θ}$   $\text{φορολόγου}$ , *one who levies tribute*; also at 39<sup>7</sup> = the meaning in Dan 11<sup>20</sup>. For stichus i  $\text{Θ}$  gives the extraordinary version or perversion  $\text{ὁμοθυμαθὸν δὲ οἱ αἰώνιοι} = \text{עוֹלָם (עַם) אֲשֶׁר יַחַד}$ ; which might have grown out of  $\text{יַחַד (!)}$   $\text{שָׁאַנְנָו אֶסְרִיר' (ים)}$  by the running together, partial effacement, and erroneous division of letters and words, such as occur not infrequently.  $\text{עוֹלָם}$ , however, might more easily have been corrupted from  $\text{שָׁלֹן}$  or  $\text{שָׁלִי}$  (cf.  $\text{חֲסִי}$  and  $\text{נִטִּין}$ ), as a badly written  $\text{ן}$  or  $\text{י}$  might be mistaken for  $\text{ם}$ . Cf.  $\text{שָׁלוֹחַ}$ , v. 26,  $\text{יִשְׁלִין}$  12<sup>6</sup>. Thus we recover an important possible variant =  $\text{אֲשֶׁר יַחַד}$   $\text{עַם}$ .)

v. 19. *Small and great* = our 'High and low', as the || stichus shows: cf. Dt 1<sup>17</sup> 1 K 22<sup>31</sup>. Sometimes the Heb. phrase means *young and old*: Gn 19<sup>11</sup>. *free*:  $\text{פָּשָׁט}$ , as Ex 21<sup>2, 5</sup>, where  $\text{Θ}$   $\text{ἐλεύθερος}$  *recte*. Here  $\text{Θ}$   $\text{οὐ}$  ( $\text{א}^{\text{c.b}}$  A; but B om.)  $\text{δεδουκώς}$ , *not fearing*—a paraphrase not a different reading.

Strophe III. WHY DO THE WRETCHES LIVE ON, WHO LONG BUT TO DIE? vv. 20–26.

v. 20. *Why is light given . . .* So  $\text{Θ B C D A}$ .  $\text{מִן הָאֵל}$  *giveth he*; or perhaps *giveth one*, Impers. But point  $\text{הָאֵל}$  Pass. There is no need to assume 'an indirect reference to God . . . partly due to reverence'.

Eyob is speaking generally. *sorrowful*; lit. *bitter* (plur.) *of soul*; 1 Sa 1<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>2</sup>.

v. 21. *wait*: lit. so 2 K 7<sup>9</sup> 9<sup>3</sup>; cf. chap. 32<sup>4</sup>. Θ δμείπονται (= ἰμείπονται B<sup>3</sup>), *long for. in vain*: lit. *it is not, or there is naught of it* (sc. to them); *they have it not. rather than treasure*: כִּסְטָמוֹנִים, i.e. *hidden* (Gn 43<sup>23</sup> sing.) or *buried* (v. 16) *treasure*. Θ (ἀνορύσσοντες) ὥσπερ θησαυρούς = כִּסְטָמוֹנִים *like* (or *as for*) *treasure* (Pr 2<sup>4</sup>): so S and B (quasi effodientes thesaurum). The vb. *dig* (חָפַר) also means *search* (39<sup>29</sup>).

v. 22. *beyond gladness*: lit. *unto exultation*. Cf. Ho 9<sup>1</sup>, אל חשמה אל גיל. Θ περιχαρῆς δὲ ἐγένοντο gives the sense. So B gaudentque vehementer. אֵל לְרִיצָא = וַע. S (*who are glad*) and come together (ומחנשים) (?). Beer's גַּל a heap of stones (Gn 31<sup>16</sup>), such as was raised over a corpse (Jos 7<sup>26</sup> 8<sup>29</sup> 2 Sa 18<sup>17</sup>), is frigid and improbable. Duhm, accepting it, explains that such unhappy ones are glad of a mere stone-heap, and exult if they find an ordinary (ordentliches) grave (קבר). But קבר is simply 'the grave', as in 10<sup>19</sup>; and 'finding a grave' = dying. The desperate do not trouble about the sort of interment that will be granted them. Besides, where גַּל means a stone-heap, אבנים always occurs in the context, even in 8<sup>17</sup>. A clear parallel to קבר would, however, not be amiss; and perhaps גִּיל preserves a vestige of גִּישׁ tomb: see 21<sup>32</sup>. We might then render:

*Who rejoice over the tomb,—*

*Who are glad when they find the grave.*

For the second stichus Θ<sup>B</sup> has only ἐὰν κατατύχωσιν, *have succeeded* (Θ<sup>A</sup> + θανάτου = קבר), omitting ישישו (who) *are glad*.

v. 23. Still subordinate to the question of v. 20: *Why is light given...* Eyob now turns from the general case to his own special instance of it. He is not yet questioning the justice of God's dealings with him. He has so far admitted God's right to deal with him as He pleases (cf. 1<sup>21</sup> 2<sup>10</sup>). He only wonders why he has not been permitted to die.

*To the Man whose path is hidden*; to whom all is dark, so that he cannot see his way, knows not what to do to escape from his present perplexities; cf. 19<sup>6,8</sup>. (Θ θάνατος ἀνδρὶ ἀνάπανμα v. ἀνάπανσις = קָבֵר שְׁחַת לְגִבֵּר נַחַת or לְגִבֵּר מְנוּחָה or something similar; which might be either a marginal note or a stichus omitted from וַע. Θ<sup>A</sup> adds οὐ ἦδος ἀπεκρυβη = אֲשֶׁר דָּרְכוֹ נִסְתָּרָה, i.e. the part of וַע wanting in Θ<sup>B</sup>. ἦδος, of course, represents ἡ ὁδός. I also felt the difficulty of going back so far as the beginning of v. 20 for the connexion of this verse, which it therefore begins thus: כָּל אֵלֶּין מְרִירָתָא לְגִבֵּר דִּי וְגו' *All these are bitter things to the Man who, &c.*)

*has hemmed in all round*. The same vb. וַיִּסָּף recurs in 38<sup>8</sup>, 'And who shut in the Sea with doors?' It is spelt with שׁ instead of ס in 1<sup>1</sup>

שך דרכה *made a fence all round him* for protection, and Ho 2<sup>8</sup> שך דרכה *fence off her way with thorns*. For the sense cf. 19<sup>8</sup>.

v. 24. *לֶחֱמִי אֲנַחְתִּי חֶבֶא* *For before (= as, like 4<sup>10</sup>) my bread my sigh(ing) cometh*. Suspicious in sense and redundant in metre (four stresses). *חֶבֶא*, which does not seem to be very appropriate, may be an intruder from the next verse (*יבא*; again in v. 26). *U Antequam comedam suspiro = לֶחֱמִי אֲנַחְתִּי חֶבֶא*, omitting the *כִּי*, which begins the next verse also, giving the two verses an appearance of being alternatives or duplicates. But *U X U = וְ*. The idea of v. 24, which Duhm and others regard as a marginal quotation, seems to be that sorrow feeds on a diet of sighs and groans: cf. Ps 42<sup>1</sup> 'My tears serve me for bread day and night'; Ps 80<sup>6</sup> 'Thou hast made them eat bread of tears'; Ps 102<sup>10</sup> 'For ashes like bread have I eaten'; also Ps 127<sup>2</sup> Is 30<sup>20</sup>. Centuries earlier the old Sumerian Psalmist wrote: U NU MUN-KUË ER SHUG-MA-MU A NU MUN-NAGË ER U-A-MU *Food I ate not, Weeping was my fare (or bread); Water I drank not, Weeping was my diet* (lit. *food and water*).

Perhaps our *בִּילְפִנִי* has displaced an original *הֵאכִילִנִי* *He has made me eat*, and the whole line may have been *לֶחֶם אֲנַחְתִּי הֵאכִילִנִי* *He feeds me with the bread of sighs* (plur. La 1<sup>22</sup>); or the first word may have been *אֲכַלְתִּי* or *לֶחֱמִי* (cf. Pr 4<sup>17</sup>), *I eat*. Another possible line would be *כִּי לֶחֱמִי לֶחֶם אֲנַחְתִּי* *For my bread is bread of sighs. And I pour out my groans like water*. Reading *וַיִּתְּךָ* (cf. *U* and 10<sup>10</sup>) for *וַיִּתְּכֵנִי*, since *שִׁאֲנִתִּי* is fem. We might also point *שִׁאֲנִתִּי* (sing. ut Ps 22<sup>2</sup> 32<sup>3</sup>), and read *וַיִּתְּךָ*: *And my groaning is poured out like water*. (*U* *δὲ ἀκρῦς ἐγὼ συνεχόμενος φόβῳ*: apparently not a paraphrase, but = *וַיִּתְּךָ כִּיִּים בְּרִאֲגָה* *And I poured out water, i. e. shed tears, in fear*: cf. Ez 12<sup>18f.</sup>.)

v. 25. Or, 'For I fear a fear, and it cometh upon me, And that which I dread cometh unto me', Driver. The Versions render the verbs in the Past tense; but the Heb. Perfects and Imperfects with Strong Waw possibly express the speaker's permanent condition. But see next note.

v. 26. Dr: 'I have no ease, and no quiet, and no rest;  
And yet turmoil cometh.'

Similarly Davidson; but this division of the stichi disregards the metre, overweighting the first stichus, and giving a short line of two stresses for the second. On the other hand, the symmetry of the grammatical construction and the accentuation, and *U B* among the Versions, distinctly favour this view. A word may have fallen out from the second stichus, which sounds somewhat abrupt, and is, moreover, ambiguous since *רָגַז* may mean either the personal *disquiet*, the agitation and 'tumult of emotions' to which Eyob was subject, or the Divine *anger* which was the supposed cause of it (cf. Hb 3<sup>2</sup> *ברגז רחם תזכר*). Here it may

cover both cause and consequence. Ⓜ ἤλθεν δέ μοι ὀργή, B Et venit super me indignatio = : ויבא עלי רגז And *Wrath attacks me*: Gn 34<sup>n</sup> (not quite the same as ויבא לי comes to me = Ⓜ: see v. 25. Both constructions, Is 47<sup>o</sup>). This may be right; although a concluding stichus of two stresses, as in the *Qīnāh*-measure (Elegiac metre), is conceivable here.

A more important question is whether these two concluding couplets really refer to the present or, as AV takes them, to the past. The Hebrew certainly admits of the rendering:

*For a fear I feared, and it came to me,*

*And the thing I dreaded befell me:*

*Not careless, nor secure, nor at rest was I,*

*When the Wrath (or Trouble: 14<sup>i</sup>) assailed (me).*

(So the Versions. In stichus ii leg. אֶזְכֹּר pro ויִּזְכֹּר; the י may be due to repetition of the preceding י. Ⓜ συνήντησέν μοι. X alone has Impf.) Dramatically, this is far more impressive than the other interpretation, which makes Eyob complain that his affliction allows him no respite ('habe ich einen Augenblick Frieden, so kommt neue Unruhe,' Du), but no sooner has one paroxysm passed than another follows. This indeed seems rather far-fetched as an explanation of v. 25, however we understand the Heb. tenses. Davidson thinks that the reference cannot be to the real past, 'because it would be contrary to the idea of the poem to suppose that Job even in the days of his golden prime was haunted with indefinite fears of coming misfortune'. But the allusion appears to be to some definite anxiety; and that Eyob's consciousness of personal righteousness did not exempt him altogether from the fear of misfortune is evident from 15. And the thing he dreaded actually befell him on a day about which he always felt the same anxiety (*Perhaps my sons have sinned . . .*)—the birthday of his eldest son (13-19). He could never be certain that his sons had not sinned during the carousals of their birthdays (at which he was not himself present); and the thought of the sin would involve that of the penalty; so that on each birthday, as it recurred, the father's heart would be haunted, for a time at least, with fears of impending evil. On this view of the passage, v. 26 seems to make Eyob declare that he was not lulled in a false security (Ju 187-10), but fully aware of possible dangers and alive to religious responsibility, when calamity suddenly overwhelmed him. There is nothing in chap. 29, or anywhere else, which really militates against this general construction of our passage. It certainly provides a finer climax to this opening monody than the other. X makes v. 26 describe Eyob's demeanour on hearing the news of his successive misfortunes *לֹא שְׁלִיית מִבְּסוּרָתָא רַתּוּרֵי וְאַתְנֵן וְנִי* *I was not easy at the news of oxen and asses, nor quiet at the news of the burning, nor did I rest at the news of the camels; and*

the anger (רִיבָה) came, upon the news of the sons. So Levy; but perhaps better interrogatively, with Walton (cf. B): *Was I not still at the news of oxen and asses, and was I not quiet at the news of the burning, and did I not rest at the news of the camels, and did the anger come on the news of the sons?* Cf. B: *Nonne dissimulavi? nonne silui? nonne quievi? et venit super me indignatio.*

# THE FIRST ROUND IN THE DISPUTATION. Chaps. 4-14.

## (i) The first speech of Eliphaz. Chaps. 4-5.

Chapter 4. 17. 1-5. *Strange that the comforter of others should himself despair!*

v. 2. There is something wrong with stichus i. Not only is it metrically redundant with its four stresses, but the Hebrew as it stands is unmeaning. Driver suggests *If one attempt a word with thee, will thou be impatient?* (lit. *be weary*, i. e. wish it ended). But this would require at least אִם־נִסְּהָ דָּבָר אֵלַיךָ הַחֲלָאָה; cf. Dt 28<sup>66</sup> and 4<sup>34</sup>. נִסְּהָ דָּבָר could hardly mean to *venture* a word (OL), but only to *test* or *try* it. We might read הִינִסְּהָ דָּבָר אֵלַי־נִלְאָה *Should one try to speak to the wearied (impatient)?*, or, since ה and ת are sometimes confused in manuscripts, we might restore חֲלָה or נַחֲלָה *sick* for מֵהָ חֲלָה. Cf. Je 12<sup>18</sup> (נַחֲלוּ מֵהָ חֲלָה). Moreover, as we find נִסְּהָ incorrectly written for נִשָּׂא in Ps 4<sup>7</sup>, it is very tempting to suppose הִנִסְּהָ = הִנִשָּׂא here. For נִשָּׂא דָּבָר cf. Am 5<sup>1</sup>. (So Duhm.) Eliphaz is reluctant to argue with a sick man, but feels bound to remonstrate with unreasonable despair. (חֲלָה can hardly be an abridged Relative Clause, as Du asserts.) ὅτι μὴ πολλὰ κῆρυξαι λέγῃς σοι ἐν κόπῳ; = אֵלַיךָ בְּתִלְאָה *Hath one spoken to thee much in weariness?*, which is obviously no improvement on מֵהָ חֲלָה. © *If I begin to speak with thee, thou wilt be weary.* B Si coeperimus loqui tibi, forsitan moleste accipies.

St. ii. *withhold*: or *restrain*. עָצַר עַצְרִי as in 12<sup>15</sup> 29<sup>9</sup>. *speech*: מִלִּין words (Aram. plur. = מִלִּים. Thirteen instances in Job.)

v. 3. *put right*: or *admonished, corrected*: יִסְּרֵנִי. The biliteral or primitive root is SAR, *bind*; cf. אָסַר to *bind* and Aram. יָסַר to *bind*. Thus we see that the Hebrew mind originally regarded moral discipline, training, and education as a sort of binding (cf. religio).

*drooping hands*: i. e. the despondent and disheartened. Is 35<sup>3</sup>. ὅτι εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐνούθησας πολλούς, with הֵן (Aram.) = אִם instead of מֵהָ חֲלָה. In st. ii χεῖρας ἀσθενούς (ἁσθενούντων) does not indicate a difference of reading, but is a paraphrase giving the sense.

v. 4. *stumbler*: ὁ ἀσθενώντας. ἀσθενεῖν = כָּשַׁל usually in ὅτι (more than thirty times). *bowed*: or *bowing, bending* from weakness. Is 35<sup>3</sup>. ὁ ποτὴρ (ἀδυνατοῦσιν).



v. 5. Stichus i seems to be overloaded (כי עתה חבוא אליך ותלא), for it is difficult to give only one stress to חבוא אליך. Perhaps כי־עֲתָה תְּבֹאֵךְ וְתִלָּא. For the vb. c suff. see 22<sup>21</sup> Ez 32<sup>11</sup>, and cf. chap. 15<sup>21</sup> 20<sup>22</sup>.

*overcome*: lit. *weary*; i. e. spiritless, despondent.

*bewildered*: or *dismayed, confounded*.

Ⓢ νῦν δὲ ἥκει ἐπὶ σὲ πόνος = תְּלָאָה עֲלֶיךָ תְּבֹאֵךְ. The first word may be right instead of כי עתה, the כ having been copied from כוּשֵׁל, the first word in the previous line, and the י being a misread ו, as often. In st. ii ἐσπούδασας = וְחִבְּלָה; so 21<sup>6</sup> 22<sup>10</sup> 23<sup>16</sup> Ec 8<sup>3</sup>.

vv. 6-11. Thy piety should inspire thee with hope; for it is not the righteous, but sinners, who are cut off by calamity.

*thy piety*: lit. *thy fear*, scil. of God = godliness, religion = יִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים Gn 20<sup>11</sup>; יִרְאָה שְׂדֵי 6<sup>14</sup>; יִרְאָה אֲדָנִי 28<sup>28</sup>; יִרְאָה יְהוָה Is 11<sup>3</sup> Pr 10<sup>27</sup> al. In st. ii the conjunction וְ must be transferred from the second word to the first. וְ חִבְּלָה וְ חִבְּלָה spoils the symmetry of the stichi, even if it could be taken as in AV. 'Siegfried and Duhm prefer וְ חִבְּלָה וְ חִבְּלָה, which makes an intolerable jingle after כְּסִלְתָּךְ. Ⓢ ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ confuses two different meanings of the stem; cf. כְּסִל confidence 8<sup>14</sup> and כְּסִל folly Ec 7<sup>26</sup> (a sense which does not occur in Job). Ⓢ ἡ κακία τῆς ὁδοῦ σου is obviously a scribal error for ἡ ἀκακία κατλ. (= חֹם Ps 7<sup>9</sup>; חֹם chap. 2<sup>3</sup> 27<sup>5</sup>).

v. 7. To scan aright מִי־הוּא־נָקִי must be read with a single stress. Perhaps מִי־נִקְיָא or even מִי־נִהְיָא (*who was the innocent that perished*). Ⓢ ὅτι οὐδὲς (οὐδέις, οὐτίς) = כִּילֹא מִי־הוּא. Were there two variants מִי־נָקִי and מִי־נָקִי? Ⓢ quis unquam innocens periit?

St. ii Ⓢ ἢ πότε ἀληθινοὶ ὀλόριζοι ἀπώλοντο = Ⓢ aut quando recti deleti sunt? But אִיפֹה is ubi? 38<sup>4</sup>. יִשָּׁר = ἀληθινός, 2<sup>3</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>. ὀλόριζοι ἀπώλοντο, radicitus perierunt; a good paraphrase of נִכְחָרוּ *were hidden*, i. e. made unseen, destroyed, like ἡφανίσθησαν. Eliphaz does not deny that a really innocent man might suffer temporary affliction.

v. 8. Lit. *As I have seen, the plowers of trouble, &c.* An unsymmetrical distich with a prosaic beginning. The Versions do not help us here. If we emend with כִּשְׂרִי according to my seeing or when I noticed (35<sup>13</sup>) for the prosy רִאִיתִי בְּאִשֶּׁר, we at least improve the metre and style of stichus i. שָׁוֶר = רָאָה is a favourite word in Job. It is confused with אִשֶּׁר again in 19<sup>27</sup>. For the proverbial phraseology see Pr 22<sup>8</sup> Ho 8<sup>7</sup> 10<sup>13</sup>; and for a different figure, 15<sup>35</sup>. Duhm thinks vv. 8, 9, 10, 11 may be spurious, because of their rude construction and want of pathos. To me vv. 8, 9 seem necessary to the argument; 10, 11 may perhaps be a marginal quotation. Merx and Siegfried reject the latter quatrain; though the abrupt change of metaphor need not startle us in Oriental poetry.

v. 9. For God's Breath as a destroying wind see Ps 18<sup>16</sup> Is 40<sup>7</sup>.  $\Theta$  ἀπὸ προστάγματος κυρίου = ממשפט יהוה Ps 7<sup>7</sup> or ממצות יהוה; against the parallelism.

v. 10. The verse is (or has become) amorphous, and the apparent zeugma is improbable, a verb being necessary to the symmetry of the first stichus. We might correct שָׁמַת אֲרִיָּה נִשְׁבַּת (קול) (The sound of) the lion's roaring is stilled (שָׁמַת?; om. קול?) or something similar. ( $\Theta$  σθένος = ισχύς = נאות or נאון for שאנת.) But a better parallel would be gained by restoring נִשְׁבְּרוּ מַחְלָעוֹת שֶׁחַל Broken are the fangs of the lion: cf. 29<sup>17</sup> Ps 58<sup>7</sup> Jo 1<sup>6</sup> (of lions) Pr 30<sup>14</sup>. In st. ii the supposed Aram. נַתְעִי should be corrected נַתְצִי; see Ps 58<sup>7</sup>. (In Syriac ܢܬܥܝ is outweigh.) But cf. Assy. natû, 'strike', 'crush', 'smash' (Pi), e.g. mountains. Lions are naturally a figure of fierce and violent oppressors, whether nations or individual tyrants (Is 5<sup>29</sup> Na 2<sup>12f</sup>. Zp 3<sup>3</sup> Pss 7<sup>2</sup> 10<sup>9</sup> 17<sup>12</sup>). God's judgement on such is final and complete.

(There are four or five different words for lion in this quatrain.  $\Theta$  begins with אֲרִיָּה, which occurs more than forty times in OT (while the shorter form אֲרִי is found only seventeen times), and which looks like an Aramaized pronunciation: cf. Syr. 'aryā. It is the Assyrian arû, lion, which may be the Semitized form of Sumerian UR, lion (labbu, nēšû) = UR, dog (kalbu). The second, שֶׁחַל, might very well be a strengthened derivative from the same root as שֶׁעָל, Aram. חֶעֱלָ fox or jackal; both animals being named from their cries, howling or roaring: cf. Assy. šahālu (שחל) to cry out, call, &c. The third, כִּפְּרִי a young lion, which has begun to hunt and roar over its prey, and is full of youthful vigour and strength (Is 5<sup>29</sup> 31<sup>4</sup> Na 2<sup>14</sup>), is perhaps from a root כפר = כָּבַר and לִישׁ to be strong (cf. also אָבַר in אֲבִיר strong, mighty). The fourth, לִישׁ full-grown (?) or mature lion, is Assy. nēšû, lion, nēštu, lioness = Sumerian NIG, bitch, lioness; cf. LIG and DIS, values of the Sumerian character for dog, lion. The last word is לָבִיא lion, Gn 49<sup>9</sup> Dt 33<sup>20</sup> = Assy. labbu, lion (from lab'u?), perhaps meaning growler; from a root לָבַא = נָבַא Assy. nabû, to call, cry aloud; cf. נָבַע Ps 59<sup>8</sup>, נָבַח, Ar. نَبَحَ to bark, and for the form לָבִיא, cf. לָבִיא mutterer, soothsayer, prophet. The Reflexives נִבְּא and הִתְנַבֵּא probably meant in the primitive period to mutter or talk in low tones to oneself, as is the way with the soothsayers of all ages and countries. Cf. 1 Sa 18<sup>30</sup> 19<sup>20-24</sup> Zc 13<sup>2,3</sup>.)

$\Theta$  σθένος for שְׁאֲנַת ( $\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}n\acute{o}s$  = גְּבוּרַת 26<sup>14</sup>); perhaps due to a false reading שְׁנֹאת, which  $\Theta$  connected with שָׁנָא to be great. In st. ii γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη = נָרַעַךְ (20<sup>16</sup>) וְשִׁמְ? פִּתְנִים; an unlikely guess at an illegible text. In v. 11  $\Theta$  renders לִישׁ by the curious μυρμηκολέων, ant-lion; cf. our term ant-bear.

vv. 12-21. Eliphaz relates a night-vision, in which he was taught the imperfection of all living beings, human and superhuman, relatively to

God. Eliphaz assumes the rôle of a Seer or Prophet, who has received a special revelation from a ghostly visitant.

v. 12. Lit. *And unto me* (emphatic by position; or *myself*) *a word* (or *thing*; דבר = ῥῆμα elsewhere) *was stolen* (יגנב Gn 40<sup>15</sup>); here used in the sense *brought by stealth, stealthily or secretly brought*; cf. 2 K 11<sup>2</sup> Kal she *stealthily removed*; 2 Sa 19<sup>4</sup> Hith. *to steal away, go off secretly*. We can say *A feeling stole over me*; *The truth gradually stole upon me*, and the like. ㊦:

εἰ δέ τι ῥῆμα ἀληθινὸν ἐγγεγόνει ἐν λόγοις σου,  
οὐθὲν ἄν σοι (om. A) τούτων κακὸν (κακῶν A) ἀπῆντησεν,

*But had there been a word of truth in thy speeches, Not one of these evils would have befallen thee!* This strange perversion of the original text, for such it is, affords a good illustration of the pitfalls that lie in the way of the reader of an unpointed Hebrew codex. The translator naturally, but erroneously, pointed (or vocalized) the first word אִלּ and *if* (י) instead of אֵל and *to me*; an error which necessitated further changes; e. g. יגנב was perhaps misread נכון *right* (cf. 42<sup>7-8</sup> ἀληθές), and וחקר אֹנִי became שמען מנהו (שמע(א) חכה וחקר אִין! which, of course, is barbarous Hebrew; but ㊦ failed to understand שמען *whisper* both here and at 26<sup>11</sup>). Perhaps ㊦ read or supposed merely קִוְּרָא אִין שְׁמַעְנָא מְנַהוּ. It adds an alternative rendering of the second line: πότερον οὐδέξεταί μου τὸ οὖς ἐξαίσια παρ' αὐτοῦ; *Shall (should) not my ear receive portentous things from Him?* = הלא חקח אֹנִי שמען מנהו. This really supports ㊦, with another guess at the meaning of שמען, whose only cognate in Hebrew is fem. form שְׁמַעְנָה *derisive whisper*, Ex 32<sup>25</sup>. *a whisper of speech*: i. e. שְׁמַעְנָה סֵלָה: cf. 26<sup>14</sup> שְׁמַעְנָה דָּבָר. The secrecy, suddenness, and unexpectedness of the revelation seem to be emphasized. Cf. 1 Th 5<sup>2</sup>.

v. 13. Lit. *in thoughts* (20<sup>2</sup>) *from or out of visions of night*. This seems to say that Eliphaz had had a troubled dream, and was reflecting upon it, when the Visitation came to him. Dreams were regarded as a medium of intercourse between man and the spirit-world by all ancient peoples; and it was common to consult a god by sleeping in his sanctuary. Cf. Gn 15<sup>12</sup> 28<sup>11-12</sup> 32<sup>24</sup> 33<sup>19</sup> 2 Sa 7<sup>1</sup> 1 K 3<sup>5</sup> Je 23<sup>25</sup> 33<sup>19</sup> Zc 1<sup>8</sup> Dan 2<sup>2</sup> 4<sup>5</sup> 7<sup>13</sup>. The following verses, however, are to be understood as describing no merely subjective illusion, but an actual experience (perhaps of the poet himself). The 'thoughts' are apparently agitated, anxious or troubled and conflicting suggestions due to his dreams. The word שְׁמַעְנָה, which recurs 20<sup>2</sup>, and of which שְׁמַעְנָה Ps 94<sup>19</sup> 139<sup>23</sup> is a later and debased form, springs from a root שַׁעַ = שַׁעַ to split, divide (whence שְׁמַעְנָה = שְׁמַעְנָה opinions, 1 K 18<sup>21</sup>), which is formed by Internal Triliteralization from the primitive SHAB to split, to discern, see, &c. (Sumerian SHAB), and then to count, reckon, as in חשב ha-shab (cf.

perhaps ✓*SAP* in סַפַּר *saḫ-ar*). Thinking and reckoning both involve division or separation of things from things, seeing them apart mentally.

Ⓢ φόβω δὲ (A om.) καὶ ἤχῳ νυκτερινῇ = בְּשִׁעָר וּבִהְמוֹן לַיְלָה; see 18<sup>20</sup> Am 5<sup>23</sup> Ⓢ. This again suggests an illegible or corrupt Hebrew manuscript.

*deep sleep*: תַּרְדֵּמָה Gn 2<sup>21</sup> 15<sup>12</sup> chap. 33<sup>15</sup> (an echo of this passage). Ⓢ φόβος here and δεινὸς φόβος 33<sup>15</sup>; but ἔκστασις, *a trance*, Gn 2<sup>21</sup> 15<sup>12</sup> (cf. Lk 10<sup>10</sup>), and strangely θάμβος, *astonishment, stupor*, 1 Sa 26<sup>12</sup>; κατάνυξις, *stupefaction, slumber*, Is 29<sup>10</sup>; and even ἀνδρόγυνος, Pr 19<sup>15</sup>. The word was generally misunderstood. The primitive biliteral root is *DAM* (TAM, TAM) *stop up, close, seal*, which is seen clearly in the Aramaic רַמַּךְ *sleep* (*DAM + K, closed-like = asleep*); as also in אִטַּם *shut lips, stop ears*, and Assyr. *katâmu* (כִּתַּם) *close or shut mouth, lips, door, &c.* A sleeper is as it were *closed* against the outer world; the organs of sense which are the avenues of perception are all stopped up or shut for the time being. Cf. Wordsworth's line, 'A slumber did my spirit seal.' (What is the significance of the ר by which the root is trilateralized into רַמַּךְ? It may have replaced ט before ר, as is often the case in Assyrian, e.g. *irdud = išdud, altu = aš'u, &c.* Thus שִׁדַּם = רִידַם = *make stop up or close*. On Semitic Trilateralism see my paper in *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, Leipzig, 1906.)

In spite of the explanation suggested above I have always felt some doubt of the text ל' בְּשִׁעָרִים מַחְוִינֹתָּ In (disquieting) *thoughts from night-visions*. It seems more natural to assume that the revelation (the apparition and its message) came to Eliphaz, as to other seers, *in a vision of the night* (cf. Gn 15<sup>12</sup>). ל' בְּשִׁנֹּת בְּחֻזִּינֹתָּ In *slumbers* (Pr 6<sup>10</sup>; perhaps here = Assyr. *šunâte, dreams*), *in visions of night*, makes a better parallel, and agrees with the imitative 33<sup>15</sup>.

v. 14. *came over me*: lit. as Ⓢ *met me*. St. ii, lit. *And the multitude of my bones it affrighted*. Ⓢ δεισεσεν, *it shook violently* probably gives the right sense, though it may represent a reading רַחֵל (cf. Ps 29<sup>8</sup>) instead of הַפַּחֲרִי (hîc tant.). The language is hyperbolic; as we might say 'My whole frame was convulsed with fear'. (The Hiphil might even be intrans. = *showed fear*.) Duhm's remark 'Wie das mit dem Tiefschlaf sich vereinigen lässt, weiss ich nicht' seems hypercritical.

v. 15. This narrative is unique in the OT—a fact worth noting for several reasons. Had the Jews been always the superstitious folk which writers hostile to faith in the Unseen would have us suppose, stories of similar apparitions would doubtless have abounded in their ancient records. As it is, the necromantic incident at Endor (1 Sa 28<sup>7-9</sup>) and Elijah's experience in the sacred cave at Horeb (1 K 19<sup>8</sup>) are the only episodes which offer even isolated traits of resemblance to the present

narrative. Apparitions of 'Angels' (בני האלהים) belong, of course, to an entirely different category.

And: not *Then*; the consecution is close. *A wind*: or perhaps *A breath* of cold air. The word רוּחַ *rûḥ*, like the Greek πνεῦμα (Θ) is ambiguous, and may denote wind, breath, or spirit, according to the context (cf. Gn 1<sup>2</sup>). The Oxford Lex. (p. 322<sup>a</sup>, s. v. חָלָף) suggests *wind* here; but elsewhere (p. 925<sup>b</sup>, s. v. רוּחַ) *disembodied spirit*, though doubtfully, with the remark that Di Du prefer *breath* or *wind*. In his commentary, however, Du observes: 'v. 15 giebt nun die Ursache der Erschütterung an: *Ein Geist geht an mir vorüber.*' But רוּחַ (ו) is not found elsewhere in OT in the sense of a ghost or disembodied spirit, nor in that of such a spirit becoming visible (= an apparition). The apparition of Samuel at Endor is called אֱלֹהִים, a *Divine Being* or *god* (1 Sa 28<sup>13</sup>; cf. Is 8<sup>19</sup> אֱלֹהֵינוּ).

(2) The dead in Hades, mere shadows of their former selves, are called רַפְּאִים (26<sup>5</sup>); they are never called רֻחוֹת, spirits (Nu 16<sup>22</sup>). We nowhere read that at death a man's רוּחַ went down into She'ol; nor is it anywhere recorded that after a man's death his רוּחַ reappeared in visible shape to the living.

(3) The verb יַחֲלֵף *passes on swiftly, sweeps or rushes on*, a poetic syn. of עָבַר (see 3), is used of wind, Is 21<sup>1</sup> Hb 1<sup>11</sup>; and 3 accordingly renders וַיֵּקָם עָלַי אָפִי *And a blast passes on before me* (or *over my face*). Cf. 1 K 19<sup>11</sup>, where, when Iahvah passes by, a violent wind (רוּחַ) rages before Him, and it is said expressly that Iahvah was not in the רוּחַ. It was only a sign or accompaniment of His approach. So here, the mysterious wind betokens a supernatural Presence; and the vague sense of this makes the percipient's hair to stand on end with fear. It is a nice question whether עָלַי should be rendered *over my face* (so Θ), or, as is more usually the meaning of the phrase, *before me, in front of me*. Dr prefers the former: 'A mysterious breath, the symbol of a presence which he could not discern, seemed to pass over him.' But cf. Ex 33<sup>19</sup> *I will make my Glory* (ל. כְּבוֹדִי) *pass before thee* (עָלַי פָּנֶיךָ).

(4) The Semitic root רוּחַ is probably to be identified with the Sumerian RI (from RIG), *to blow* (*zāqu*), *wind, blast* (*ziqu* = 3 וַיֵּקָם); and *wind* (*air, breath*), is doubtless the primary sense of the Hebrew רוּחַ.

*The hairs of my head* = שְׁעֵרַת רִאשִׁי (Ps 40<sup>13</sup> 69<sup>5</sup>) instead of שְׁעֵרַת בָּשָׂרִי (Ps 119<sup>120</sup> בָּשָׂרִי) *My flesh* (*ḥār*) *bristled up from fear of Thee*; where we might well read שְׁעֵרַת בָּשָׂרִי *my hair*. Since the Kal is intrans., Piel should be trans.: *It lifts or makes to stand on end*. [We must read either יִסְמַר, יַחֲלֵף, or תַּחֲלֵף; תִּסְמַר, according to the gender of רוּחַ *wind*. This is fem. in 19<sup>19</sup> 37<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>17</sup> (my *breath*? see note), but masc. in 41<sup>1</sup> (*the air*) Hb 1<sup>11</sup>, cf. 1 K 19<sup>11</sup>. It is

fem. in Is 40<sup>7</sup> (*Elohim's Breath* = the wind). In the sense of the Divine Creative Breath 33<sup>4</sup>, which is the vital principle or 'spirit' in man, 6<sup>1</sup> 17<sup>1</sup> 32<sup>8</sup> (Gn 2<sup>7</sup>, cf. Ez 37<sup>9,10</sup>), it is fem.; as also in the derived sense of a man's spirit or temper, 21<sup>4</sup> 32<sup>18</sup>. In other passages of our book there is no indication of the gender of רִיחַ. (20<sup>3</sup> is corrupt.)] Duhm asserts that רִיחַ here 'ist, weil masc., nicht der Wind, sondern ein Geist, vgl. I Reg 22 21; ein Wind würde auch nicht zu dieser Erscheinung passen'. But the wind is sometimes masc., Ex 10<sup>13</sup> Nu 11<sup>31</sup> &c.; and 1 K 22<sup>21</sup> is hardly a secure foundation, for even if רִיחַ be original there, the passage is describing a vision of the celestial Court, not an earthly apparition inducing strong physical effects on the beholder, and causing his

'. . . knotted and combined locks to part,  
And each particular hair to stand on end,  
Like quills upon the fretful porcupine.'

*Hamlet*, Act i, Scene 5.

And lastly, as we have seen, the wind, as heralding the Divine Approach, does suit this apparition (or theophany), equally with the partially parallel passage, 1 K 19<sup>11</sup>, on which it possibly depends.

v. 16. A tristich; a fact which suggests the loss of a line. Duhm thinks יַעֲמֵד *It stops* . . . may be the entire first stichus, which the poet cut short in order to deepen the impression of uneasiness, 'wie in einem Shakespeareschen Monolog'. Such an abridged line is, however, without parallel in the book; and יַעֲמֵד וְלֹא־אֵכִיר מֵרֹאשׁוֹ is a metrically perfect stichus as it stands. On the other hand, if the parallel with 1 K 19<sup>11,12</sup> hold good (cf. esp. the end of the verse), we can only suppose that some such stichus as וַהֲנֵה שָׂרֵי עֵבֶךְ *And lo Shaddai went by!* has either been intentionally omitted, or has fallen out owing to similarity of letters (בִּשְׂרֵי — שָׂרֵי). The piece would thus become a theophany (cf. Ez 1<sup>26</sup>).

*He stops, but I discern not His form* or looks, features: מְרֹאֶה: cf. Joh 5<sup>37</sup> εἶδος = מֵרֹאֶה Ez 1<sup>26</sup> (Ⓜ), Is 52<sup>14</sup> (Ⓜ). Cf. also Ex 33<sup>20</sup>.

*A figure*: or shape, likeness, form (Ⓜ μορφή). Cf. Nu 12<sup>8</sup> *And the form of Iahvah he beholds*: Dt 4<sup>12,15</sup>. Moses saw Iahvah's תְּמוּנָה, but the people merely heard a Voice.

*I hear a murmuring sound*: lit. *A murmur* (or *whisper*) *and a voice I hear*. Cf. 1 K 19<sup>12</sup> *And after the fire* (lightning) *a sound of a low murmur*. דְּמָמָה stillness, silence, denotes a low voice or attenuated sound (קוֹל דְּמָמָה דָּקָה); e. g. the light whisper or murmur of the wind when it dies away: *He husheth the storm to a murmur* (לְדָמָמָה: Ps 107<sup>29</sup>). Unwilling, as it would seem, to admit even a dim and indistinct vision of God, Ⓜ modifies the sense of vv. 15, 16 as follows: *And a wind came upon my face, But my hair and flesh bristled up. I stood up, and recognized not; I looked, and there was not a form before my eyes, But I was hearing*

a breeze and a voice. This would require (v. 16) אַעמַר for יַעמַר and מְרֹאֵר תְּמוּנָה לִנְגֵד אֵל instead of מְרֹאֵר תְּמוּנָה לִנְגֵד אֵל. The changes are probably dogmatic, and obviously for the worse. (Of course allowance must also be made for the possibility of a partially illegible or otherwise corrupted Hebrew text.)

v. 17. מְאֹלֵה אֵל and מְעִשְׂהוּ are most naturally taken as in AV *Shall a mortal be juster than Eloah, Or a man be purer than his Maker?* and perhaps the author of the Elihu-section understood it so (32<sup>2</sup>). But Eyob had said nothing so far to imply this absurdity. The context (vv. 18, 19) requires the meaning given above, *before God* (so Da Du Dr); i.e. in the judgement or estimation of God: so ὁ μὴ καθαρὸς ἔσται βροτὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου; (the introductory τί γάρ; is only a harmless rhetorical flourish). Cf. Nu 32<sup>22</sup> מִיָּהוּהוּ נָקִים וְהֵייתֶם = ὁ καὶ ἔσεσθε ἀθῆτοι ἐναντί Κυρίου. There also, as here, a second מ' = ἀπό; a fact which militates against Kittel's suggestion that ὁ read לפני there. An y may, however, have fallen out after ש (the two letters are often confused), and we may restore האנוש עם-אלה יצדק; cf. 9<sup>2</sup> 25<sup>1</sup>, where the phrase צדק עם *to be just with* (= in the estimation of) (God) occurs in a similar connexion, 25<sup>5,6</sup> constituting an exact parallel to 4<sup>16,19</sup>. In st. ii we must then restore וְעַם-עֲשֶׂהוּ for אֵל-מְעִשְׂהוּ אֵל. ὁ ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἀμειπτος ἀνὴρ; = אֵל (ו) מְעִשְׂהוּ וְנִי, a difference mainly of pointing and division of letters.

v. 18. Behold: הִנֵּה. ὁ εἰ = Aram. הִנֵּה (Dan 2<sup>6</sup> +). *His servants* = the angels, as the || st. indicates. Elsewhere only of human ministers of His will, patriarchs, prophets, &c. Cf. Am 3<sup>7</sup> Is 44<sup>26</sup>. (Cf. also σύνδουλος, Re 19<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>9</sup> of an angel.) Eliphaz repeats the same thought, 15<sup>15</sup>. God, apparently, is the Maker (v. 17) of Man, but not of the denizens of Heaven, who are altogether higher beings (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) and, at least originally, minor gods grouped around the Supreme in the Court of Heaven. Hence Iahvah is the God of gods (*il ilāni*), that is to say, the highest God, the Most High. Stripped of all mythological associations, the doctrine of Eliphaz is that no Being below the Highest can be absolutely free from relative imperfection. But imperfection involves liability to error; and error justifies the Divine censure.

The idea that the Supreme cannot altogether 'trust in' or depend upon the faithfulness and inerrancy of any lower beings, however exalted their nature, is perhaps implicit in the very notion of a hierarchy of heaven, arranged in ranks, one above another, in endless gradation. The conception of a 'Host of Heaven' involves the further conception of discipline and obedience, with the possibility of their opposites; and all such ideas, of course, have their physical basis in primitive observation of the regular and irregular movements of the heavenly bodies and other celestial phenomena—the daily course of the sun from east to west, the

recurring changes of the moon, the apparent vagaries of the planets (πλάνητες ἀστέρες; cf. Jude<sup>13</sup> ἀστέρες πλανῆται, 'wandering stars'), meteors, and shooting stars. In the Babylonian mythus of Creation Merodach takes measures to prevent the heavenly bodies from 'doing evil' or 'going astray' (Ana lâ êpêš annî || lâ êgû manâma; Cr. Tab. V. 7); and he is praised as 'holding (v. appointing) the paths of the stars of heaven', and 'shepherding all the gods like sheep' (ša kakkabâni šamâmê || alkâtsûnu likillu! (v. likîn!) Kîma çeni lirtâ || ilâni gimrašûn! Tab. VII. 110-111). The 'sin' of which these subordinate 'gods' might be guilty was deviation from their appointed paths (cf. Ju 5<sup>20</sup> Is 22<sup>21</sup> 2 Pe 2<sup>4</sup> Jude<sup>6</sup> Re 12<sup>7</sup>)—deserting their stations and overstepping the boundaries which had been fixed by the Supreme. Such conceptions of the relation of the Angels to God are obviously primitive. Later speculation established a sharp distinction between evil angels and good, and in time even their names became known (cf. Is 40<sup>26</sup> Ps 147<sup>4</sup>).

The fault ascribed by the Supreme to His Angels is according to מ תהלה; an obscure and isolated word, which G renders σκολιόν τι (= תהפכות Pr 16<sup>23</sup> al.), *something crooked* (unrighteous or amiss) = B pravitatem; I עֲלֵמָה matter, res (cf. 1 Sa 22<sup>15</sup>), *ground of accusation*, as in Dan 6<sup>5,6</sup>; ט חֲמוּץ (חמה) *stupor, amazement, awe*: all mere guesses from the context. It might conceivably mean *boasting, vain-glory, pride, gloria* (תהלה from הלל II, which is ultimately identical with הלל I), or *folly, wilfulness, madness* (cf. Po'el, Po'al, Hithpo. of the same root, and הוֹלֵלוּת, הוֹלֵלוּת *folly or madness*). The former sense agrees with Is 14<sup>12,13</sup> (the Fall of Lucifer—הֵילֵל בֶּן שָׁחַר, the Morning Star); cf. also Lk 10<sup>18</sup>. 'By that sin fell the Angels.' The latter meaning, *folly*, which certainly suits the context, will also be the sense if we follow Hupfeld (Merx, &c.) in reading תִּפְלָה (1<sup>22</sup> 24<sup>12?</sup>); a very attractive conjecture, accepted by Budde, Siegfried, and others. The identical phrase, יִשִּׁים תִּפְלָה (cf. תִּפְלָה נָתַן 1<sup>22</sup>) actually recurs 24<sup>12</sup>, if we may rely upon מ (but see the note ad loc.). Dillmann gets the meaning *error* by assuming that תהלה springs from a √תהל = Eth. תהל; which in Conj. III means *vagum oberrare* (Di Lex Aeth<sup>552</sup>). The sense is excellent (Jude<sup>6,13</sup>; vid. supr.); but the etymology doubtful. Others compare Arab. وَهَلَ to *make a mistake in a matter, to forget* [not in Lane]; as though תהלה were equivalent to תהלה from a √והל, which is hardly probable. [Does תִּפְלָה represent a misunderstood תִּהְלָה? And to His Angels He attributeh (not) glory (25<sup>5,6</sup> Hb 3<sup>3</sup>)! Much less, &c., v. 19.]

v. 19. *Much more*: or *Much less*: see last note. The Heb. מֶה (usually + וְ) may be rendered either way, according to context. Perhaps we should read שְׁכַנִּי [ב] for the following word.

G τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας πηλίνας . . . ἐπαισεν αὐτοὺς σιγὰς τρόπον. But G<sup>A</sup> εἰ δὲ τοὺς κατοικ. κτλ. as if the Heb. word were מֶה *Ah!*



(Ez 24<sup>6</sup>). *Dwellers in houses* (constructed) of clay; i.e. poor humanity. The phrase seems to distinguish man himself from his material body, which is regarded as the house he lives in. It is built of clay (חֹמֶר), the fragile stuff of pottery (Je 18<sup>4</sup>): see chap. 10<sup>9</sup>. God is the Potter who fashions man out of this frail and brittle material: Is 45<sup>9</sup> 64<sup>7</sup>. (The 'dust' or 'earth' of the next line is syn. here and Gn 2<sup>7</sup>.) In 33<sup>6</sup> Elihu says: *Lo I, like thee, am no god; I too was nipped off from clay*. The old Babylonian Epic uses the same phrase of the creation of Engidu, the fellow of its hero Gilgamesh: 'The goddess Aruru washed her hands; clay she nipped off (*tīṣa iqṭariṣ* = מִטּ יִחְרֹץ), threw it on the plain (or desert: *ṣēri* = EDIN) . . . created Engidu' (NE viii. 34 sq.). The same goddess assists Merodach in the creation of man, according to the important bilingual text first published by Pinches (JRAS xxiii, MS, 393 sqq.; CT xiii. 35 sqq.), where we read:

NAM-LÙ-GĀLLU BA-RU

amelûti ibtanî

D. ARURU NUMUN „ DINGIR-TA NEN-MA (?)

iltu „ zêr amelûti ittišu ibtanû

'Mankind He created; The goddess Aruru seed of Mankind with the god she made come forth' (Assyr. *with Him she created*). The allusion to Aruru here may be a harmonistic interpolation, as Marduk appears as sole Creator everywhere else in the piece, just as in the Seven Tablets of Creation.

Eliphaz argues that if celestial beings are not inerrant or impeccable in the sight of the Supreme, much less can terrestrial man be so. His ghostly visitant appears to ignore the story of the Fall, as Duhm has noted. Human frailty is traced to the imperfect material of the body: cf. Ps 103<sup>14</sup>.

*Whose foundation is in the dust* (or earth). The Relative may refer either to the 'houses of clay' or to their inhabitants. The latter agrees better with what follows; but perhaps the two were not sharply distinguished in the mind of the poet. We might render: *Whose foundation* (יִסוֹד; cf. cogn. סַעַר *stay support*; the foundation being that on which a building is supported) *consists in earth*, is earthen (*Beth Essentiae*), i.e. of clay.

*Which (Who) are crushed before a (the) moth*. Reading מִכָּאֵי יִדְכָּא (5<sup>4</sup> 34<sup>26</sup>) and מִכָּלֶפֶי; as though the attack of the feeblest of insects might be fatal to a man. Cf. Is 50<sup>9</sup> 51<sup>8</sup>. In these and other passages, however, where the moth (עָשׂ, Assyr. *ašašu*) is brought into relation with man, the reference is to the clothes-moths, of which there are various species, whose grubs fret or eat away garments of wool and fur: see 13<sup>28</sup>. And as the punitive action of lahvah is compared to this wearing and wasting work of the moth, Ps 39<sup>12</sup> Ho 5<sup>12</sup> (*And I was like the moth to*

*Ephraim* || *And like a rot to the House of Israel*), we should naturally expect the same ground of reference here. This might be obtained by reading יִדְבָאִם (or יָבֵם = 𐤓 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀𐤓, *He smote them*) לְפִי עֵשׂ (cf. הִכָּה לְפִי חֶרֶב), *Whom He (Eloah) demolishes by the mouth of the moth*. It is even possible that 𐤓 read or conjectured יֹאכֵלִם *Whom He eats*, instead of יִדְבָאִם, since 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀𐤓 may mean *He eat*, like ἐπάσαστε (Hesych. παίειν, τύπτειν . . . ἢ ἔσθιειν. Cf. Aristoph. Ach. 835). So 𐤁 Consumetur velut a tineā.

It must be admitted that the text is more or less uncertain from this point to the end of the chapter. The triplet instead of a couplet makes v. 19 suspicious at the outset; and it seems probable that the third line should begin the next distich. At all events, יִדְבָאִם (or יִדְבָאִי) is a synonym which makes a good parallel for יָבֵמִי, and לְפִי עֵשׂ may conceal a note of time corresponding to לְעֶרֶב; e.g. עֲלוֹת־שָׁחַר referring to death in the night (cf. Is 17<sup>14</sup> 38<sup>13</sup>). This would give:

‘Who are crushed ere the rise of Dawn,—  
Between Morn and Eve are shattered.’

Or we might regard לְפִי עֵשׂ as a corruption of לַפְנוֹת שָׁחַר *at the approach of Dawn*: cf. Ex 14<sup>27</sup> Ps 46<sup>6</sup>. In any case, the point seems to be the brief duration of human life (cf. Ps 90<sup>3-10</sup>); and, as we have seen, the moth is not elsewhere an emblem of ephemeral existence but of destructiveness. In the poem which has been called the ‘Babylonian Job’ we read:

Ša ina anišat ibluṭu imūt uddēš  
Surriš uštadīr zamar iḫtamaš

‘He who was alive yestereve died in the morning; In a moment was he troubled, quickly was he crushed.’ Cf. our own popular saying ‘Here to-day and gone to-morrow’; and the Chinese *Wei tsai tan sih*, ‘The danger is between morning and evening’ (= Death is only a question of hours). See Giles, *Dict.* 12589.

In the next clause of the Heb. the word מְשִׁים is corrupt, the vb. שִׁם being unused in Hiphil. Even if מְשִׁים (scil. לֵב) might mean *regarding* or *heeding*, לִנְצָה מְשִׁים could only imply *For want of one* (or, *Without any*) *regarding they perish for ever* (cf. Ho 4<sup>6</sup> and v. 11 supr.; 24<sup>7-8</sup> 31<sup>13</sup>). But Eliphaz does not mean that nobody troubles about the fate of men, because they are so unimportant, as Duhm puts it. See v. 8 sqq. 𐤓 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀𐤓 suggests מְשִׁיעַ *helper, saviour*, as in Dt 28<sup>29-31</sup> and a few other places.\* But perhaps the word was חֲשִׁיה which would give a better parallel to חֲכֵמָה (cf. 26<sup>3</sup>): see also 5<sup>12</sup> 6<sup>13</sup> 11<sup>6</sup>. The phrase לִנְצָה יִאֲבְרוּ is confirmed by 20<sup>7</sup>. The meaning is that, once dead, they never return from She’ol to the present life: 7<sup>9</sup> 10<sup>21</sup> 14<sup>7-12</sup>. We get a good parallel stichus by a slight emendation of v. 21 b, reading יָמוּתוּ בְלֹא



*The holy ones* are the Angels: cf. 4<sup>18</sup> with 15<sup>16</sup>; Ps 89<sup>6,8</sup> Zc 14<sup>5</sup> Dan 4<sup>10,14</sup>. As I have shown elsewhere, קדושים, קדוש, is properly *bright, shining*, and then *clear, pure, holy*; cf. Assy. *quddušu*, *brilliant, pure*, a syn. of *ellu*, הלל, *namru*, נור. And since the Angels or Host of Heaven were originally the stars, we may infer that קדושים as a designation of the Angels primarily denoted the Shining Ones (cf. Dan 12<sup>3</sup>). The idea of what *we* mean by 'holiness', or moral and spiritual perfection, seems excluded by 4<sup>18</sup>.

*Call* (for help)! *is there one about to answer* (particip.) *thee?* *And unto whom of the Celestials wilt thou turn* (for aid: Le 19<sup>31</sup> 20<sup>6</sup>)? The practice of the 'Invocation of Angels' seems to be implied by the question, and was probably not unknown in the author's day, although few traces of it survive in the OT. We know, however, that, in spite of the opposition of the Prophets, Necromancy was practised in Israel throughout the monarchical period (see my paper 'Shumer and Shem' in the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. vii); and if the spirits in She'ol below could be invoked in times of stress, why not also, and with more apparent reason, the mightier Powers of Heaven? Cf. perhaps Gn 48<sup>18</sup> Ho 12<sup>4</sup> and the direct address to the Angels, Ps 103<sup>20,21</sup> 148<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, the Angels of God are so wise (חכמים) that they know everything that happens here below (2 Sa 14<sup>20</sup>): a wisdom beyond the reach of mortal man (4<sup>21</sup>). If the 'spirit' (רוח) which brought the oracle to Eliphaz was angelic (cf. 1 K 22<sup>19,21,24</sup> Zc 1<sup>8,9,10</sup>)—and we can hardly suppose a ghost called up from She'ol to be intended—we understand why Eliphaz is so sure that it would be futile for Eyob to appeal to the Angels. The oracle has made him quite clear as to their point of view; precluding, as it does, for all created beings a case against the Creator. Why then, asks Eliphaz, persist in futile appeals or protests in the face of what we know of God's perfection and man's imperfection? why break in upon the silence of Heaven with outcries that are certainly vain and may prove hurtful to yourself? Only a fool would do it. v. 2. *For a fool resentment may slay, And a gull passion may kill*: that is, either You may die of rage, or else, Your blind insensate fury may provoke an aggravation of your sufferings. Cf. 2<sup>9,10</sup>.

The term אויל *foolish, fool*, and its cognate יאל *to be foolish*, if related to Ar. آل *to return, to thicken, coagulate*, of fluids, might signify *thick, dense, crass, obtuse, thickhead*, or the like; but it seems more plausible to compare it with אמל *to be weak, feeble*. The √מל (= ול) reappears in נמלה *ant* (עם לא עו) Pr 30<sup>26</sup> and perhaps in קמל *to languish or decay*. Cf. also Assy. *uldu*, *weak, weakling, weak-witted*; f. *ulaltum*, of a woman, *weak* = become infertile = אמללה 1 Sa 2<sup>5</sup> Je 15<sup>9</sup>; *ullu, ul, al*; Heb. אל, *non-existence, nothingness, naught, not*. The transition to the idea of moral evil usual in אויל and other Heb. words denoting foolish may be illustrated by our own *naught, naughty* (Pr 6<sup>12</sup>). (The √מל, ול, may

otherwise be the Sumerian MAL, GAL, *open* : cf. the syn. פָּתַח *open*, i.e. to all approaches, good or evil; *unreserved, unsuspecting, simple*, in the good, but chiefly in the bad sense; which comes from Sum. BAD, *pīlu*, to open.)

*Resentment*; or *vexation, anger, or grief*, at unmerited treatment. Heb. כָּעַשׂ in Job (= כָּעַם elsewhere and 22 codd. here). Cf. perhaps Sum. KASH, *impatient, furious*, of Ningirsu's chariot-horse.

*Passion*: or *heat*. קָנָא can hardly be *jealousy* here. The word was originally a colour-term; cf. Ar. قَانَا to become intensely red (or black) from henna. In Syr. ܩܢܐ (קָנָא) is *pale, livid, colour of lead*. We may suppose that Sum. GIN, *çalmu, black, dark* (CT xii. 30) is related to the Sem. √קָנָא as Sum. GIN, GI, *qanû, reed*, to Sem. קָנָה, קָנִיָּה *reed*. Thus קָנָא properly denotes the change of colour which betrays strong emotion, whether anger or jealousy.

v. 3. *I myself* (אֲנִי emphat.) *have seen a fool rooted out* (leg. מִשְׁרָשׁ; cf. 31<sup>8</sup>: מִשְׁרָשׁ *striking root*; Ps 80<sup>10</sup>: which does not harmonize with the context). *And his homestead* (v. 24; 18<sup>15</sup>) *perished of a sudden*. Leg. וַיֵּאבֵד, or simply אָבַד instead of וַיֵּאָקֹב *And I cursed*. If this were genuine, it could only mean that the ruin of the fool's house was the consequence of the sudden curse of Eliphaz. Driver's 'I.e. his habitation having been suddenly ruined, I cursed it as the abode of one who had been a sinner' is remote from the plain sense of the Hebrew, and supplies a good instance of the shifts to which unwillingness to correct the text may reduce conservative scholars. ὁ ἀλλ' εὐθέως ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δαίττα = וַיֵּאָכֵל נֹוֹהוּ: see 6<sup>6</sup> 18<sup>15</sup> Is 51<sup>8</sup> for אָכַל = βιβρώσκω. Perhaps וַיֵּאָכֵל or וַיֵּאָכֵל is right here (*his habitation was devoured or consumed*; cf. Is 17<sup>20</sup>); but אָבַד, a common word in Job, seems better. וַיִּרְקַב or וַיִּרְקַב *rotted* (of timber, Is 40<sup>20</sup>) does not suit נֹוֹהוּ. The || suggests וַיִּעָקֹר *was uprooted*: Zp 2<sup>4</sup>. Usually δαίττα = אֹהֶל *tent*, as in 8<sup>22</sup> 11<sup>14</sup> 18<sup>8,16</sup> 22<sup>28,29</sup>. In 8<sup>6</sup> it again = נֹוֹה (leg. נֹוֹה pro נֹוֹת), which originally meant a place of *lying down*, a *resting-place* of flocks (2 Sa 7<sup>6</sup> Is 65<sup>10</sup>). In Semitic the root seems to be peculiar to Hebrew and Sabean (see Driver's excellent note on 1 Sa 19<sup>18</sup>); but we need not suspect it on that account. On the contrary, we may regard it as an offshoot from the Sumerian NA, NU, for which we find the Assyr. equivalents *rabāṣu*, to lie down (רָבַץ), *zarbaṣu*, sheepfold, cattleshed; *narbaṣu*, lair, abode; *šubtum*, dwelling-place, as well as *maialu, maialtum*, bed, &c., &c. It is surely more than a mere coincidence that in Hebrew נֹוֹה is associated with רָבַץ and its derivv. (the very root which in Assyr. is so freely used for the explication of the Sumerian NA, NU), and that the extension of meanings exhibited by the Hebrew נֹוֹה and its derivv. runs so far parallel to the uses of the Sumerian NA. See also Ez 25<sup>6</sup> 34<sup>14</sup> Je 33<sup>12</sup> Pr 24<sup>15</sup> Ps 23<sup>2</sup>.

Ⓔ generalizes with the plur. ἄφρονες ῥίζαν βάλλοντας . . . αὐτῶν, but

Eliphaz appears to be alleging a particular instance from his own experience: *I myself once saw* . . .

v. 4. The sins of the father are visited on the children; his ruin entails theirs. Left without their natural protector, whose death is implied in v. 3, they were far from secure or prosperous, and were always *crushed in the gateway* (so Pr 22<sup>22</sup>)—robbed of their rights by the influence of powerful adversaries in the place of justice. Cf. 31<sup>21</sup> Ps 127<sup>6</sup> Am 5<sup>10</sup>.  $\Theta$   $\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha\beta\rho\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  δὲ ἐπὶ θύραις ἡσσόνων, *Let them be derided(?) at doors of inferiors*.  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$  =  $\sigma\kappa\iota\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  (Hesych.). Perhaps corrupt for  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\alpha\phi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , *let them be buffeted*, or  $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  (cf. Is 53<sup>5</sup>  $\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  =  $\text{מַרְבֵּץ}$ ):  $\Theta^A$   $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\beta\eta$ ) =  $\text{יִרְבֵּא}$  in all probability. So also  $\Theta^A$   $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\rho\iota\beta\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$   $\Theta^\Theta$   $\kappa\upsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$   $\Theta^\Sigma$   $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\theta\eta\gamma\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$  imply same text as  $\text{מ}$ .

v. 5. *Whose harvest* or crop:  $\text{קצירו}$  : rather  $\text{קצירם}$ .  $\Theta$   $\Theta$  imply  $\text{קצירו}$ , which some prefer. ( $^A$  γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι συνῆγαγον,  $\Theta^A$  ἐθέρισαν.) The noun gives a closer || to what follows.

*the hungry* (emphat.) *eateth*: or *would eat* (freq.) every season.  $\Theta$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$   $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ , misreading  $\text{יִשֶׁר}$  (1<sup>18</sup>) for  $\text{רַעֲבִי}$ .

*And all their sustenance he taketh*: reading  $\text{וְכָל מִצְנֵיָם}$  for  $\text{וְכָל מִצְנֵיָם}$ , which is evidently corrupt.  $\text{כָּל}$  and  $\text{כָּל}$  are not seldom confused.  $\text{מִזֶּן}$  Gn 45<sup>23</sup>; an Aramaism. The  $\sqrt{\text{זן}}$  may be compared with Sum. DUN, Ch. *tun*, *t'un*, to swallow, gobble up (DUN-DUN, to feast, *patānu ša amēli*; *naptanu*, *iptennu*, meal, feast. פָּתַן = פָּתַן = בָּדַן!).  $\Theta$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$  δὲ ἐκ κακῶν οὐκ ἐξαίρετοι  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  (=  $\Theta^A$   $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\rho\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  =  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\theta\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ) =  $\text{וְכָל מִצְנֵיָם יִקָּחוּ}$  ( $\text{וְכָל}$ ). This suggests  $\text{מִרְעָם}$  *their pasture*, or better perhaps  $\text{עֲמִירָם}$  *their sheaves*; cf. Am 2<sup>13</sup> Mi 4<sup>12</sup>.

The next line (also corrupt) makes the verse a tristich; so either this or that must be sacrificed.  $\text{וְשֵׁאֵף צִמִּים חִלָּם}$ , which some render *And a snare* ( $\text{צִמִּים}$  18<sup>9</sup> only) *snappeth at their wealth*, does not suit the context, even if the words could mean that.  $\text{שֵׁאֵף}$  (cognate with  $\text{נִשְׁאֵף}$  and  $\text{נִשְׁאֵב}$ , Is 42<sup>14</sup>, *breathe, blow, pant*) may mean *pant after, be eager for* . . . as in 7<sup>2</sup>, where the metre would be improved by adding the prep.  $\text{אַל־}$  (cf. Ec 1<sup>5</sup>); but hardly *snap after*. And why should a snare be so strongly personified in such a context? In 18<sup>9</sup>  $\Theta$  gives  $\delta\upsilon\psi\omega\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  =  $\text{צִמִּים}$  *thirsty ones* for  $\text{צִמִּים}$ ; and so  $\Theta^A\Xi$  and  $\Theta\mathfrak{B}$  here. This, or rather the sing.  $\text{צִמָּא}$  (|| c  $\text{רָעֵב}$  in st. i) is prob. correct. But what of the verb? *And the thirsty is (was) eager for their wealth* is passable sense, but inadequate to the context. Duhm's  $\text{וְשֵׁאֵף צִמָּא מִנְּלָם}$  *And the thirsty draweth from their well* will not do, for  $\text{נָל}$  *wave, heap*, never means a *well*. (in Ct 4<sup>12</sup>  $\text{נָל}$  must be read with many MSS and  $\Theta\mathfrak{B}$ ). We prefer to transpose a letter and restore  $\text{שֵׁאֵף} = \text{אִסַּף}$  (cf.  $\text{נִעַשׂ} = \text{נָעַם}$ , v. 2); a harvesting term like  $\text{קצר}$ : see Ex 23<sup>10,16</sup> Dt 11<sup>14</sup> Je 40<sup>10,12</sup> (of wine and oil and fruit). *And the thirsty would (or did) gather their fruitage* or

produce (יבלם for חילם). יביל is || פרי c fruit, Lc 26<sup>1,20</sup> al., and in Hb 3<sup>11</sup> denotes grapes. In Ez 34<sup>27</sup> (ט actually gives τήν ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς for יבילָהּ, as though it read חילָהּ). On the other hand, Jo 2<sup>22</sup> has חילם (ט τήν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν) of the fruit of the fig-tree and the vine and almost as a syn. of פרי; and it seems not impossible that חילם (ט αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχὺς) may have been so intended here. (U's verb ἐκσιφωνισθείη = ושאב prob.) Cf. 24<sup>6,11</sup>. The likeness of form between מוצנים and צמים and that of sense between יקחו and אשא (אסא) suggest a suspicion that one or other of the two lines is a duplicate or variant.

vv. 6, 7. The ruin of the fool and his family was not due to mere ill luck or mischance; for affliction is not a spontaneous or accidental growth, springing up like a weed out of the ground. It is from above and is, in fact, an inevitable consequence of the congenital imperfection of man. Since Eyob was human, he was by nature liable to sin, and the greatness of his affliction indicated that he must have sinned greatly, though not past forgiveness, inasmuch as he had not himself perished like the fool whose destruction Eliphaz had witnessed. Every wise man will expect his share of trouble, greater or less according to his deserts. Thus there is no real contradiction of 4<sup>19,29</sup>, and no good reason for banishing to the margin these two fine and perfectly relevant verses.

The י of v. 6 rather overloads st. i, unless we pronounce נילא יצא univocally. It may quite well be regarded as an accidental anticipation of v. 7.

v. 7. *is born*. Ketib Niph. Impf. יביל is preferable to Qere Pu. Pf. יל on account of the || ינבירו. The phrase *is born to trouble* might mean *is a son of Trouble* (cf. 1<sup>2</sup> and the Nom. Prop. בני אנוי), personifying עמל; but this is less likely. The verse is cast in a common proverbial type: lit. *For Man to Trouble is born; And Sons of the Vulture fly high* = (ט<sup>B</sup> ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος γεννᾶται κόπῳ (= לֵאָה ut supr.?), νεοσσοὶ δὲ γυπὸς τὰ ὑψηλὰ πέτονται. *Sons of the Vulture*: leg. בני נשר (Pr 30<sup>17</sup> Hb 1<sup>9</sup>) instead of בני רשא *Sons of Flame* = sparks (here only). The phrase of מ could not mean lightnings or fire-bolts (cf. Ps 78<sup>48</sup> Dt 32<sup>24</sup>), for these do not 'soar high', but descend; and a similar objection lies against Cheyne's 'burning arrows' (cf. Ps. 76<sup>4</sup>). Even 'sparks' that shoot up can hardly be said to 'soar high'.

It is a mistake to expect scientific precision of statement in literature, especially in Oriental poetry. A spirit of pedantic and prosaic literalness has found many difficulties here in the connexion of thought; but what sensible reader will demand mathematical exactness in a proverb or a simile? The statement of the verse is simply that 'trouble' comes as naturally to man as soaring flight to young birds of prey. The causes of sin and suffering are inborn in man—inherent in human nature.

vv. -16. If Eyob is wise, instead of continuing his angry outcries he

will 'inquire of God' (יִשְׁאַל־יְהוָה Is 8<sup>10</sup> 19<sup>3</sup> Dt 18<sup>11</sup>), who is the author of all good both in the physical and in the moral sphere, and delights to show His power by humbling the mighty and exalting the weak and oppressed.

v. 8. *my case*. עַל־דְּבָרִי here only in this sense. Ec 3<sup>18</sup> al. Ⓢ paraphrases κύριον δὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην ἐπικαλέσομαι, possibly reading שְׂרִי for אֱלֹהִים (ⓈΑ παντοκράτορα).

In v. 9 ἐνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαισία, both *glorious and extraordinary things*, looks like a double rendering of נִפְלְאוֹת (= ἐξαισία 37<sup>16</sup>; ἐνδοξά Ex 34<sup>10</sup>).

v. 10. הַנֶּחֱן is prob. a scribal error for נֶחֱן, as it is followed by יִלְחֵל, and the ptcpp. of the other verses are anarthrous. The verse briefly indicates one department of God's wonder-working power. It is dwelt on at greater length, 38<sup>25</sup> ff. For the connexion of thought see Ps 107<sup>33</sup> ff. God sends or withholds rain according to human desert. It is a feature of His moral government of mankind. Knowing nothing of the natural causes of atmospheric changes, the poet and his contemporaries regarded them as directly miraculous. For another view of their relation to conduct, see Mt 5<sup>45</sup>. The verse is prob. a (marginal?) quotation, since it is written in a different measure (four beats in each stichus).

*the commons*: or open country *outside* (חוּץ) the towns; 18<sup>17</sup> (leg. plur., as here); Pr 8<sup>26</sup>. The √ חוץ = חָצַץ = חָצָה, &c., akin to קוץ = קָצַץ = קָצָה, &c., and the prob. more primitive (נָח), נָזַח, &c. All these roots and their derivv. denote various kinds of *cutting, dividing, parting, separating, cutting off, ending*, and the original biliteral forms may be recognized in the Sumerian ĠAZ, ĠASH, GAZ, ḫačābu, ḫačācu, ḫipā, palāqu, dāku, &c. The street is the place where the houses are *cut off* or end abruptly, their end or boundary (קָצַץ, קָצָה); the open field or country is the border or boundary of the town.

v. 11. *the humble*: or lowly; prob. in station, through poverty. God fertilizes their fields with His rain, and so raises them to wealth and prosperity. See Ps 107<sup>35-38</sup>.

*And to raise*. שִׁנֵּיב for שִׁנֵּיב, which cannot well continue the construction after the Infin. of Purpose לְשִׂיב. Ⓢ ἐξεγείροντα implies Pi.

*them that mourn*: scil. over the drought and barrenness of their land. קָדְרוּ: so קָדְרוּ, Je 14<sup>2</sup> (in a similar connexion. The whole chapter supplies an excellent illustration of our passage, clearly establishing the connexion between vv. 9-11, which some have needlessly doubted). Ⓢ ἀπολωλὸτας = אֲבָרִים; a misreading. *to wellbeing*. יִשְׁע accus. loci; but restore לְיִשְׁע or בִּישְׁע (cf. לְמָרוֹם ante). Perhaps יִשְׁעוּ (cf. Ps 69<sup>30</sup>), *His salvation setteth on high or raiseth*.

v. 12. As God exhibits His overruling Power by lifting up the humble, so He also displays it when He will by turning the wisdom of the worldly-wise into foolishness, causing them to overreach themselves and



their own schemes to issue in their overthrow (2 Sa 15<sup>31</sup> Ps 5<sup>11</sup> 18<sup>2b</sup>). No mortal can hope to outwit the Allwise. Cf. 1 Co 1<sup>26</sup> 3<sup>19</sup>. We have here an implied contradiction of a primitive idea concerning the unseen Powers (see note on 1<sup>1</sup>; and cf. the frauds practised upon Cronos, Silenus, and other gods in the Greek mythology).

*thwarteth*: or *frustrateth*: כִּפֵּר: lit. *breaketh* or *shattereth*: of plans, *maketh to fail*. Ps 33<sup>10</sup> Pr 15<sup>22</sup> 2 Sa 15<sup>34</sup>. (Θ διαλλάσσοντα = נִמְ(י)ר; a misreading of similar letters.)

*achieve no success*; or effect nothing real or solid. תושיה (from ישה like תִּנְיָה from ינה) strictly means *being, existence, fact, reality*, and so *solid* or *substantial counsel, practical wisdom*, and its result *success*. The וְשֵׁה, which in Heb. has been supplanted by the substantival שֵׁה, appears in Assy. as išû, Pf. išî, Pm. išâku, *to have, to exist, to be*. Thus Θ ἀλγέθης, (anything) *real* or *substantial*, any solid result, is apt enough. Perhaps, however, we should read תְּשׁוּעָה *deliverance*, as Θ does (wrongly) in 30<sup>22</sup>: *So that their hands effect no deliverance*.

v. 13. *catcheth* or *snareth*, as in a trap: Je 5<sup>26</sup> Pr 5<sup>22</sup> Am 3<sup>5</sup>.

*in their own craft* or *cunning* or *shrewdness* or *prudence* (Pr 1<sup>4</sup> 8<sup>5,12</sup>): Θ ἐν τῇ φρονήσει (but Θ<sup>A</sup> + αὐτῶν), perhaps reading בְּעֵרְמָה מִן בְּעֵרְמָה (from עֵרַם, which is not otherwise found) is improb. Leg. בְּעֵרְמָתָם (cf. Pr 11. cc.), and see S. Paul's quotation from memory, 1 Co 3<sup>18</sup> (ὁ δρασ-σόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν). For the idea, see also Ps 7<sup>15f.</sup> 9<sup>15f.</sup> Pr 26<sup>27</sup> Ec 10<sup>8</sup>, &c. What seemed a faultless plan may fail, and even involve its authors in ruin. בְּאַרְבָּם *in their treachery* (Je 9<sup>7</sup>) is unsuitable. The irony of Fortune, or rather of Providence, may defeat the schemes of the wisest. Cf. Pr 21<sup>30</sup>.

*the shifty*; or *tortuous*: lit. those who *twist* and *writhe*, as in wrestling (נִפְתָּלִים; cf. Gn 30<sup>8</sup> Ps 18<sup>26b</sup> Pr 8<sup>6</sup>). Θ πολυπλόκων, *much-tangled* or *twisting*; cf. πολυπλοκία, *craftiness* (but Σ σκολιά).

*maketh vain*: יִהְיֶה לְהִנָּח for נִמְהָר. Θ ἐξέστησεν, *he deranged* or *distracted* = יִהְיֶה לְהִנָּח *maketh foolish* (12<sup>17</sup>), which is possibly right (יְהוֹלֵל or מְהוֹלֵל, as Ec 2<sup>2</sup>): cf. Is 44<sup>26</sup>. Otherwise we might restore יִמְהָר *he changeth* or *overthroweth* or *perverteth it* (v. 5); or even יִהְיֶה לְהִנָּח *he maketh it vain* or *futile*. An Impf. seems to be required by the context; and in any case נִמְהָר, which is only used of persons elsewhere (Is 32<sup>4</sup> 35<sup>4</sup> Hb 1<sup>6</sup>; all), is unsatisfactory here. It cannot mean 'is carried headlong' (to ruin?), as RV, but only 'is hurried, hasty, impetuous, anxious', or the like: an inadequate sense in the context.

v. 14. Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat, 12<sup>16</sup> Je 4<sup>10</sup> 20<sup>7</sup> 1 K 22<sup>20</sup> Ez 14<sup>9</sup> Ro 1<sup>21f.</sup> 2 Th 2<sup>11</sup>. Judicial blindness obscures even the obvious. Their clever schemes having failed, the worldly-wise are lost in bewilderment. We may remember that the zealous propagandists of Negation have not yet found any better substitute for the Light of the

World (Joh 8<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>35f.</sup>) than a dark and dreary pessimism, whose ultimate outcome can only be the paralysis of moral endeavour and despair of the future of the race. Cf. Is 58<sup>10</sup> 59<sup>10</sup> (and perhaps read ינששו after the latter passage).

v. 15. מִפִּיהֶם מִחֶרֶב וַיִּשַׁע and *he hath saved from the sword from their mouth* is clearly corrupt, as the transitive verb requires an object in place of the meaningless מִפִּיהֶם which, moreover, violates the parallelism. It may be regarded as a gloss on מִחֶרֶב which has displaced the original עָנִי *poor, humble*, a common || אֲבִיִּן 24<sup>1</sup> Pr 31<sup>20</sup>. The *ductus litterarum* might also suggest יתום *the orphan* (Je 5<sup>28</sup>). Duhm strangely alters וַיִּשַׁע into וַיִּשְׁע 'aber er wird retten', as if Eliphaz were making a special promise to Eyob, instead of a general statement of the Divine procedure. (The Impf. c Waw Conv., in continuation of the Ptcpp. מִכֶּסֶד, לִכְר, affirms what God has always done in the past and therefore will do in the future.) ὁ ἀπόλοι(ν)το δὲ ἐν πολέμῳ implies וַיִּשָּׁם or וַיִּשָּׁד for וַיִּשַׁע. In st. ii ἐξέλθοι may represent a guess of (Aram.) מִפִּיהֶם for מִפִּיהֶם.

v. 16. Lit. *And there became to the weak a hope; And Injustice, she shut her mouth.* False accusations, insults, and injurious menaces to the weak and helpless are shamed or scared into silence by the signal interposition of Heaven. St. ii recurs in Ps 107<sup>42</sup> (an echo of this passage). Cf. also Is 52<sup>15</sup>. For עוֹלָה *injustice* or *iniquity*, in the special sense of *untruthful language*, see 13<sup>7</sup> 27<sup>4</sup>.

vv. 17-24. Affliction is a blessing in disguise; and, if humbly accepted as such, can only issue in greater good than ever.

v. 17. The emphatic exclamation אֲשֶׁרִי should naturally head its own sentence, as in Ps 1<sup>1</sup> *al. saep.* The intrusive הִנֵּה (om. 5 codd.; ⑤ ⑥ ⑦) is prob. from the hand of a copyist who, ignoring the rhythm, desired to call special attention to what follows. Om. also אֱלֹהֵי metr. grat. For the sentiment see Pr 3<sup>11,12</sup> (where in v. 12 we must read וַיִּכְאֵב *and he hurteth*, as here, instead of וַיִּכְאֵב *and like a father*). See also Heb 12<sup>5-11</sup>. Elihu amplifies the idea of the remedial intention of sickness, 33<sup>17-30</sup>.

v. 18. Or, *For 'tis He that hurteth, &c.* Sickness and health, weal and woe, are both from God, as Eyob, of course, admitted equally with his would-be monitor. It was the ground of his perplexity. For the thought see Ho 6<sup>1</sup> Dt 32<sup>39</sup> Ps 147<sup>3</sup>. *bind up.* ⑤ πάλιν ἀποκαθίστησιν = וַיִּשֶׁב for וַיִּחַשׁ. But ⑥ ἐπιθήσει = וַיִּשֶׁם; ⑦ μολώσει *will bandage* (= וַיִּחַשׁ Ho 6<sup>1</sup> ⑤). Ad fin. v. תְּרַפָּאנָה = תְּרַפִּינָה (י for א, by attraction of preceding e-vowel; or perhaps a mere scribal error).

v. 19. *In six . . . And in seven . . .* This shows that בִּשְׁשׁ is right, not מִשְׁשׁ (wrongly inferred from ⑤ ἑξάκις ἑξαγαγῶν κτλ.). The sense is: In all successive troubles, no matter how many, He will deliver thee. For the mode of speaking, cf. Pr 6<sup>16-19</sup>: *These six things hateth IAHVAH, And seven are abominations of His soul.* The seven are

then enumerated. Cf. also Pr 30<sup>15ff.</sup> Accordingly, we should expect a similar enumeration here, if the text be sound; and, in fact, vv. 20-22 supply it even in the traditional text.

v. 20. The first two 'straits'—War and Famine. *he will ransom thee*: Heb פָּדָךְ: a Pf. of Future Certainty. 𐤱 rightly ῥύσεται σε. The Common-Semitic פָּדָה, Assy. *padû*, to release, set free, prob. goes back to the Sum. BAD, to open, as do also *pitû*, פָּתַח, פָּתַח, &c. 𐤱 dual, Leg. מִיד sing., c 𐤱 ἐκ χειρός, and Ho 13<sup>14</sup>; Ps 22<sup>21</sup> al.

v. 21. *from the lash (or scourge) of the tongue* = 𐤱 ἀπὸ μαστιγῆς γλώσσης. מִשּׁוֹט for בְּשׁוֹט. Cf. Ps 31<sup>21</sup>. But all the other evils mentioned are physical calamities; and it is strange to find slander in such company. Moreover, God's four sore judgements had become almost a proverb (Famine, Wild Beasts, Pestilence, and Sword: Ez 15<sup>17</sup> 14<sup>13-21</sup>; cf. Le 26<sup>16-26</sup> Dt 32<sup>24f.</sup>); and after the 'Famine' and 'Sword' of v. 20, Wild Beasts and Pestilence would naturally follow. And as the former are specified in v. 22 (חֵית הָאָרֶץ), mention of the latter might well be expected in the intervening verse. Now שׁוֹט *whip* (Na 3<sup>2</sup>) seems to occur in 9<sup>23</sup> fig. = Divine Scourge, Plague, or some other calamity (cf. Is 10<sup>26</sup>; not 28<sup>15</sup>: see Box ad loc.), but is not so found elsewhere in Job. On the other hand, we have שׁוֹט, 1<sup>7</sup> 2<sup>2</sup>, of Satan's roaming and roving about the earth. We may therefore point בְּשׁוֹט, and reading רִשָּׁף *pestilence* (Hb 3<sup>5</sup> Dt 32<sup>24</sup>) for לָשׁוֹן *tongue* (with Duhm), we get the sense *When the Pest is abroad, thou shalt be hidden*. With שׁוֹט here cf. יוֹחֵל, Ps 91<sup>6</sup>; a passage which also suggests בְּשׁוֹר קָטַב *when Plague wasteth* (or *killeth*, Ju 5<sup>27</sup> Je 5<sup>6</sup>). For קָטַב as a syn. of רָשַׁף *pestis*, cf. Dt 32<sup>24</sup> (Ho 13<sup>14</sup> = דָּבַר id.). We might get the same general sense by reading the whole verse thus:

מִשּׁוֹט יָשׁוּר תִּחְבֶּא

= וְלֹא תִירָא רִשָּׁף כִּי תָבוֹא

*From the Scourge that killeth thou shalt be hidden* (cf. Ps 91<sup>1</sup>),

*And thou shalt not fear the Pest when it cometh.*

ישׁוּר for לשׁוֹן; רִשָּׁף = מִשּׁוֹר reversed! But ישׁוּר almost certainly echoes ישׁוּר in Ps 91 l.c. (note the Med. ו); and there are other points of connexion with the psalm, as we shall see presently.

v. 22. 'dl (dupl)' is Kittel's curt and positive note. It is true that we have לֹא תִירָא and מִשּׁוֹר in v. 21 and אֵל תִּירָא and לֹשֶׁר in v. 22; while כָּפֶן *famine*, v. 22 (also 30<sup>3</sup>) is an Aramaism = רָעַב, v. 20. If, however, v. 22 was originally a mere duplicate of the previous verse, the poet's catalogue of Seven Evils cannot satisfactorily be made out. But שׁוֹר may represent a partly effaced שׁחַל, and כָּפֶן may be a disguise of פָּחַן, the letters כָּפֶת being subject to frequent confusion in Hebrew manuscripts. We therefore restore וּלְפָחַן חֲשׂוֹק (cf. 11) *At the lion and the cobra thou shalt laugh, And of the beasts of the earth thou shalt not*

(leg. ולל) *be afraid*. Cf. Ps 91<sup>14</sup>. A cross-division, no doubt; but the poet is enumerating objects of terror, after his literary precedents, and is not attempting a zoological classification.

Ⓜ<sup>B</sup> ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐρχομένων hardly implies מרע for מש(ו)ר, but merely paraphrases מ. Ⓜ<sup>A</sup> ἀπὸ ταραπυρίας = משר; see Hb 1<sup>3</sup> 2<sup>17</sup>. Instead of מ לשר ולכפן Ⓜ gives ἀδίκων καὶ ἀνόμων = לַעֲלֹל וְלַחֲנֹף (see 18<sup>21</sup> 29<sup>17</sup> 31<sup>3</sup> and Is 9<sup>16(17)</sup>), which may lend some support לִשְׂחַל ולפתן (ש = עו; ח = ח, as often). 'Die Lesung der LXX: שַׁחַל und פֶּתֶר, aramäisch, kommt nicht ernstlich in Betracht' (Duhm). But that is not the reading of Ⓜ, which never renders שַׁחַל by ἀδικεῖν or ἀδικος.

v. 23. Lit. *For with the sons (בני) of the field is thy covenant*. אבני מ. stones. Rashi's conjecture of an older reading אֲרִיִּי *lords*, in the sense of the mythical satyrs and the like, is less probable. The passage is a reminiscence of Ho 2<sup>20</sup> (AV 18); and בני השדה is a poetic variation of חית השדה. These, the wild boar, the fox, &c. (Ps 80<sup>14</sup> Ct 2<sup>15</sup> Ho 2<sup>14</sup> (12)), will no longer ravage the fields and vineyards. Ⓜ om., not understanding the st., or by mere oversight.

Was אבני suggested by Ps 91<sup>12</sup> בַּן חֲנוּף בִּאֲבֵן רִגְלֶךָ *Lest thou strike thy foot on the stone?* Driver thinks of a 'poet. figure, implying that stones will not accumulate to mar his fields'. But how could this happen, except on a hill-side, or through human agency (2 K 3<sup>19</sup>), which is hardly implied here?

v. 24. *Shalt go over thy fold or muster thy flock*. For פקר see 1 Sa 11<sup>8</sup> al. For נוה *sheepfold(s) or pastures*, see notes on v. 3. Ⓜ<sup>B</sup> ἡ δὲ δίαυτα τῆς σκατῆς σου οὐ μὴ ἀμάρτυ, *The abode (or maintenance?) of thy tent shall not fail*, is curious. It looks as if Ⓜ read לֹא תִהְיֶה לָּא אֲהַלְךָ (נוה = δίαυτα in vv. 3 and 8<sup>6</sup>). Ⓜ<sup>A</sup> gives καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ τῆς εὐπρεπίας σου καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀμάρτυς, pointing ἰπְקִירָת against the sense and mistaking נוה for נֹאֶה.

v. 25. *And thou shalt know*: as before, v. 24. 'Dass beide Verse mit וְיָדַעַת beginnen, ist nicht grade schön und wohl auch nicht ursprünglich.' The repetitions in vv. 21-25, however, may be regarded as rhetorical. They give the impression of eager urgency on the part of the speaker, as though he were making an extemporaneous appeal. It would have been as easy for the poet to vary his phrases as it is for a modern critic to find fault with a sameness which so effectively mimics the manner of unpremeditated speech. 8 codd. and Ⓜ הַשְּׂדֵה *the field* pro הָאָרֶץ *the earth*; but cf. Am 7<sup>2</sup>.

v. 26. *with powers unimpaired: or in thy full vigour*: lit. *in thy moisture or freshness*. Thou shalt never become dry and sapless, like a withered tree; but shalt retain all thy faculties to the last, like Moses, Dt 34<sup>7</sup>, whose 'eye was not dim nor his natural force (לֵה) abated' at the age of 120. Leg. בְּלִחָה pro בְּבִלְחָה here, and in 30<sup>2</sup> (the only other place where the doubtful word בְּלַח occurs), אֲבָרִי לָהֶם *youths whose*

*sap* has perished. (The Ar. *عكس* to show the teeth, grin, lends no support to *עָלַף* in the sense required by the context.) Cf. also Je 11<sup>19</sup> (*בלחמ > בלחמו*). *Θ* om. hic; 30<sup>2</sup> legit, ut videtur, *ἡλῆξ συντέλεια*.

As the corn (lit. *heap* or *shock* of sheaves: Ex 22<sup>5</sup> Ju 15<sup>5</sup>) *goeth up*; scil. to the high place where it was threshed and winnowed, the *גֶּרַן* or threshing-floor. *Θ*<sup>B</sup> has a double or conflate version of the st., the alternative being the more accurate rendering (*θημωνιά* = *θημωνιά* = classical *θημών*, a *heap*).

We cannot suppose a direct reference to the complete restoration of Eyob's fortunes in the Epilogue (42<sup>10 ff.</sup>), although Eliphaz perhaps poses as a Seer, 4<sup>12 ff.</sup>. Nor has the poet for the moment forgotten (vv. 20, 24, 25) that Eyob has already lost his all—slaves, flocks and herds, and children alike. But neither can we suppose 'a gentle irony' (eine *leise Ironie*) to be intended by making Eliphaz develop his doctrine at such length in contradiction of the obvious facts of the case before him, and close with an emphatic assertion that things are really so unless indeed the same irony is to be traced in every reiteration of the same doctrine in the speeches of the Three Friends and even in those of Elihu. The section vv. 17–27 (*Happy the man, &c., . . . in its season*), which reads almost like a psalm (cf. Pss 1, 91, 92, 112, 128, &c.), might conceivably be a quotation of a then well-known piece; in which case the poet would not feel free to make any material alteration in its phraseology. But that assumption is not essential to a right conception of the argument. The opening 'Happy is the man,' &c., is quite general; and the repeated 'thou's' and 'thee's' of the following verses are no more personal to Eyob than those of Ps 92. The poet, of course, knows the issue, but Eliphaz does not. The dénouement when it comes is a great surprise to the three friends who had been so certain of Eyob's guilt that they felt small sympathy for his miseries (cf. 6<sup>14 ff.</sup>). Vv. 19–26 cannot be a prophecy of Eyob's future, if only because of v. 27 which declares that what precedes is a statement of the results of the friends' personal observation and experience, which Eyob would do well to lay to heart. Eliphaz does not forget. The painful facts are before his eyes. He shows an appalling want of sympathy when he deliberately draws an idyllic picture of the good old man enjoying to the last those marks of the Divine favour—health, wealth, and numerous offspring—of which Eyob had so suddenly been bereft. He implies that if Eyob's life had always been governed by the rule of patient submission to the Divine Hand, alike in weal and woe, he would not have been brought to this pass, and his fortunes would have been far otherwise. Even now there is room for penitence and mercy; and Eyob may live to see brighter days. Eyob replies (7<sup>6 ff.</sup>) that it is too late; his sickness is fatal, and his sufferings will soon end in death.

So far from ignoring or forgetting Eyob's ruined state, Eliphaz has it always present to his mind as proof absolute of that guilt which, according to him and his friends, such ruin must always imply. The section, as a whole, purports to set forth how God usually deals with the man who admits his fault and takes whatever ill befalls him as a Divine chastisement intended for his good. Had this always been Eyob's attitude, the blessedness described would have been his happy lot. But, as things were, his actual condition was crying evidence of the sin that caused it, and angry rebellion was an aggravation of the original offence. The only hope for him lies in acknowledgment and submission. In bitter contrast with the woful present, Eliphaz draws a picture of what might have been. In the long run it goes well with the good man who owns his faults and is patient under the Divine chastisement. His health, his crops, his cattle, his children, thrive, and his end is happy. Eyob's unparalleled calamities, the opposite of all this, are conclusive evidence of unacknowledged guilt; but if he will submit and humbly confess his fault, he may yet find mercy.

v. 27. *We have heard it*: שָׁמְעָה; cf. Θ ταῦτά ἐστιν ἡ ἀκηκόαμεν. שָׁמְעָה hear it! The other pointing gives a better parallel, and is almost required with the emphatic אָתָּה which follows.

Chapters 6, 7. EYOB'S FIRST ANSWER TO ELIPHAZ.

Chapter 6. My affliction far outweighs my 'resentment', as you call it (כַּעַשׁ, 5<sup>2</sup>). I do not cry out without cause, any more than a wild ass or an ox would be noisy if he were not hungry. Complaining is the salt which helps me to stomach my sufferings. I long to die; for, worn out with disease, I am helpless and hopeless (vv. 1-13).

v. 2. *my misery or trouble* (אֲוִי = Θ τὰς δὲ ὁδύνας μου cf. 20<sup>10</sup> Gn 35<sup>18</sup>). Or leg. אִירִי *my calamity or distress*. Both words are common in Wisdom-Lit. מַר (Q) הָיִיתִי *my ruin*; fem. sing. But in this sense the plur. is usual, Ps 91<sup>3</sup> al. Pr 19<sup>13</sup> v. 30 (30<sup>13</sup> is corrupt). Moreover, a masc. subject is required for יִכְבֵּר, v. 2.

St. ii, lit. *And that they would lift* (Impers. = *were lifted*): Θ ἄπαυ, sing. *he (or one) would lift*. 'To lift' is also the etymological meaning of שָׁקַל, Assyr. šaqālu, *to weigh* (cf. the Sum. GAL, našú = נָשָׂא, *lift, carry*); and our own 'weigh' = A. S. wegan, *lift, carry*. See Skeat.

v. 3. מַר כִּי עָתָה *For now* (= then), as in 3<sup>13</sup>. The עָתָה overloads the st., and is superfluous. With the simile cf. Pr 27<sup>3</sup>.

*wild*: incoherent and disordered, like the babble of delirium. מַרְעִי, Pf. of מָרַע or לָעַע. Θ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐστὶν φαῦλα, perhaps reading מַרְעִי (לָעַע): cf. Θ Is 28<sup>11</sup> 33<sup>19</sup> (of unintelligible foreign speech); Ho 7<sup>16</sup>. But see also Pr 20<sup>25</sup> Ob 16. יָעַל *go up* (in the balance Ps 62<sup>10</sup>) gives a better parallel.

v. 4. *in my flesh*: בְּבָשָׁרִי pro מַעֲרִי with me; which, acc. to Dr, means

'ever present to my consciousness'. בָּעֲרִי *in my skin* or בְּבָשָׁרִי *in my flesh* = ὁ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, is simpler, and yields a better || to 'my spirit'. Eyob's skin was the visible seat of his malady: see 7<sup>6</sup> 19<sup>20</sup> 30<sup>30</sup>. For בָּשָׂר = σῶμα, see 41<sup>16</sup>. With the 'arrows of Shaddai', tipped with the poison of disease, we may compare the shafts of death which Apollo Smintheus shot at the Achaeans host, Il. i. 44 ff. See also Ps 91<sup>5</sup> f. Dt 28<sup>22</sup> 32<sup>23</sup> f. Ps 18<sup>16</sup> Ez 5<sup>16</sup> Ps 38<sup>2</sup> La 3<sup>12</sup> f. al.

*Whose venom my spirit drinketh.* Om. אֲשֶׁר as superfluous and prosaic. It spoils the rhythm, unless we read שָׁחַמְתָּם. ὁ ὧν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν ἐκπίνει μὲν τὸ αἷμα (θυμός = חָמָה as in Dt 32<sup>33</sup>) reads רָחִי for רָחִי (רוּחִי).

*Eloah's terrors array themselves against me* = אֱלֹהִים יַעֲרֹכֵנִי. A questionable text. The first word recurs, Ps 88<sup>17</sup> only; and ὁ gives ὅταν ἀρξώμαι λαλεῖν (= אָמַרְי בָּעַת אֲמָרִי) κεντούσιν με (= וִידְקֹרֵנִי: cf. Nu 25<sup>8</sup> ἀπεκέντησεν = וִידְקֹרֵנִי; Ju 9<sup>34</sup> ἐξεκέντησεν αὐτόν = וִידְקֹרֵהוּ; κατακέντ Je 51<sup>4</sup>), *Whenever I begin to speak, they stab me.*

Kittel's note 'I c ὁ יַעֲרֹכֵנִי cf. 1 R 18, 18' is therefore incorrect as regards ὁ (עָרָה = διαστρέφειν in l. c., 1 K 18<sup>17</sup> f.). Otherwise Dillmann's יַעֲרֹקֵנִי *trouble me* is a good suggestion, and perhaps better than יַעֲרֹקֵנִי *gnaw me* (cf. 30<sup>17</sup>). Duhm completes the tetrastich by transference of v. 7<sup>a</sup> *My soul refuseth to rest*, which is certainly ingenious; see, however, the notes on that verse. Possibly a line like וַיִּמָּצֵא אֵל תְּבַעֲתֵנִי (33<sup>7</sup> 9<sup>34</sup> 3<sup>5</sup> 13<sup>11,21</sup> 15<sup>24</sup> Ps 88<sup>16</sup> f.) *And the dread of El affrighteth me* has fallen out owing to its resemblance to בָּעֲרִי אֱלֹהִים.

v. 5. As animals cry out for hunger, so I cry out for pain.

*fodder*: בָּלִיל (24<sup>6</sup>): str. *moistened food, maslin*. See Is 30<sup>24</sup> בָּלִיל חֲמִיץ *fodder seasoned with rock salt* or with salt herbs, which would bring out the sap. The בָּלִיל = Assy. *balḏlu*, to pour, pour out or over, to moisten, wet, and (of metals) melt. The primitive root is seen in the Sumerian BAL, *tabāku*, to pour out. (Om. Suff. c ὁ ὅ ὅ.)

v. 6. *Is tafil eaten without salt?* The name of some succulent vegetable, eaten as salad, seems to be required by the parallelism. In Arabic *tuf* means spittle (which is a slimy and, in health, a tasteless fluid), and *tafala* is to spit or spirt saliva. In the Talmud תָּפַל = *unsalted, fresh*, of בָּשָׂר *flesh* and דָּג *fish*, as opp. to מְלֵחַ *salted* (Shab. 128<sup>a</sup>), prob. as retaining the slimy and sticky juices which salt draws out. In Ez 13<sup>10</sup> ff. תָּפַל = the plaster of a wall (a slimy sticky substance, smeared over the surface) = Assy. *tapalu*. In this last sense Heb. and Aram. have also מָפַל (13<sup>4</sup>), to plaster, stick on, with the intermediate *t*, from the root D-B preserved in רָבַץ to stick or cling to.

עֲפִסָּה *the thing that has lost its flavour or savour*, insulsum, insipidum (cf. Mt 5<sup>13</sup>); a term used, like Heb. תָּפַל (La 2<sup>14</sup>) and תְּפִלָּה *folly, unreason* (1<sup>22</sup> Je 23<sup>13</sup>), fig. in the sense of *foolish, silly*.

*without salt*: עֲפִסָּה is prob. a scribal error, due to reading

ⲙⲁⲗⲗ salt backwards. ⲧⲏⲃⲏⲗⲁ ⲙⲟⲗⲓⲧⲁ ⲙⲟⲗⲁⲧ cooked stuff in which is no salt.

sap of bugloss (*Anchusa officinalis*): or slimy juice of purslane (*Portulaca oleracea*). Heb. בריר חלמות in the slime of ḥallāmūth. רִיר is spittle in 1 Sa 21<sup>14</sup> (= Aram. רִירָא). As vb. it means to flow, let flow (Le 15<sup>3</sup>), and may be compared with Sum. RI, to go, to flow, to beget (also A-RI, water—let flow = beget; cf. Nu 24<sup>7</sup>); UĠ-RIA, witchcraft, bewitching, enchantment (spittle—let flow). The importance of spittle in Babylonian magic is well known. (RIR = RI-RI? The Arab. rawwala, slaver, emit semen, rāla, to slaver, riyāl, slaver, are younger forms. The same root R-L = R-R may perhaps be recognized in עִרֵל uncircumcised; cf. Arab. أَرَلَ and أَرَلَ (رעל = רל trilateralized internally). The primary sense would be *fluxui obnoxius*.

חלמות: ⲧⲏⲃⲏⲗⲁ ⲙⲟⲗⲓⲧⲁ ⲙⲟⲗⲁⲧ the while of an egg and the yolk; combining two opposite interpretations. It adds: 'Another Targum. As no greenstuff (בִּשְׁשׁ = Syr. حَفْصٌ wild rue!) is eaten without salt, so there is no taste in the slime of the yolk (ברירא דחלמונא).' The 'slime of the yolk' seems an odd way of signifying the 'white' of an egg. Ⲙ Or is there taste ⲙⲓⲥⲁⲙⲁⲗ in the slime of the *Anchusa* herb (a kind of borage)? Saad., however, renders *fī rīqī'l ḥamqā'i*, in succo portulacae, in the juice of purslane; a leguminous plant which exudes mucilage (see Lane, s. v. حَق).

Ⲙ, which gives a good paraphrase of the last verse, has ἄπρος (לחם) for תפל (owing to confusion and transposition of similar letters); while instead of חלמות בריר it presents ἐν ῥήματι κενοῖς, reading ברברי (Ex 5<sup>9</sup>) and perhaps pointing ḥallāmōt (= in words of dreams).

v. 7. In v. 7 a we find παύσασθαι = לרניע (cf. Dt 28<sup>65</sup> = ἀναπαύσει) and ἡ ὀργή μου = בעשי (v. 2) instead of נפשי. For mine 'impatience' refuseth to rest is at least a good variant, if not the original reading. Eyob's indignant outcries were the salt of his sufferings. For 7 b we have βρώμον (= βρωμῶν) γὰρ ὁπῶ τὰ σῖτά μου (32<sup>4</sup>) ὥσπερ ὁσμὴν λέοντος For I perceive my food as rank as the reek of a lion; a possible paraphrase of וְהָמָה בָּאֲרִי לַחְמִי It maketh my bread stink like the lion. (Cf. 33<sup>20</sup>: Bateson Wright.) Rejecting the improbable allusion to the smell of a lion, and reading בָּקִי (= בקיא), we get the sense It loathes it as vomit of my food or It makes my food loathsome (lit. stinking) as vomit. וְהֵמָּה כְּרִי לַחְמִי They are like the sickness of my food; which is clearly nonsense. It is quite likely, considering that in the || passage 33<sup>20</sup> חיה is the subject of וְהָמָה and || to נפש in the sense of appetite (38<sup>39</sup>), that the true text here is וְהָמָה חִיִּי לַחְמִי My Life loatheth my food.

Duhm, after completing the quatrain, v. 4, by help of 7 a, My soul refuseth to rest (Ⲙ: vid. supr.), gets rid of וְהָמָה כְּרִי לַחְמִי by banishing it



to the margin as the perversion of an Aramaic gloss on חלמות, viz. הפו כרו חלמון *They are (?) now egg-yolk*. Further, out of this gloss, already embodied in the text, ⑤ made המה כריה לבי (א) *They are like the stink of a lion*. Duhm adds that, as Bickell notes, the Syrians call leprosy 'Lion-stench', because of the foul smell of the ulcers. Ingenious as all this may be, it leaves out half of ⑤'s rendering (βρόμον ὀρεῖ τὰ σῖτά μου = לחמי (?) והמת). Moreover, the plur. המו—המה cannot refer only to חלמות.

⑤ *My soul is weary of its striking, Or my battle shouteth like a drunken man*, absurd as it sounds, agrees with ⑤ in st. i, merely taking לנעו in its other sense, *to strike*; while in st. ii it points המה *shouted* instead of המתה *they* and לחמי *my fighting* instead of לחמי *my food*, and substitutes כרוה *ut ebrius* for the unintelligible כרוי. The verse may be a marginal intrusion. Cf. Bickell.

v. 8. *My hope*. Apparently a reference to the words of Eliphaz, 4<sup>6</sup> 5<sup>16</sup>. Eyob repudiates the suggestions of his mentor. His only hope and prayer is to die. תאיתי *my wish* (Hupfeld) would yield a closer ||, but is hardly necessary. Ps 21<sup>3</sup>.

v. 9. *Eloah*; ⑤ ὁ κύριος (also in v. 8, where ⑤A ὁ θεός, i.e. θεός). Leg. שדי Shaddai here (= Κύριος, vv. 4, 14).

would will: or be pleased: or undertake (= ⑤ ἀρξάμενος). The ואל, ואל, may be compared with Sum. UL, *joy, pleasure* (ullu, elcu), and MUL (= WUL), *shine, be bright*, whence also springs אל God.

crush: 4<sup>10</sup> 19<sup>2</sup> al. ⑤ τρωσάτω με. Prob. not a different reading. The translator uses τρωσάτω loosely for various Heb. verbs: see 16<sup>6</sup> 20<sup>24</sup> 41<sup>20</sup>. Instead of *Would let loose* (תיר) Hi. Impf. of נתר 37<sup>1</sup>; Ps 105<sup>25</sup> Is 58<sup>6</sup>) *his hand and cut me off* (scil. like threads from the warp: Is 38<sup>12</sup>), ⑤ writes εἰς τέλος δὲ μὴ με ἀνελέτω, *But let him not take me away utterly (or for ever)!*—a deliberate alteration. The daring language of the original shocked the translator's sense of reverence. It is possible, of course, that his text was illegible here, and that he read ויהי לוא יבצעני; but such a contradiction of the previous line is unlikely. ⑤ perhaps remembered Je 10<sup>24</sup>. ⑤AΣ ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα κτλ. more correctly. (For a similar prayer, cf. Nu 11<sup>15</sup> 1 K 19<sup>4</sup>.)

v. 10 (a triplet) looks like a doctrinal gloss based upon Ps 119<sup>40.50</sup>. נחמתי *my comfort*, occurs only there and here. קדוש *The Holy One* (Is 40<sup>25</sup> Hb 3<sup>3</sup>) is not a name of God elsewhere in Job. In fact, the word does not occur at all in the sing., and only twice in the plur. (as a designation of the Angels). Further, the Heb. text is very doubtful. The form יהתי (Weak Waw c Juss.) naturally continues the previous construction: *And that my comfort might still exist*: which is almost meaningless. Reading ואת, with three codd., 𐤁 (אד), 𐤁, and, above all, with the archetypal passage Ps 119<sup>60</sup>, and taking ותתי as

beginning the Apodosis, we get the sense: *Then this should become my comfort.* (Θ εἶη δέ μου πόλις τάφος = וְהָיָה עֵינִי קְבוּרָתִי; a misreading of similar letters, which really confirms מ. For τάφος Θ<sup>AO</sup> παράκλησις recte.

*And I would exult.* מְאֻסְלֶרָה; almost certainly corrupt. The *semel dict.* סִלַּר, which in the Talmud = *aduri, retrahi*, does not suit here, and is prob. a disguise of עלם = עלו to rejoice, exult, which we find elsewhere only in Job (20<sup>18</sup> 39<sup>13</sup>), and in Pr 7<sup>18</sup>†. The ἀπ. λεγ. חִילָה, again, should at least be the not uncommon חִיל (Ex 15<sup>14</sup> and five other places; but not elsewhere in Job). לֹא יִחְמוּל, however, which follows, can only refer to a person—in this case, God (cf. 16<sup>13</sup> 27<sup>22</sup>). We therefore restore בְּחִילָה when he tortureth (Hi. Infin.—cf. Ps 29<sup>3</sup>), or we might perhaps merely point בְּחִיָּה = בְּחִילָה in the same sense. For לֹא leg. וְלֹא c 26 codd. The st. thus says: *And I would exult when He tortured and spared not!* Θ ἐφ' ἧς ἐπὶ τευχέων ἡλλόμην ἐπ' αὐτῆς = וְאֶעֱלֶסָּה בְּחִיָּהּ (or וְאֶדְלֶנָּה; cf. Ps 18<sup>50</sup>). St. iii is not very clear. *For I have not hidden* (put out of sight) *the words* (moral precepts) *of the Holy One.* In 23<sup>12</sup> he protests that he has treasured them in his bosom. For כָּחַר Pi. to hide principles or facts of moral observation, cf. 15<sup>18</sup> 27<sup>11</sup>. If it be meant that Eyob has never disregarded the Commandments, and that 'no accusing conscience would therefore impair his comfort in death' (Dr), the verse would seem to hint at redress in the life beyond the grave. As we shall see, however, nothing of that kind is to be found anywhere in the rest of the book. Eyob expected and obtained complete vindication in the present life. A more suitable statement would be something of this kind: 'It should still be my comfort and joy, amid the extremest agonies, that (פִּי; Ps 119<sup>50</sup>) I have spoken nothing but the truth.' *That I have not hidden* = that I have openly declared; a meiosis. קְרוּשׁ, which overweighs the st. with a fourth stress, may be replaced by קִרְשׁ (cf. Θ ῥήματα ἅγια) or even יִשָּׁר (v. 25). What I said (3<sup>20</sup> ff.) about God's dealings with man was not impious, as you suggest, but *holy* (i.e. blameless) or *right* (i.e. correct). Cf. 42<sup>7-8</sup>. Θ οὐ γὰρ ἐψευσάμην ῥήματα ἅγια Θεοῦ μου, *For I belied not holy words* (= broke not holy commandments?) *of my God* (Θ<sup>A</sup> ἐν ῥήματι θεοῦ). But כָּחַר is not *negare, mentiri*, anywhere else in Job (where it occurs six times besides) or the OT, though the root has that meaning in Ethiopic (cf. also Ar. جَحَدَ negavit).

v. 11. *wait*: the attitude of hope is implied. יָחַל is used thus abs., 13<sup>16</sup> 14<sup>14</sup>. It is trans. in Ps 119<sup>49</sup>; but cf. vv. 74, 81. Θ ὑπομένω, cf. Ja 5<sup>11</sup> τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰωβ. Add וְיָג metri gratia.

*end*: i.e. of life: its appointed limit: Ps 39<sup>5</sup> Gn 6<sup>13</sup>. It seems implied that the end is near. *endure*: or *be patient*: lit. *prolong* or *lengthen my soul*. In Heb. length and shortness of soul or spirit mean patience and impatience respectively. So we speak of a 'short temper'.

v. 12. The second st. is metrically too short. Prob. הָא (הוּא) has

fallen out at the end before the following הָא, v. 13. Also a Waw cop. (leg. וָא) has fallen out after Yod (י) *ad init.* st. ii.

*of bronze.* The anomalous and isolated adj. נְחוֹשׁ should probably be replaced by the subst. נְחוֹשֶׁת *copper, bronze* (28<sup>2</sup> 40<sup>18</sup> 41<sup>10</sup>; 20<sup>24</sup>); the poetic equivalent of נְחוֹשֶׁת, the root of which has nothing to do with נחש *serpent* (from נחש = לָחַשׁ *to hiss, whisper, &c.*), but prob. means *shining, brilliant*, and may be affiliated to the Sumerian GUSH, ĠUS, ĠUSH, and ĠASH, in the like sense (נִחֹשׁ = NI + ĠUŠ, *what is bright*; cf. Assy. loan-word *huššū*, *red-gleaming*, said of gold and other metals). Copper or bronze is a standard image of brightness in the similes of old Babylonian religious poetry (the incantations, exorcisms, &c.): e. g. IM-SUB-TA ĠEN-TA-SUB = *kīma kē mašši limmašši*, 'Like glistening bronze let him *glisten*!' The obscure נחשׁ of Ez 16<sup>36</sup> may be compared with Assy. *nuhšu*, *overflow, luxury*.

v. 13. מִי is again evidently corrupt. RV would require הָא instead of הָאם. The אָם may have been repeated from the last verse, or have grown out of repetition of the following אֵין. Leg. לֹא *Lo!* a common word in Job (4<sup>18</sup> 9<sup>11</sup> f. 13<sup>15</sup>, &c.), c. 33, and עֹרְתָה instead of עֹרְתִי (Ps 60<sup>19</sup> 63<sup>8</sup>): *Lo, there is no help in me*; no power of resistance, to bear up against my sufferings. But perhaps we should read לִי for בִּי, in closer agreement with st. ii: *Behold, there is no help for me* (or *I have no help!*). In st. ii we must restore תְּשׁוּעָה *aid, deliverance, salvation* (= ἡ βοήθεια), the || to עֹרְתָה in Ps 60<sup>13</sup>. Cf. 5<sup>12</sup>. [In st. i ὁ ἑὸς αὐτὸς ἐπεποιθεῖν; implies no difference from מִי except בִּי *in Him* for בִּי *in me*. The reading proposed by Duhm, הָא מֵאֵין, which merely divides the letters differently, *Lo, whence is my help in me (myself?)* = I have no inward strength at all, though yielding a tolerable sense, does not harmonize well with the form of st. ii, and finds but doubtful support in Is 40<sup>24</sup>, where also the text is questionable. הָא (Gn 47<sup>28</sup> Ez 16<sup>43</sup>?) is not a Job-word.]

v. 14. מִי מֵרַעְיוֹ חֶסֶד is meaningless. Nothing plausible can be made of מֵרַעְיוֹ; and a verb is demanded both for sense and parallelism. Now, in the section beginning with this verse (vv. 14–23) Eyob is very naturally upbraiding his friends for that lack of sympathy which makes them so ready to suspect him, and to reproach instead of consoling him. ὁ ἀπειλῶ suggests מָאס (cf. 10<sup>3</sup> ἀπειλῶ = תָּמָאס) or לָמַס for לָמַס. The verb may be recognized in חָסַד (point חֶסֶד!), *he has reproached*; an Aramaism, as in Pr 25<sup>10</sup>. For מֵרַעְיוֹ *his friend(s)*, see Pr 19<sup>7</sup> Gn 26<sup>26</sup>. Thus we recover the sense *Him that is dissolving his friend hath reproached, And the fear of Shaddai he (the friend) forsaketh*. 'is dissolving' = is in the throes of dissolution, is already melting away or going to pieces (cf. 7<sup>5</sup> Ps 58<sup>8</sup> both Niph.). Since, however, מָאס *to reject, despise*, is common in Job (5<sup>17</sup> 8<sup>20</sup> 19<sup>18</sup> al.), and since חֶסֶד *kindness, mercy*,

*sympathy* is a good || to יראת ש' (Ho 6<sup>6</sup> Mi 6<sup>8</sup>), it may perhaps seem preferable to restore to חסד מרעי (ב) *My friend hath refused mercy*. (Cf. ⑤ *Mercy renounced me*.) ⑤ oddly renders יראת by επισκοπή, as if the root were ראה > ירא. The sentiment of RV is doubtless implicit in the modern doctrine of Toleration, but quite contrary to the spirit of the OT, which nowhere expresses forbearance towards the man 'who forsaketh the Fear of Shaddai'. And it is without parallel in the book of Job.

v. 15. *My own kinsmen have proved faithless as a Wady*; a winter torrent, which gradually dries up in summer, cheating the hopes of wayfarers who expect to find water there. ⑤ χειμάρρους ἐκλείπων.

*transitory waters*. Lit. *waters that pass away*: leg. מים עברו cf. 11<sup>16</sup> במים עברו נחל'im improb. repeats נחל from st. i. ⑤ ἡ ὥσπερ κύμα παρηλθόν με: cf. 11<sup>16</sup> ὥσπερ κύμα παρελθόν. (⑤ ⑥ omit אפיק.)

v. 16. *with a pall of ice*: lit. *from ice*. ⑤ curiously misrenders οἰτίνες με διευλαβοῦντο, νῦν ἐπιπεπτώκασίν μοι ὥσπερ χιών ἡ κρύσταλλος πεπηγώς (cf. Ex 15<sup>8</sup> ⑤) = היגורים מני עתה נפלו עלי בשלג וקרח: For יג' = διευλαβ. see Dt 28<sup>60</sup> Je 22<sup>25</sup>. It is a Job word, 3<sup>25</sup> 9<sup>28</sup>. ⑥ also gives דרחלין *who fear*.

*lay piled*: or *pileth itself*: reading יתעלם for יתעלם *hideth itself*. Cf. נִפְּחוּ Niph., Ex 15<sup>8</sup>, and the Syriac use of the same root.

v. 17. *In the dry season*: reading חרב *scorching heat* for יזרב (י). Cf. Gn 31<sup>40</sup> Is 4<sup>6</sup>. *In the time of summer heat* (חַרְבָּ opp. לְקַח) is a much more natural expression than *In the time when they are burnt* (Du, versenkt werden), and חרב recurs, 30<sup>30</sup>. We might also read שָׂרַב, Is 49<sup>10</sup>. The Waw belongs to the following word.

*they disappear*: ונצמתו: str. they are *silenced*, and so *destroyed* or *annihilated*. צמת (in Heb. a poetic word: Pss Job La 3<sup>53</sup>) may be compared with the synonymous שמום, שמום (1. *silenced, struck dumb, astonished*; 2. *ravaged, destroyed*), and with דמם *become silent, perish* (SH = earlier D). Thus צמת = Ar. صَمَتٌ to be or become *silent, mute, or speechless*.

*when it is hot*: or *when it becometh warm*: בָּחַם > בָּחַמוּ. There is no reference for the masc. suff., and the Waw belongs to the following verb (Waw Conv.) יֵצֵא go out, be doubted, of a light (Aram.; poet. in Heb.), 18<sup>6</sup> 21<sup>17</sup> Pr 13<sup>9</sup> Is 43<sup>17</sup>. Niph. here only (pass. qs. 'are doubted'). The word is an Internal Trilateralization of a root DAG = Sum. DAG, go away, yield, give place, cease (naparká).

vv. 18-20 explain why the winter torrents have become a proverb of faithlessness. They disappoint the hopes of travellers who turn out of their way, expecting to find water in them, and perish in the desert. But there is something strange in the Hebrew of v. 18; and the difficulty does not altogether disappear when we restore אֶרְחֹת caravans (with one MS) for אֶרְחֹת paths. See Gn 37<sup>25</sup> Is 21<sup>13</sup>. The same change is certainly

necessary to the sense in the next verse (point אֶרְחוֹת!). RV *The caravans that travel by the way of them turn aside* makes the best of a bad case; but אֶרְחוֹת דָּרָכָם is a curious phrase, and st. ii *They go up into the Waste and perish* is surely the climax which should follow, not precede, vv. 19, 20. (The statement obviously cannot refer to 'the course of the streams being diverted and lost in the desert'. Water does not 'go up'.) First we have the caravans, v. 19, looking eagerly (3<sup>d</sup>) for the vanished waters; then their mortification at finding their confidence misplaced, v. 20; and finally their ascending by the dry bed of the wādy into the desert again, to perish miserably (v. 18). Instead of אֶרְחוֹת in v. 18 we propose לְאַחֹר backward: cf. Ps 114<sup>3</sup>. The Niph. יִלְפְּחוּ should be pointed Pi., in the sense of *they bend or turn round*. So one cod. Cf. Ar. كَفَّتَ to twist, wring, or turn a thing about; to turn a man aside. Cf. Niph. in Ru 3<sup>8</sup>. In Assy. lapātu, Pret. ilput, means to turn, revolve (of doors), to overturn or overthrow, and to touch, handle, or take hold of (cf. Ju 16<sup>29</sup>). In v. 20 sense and metre require בָּטְחוּ בָם they trusted in them instead of the meaningless בָּטַח בָּם. 𐤁𐤔 read the plur. In st. ii read עֲדִיהֶם (referring to מִים v. 15; cf. 16, 17) for עֲדִיהָ.

In v. 17 𐤁 appears to have read נָרַע מְקוֹמוֹ לֹא נִלְמַח שָׂרָב וּבַחֲמוֹ לֹא נָרַע מְקוֹמוֹ According as it melted and when it became warm, its place (or existence Aram.?) was not known (or נָכַר?). But in v. 18 it seems to depart entirely from the text of 𐤁 with the paraphrase: *So was I also forsaken by all; Yea I perished and became an outcast*. Yet this might be a loose rendering of יִפְּחוּ דָּרָכָם מִעָלַי וּמִבֵּיתִי אוֹכֵר They turn aside their way from me, And from my home I perish, or something very similar; which hardly presupposes anything more than corruption of the text of 𐤁.

In v. 19 𐤁 mispoints הִבִּיטִי and misreads קִוִּי for קָוִי; in v. 20 נָאוּ עֲדִיהֶם has been mistaken for בָּאוּ וְעָרִים (= ἐπὶ πόλειςιν καὶ χρήμασιν). 𐤁 turns the verse into a proverb: *And they will incur shame Who trust in cities and riches*.

v. 21. *Such . . . to me*. Lit. *So now have ye become to me*: restoring בָּן . . . לִי for 𐤁 . . . לִי. Instead of לִי to him, which is quite unsuitable here (if the statement were *For now ye are His*), the Ketib is לֹא not, which RV assumes may mean *nothing* (*For now ye are nothing*); but that is never the case. 𐤁 ἀτὰρ δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπέβητέ μοι ἀνελεημόνως = כִּי אַתֶּם כִּי אַתֶּם הֵייתֶם לְאֹכֹר־לִי see 30<sup>21</sup>. Perhaps we should read לְאֹכֹר־לִי *For ye have become cruel to me*. לְאֹכֹר, moreover, might be 𐤁's misreading of לְאֹכֹב a deceptive stream (Je 15<sup>18</sup>).

In st. ii leg. וַיִּתְּרָאוּ. Waw has fallen out after Waw (or Yod). Cf. 𐤁 ὥστε ἰδόντες τὸ ἐμὸν τραῦμα φοβήθητε = וַיִּתְּרָאוּ כְּאֵבִי וַיִּתְּרָאוּ (τραῦμα = כָּאֵב, 16<sup>6</sup>; cf. the verb, 14<sup>22</sup>. כְּאֵבִי my pain may be right here, instead of the ἀπ. λεγ. וַיִּתְּרָאוּ a terror. See also 2<sup>13</sup>: *They saw that the pain was very great*). Eyob says: I had expected a refreshing draught of sympathy

from you, my old friends, to cool the heat of my torments; but at the sight of them you take alarm, and fear is apt to be cruel. They were afraid that unqualified sympathy might be construed as approval of Eyob's protestations and bring similar calamities upon themselves. In the next two verses (22, 23) Eyob takes an ironical tone. 'You need not be so alarmed. You are as cold and hard as if I had asked you for money. I have asked no material succour of you. Sympathy is cheap; and kind words cost nothing.' Eyob had asked no complimentary presents, such as are customary in the East (cf. 1 K 10<sup>2,10,13,25</sup>), nor bribes to win the favour of a judge (cf. Mi 3<sup>11</sup>), nor intervention (in the shape of propitiatory gifts?) between himself and powerful enemies, nor payment of ransom to brigands (? עריצים *terrible ones*), or figuratively, as in Je 15<sup>21</sup>, deliverance from formidable foes. Perhaps עריץ *sing. the tyrant*, would be better; cf. the ||, and 15<sup>20</sup> 27<sup>13</sup> note (all the occurrences of עריץ in Job).

In v. 22 ט paraphrases st. i, and ἐπιδεῖσθαι in st. ii suggests שָׁחַרְתִּי *have I sought?* or perhaps חָשַׁרְתִּי (= חסרתי), *do I need?* (Dt 15<sup>8</sup>), instead of שָׁחַר.

v. 24-26. Cease your dark hints, and speak out! tell me my sin plainly, and I will say no more. Or are you merely blaming the wild words of despair? Words are but wind.

v. 24. *Teach me*: like priests giving oracular responses (Mi 3<sup>11</sup>).

*mine error*. Heb. מַה שָׁנִיתִי *how I have gone astray*; not so much wilfully (Eliphaz had not charged him with any wilful sin), as through the infirmity natural to man, 4<sup>19</sup>. Yet see 4<sup>7,8</sup>. But st. i ('I will be silent') and v. 25 f. indicate that it is rather the objection taken to the violence of his language and his questionings of Providence that Eyob intends. He maintains the practical innocence of his complaints, irreverent and presumptuous as they may seem to us.

v. 25. *Why are honest words* (lit. *words of uprightness*) *grievous* (*hard, difficult, intolerable*)? נִמְרָצוּ: see 16<sup>3</sup> Hi. *aggrieveth thee* (but leg. phps. יִפְרִיץ); 1 K 2<sup>8</sup> and Burney's note ad loc.; Mi 2<sup>10</sup> (?). The root מִרַץ is common in Assy. in the senses *hard, difficult, troublesome, grievous, sick, painful* (of disease), *sorrowful*, and the like: e.g. ḥarânam namraça, *a road of difficulty*, Neb. ii. 21; Ša Ahuramazda utâmâ ina muḥḥika la imarruḥ, *What Ahuramazda commandeth, let it not be troublesome to thee!* Inscr. of Darius, Naksh-i-Rustam, 36. Eyob asks why his 'honest' (or truthful) words should annoy his friends so seriously. Cf. ט's elegant paraphrase: 'But, as it seems, a truthful one's words are amiss.' We might also render the Heb. stichus as a sarcastic exclamation: *How painful* (or *grievous*) *are honest words!* There is therefore no need to substitute נִמְלָצוּ (Ps 119<sup>108</sup>) for נִמְרָצוּ, c 1 MS and L.

*And what* (or *how*) *doth reproof from you reprove?* (!) Contemptuous irony. *Reproof from you* is more emphatic than *your reproof* (הוֹכִיחַכֶּם).

laying, as it does, a bitter stress on the pronoun. The expression is, however, isolated; and the Versions failed to understand it. ⑤ 'For not from you (מִכֶּם) do I beg strength (כֹּחַ)' virtually repeats v. 22.

v. 26. Lit. *Is it to reprove words that ye think?* ⑤ παύσει = חשבתו. In st. ii the Heb. ולרוח אמרי נואש might perhaps mean *And (But) for the wind are the words of a despairing one!* if the context were different. But ולרוח prob. disguises a form || להוכיח, perhaps ולניח (= ולהניח) *And to quiet*, > ולריך *And to wash away*, Is 4<sup>4</sup> (Dr), which, though nearer in form, is remoter in sense. ולסכר *And to correct* (4<sup>3</sup> al.), is also possible (Heth and Samech being sometimes confused in manuscripts: see Dr, *Mosheh ben Shesheth*, p. ix), or even ולחריש *to silence* (11<sup>3</sup>†). ⑤ οὐδὲ γὰρ (⑤<sup>A</sup> om.) ὑμῶν φθέγμα ῥήματος ἀνέχομαι = ולא רוח אמרכם אשא. (For ἀνέχομαι = נשא see ⑤<sup>2</sup> 21<sup>3</sup>). This suggests an illegible text rather than arbitrary alteration. Assuming dislocation of the original order of the Heb. words, and comparing 16<sup>3</sup> (see also 8<sup>2</sup>), we might be inclined to more drastic emendation and read ולענות אמרי רוח *And to answer words of wind?* Cf. also 32<sup>12</sup> 33<sup>13</sup>.

v. 27. This verse, as it stands, is correctly rendered in RV. It seems to accuse the friends of a degree of hardheartedness that would stop at nothing where sordid gain was in view. Eyob, however, was not an unprotected 'orphan'; nor was there any question of 'bargaining' (40<sup>20</sup>) over his person. The language looks proverbial, but is inappropriate to the context. Reading (by a different division of the letters) עלי תם for על ית(ו)ם, and (with ⑤ 23) תפילי instead of תפילי, and in st. ii (which is metrically short) ותחפידו במלים על־דעכם, we get the satisfactory couplet

*Even upon the blameless (1<sup>1</sup> 8<sup>20</sup> 9<sup>20</sup>) will ye fall,  
And join words together against your friend?*

(Cf. ⑤, which gives ἐνἀλλεσθε δέ for ותכרו here, and in 16<sup>4</sup> renders אחבירה במלים by ἐναλοῦμαι ὑμῶν ῥήμασιν.

v. 28. *Look at me*: lit. *turn or face round*; as if they had averted their faces from him, in indignation or shame at his reproaches. Cf. 21<sup>5</sup>; and for פנה בַּ Ec 2<sup>11</sup>. *Look me in the face, he cries; eye to eye can I lie to you?* (אם Interrog. = Num? cf. v. 12.) ⑤ *But now, looking into your faces, I will not lie!* taking אם (perhaps rightly) as the Particle of solemn asseveration common in oaths. As the st. is metr. short (2 beats), insert אני which may have fallen out before אם: *And to your face I (emph.) will not lie!*

v. 29. Go back on your hasty presumption of my guilt; and do me not the injustice of refusing to hear me out. The repeated שבו is suspicious: ⑤ (καθίσαιτε δὲ) points the first שְׁבוּ *Be seated!* (as though the friends had risen to depart in disgust), and omits the second. For st. ii it gives καὶ πάλιν τῷ δικαίῳ συνέρχεσθε = ועוד עִם־צַדִּיק באו (cf. 22<sup>1</sup>

καὶ συνελύσεται σοι εἰς κρίσιν = יבוא עמך במשפט and 9<sup>32</sup>). Now, as ㉔<sup>nc.a</sup> and ㉔<sup>A</sup> add ἐν κρίσει at the end of st. i, some such reading as וּבְמִשְׁפָּט עוֹד צְדִיק יבוא (And let my righteousness again be tried!) would appear to be indicated, or (lit. as ㉔) : וּבְמִשְׁפָּט עוֹד עֲסִידִיק באו (And into judgement again with a righteous one enter!), or simply וּבְמִשְׁפָּט : (ח)באו : (And again with me enter into judgement!). Other emendations might be suggested, e.g. : וְהִשְׁבוּ עוֹד צְדִיק לִי And give me back my righteousness! or, again, יֵשׁוּב עוֹד צְדִיק לִי Yea, return! my righteousness is still in me! (בי for בה, which ㉔ ㉔ appear to omit). ㉔ Return now, and justify! (= צְדִיק 32<sup>2</sup>). It would be better to point צְדִיק be just! sc. in your judgement of me (? בי in me = in my case): cf. 10<sup>15</sup> Ps 51<sup>4</sup>. וְעוֹד צֶדֶק יבא And again let Justice come! is a plausible, if not a convincing conjecture (Kittel); but when Dubm retains the text of ㉔, and renders Yea return; my right is still therein; i.e. I am justified in speaking as I do; we can hardly suppress the objection that there is no possible antecedent to בִּי in the verse except עוֹלָה, with which, as he says, no reasonable man would think of connecting it. After all this, we shall perhaps be pardoned if we venture to make another suggestion, which has at least the merit of simplicity. Read וּשְׁמַעוּ רַבֵּי צְדִיק And hear my righteous words.

v. 30. Is there really 'Injustice' (5<sup>10</sup>)—anything morally wrong—in what I have said? have I lost the faculty of discernment between truth and falsehood? Dr rendered st. ii: *Cannot my taste* (lit. *palate*) *discriminate calamities* (30<sup>13</sup>)? explaining, 'i.e. whether they are deserved or not'. But the Heb. seems rather to ask: *Or my palate—doth it not sense* (or *perceive*) '*calamities*' (if that be the meaning of הָוֹת)? The verb בִּין is used of sense-perception, 9<sup>11</sup> 14<sup>21</sup> 13<sup>1</sup> al. (all c ㉔ of Direct Obj., but Pr 7<sup>1</sup> al. c Accus. as here). If Eyob's misfortunes be intended by הָוֹת, the meaning will be: Does not my palate know calamity by its nauseous taste? i.e. My sufferings are not imaginary; I do not cry out for nothing (cf. 6<sup>6</sup>). This, however, is a bad || to st. i, which demands to be informed whether there is any 'injustice' (of statement; untruth: 13<sup>7</sup>) in his 'tongue'; i.e. perhaps as an inherent incapacity for speaking aright or truly. If הָוֹת might mean *deceit, falsehood* (cf. 13<sup>7</sup> 27<sup>4</sup> where the || to עוֹלָה is רַמְיָה), we might well adopt that meaning here. Now in Ps 5<sup>10</sup> 38<sup>13</sup> 52<sup>3</sup> 55<sup>12</sup> Pr 17<sup>4</sup> the word is associated with crafty speech and lying. Moreover, the Arabic uses of the root هوى (הוה) seem to indicate *hole, pit, hollow*, as the primitive meaning, from which the transition is easy and natural to the idea of *emptiness*, on the one hand, and to that of *falling down, inclining to, &c.*, on the other. See Lane. Thus הָוֹת *emptiness, hollowness, falsity, villainy*, whether of words or opinions, would be a synonym of שֶׁמַּיָּם *emptiness, nothingness, falsity, worthlessness* (7<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>11</sup> 15<sup>31</sup> 31<sup>5</sup> al.).

(It is, of course, possible that the ר of רַמְיָה *deceit* was accidentally



omitted, and that מיה was then read backwards as היה. since ו and י, מ and ת, are often mistaken for each other in Hebrew manuscripts.)

Ⲑ ⲛⲓ ⲟⲩ ⲗⲁⲣⲡⲩⲅⲓ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲕⲓ ⲥⲩⲛⲉⲥⲓⲛ ⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ; = : אַם חֲכִי לֹא בִינָה יִהְיֶה; (cf. 27<sup>1</sup> Is 59<sup>3</sup> Ps 35<sup>28</sup> = Ⲑ 34<sup>32</sup>); an interesting but hardly correct substitute for ⲙⲓ, which Ⲑⲛⲓ also failed to understand. (Ⲑ perhaps read אמת *truth* for הוות.) Cf. also Ma 2<sup>5</sup>.

Chapter 7. After a brief pause, as it would seem, Eyob resumes his pleadings, which appear to be aimed at God rather than the three friends. It is a passage which reads like an exquisitely plaintive and pathetic elegy, lamenting the general hardness of man's lot, but more especially his own hopeless misery which has no prospect but speedy death. Therefore he is bold to remonstrate with his Maker, and to demand why He cares to persecute to the death a being so infinitely beneath Himself as mortal Man.

vv. 11-21. In 6<sup>28-30</sup> Eyob has begged a further hearing, on the ground that his tongue and his palate, his powers of speech and his moral sense, are still unimpaired. In 7<sup>11</sup> he continues: *I also will not restrain* (16<sup>6</sup>) *my mouth*: I will speak as freely as you have done. (RV *Therefore I will not*, &c.; but אֲנִי נָם means *I also, I too*, with emphatic Pron.) This statement follows naturally on 6<sup>30</sup>. We have therefore transposed the section to the beginning of the chapter. The division of the chapters is evidently, as often, quite arbitrary.

v. 11. The verse, as it stands, is a triplet. A stichus like אַפְתַּח שִׁפְתֵי עַמִּי *I will open my lips with Thee* (cf. 11<sup>6</sup> 32<sup>20</sup>), or אֲכַלֵּא *My lips I will not shut* (cf. Ps 40<sup>10</sup>) may be supplied to complete the quatrain. The former seems preferable. Ⲑ opens st. iii with ἀνοίξω (= אַפְתַּח: 3<sup>1</sup> al.), and עַמִּי supplies a reference for 'Thou' (vv. 12, 14). Otherwise we might be tempted to think that stt. ii, iii were variant forms of the same line derived from different editions or recensions of the Heb. text; 'doublets' such as we find, for instance, in the old Babylonian Epic of Nimrod (Gilgamesh). Cf. 10<sup>1</sup> אֲכַרְבָּה בַּמֶּרְ נַפְשִׁי *I will speak in the bitterness of my soul*, which Bickell and Duhm consider to be the true reading here (after 'die ursprüngliche LXX' [?]), interpolated there.

v. 12. An allusion to the ancient Babylonian mythos of Creation, which told how Bel-Merodach, the great god of Light, after his supreme conflict with Tiāmat (תְּהוֹמִים), the mighty Dragon of the primeval chaos of waters, divided her vast carcass between heaven and earth, spreading half of it over heaven ('the waters above the firmament': Gn 1); after which 'He drew bolt(s), he posted a watch, He charged them not to suffer her waters to come forth' (*mišlušša iškunamma šamāma uḥallil; išdud parkū maṣṣarū ušaḥbil; mēša la šūḩā šunuti imla'ir*. Creation Tab. IV. 138-40). The naked brevity of the reference here proves that the poet assumed that the allusion would be familiar to his readers. See also 26<sup>19</sup>

38<sup>o-10</sup>; Is 27<sup>1</sup> 51<sup>o</sup>. The word נָחִי serpent, dragon, used in Heb. of aquatic monsters, and in these passages of the legendary Monster of the Deep, may be derived from the √תנן = Assyr. *danānu*, דנן *to be strong* (cf. *nadānu* = נהן, and conversely *abātu*, *kabātu* = אבר, כבר; also TA *tanniš* = *danniš*, &c.), and would thus mean, strictly speaking, *strong, mighty, forceful* one. The Heb. *tannîn* is, in that case, etymologically and formally identical with the Assyrio-Babylonian *dannînu*, a syn. of *iršitu*, the *Earth* (Creation Tab. VII. 115; 5 R 21. 59); and the Earth, as fashioned out of the other half of *Tiāmat*, may have been mythically conceived as a huge dragon lying in the Deep and rising above it (cf. 2 Pe 3<sup>5</sup>: 'Earth, consolidated out of Water and amid Water').

v. 13. *When I say. Or If I think* (= *say* in my heart. בלבב may be either expressed, as in Ps 10<sup>6,11,13</sup>, or omitted).

*will take away part of my complaining.* משיחי for משיחי. If we keep מ, we must render *My bed will help me bear, &c.*, supplying אחי *with me*, which is expressed in the same construction, Nu 11<sup>17</sup>. ὁ ἀνοίσω δὲ πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἰδίᾳ λόγον (A διάλογον ἰδίᾳ) τῇ κοίτῃ μου = אשן שיחי : במשכבי, taking שיח in the sense of *talk*, and changing the Pers. of the Verb. (Prob. not a different reading, but a misinterpretation of the text.)

v. 14. *with visions.* בחו' for מוח', which is a reminiscence of 4<sup>13</sup>. ὁ ἐν ὁράμασιν *recte*. Fearful dreams were believed to be divine portents of imminent evil. They are said to be characteristic of Eyob's malady (Elephantiasis). Both stichi of this verse are metrically defective, unless we admit that a long word may have two stresses. Of course we might suppose that a word has fallen out of each member, e.g. ראשי and לילה respectively: *Thou scarest me with dreams of the night, And with the visions of my head* (Dan 2<sup>28</sup> 7<sup>1,16</sup> Aram.) *affrightest me*, cf. 4<sup>13</sup> 20<sup>8</sup> 33<sup>16</sup>. It is also possible that Eyob dwelt upon the fact that even his bed, instead of giving him some respite, only aggravated his miseries. Accordingly, על-משכבי, על-ערשי, may once have stood in the verse: *Thou scarest me with dreams on my couch, And with visions on my bed Thou affrightest me.*

v. 15. As pointed, מ can only mean: *And Thou hast chosen the strangling of my soul.* Point מְחַנֵּק instead of the Stat. Constr. מְחַנֵּק. The word occurs here only; but see 2 Sa 17<sup>23</sup> for the related verb (חנק). This root is cognate with ענק, Ar. *onq*, Aram. עִנְקָא *neck*, which look like worn forms of the Sumerian GU(N), *neck*, with nasalized final sound (cf. Chinese king, *kêng*, *neck, throat*, and *hiang*, *hong*, ngoñg, *nape of neck*).

ὁ ἀπαλλάξεις ἀπὸ πνεύματος μου (Ἑ<sup>A</sup> om. μου) τὴν ψυχὴν (Ἑ<sup>A</sup> ζωήν) μου = חסיר מרוח(י) נפשי (Ἑ<sup>A</sup> חיתי, ut 33<sup>22</sup>) *Thou removest* (9<sup>34</sup> 27<sup>5</sup> 34<sup>6</sup>) *from* (my) *spirit my soul* (life). This seems to depend on misreading of similar and partially effaced Heb. letters. For st. ii, which like both members of v. 14 (q.v.), appears to have lost a third accented word,

Ⓞ<sup>B</sup> gives ἀπὸ δὲ θανάτου τὰ ὀστά μου = וממות עצמותי (= מ, slightly modified to suit Ⓞ's version of st. i). Ⓞ<sup>A</sup> ἤνθ δὲ ψυχῇ μου ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματός μου = ונפשי מעצמי. Cf. Ps 139<sup>15</sup> (עצמי). This does not help us much, although מות *And death* is prob. right > מוה (ו having fallen out after י as often). Reading מעצבותי (9<sup>28</sup>) in place of מעצמותי, we get the passable sense *And death rather than my pains*. (RV *And death rather than these my bones* = *rather than this skeleton* will not do; if only for the reason that the indispensable pronoun is wanting in the Heb.). We may further reinstate some verb denoting desire after מוה; e. g. אָהָה, the Subject of which is usually נפש (23<sup>13</sup>), or חָכְתָהּ ל (3<sup>21</sup>). The spirit of the suggestion (Reiske and others) that מאסתי, the (corrupt?) word which now begins v. 16, should really end v. 15, is too modern. Duhm translates: *Den Tod verachte ich vor meinen Schmerzen*. But Eyob never speaks of *despising* death. He longs for it, as the sure end of his miseries (chap. 3 throughout). There is pathos and an intense melancholy in the tone of 7<sup>9.10.21</sup> 9<sup>25 f.</sup> 10<sup>18-22</sup> 14 (throughout), but never a word of contempt. In fact, nowhere in the OT is death so regarded. Moreover, if we detach מאסתי from it, st. i of v. 16 becomes metrically too short. We may read נמאסתי *I flow, dissolve, melt or waste away*, sc. with my malady (v. 5 ad fin.); cf. the cognate roots מסס Niph. *to melt, flow away* (Ps 58<sup>9</sup>) and מסה id.: or better perhaps אמרתי *I have said (Methinks)*, as in v. 13. Ⓞ om.<sup>1</sup> (These words are prob. akin to Assy. *misû*, *wash, purify*, and *mašāšu* Niph. *become bright*; the ultimate primary root being the Sumerian MASII, *bright, shining, to purify*. The other and much commoner מָאס *reject, despise*, springs from a root MAS = BAS, BAZ, preserved in בָּזוּ, בָּזָה *despise*, and בָּטַס *trample on*, which last perhaps contains the original idea.)

v. 16. *I cannot always live*: lit. *Not for ever shall I live*. It seems hardly worth while for the Eternal to persecute His ephemeral creature, or to pay so much attention to mortal man. Cf. Is 2<sup>22</sup>. Vv. 17, 18 apply the thought of Ps 8<sup>4</sup> in a bitterly ironical sense.

v. 17. *set thy mind upon him*: or *give thy thought to him*; *heed or notice him*, 1<sup>8</sup>.

v. 18. *visit*: or *observe*. Cf. 10<sup>12</sup> 31<sup>14</sup> 35<sup>15</sup>. Rather perhaps: *visit his faults with punishment* (cf. v. 21). לְבַקְרִים, as in Ps 73<sup>14</sup> Is 33<sup>2</sup> al. (not לְבַק' ut וַע). לְרִגְעִים *at moments*; *momentally*. Is 27<sup>3</sup> Ez 26<sup>16</sup> al. *try*: *test or examine* his moral condition. (Point 'וְתִפֵּק', not 'וְתִפֵּ'. Cf. Ⓞ, which, however, misunderstands the Adverbial expressions with its ὡς τὸ πρῶτ and καὶ εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν = וְלִמְנוּחַ: cf. Dt 28<sup>65</sup> Is 34<sup>14</sup>: perhaps וְלִמְנוּחַ: cf. Je 6<sup>16</sup>). From the metrical point of view, the remarks on v. 14 apply to this verse also. Possibly the Adv. expression was originally repeated in each stichus, to indicate the systematic regularity of the visitations

<sup>1</sup> Unless ἵνα μακροθυμήσω = כִּי אֶמַס (misread and transposed!).

(cf. יום יום *day by day*). A scribe may have omitted the repeated words as needless, or by sheer inadvertence.

v. 19. *How long* ? קָצָה: so also in Ps 35<sup>17</sup>. In 13<sup>23</sup> Ps 119<sup>84</sup> it means *How many* ?; in 21<sup>17</sup> *How often* ? Cf. Ps 78<sup>40</sup>. *look away from me*. See Ps 39<sup>14</sup>. *Nor give me a moment's respite* ? lit. *Wilt not drop me until I swallow my spittle* ? (30<sup>10</sup>. רֶקֶק saliva, רֶקֶק, יֶרֶק, *to spit*; cf. Sum. UG, *id*. The other יֶרֶק = Sum. RIG, *green*.) ⑤ adds ἐν ὀδύνῃ; a gloss implying (wrongly) that he 'swallowed his spittle', or gulped, for pain.

v. 20. Restore אֵם before חַטָּאתי: see the echo of this question, 35<sup>6</sup>, which also proves that the meaning cannot be: *If I have sinned, what shall I do for Thee* (sc. by way of satisfaction), but *If I have sinned, what do I do to Thy detriment* ? (Dr: 'how can I injure Thee?'). How can any thing I do affect God, one way or the other? Cf. also the like implications of Eliphaz, 22<sup>2-3</sup>. 'Die unpoetische Form macht aber v. 20<sup>a</sup> verdächtig,' says Duhm. The form is, however, practically identical with that of 35<sup>6</sup>. נֹצֵר הָאָדָם *Thou Guard* (or *Keeper*) of *Man*! which would usually imply protection (cf. the syn. שָׁמֵר, 14<sup>16</sup> Ps 121), has here the unfavourable sense of keeper or guard of prisoners and the like. The metre might be completed by inserting עָלַי *over* after נֹצֵר (cf. Ps 141<sup>3</sup>) or better לִב *heart* (⑤ רֹגֶן רֹגֶן = לִב, as in v. 17); but perhaps the first half of the verse should follow the second. The transposition would give us three couplets in Qinah-measure for the close of the chapter.

If I sin, what do I to Thee,

Thou Keeper of Man?

And why not pardon my fault,

And let my guilt pass?

For soon in the dust I must lie,

And Thou seek me when gone!

*Wherefore hast Thou set me for a butt to Thee* ? מַפְנֵעַ something to aim at, hit or attack; a butt or mark; syn. (ἀπ-) of מַטְרָה which follows. (⑤ κατεντευκτική σου, 'thine assailant', pointing מַפְנֵעַ. Cf. 36<sup>32</sup>.) *So that I am become Thy target* ? = ואהיה לך למטרה cf. 16<sup>12</sup> La 3<sup>12</sup>. This at least provides a better parallel than ונשאת עלי למשא *So that I am become a burden on me* (i.e. *myself*). Cf. 2 Sa 15<sup>33</sup>. עלי *on me* is one of the eighteen changes of reading made by the Scribes, according to Jewish tradition (תקוני סופרים), on the ground of religious reverence, עלך *on Thee* having been the original text (cf. ⑤ εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορτίον). The change, as in other instances, cannot but seem childish, in view of the many far more daring expressions which have been left unaltered in the speeches of Eyob.

v. 21. *And why*. Leg. ולמה (⑤ καὶ διὰ τί), as in v. 20. The question *And why dost Thou not take away* (or *forgive*) *my transgression*, &c. implies the preceding אֵם חַטָּאתי (v. 20), and supports its genuineness. Instead of תִּשָּׁח ⑤ points תִּשָּׁח (= תִּשָּׁח) *forget*, or rather Hi. תִּשָּׂא (= תִּשָּׂא)

*cause to forget* (οὐκ ἐποιήσω τῆς ἀνομίας μοι λήθην). In st. ii the insertion of מַעְלִי after וְחַעבִיר (cf. Zc 3<sup>4</sup>) would restore the normal measure: *And let my sin pass from me?*

*For now.* As it is, my punishment is fatal; and pardon will come too late after the inevitable end. For וְלִעְפָּר read עַל-עֵפָר with the verb שָׁכַב, as in 20<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>26</sup>. *To lie down on the ground* = to die.

v. 1. *a hard service*: or *a term of warfare*. The word צָבָא is used of the work done by the Levites in the Sanctuary, Nu 4<sup>9,23</sup> al., which was certainly arduous enough; and the context here requires the meaning *service*, as in 14<sup>14</sup>. [There can be little doubt of the identity of Heb. צָבָא *army, warfare, service*, (and the Denom. צָבָא *to war*), with Assyr. çābu (from çab'u), *man, warrior*, the common ideogram of which is, in the primitive Sumerian script, the outline of a bow (see *Chinese and Sumerian*, p. 20; Sign-list, no. 43); indicating that the original meaning of the symbol (read ERIM, ERIN, ZAB) was *bowman, archer, warrior*. Cf. the Egyptian hieroglyph for *menfit*, 'soldier', 'army', viz. a man kneeling on one knee and grasping a strung bow.] Cf. the Latin *militia*, in the sense of a civil service or office, esp. a laborious one.

A man's life at best is a weary time of continual toil, allotted by the Divine Taskmaster (Gn 3<sup>17-19</sup> Ec 1<sup>19</sup>). Read עָלִי c Qrī > עָלִי Ktīb.

*Are not his days like those of a hireling?* i.e. jealously measured out and exactly determined, not bating a single hour of labour and sorrow. Cf. 14<sup>6</sup>. See also Is 16<sup>14</sup> 21<sup>10</sup>, where we have the similar phrase כְּשָׁנֵי שָׂכִיר *like the years of a hireling*; i.e. full or exact years. מְ, taking צָבָא in the military sense, curiously renders it *πειρατήριον, piratical expedition or enterprise*, perhaps *raid*; prop. *nest or gang of pirates* (so again, 10<sup>17</sup>). In 19<sup>12</sup> the same word = גִּדּוּר *troop of raiders* (so Gn 49<sup>19</sup>), cf. 25<sup>3</sup> (πειραταί).

v. 2. *pants for shade*; prob. of evening, Je 6<sup>4</sup> Ct 2<sup>17</sup>. (פָּנָה *pant, breathe hard, gasp, desire*, springs from the same root as גָּשַׁף, גָּשַׁף *blow, breathe*; and אָרָה, אָרָה *desire, want*, &c., are of the same origin, since AB, AW, may be regarded as worn forms of SHAB. Further, the perplexing נָפַח, which like פָּנָה takes the simple Accus., may be explained as the N-form of the latter, since breathing hard is associated with desire and the sexual nusus, Je 2<sup>24</sup> 5<sup>7,8</sup>. See *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, vol. vii, 'Shumer and Shem', p. 29 ff. for these variations of sound.)

ὅ ἡ ὥσπερ θεράπων δεδουκῶς τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν καὶ τετευχῶς σκυῖας is app. a combination of two renderings. In 3<sup>19</sup> καὶ θεράπων δεδουκῶς (A<sup>c.b</sup> A οὐ δέδ.) τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ represents Heb. וְעַבְדְּךָ חַפְשִׁי מֵאֲדָנִי. It would seem therefore that יִשְׁפָּא was misread חַפְשִׁי here; the three letters common to both words being read backwards, as in other instances. ὅ uses δέδουκα six times in Job for as many different Heb. words! It seems to be a favourite word with the translator. It is correctly used, 3<sup>26</sup> 38<sup>40</sup>; cf. Is 60<sup>14</sup>, but as strangely as here, 26<sup>13</sup> 41<sup>2</sup>. τετευχῶς (A τετευχηκῶς) = יִשְׁפָּא; another perversion of יִשְׁפָּא.

v. 3. *I have been endowed with*: or *made to possess* (Heb. הנחלתי). But Ⓢ υπέμεινα = הוחלתי (32<sup>11.16</sup>) *I have waited*, or יהלתי (6<sup>11</sup> 14<sup>14</sup>), id. Ⓜ agrees better with st. ii. *Months* (ירחי): an unlikely || to *nights* (לילות). *Days* (ימי) would be more natural; esp. as, both in what precedes and in what follows, Eyob is complaining about his 'days'. In fact, the point of the simile, vv. 1, 2, is obscured by the reading 'months'; the point being that Eyob, like the hired labourer or the toiling slave, ardently longs for the end of every day. And since he is hopeless of recovery, he desires above all the end of his 'hard service', which can only be death.

*delusive*: or *disappointing*, or *void* of all good, *futile*, *vain* and *profitless*. שוא *emptiness, nothingness, falsity*, and more positively *evil*, like און. 11<sup>11</sup> 15<sup>31</sup> 31<sup>6</sup> 35<sup>13</sup>; Ps 60<sup>13</sup>; Ex 26<sup>7.16</sup>. In Arabic, where سوا and its derivatives are largely represented, the last appears to be the predominant meaning, and there is no trace of the idea of emptiness. Two of the native authorities compare it with بئس = באש; and it seems not impossible that the Sem. root was שו = שב, a softened form of חב = Sumerian ĠAB, *bišu, stinking, foul, bad*.

In st. i ⓈⓂ (but not Ⓢ) om. לי, which, however, may really belong to the following word, if we read the whole line thus: בן הוחלתי לימי שוא *So have I waited in evil days* (perhaps בימי; but cf. Ez 22<sup>14</sup> al. for ל of Time). St. ii may then be rendered: *And (in) the troublous nights allotted me* (pointing מנרלי; a Relat. clause).

v. 4. As it stands in Ⓜ, this verse is both grammatically and metrically defective. ערב ימדר cannot mean *but the night is long* (RV), but only *and evening measure*, which is nonsense. Pr 7<sup>9</sup> (OL) is no real instance of ערב = *night*. Moreover, the original quatrain has become a triplet. The || passage Dt 28<sup>67</sup> suggests the tentative restoration: אמשכנתי ואמרתי (על-משכנתי) *If I lie down (on my bed) I say, מייחן בקר ואקום Would that it were morning that I might rise!* ואמקמתי מייחן ערב *And if I rise, Would that it were evening!* ושבעתי וגו' *And I am sated with unrest (flutterings, agitations) until twilight.* Ⓢ, however, gives: ἐὰν κοιμηθῶ, λέγω Πότε ἡμέρα; ὥς δ' ἂν ἀναστῶ, πάλιν Πότε ἑσπέρα; = אמשכנתי ואמרתי מתי יום ואמקמתי מתי ערב. Thus, by supplying יום *day* or בקר *morning* (= ἡμέρα 1 Sa 14<sup>36</sup>) after מתי in st. i, and reading מתי for מדר in st. ii, Ⓢ mends the sense but not the metre of the verse. Some phrase like על משכנתי *on my bed*, or לישן *to sleep*, improves both in st. i. נשף is never the *morning*, but always the *evening, twilight*, even in Ps 119<sup>147</sup>. Otherwise, rejecting ערב (מתי) ומדר as an intrusion from the margin, we might reduce the verse to a distich, *If I lie down, I say, When shall I rise?* (מתי-אקום, perhaps spoken as one word *māthāqūm*, or the like); *And I am surfeited with restless movements until the morning grey.* Cf. Ⓢ (ἀπο ἑσπέρας) ἕως πρωί. (Ⓢ δδύναυ = מדרות for נדרים; cf. 3<sup>20</sup> Ez 21<sup>6</sup>.)

v. 5. ⑤ paraphrases st. i: *φύρεται δέ μου τὸ σῶμα ἐν σαπρία σκωλήκων*, *My body is mixed (wetted) with wormy rot*. רמה *worm* is str. סקולקס. Ex 16<sup>24</sup> (= syn. תולע 25<sup>6</sup>); but is rendered סאפריא, *rotteness* (of which worms are a symptom) in 17<sup>14</sup> 21<sup>26</sup> 25<sup>6</sup>. In Pr 12<sup>4</sup>, on the other hand, רקה *rotteness* is rendered סקולקס. What we have here, therefore, is app. a 'conflate' equivalent of רמה.

The two next words, וְיִשׁ עָפָר (Qrī וְיִשׁ), traditionally interpreted *and clods of earth* (= ⑤ βώλακας γῆς, cf. Eccus 22<sup>10</sup>), are metrically redundant, and may have crept in from the margin. In many codd. the ו is a minuscule, which may imply that it is not original, but was added conjecturally. In that case, יִשׁ עָפָר may perhaps be a relic of 21<sup>26</sup> עָפָר וְיִשׁ once cited here in the margin. The last three words, מְעִירֵי רִנֵּי וְיִמָּאֵם *My skin* (a frequent || to *flesh*) *hardens and dissolves* (i.e. in turn), suffice both in sense and metre for the second stichus. רִנֵּי may perhaps bear the same sense here as Ethiop. 270: *concreescere, coagulari, spissari, congelari* (see Di): *thickens*, or as we say, *gathers*, of ulcers and sores: but the use is unique in OT. [The Sumerian RA, which is prob. from RAG—cf. LAG, in the like meanings—and signifies both *alḏku*, 'walk', 'go', and *kānu*, 'be fixed', 'firm', will be seen to account for the various applications of the root RAG in Semitic. The primitive character is an outline of *the foot*, the organ alike of *moving* or *going* and *standing* or *stopping*. Hence we can explain רָגַל *foot*, str. *the walker* and *stander*, רָגַז *quiver, shiver, shake*, with fear, anger, or other emotions, רָגַע *move to and fro or up and down, stir up, disturb, agitate*, Is 51<sup>15</sup>, רָגַע *a brief space of time, a moment*, v. 18, 20<sup>6</sup> 21<sup>13</sup>, cf. Is 54<sup>7</sup> קָצֵן *for a brief while*, str. perhaps a *stand* or *stop*, cf. Lat. *statim*, or else a *quick movement*, a *shake*, cf. our phrase 'in two shakes', אֲרִנֵּי *id.*, Pr. 12<sup>19</sup>, and רָגַע Niph. *to stand, stop, become fixed or set, to rest*, Hiph. trans. *fix, set, appoint*, like הִנִּיחַ, Is 51<sup>4</sup>. The Arab. رَجُلٌ *a man* is prob. not connected with this root, but may be equated with the Sumerian LUGĀL, *amēlu*, *a man*, since R and L interchange: much as Aram. תְּרַנְנֹלָא *a cock* = Sum. DAR-LUGĀLU, *id.*, lit. 'the Fowl King', with interchange of L and N.]

For st. ii ⑤ gives: *τήκω δὲ βώλακας γῆς ἀπὸ ἰχώρος ξύων*, *While I melt clods of earth with matter as I scrape* = : וְיִשׁ עָפָר מְתַנְנֵר אֶמָּסָה. See 2<sup>8</sup>, where להתנער *to scrape himself* (i.e. to scrape off the pus and scurf from his ulcers) is rendered *ἵνα τὸν ἰχώρα ξύῃ*. Here the translator supposes that the dropping pus dissolves the clods at the sufferer's feet. For *τήκω* = *המסה*, cf. Ps 147<sup>18</sup>. Others interpret עָפָר נוֹשׁ as denoting 'the hard earthy-like crust of his sores'. But, apart from other objections, עָפָר in Job is always the *ground* (soil, dirt, earth): 4<sup>19</sup> 5<sup>9</sup> 7<sup>21</sup> 8<sup>19</sup> 10<sup>9</sup> 14<sup>8</sup> 16<sup>16</sup> 17<sup>16</sup> 19<sup>25</sup> 20<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>26</sup> 22<sup>24</sup> 27<sup>16</sup> 28<sup>2,6</sup> 30<sup>6,19</sup> 34<sup>15</sup> 38<sup>38</sup> 39<sup>14</sup> 40<sup>13</sup> 42<sup>6</sup>. It is not hard but soft earth, 38<sup>38</sup>, such as humus, dirt, and dust.

v. 6. מ lit. *My days are swifter than a loom* (Ju 16<sup>14</sup>); which can hardly be right. The loom is fixed; it is the shuttle that 'goes flashing through the loom'. Hence AV, RV. In 9<sup>25</sup> we have: *My days are swifter than a runner*; cf. 2 C 30<sup>8</sup>: the 'runner' being a royal post or messenger. מֵרַר might be a corruption of צִיר messenger, Pr 13<sup>17</sup>; but it seems quite possible that it represents a lost word מֵרַר (אֵרַר) ἄγγελος, a royal post or messenger, such as bore the king's dispatches (מֵרַרֹת) in the Persian empire. ὁ λαλία = מֵרַר speech. This slightly confirms our conjecture, so far as the order of the letters is concerned. For the rest, ὁ βίος μου is a good paraphrase of יָמֵי my days (cf. v. 1 ὅ). St. ii, lit. *And are finished (or ended) without hope*. He expects a speedy death: cf. 17<sup>11.15</sup>. ὁ ἐν κενῇ ἐλπιδί, in delusive hope does not quite express the meaning.

v. 7. Remember then. Insert מֵרַר = ὁ οὖν, 17<sup>15</sup> 19<sup>6</sup>.

but air: or mere breath: or wind. רֵיחַ is wind, air, breath, spirit, acc. to the context. See on 4<sup>15</sup>.

v. 8. Him that seeth me; i.e. God, the Allseeing; cf. st. ii, and אֵל רֹאֵי Gn 16<sup>17</sup>.

descry: or behold: ὁ περιβλέπεται με, look round at or look about for me. שׁוּר is a favourite word in Job (see on 19<sup>27</sup>); in origin perhaps akin to שָׁמַר (= shawar), watch, guard, observe, and תִּירָה seek out, spy out, explore. Cf. Sum. SIR, SHER, light, shine, &c. (núru, namáru).

With Thine eyes upon me, I shall be no more: or I shall disappear under Thine eyes. Lit. Thine eyes (will be) on me, and I am not. In the moment of death Thy victim will escape Thee for ever. The Heb. is terse and vivid. For the construction see Ps 101<sup>6</sup> Pr 23<sup>5</sup> Ru 2<sup>9</sup>.

v. 9. Smoke: reading עָשָׁן c א (עָנָן) for מֵרַר cloud(s); ὁ νέφος. The verb קָלָה (v. 6) suits this: cf. Ps 102<sup>4</sup> For my days are consumed (כָּלָה) like smoke (כַּעֲשָׁן). Cf. also Is 51<sup>6</sup>. To read עָלָה goeth up (Ps 18<sup>9</sup> al.) instead of כָּלָה would produce a false antithesis with לֹא יֵעָלָה at the end of the verse. ὅ's loose paraphrase connects st. i with v. 8 (And I am no more, As a cloud cleared off from heaven).

What is denied is the possibility of a bodily return from the grave. 'Coming up' from Hades (Heb. She'ol) as a ghost or apparition (1 Sa 28<sup>14</sup>) is not questioned. The assertion is that, once a man is dead, there is no renewal of his earthly life.

Chapter 8. FIRST SPEECH OF BILDAD THE SHUHITE.

v. 2. There is some error in st. ii. מֵרַר וְרוּחַ כְּבִיר אֲמַרִי פִּיךָ cannot mean RV, but only *And a strong wind be the words of thy mouth?* Besides רוּחַ wind is fem. in Job (1<sup>9</sup>): see on 4<sup>15</sup>. We might restore וְרוּחַ תְּכַבִּיר וְנֹי וְרוּחַ And thy temper multiply the words of thy mouth? (רוּחַ = anger): cf. 15<sup>13</sup>. See also 21<sup>4</sup> (רוּחַ = impatience). Elihu also has מְלִין, יְכַבִּיר רוּחַ words of wind (16<sup>8</sup>),



we may further suggest *וּפִי יִכְבֵּיר אִמְרֵי-רוּחַ* *And thy mouth multiply windy words?*  $\text{Θ}$  πνεῦμα πολυρῆμον τοῦ στόματός σου =  $\text{M}$ .

v. 3. *wrest*: or *crook*: or *distort*.  $\text{יַעֲקֹל}$  pro  $\text{וַיַּעַת}$ , which recurs in st. ii. A scribe overlooked the rare word. Cf. Hb 14.  $\text{מִשְׁפָּט מַעֲקֵל}$  *wrested* or *crooked judgement* (the same noun as here). 34<sup>12</sup>, however, favours  $\text{וַיַּעַת}$ ; and the emphatic repetition of the word may have been intentional. (Neither  $\text{וַיַּעַת}$ , 33<sup>22</sup>, nor  $\text{וַיַּעֲשֶׂה}$ , Mi 3<sup>9</sup>, is found with Obj.  $\text{מִשְׁפָּט}$  elsewhere.  $\text{Θ}$  ἀδικήσει κρίνων =  $\text{בְּשִׁפְטֵי יַעֲשֶׂה}$ : cf. 10<sup>3</sup> for the verb. In st. ii,  $\text{ταράξει} = \text{וַיַּעַת}$ : cf. 19<sup>6</sup>  $\text{עותני} = \text{ἐστιν ὁ ταράξας με}$ .)

v. 4. *Though* or *If*.  $\text{אִם}$ , which also introduces the next two verses. With RV marg. we might regard st. ii as the apodosis: *If thy sons sinned against Him, He threw them* (cf.  $\text{בָּאֵשׁ שְׁלַח}$  *throw into fire*) *into the hand (power) of their offence*. So  $\text{Θ}$ . Bildad assumes that they had sinned. From his point of view, their destruction was proof of it. Or we might omit  $\text{אִם}$  here and, noting the emphatic position of  $\text{בְּנֵי}$ , translate: *Thy sons, they sinned against Him; And* (the inevitable consequence) *He threw them, &c.* Bildad does not refer to the death of Eyob's children as the chief of his calamities, but as a signal instance of the truth of the doctrine that, as sin issues in suffering, so suffering presupposes guilt.

v. 5. *If thou thyself*.  $\text{אִם-אַתָּה}$ . The Pers. Pron. is emphatic. *Thou wilt not share the fate of thy sons, if only thou wilt now seek grace*. It seems to be implied that Eyob had also sinned, though not in the same degree, since his life had been spared hitherto. (If we adopt either of the alternative renderings of v. 4 suggested in the note on that verse, we should read  $\text{וְאִם-אַתָּה}$  *But if thou thyself, &c.* Cf.  $\text{Θ}$ :  $\sigma\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$ . *seek El earnestly*:  $\text{תִּשְׁחַר אֱלֹהִים}$ . As  $\text{שָׁחַר}$  usually takes an Accusative of the Object, it has been proposed to omit  $\text{אֵל}$  unto. 'Nicht sehr schön ist . . . in v. 5 das  $\text{אֵל וְאֵל}$ ,' remarks Duhm; adding 'die LXX hat die beiden ersten  $\text{אֵל}$  nicht'. The latter statement is erroneous; for  $\text{κύριος} = \text{אֱלֹהִים}$ , acc. to the usage of  $\text{Θ}$  in Job, where  $\text{אֵל} = \text{κύριος}$  (or  $\delta\ \text{κύριος}$ ) some forty times.  $\text{Θ}$  omits the following  $\text{וְאֵל}$ , so as to connect  $\text{שָׁחַר} = \text{παντοκράτορα}$  (so fifteen times in Job) with the preceding  $\text{אֵל}$ ; thinking, no doubt, of  $\text{אֵל שָׁחַר}$  El Shaddai, but disregarding the metrical division of the stichi. For the rest, the construction  $\text{שָׁחַר אֱלֹהִים}$  may be compared with  $\text{שָׁחַר לֵאלֹהִים}$ , 24<sup>6</sup> (both are doubtless late constructions). To omit the first  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ , in fact, would spoil the symmetry of the stichi: cf. 5<sup>8</sup>. So much for the matter of 'Schönheit'. As to the suggested  $\text{אֱתֵּן אֵל}$  (Kittel), that phrase would be unique in Job and, indeed, in the OT.

v. 6. A tristich: so also in  $\text{Θ}$ . Most critics relegate st. ii to the margin. But  $\text{כִּי-עַתָּה}$  forms a good introduction for the Apodosis of v. 5; and  $\text{אִם-אַתָּה תִּשְׁחַר}$ , st. i, looks like a variant of  $\text{אֱתֵּן אֵל}$  (v. 5a); while it certainly interrupts the syntax rather awkwardly, following, as it does, on the compound protasis of v. 5. *Surely, now He would*

awake (Ps 35<sup>23</sup>) over (= for; late use of על) thee, And would requite thee according to thy righteousness. The text is questionable in both stichi. ⑤ omits כי עתה, and gives δεήσεως ἐπακούσεται σου = (or עלִיךָ 2 K 20<sup>12</sup>) יִשְׁמַע־לְךָ He will listen to thee (or perhaps יַעֲתֶר־לְךָ He will become propitious to thee; cf. 2 Sa 21<sup>14</sup>). But ἐπακούω = שמע more than twenty times; נעתר only about six), instead of יַעֲתֶר עֲלֶיךָ (for which יעור would be more usual: Ju 5<sup>9</sup> Is 51<sup>12</sup>). Then, again, st. iii. ושלם נות צדקך And make safe (?) thy righteous abode has a strange appearance. ושלם is not so used elsewhere. The common meanings are to requite, recompense, reward, compensate, pay a vow, 21<sup>19,31</sup> 34<sup>11,33</sup> 22<sup>27</sup>. The probable sense here is that God will make up everything, will make everything good to His suppliant. נות (Ps 68<sup>13</sup> +) should at least be נָתַה Ex 15<sup>13</sup> Je 31<sup>23</sup> צדק נָתַה: see on 5<sup>3,24</sup> 18<sup>15</sup>. But read כָּמוֹ: And He will make good (or compensate, sc. thee) according to thy righteousness: or else כַּצֶּדֶקךָ ושלם לך בצדקך And He will repay thee according to thy righteousness. The similar passage 22<sup>27</sup> may, however, suggest the more radical emendation: ושלמת לו נדריך And thou shalt pay Him thy vows. Ps 50<sup>14</sup> 66<sup>13</sup>.

v. 7. Lit. And thy beginning (Gn 1<sup>1</sup>) shall be smallness (Gn 19<sup>20</sup>), And thine end or after-state (42<sup>12</sup>) shall grow greatly (Ps 92<sup>13</sup>). ⑤ Thy first things, then, shall be few, But thy last untold (ἀμύθητα = רב much, many, 36<sup>28</sup>). The gender is neglected in both clauses. There is therefore no reason to follow ⑥ in pointing ישנה as Hiph. He will increase (Ols, Siegfr, Du), or to read שְׁנִיָּא instead of it (on the ground of ⑤, which really supports ⑥). A more strictly literal rendering might be: And it shall be, thy beginning was fewness; And thine end (shall be)—it (i. e. the fewness) shall increase greatly.

vv. 8–19. Bildad appeals to the Wisdom of the Fathers, the experience of the past which proves, as he thinks, that they who forget God suddenly perish. He wishes Eyob to apply the moral to himself.

v. 8. the first (not former) age or generation; i. e. the primitive and patriarchal times (אבות), when men lived longer (cf. v. 9), and therefore attained to fuller knowledge and riper experience than their degenerate descendants. The wisdom of the Ancients has always and everywhere been proverbial, until comparatively modern times.

St. ii. Reading בון consider attentively (Dt 32<sup>10</sup>) or give heed to. ⑥ בון fix (scil. thine heart) on . . . ; but this verb is not so used elsewhere. See 1 Sa 23<sup>22</sup> for a similar error. ⑤ סֹלְחִים and understand = ובונו. the findings (lit. search; thing sought out) or quest of the Fathers: ⑥ אבותם of their fathers. The 3 Pers. Pron., which could only refer to the 'First Generation', may be due to reminiscence of 15<sup>18</sup>. Or the מ may be a misreading of נו our. ⑤ curiously: ἐξιχνίασον δὲ κατὰ γένος πατέρων = וְ(ל)מָנָן (ת)חַקֵּר אֲבוֹת Gn 11<sup>12</sup> f. ἐξιχνιάω = חָקַר, 5<sup>27</sup> al.

v. 9. Of yesterday: מִתְּמוֹל; so ⑥ ⑦. ⑥ om. prep. מ. (תְּמוֹל, Aram.

אֶתְמָלִי, אֶתְמָלִי, Mand. עֲתֻמָּל, Assy. timáli, itimáli, inatimáli, supplies an instance of the weakening of *y* to *n*; being derived from *עַתָּה* *time* and *מִלְּפָנֶיךָ* *before, ante*, and thus meaning the *day before* to-day. With the first element in the compound cf. Assy. inu, enu, f. ittu, ettu, *time*, Sumerian EN, ENE, *id.*)

*like a shadow*: as transitory, and soon vanishing away. בָּצֵל, as in the quotation I C 29<sup>15</sup> 'בָּצֵל יִמִּינוּ עַל הָאֵר'. Cf. also 17<sup>7</sup>. So ㊄㊄. Perhaps וְבָצֵל (not וְבָצֵל). The verse is parenthetical, if genuine.

v. 10. *Will not they* (emphatic Pron.) *teach thee and* (restoring 1, c codd. et ㊄㊄) *tell thee?* That is, the Ancients who lived long enough to find out the truth, and whose lore has come down to us by hallowed tradition.

*from their heart's wisdom*: lit. *out of their heart*: cf. 15<sup>18</sup> *from thy mouth*. *Heart* here = intelligence, thought, or insight and understanding as resulting from thought and reflexion. 36<sup>5</sup>.

v. 11. Insert ㊄ or to introduce st. ii and improve both construction and rhythm. So ㊄㊄. For the *papyrus* or paper-reed (בָּבִיל), see Ex 2<sup>3</sup> Is 18<sup>2</sup>. ㊄ confuses the word with Heb. בָּבִיל *marsh*, which, however, is also used in the sense of אֶבְמוֹן *bulrush*, Je 51<sup>32</sup>. בִּצְצָה *bicṣā mire*, mud, moist earth, 40<sup>21</sup>, and בִּצְן *id.*, Je 38<sup>22</sup>, correspond to Assy. *baṣṣu*; e.g. in the phrase *baṣṣa u turuba šipik epirū rabūtim*, 'mud and dust (㊄), a heap of much earth'.

*Nile-rush*: or *sedge*: אֶרֶב, Gn 41<sup>2.18</sup> (app. an Egyptian word). ㊄ βούτομον, perhaps *butomus*, the flowering rush. The poet appears to have had some knowledge of Egypt (cf. the description of the crocodile, chap. 41. Macgregor of the 'Rob Roy', however, encountered a crocodile among the reeds of lake Hūleh in N. Syria.)

The verse appears to cite the Wisdom of the Ancients in appropriate gnomic or proverbial form; reminding us of the traditional saws of the Seven Sages of Hellas.

v. 12. Lit. *It is still in growth and* (but) *is not moist* (or *sappy*). We read וְלֹא יִרְטֵב וְעוֹדֵנִי אֶבֶב: cf. v. 16 יִרְטֵב *wet, moist, sappy*; 24<sup>8</sup> יִרְטֵבוּ *they are wet, soaked*, by showers. ㊄ עוֹדֵנִי בִּאֲבוּ לֹא יִקְטָף *It is still in its freshness* (or *first growth*); *it is not plucked off* (or *up*): 30<sup>4</sup> Dt 23<sup>26</sup> Ez 17<sup>4</sup>. The point is that the marsh-plant, if deprived of the water which supplies its vital sap, withers rapidly and fails to attain full growth.

With the ㊄π. λεγόμε. אֶבֶב, cf. Aram. ㊄אֶבֶב, ㊄ Ho 9<sup>10</sup>, and Assy. *abābu*, to be *bright, fresh*, e.g. *kīma irṣitīm libib*, 'Like the earth let him flourish!'; *ababa* = *qistu, wood, forest*, Aram. ㊄אֶבֶב *id.*

v. 13. *the end*: the hereafter or future, the latter end: reading אַחֲרִית (㊄ τὰ ἔσχατα: v. 7, 42<sup>12</sup>) instead of אֲרָחוֹת *the paths*.

*the worldling*: ㊄ ἀσεβοὺς, *impious, ungodly*. So again 8<sup>13</sup> 15<sup>34</sup> 27<sup>5</sup>. In twenty-two other places ἀσεβής = ㊄שָׁע in Job, as in Proverbs (sixty-five

times) and gen. in OT. The sense here is defined by the preceding phrase, 'those who forget God'; i. e. the irreligious or worldly, in whose thought and life there is no recognition of God, and who are ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (Eph 2<sup>12</sup>). The root חנף has usually been compared with Ar. حَنَفَ to *incline to*, or *decline from*, a thing, and حَنِفَ or حَنْفٌ to *have a wry or crooked foot or leg*. It would then be one of the numerous offshoots of the primitive GAM, GAN, KAM, KAN, HAM, HAN, to *bend, bow, &c.* (*Proc. Brit. Acad.*, vol. vii, 'Shumer and Shem', p. 23). It is, however, perhaps better to connect it with Assyr. ḥanābu or ḥanāpu, to *spout or grow luxuriantly*, of hair and vegetation; since words denoting luxuriant growth are metaphorically used to express wantonness and rebellion against moral restraints. Cf. also the phrase ḥanāpu ša tāmtim, app. meaning the *swell* of the sea (Sum. SIG-DU.DU, to be *wool-heaped* or *wool-covered*; alluding to the white wool-like crests of the waves. 5 R 19 7a); and נָאָה to *grow up*, v. 11, used of the *rising* of a torrent, Ez 47<sup>5</sup>, נָאָה *proud*, נִפְאָה *swelling* of the sea, Ps 46<sup>4</sup>, and other derivv. The pride which refuses to acknowledge dependence upon God and issues in many kinds of rebellion, is perhaps the most deadly sin from the point of view of spiritual religion. 'By that sin fell the Angels.' (Cf. Is 14<sup>13, 14</sup>; Mt 11<sup>29, 30</sup>). The legends of the Titanic rebels who of old fought against Heaven fitly symbolize their impious pride by their monstrous growth and stature.

v. 14. יָקוּט a word otherwise unknown; RV *shall break in sunder*, marg. *be cut off*, as if from a supposed קטט = Ar. قَتَّ to *cut*. So Saad. يَنْقَطِعُ *cut off*. But a noun is required, as in the || st. and 31<sup>24</sup>. קוֹיִם will not do; קו is always a measuring-line (38<sup>8</sup>), and the plur. does not occur. קוֹרֵי spider-threads, Is 59<sup>5</sup>, suggests קוֹרֵים (spider-threads, a cobweb; perhaps a gossamer (Dr) or spider's film floating in the air. קוֹי קִיט summer-threads (?) is pretty but improbable. כְּחוֹט like a thread (Ju 16<sup>12</sup>; simile for a thing easily broken), or בחוט in a thread, may be further suggested. We say, 'His life hangs on a thread.'

Ⓢ, not understanding יָקוּט and misled by בית in st. ii, gives an infelicitous paraphrase: *For his house shall be uninhabited, But his tent shall turn out a spider (!)*. Cf. Ⓢ 27<sup>18</sup>.

v. 15. Or, *He leaneth upon his house, and it standeth not; He clutcheth it, and it remains not upright* (gives way).

v. 16. עַל גַּנּוֹתָיו over his garden does not seem quite satisfactory. Ⓢ ἀπὸ σπρίας αὐτοῦ, out of his decay (= רָפָה in three other places, 17<sup>14</sup> al.). Ps 80<sup>12</sup> נָהַר יוֹנֵק suggests תְּשֻׁלָּה קִצְרִיָּה עַד יָם וְאֵל נָהַר beside (or אֵלֵי unto) the river; or אֵל פֶּלֶג unto the canal (29<sup>6</sup>, cf. 38<sup>25</sup>).

עַל-גִּבּוֹת above the roofs does not suit either יוֹנֵק sucker, shoot from the root at the bottom of the main stem, 14<sup>7</sup> 15<sup>30</sup>, nor תֵּצֵא comes out, emerges

from the soil. After all, מ may be right: *Sappy is he before the sun* (he can face the summer heats without fear of being dried up); *And on his garden his suckers spring forth.* A last suggestion, however, may not be deemed superfluous. Since 'suckers' shoot forth about and beside a trunk, it seems plausible to read נועו for נהו (see 14<sup>8</sup> Is 11<sup>1</sup> 40<sup>24</sup>): *And by his stock his sucker cometh forth.*

v. 17. *About a cairn his roots he twineth; And a house of stones* (stony house) *he chooseth.* For גל a heap of stones, see 15<sup>28</sup> (ruins), Jos 7<sup>26</sup> (over a grave). RV marg. *beside the spring*; but גל never has this meaning (in Ct 4<sup>12</sup> גן must be read c 𐤒𐤍𐤁). The tree which symbolizes the ungodly in prosperity has a firm grip of the ground, being founded as it were upon rock instead of loose soil. יסבני are entwined; but ש takes the verb as a Sing. and connects the 1 with st. ii, which agrees better with the context. Read therefore יסבני or ישבני (ש κοιμάται = ישכב; cf. also שבכה 18<sup>8</sup>). συναγωγήν λίθων is a quaint but not inaccurate explanation of גל.

a house of stones. The stone heap out of which its stem rises is regarded as the tree's 'house', chosen for its strength and security against wind and storm. A man's house is his castle; as was more especially the case in ancient times. Under different figures the seeming security and real insecurity of the godless is insisted upon in vv. 14 ff.; and the occurrence of בית in 14, 15 favours its recurrence here. ש ἐν δὲ μέσῳ χαλίκων ζήσεται = ובין אבנים יחיה *And between stones he liveth.* The verb יחיה has troubled later translators than ש, and various substitutes have been proposed, of which the most ingenious is Hoffmann's יחיה (= יאחזה) *he graspeth it.* But there seems no reason why יחיה should not mean *he looketh out or chooseth* (cf. Ex 18<sup>21</sup>) = יראה, the action of the tree being poetically regarded as personal.

v. 18. *El swalloweth him up out of his place.* Leg. אל, the necessary Subj., pro אמר If, which leaves the Verb Act. without a definite Subj. Cf. 27<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, the hypothetical form is quite inappropriate here, where the sudden end of the godless man's seeming security is stated. The cause is, of course, according to Bildad's doctrine, the intervention of God. For בלע to swallow, akin to לע id., see 7<sup>19</sup> 20<sup>16,18</sup>; Pi. fig. swallow up, destroy, 2<sup>8</sup> 10<sup>8</sup>; Pu 37<sup>20</sup> *be destroyed.* His place (מקום) or stead confirms בית > בן in the previous verse: see 7<sup>10</sup> where בית and מקום are associated as here. The same passage throws light on st. ii: *And it* (his place) *disowneth him with 'I know thee not!'* (lit. *I have not seen thee*; or, as we might say, 'I never saw thee before'). His home knows him no more. He becomes a stranger to the familiar spot. It soon forgets him. Cf. also 20<sup>9</sup>; and 20<sup>7</sup> ירעיו = ראיו *his acquaintance*, they who knew him). ש (wrongly): οὐχ ἐόρακας τοιαῦτα = לא ראיתו כן.

v. 19. St. ii proves that the metaphor of the tree is maintained; but in

the present text of st. i it appears to be dropped. 'Lo, that is the joy of his way' is a strange statement to be made of a stationary object like a tree, and further is out of all clear relation to the context, even if the word 'joy' be 'meant ironically' (Dr).  $\Theta$  gives something quite different:  $\delta\tau\iota \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\phi\eta$  (15<sup>21</sup>)  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \tau\omicron\iota\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta$ . We propose  $\text{בן הוא משיע (מסיע) דורו}$ , and in st. ii  $\text{יִצְמִיחַ}$ : *Thus He* (emphatic pron.; viz. El) *plucketh away his abode, And causeth another to spring from the ground.* The phrase  $\text{דור הסיע}$  is from Is 38<sup>12</sup>. Otherwise, we might suggest  $\text{משרש}$  for  $\text{משוש}$ : *Thus He uprooteth his abode*: cf. Ps 52<sup>7</sup>.

v. 20. *Nor hold (or grasp) the hand of evildoers*: either to support or to lead them.  $\Theta$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta\epsilon \delta\omega\rho\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \sigma\upsilon \delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  =  $\text{ולא יקח מיד מרע}$ .  $\text{M}$  is preferable; though the affirmation that El is an incorruptible Judge is not unsuitable to the context.

vv. 21, 22.  $\text{M}$ 's continuation *Until (עד) He fill thy mouth with laughing, And thy lips with shouting* (a metrically short st.) does not really continue the previous sense; and the pointing  $\text{עַד}$  yet, still, again, only gives us a prophecy in the air. The change from the third to the second Pers. Pron. in these two verses breaks the connexion with what precedes.  $\Theta$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\omega\nu \delta\epsilon \sigma\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\alpha \delta\epsilon \chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\eta \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  (22)  $\text{Οἱ δὲ ἔχθροὶ αὐτῶν κτλ.}$  yields a more consecutive and natural close to Bildad's argument. In accordance with this, we read:

פִּי יִיטֵר יִמְלֵא שְׂחוֹק  
וּשְׂפָתַי וְךָ תִרְעֶנָּה  
שְׁנֵאֵיו יִלְבְּשׁוּ בִשָּׁת  
וְאֹהֶל רַשְׁעִים אֵינֶנּוּ

Thus Bildad implies that Eyob was *not*  $\text{חַם וְיִשָּׁר}$  (2<sup>3</sup> 1<sup>1</sup>), inasmuch as his 'tent' was certainly 'no more'.

(In v. 20  $\Theta$   $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$  =  $\text{חָם}$ ; and in 2<sup>3</sup>  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$  =  $\text{חַם וְיִשָּׁר}$ . For  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$  =  $\text{יִשָּׁר}$ , see also 4<sup>7</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>. We may regard  $\text{M}$   $\text{עַד}$  as a disguised relic of  $\text{שָׁר}$ , since  $\text{ע}$  and  $\text{ש}$  are sometimes, and  $\text{ד}$ ,  $\text{ר}$  very often, confused with each other. In  $\text{שְׂפָתֶיךָ}$  one letter ( $\text{ו}$ ) has fallen out before the  $\text{ך}$ . Bildad has already (v. 6) coupled together  $\text{נָקִי}$  pure and  $\text{יִשָּׁר}$  upright.  $\text{M}$  would thus appear to be an infelicitous restoration of a mutilated text.)

Chapter 9. Eyob ironically grants that God is never unjust (8<sup>3</sup>). He is, in fact, so far exalted above man, as to be beyond the reach of argument or remonstrance. He does what He wills, and is a law to Himself.

v. 2. *And how shall a mortal be just with God?* See the note on 4<sup>17</sup>; and cf. 25<sup>4</sup> where this question is repeated. The implication is that frail humanity can never be wholly without fault in the eyes of the Divine Judge (cf.  $\Theta$   $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \xi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma \beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha} \text{Κυρίῳ}$ ). This at least is Bildad's meaning. The following words, however, seem to

involve a new construction of the question in the mouth of Eyob, viz. How is a mere man *to be justified* with God? how is he to compel God to admit his righteousness?

v. 3. *If he would fain argue his case with Him* (13<sup>3</sup>), *He will not answer him one point of a thousand*: He will not vouchsafe even the least reply to his questionings; He will give him no answer at all. Again and again Eyob complains that he cannot come at his Divine Persecutor (he, like his Friends, believes that his calamities are directly due to God, though the Prologue teaches us otherwise); that God eludes all his approaches, holding Himself aloof from His creature in inaccessible Majesty, apparently indifferent alike to the protests and the sufferings of His victim. Cf. v. 11 and 23<sup>9-9</sup>. (The reference of the Pers. Pronouns in this verse is ambiguous; and in a different context the meaning might be, as Dr gives it: 'If one were to desire to dispute with Him, he could not answer Him one of the innumerable questions which, in His infinite superiority to man, He would put to him.' Cf. the 'innumerable questions' of 38-41. But Eyob would not be likely to recognize evidence of his own guilt in mere ignorance of the constitution of Nature. Indeed, after making him realize that ignorance to the full by the long series of questions in chaps. 38 sqq., God Himself is represented as expressly confirming the justice of his argument (42<sup>7</sup>).)


v. 4. Lit. *Wise of heart and firm* (or *stout*) *of strength, Who hath resisted Him* (הקשה *hardened*, scil. *his neck*, Je 7<sup>26</sup>, or *his heart*, Pr 28<sup>14</sup>) *and remained whole*? (וישלם = ὁ ὑπέμεινεν: so 22<sup>21</sup> 41<sup>3</sup>).

v. 5. *Who removeth mountains unperceived*: reading (!) וְיָדַע instead of וְלֹא יָדַע *and they know not*. The unconsciousness of the mountains hardly called for remark; but the Divine Agent acts, without letting Himself be seen. For יָדַע Niph. cf. Gn 41<sup>21</sup> and esp. Ps 77<sup>19</sup>. (ע *without knowing it*; lit. *and does not know*, meaning perhaps *without heeding or caring*; but the ascription of unconscious or heedless action to God is unlikely here. Indeed st. ii makes the action intentional.) We may also suggest וְלֹא יָדַע, or even Pu. Pf. יָדַע, *and they are no more perceived* = and they disappear; cf. Assyr. *idû*, *to see, to know*, Pa. Permans. *ld uddâ uçurâtî*, 'the sculptures were not visible', Neb. *Senkerêh* Cyl. (The root דַע may be compared with שַע in שַעה *to gaze at*.) In st. ii the prosaic אֲשֶׁר is obviously corrupt. But וְיִשְׁדָּם בְּאַפּוֹ is both unmetrical and bad Hebrew. A slight change would give וְיִשְׁדָּם הֶפֶךְ בְּאַפּוֹ *And their foundation He overturneth in His wrath*: cf. Assyr. *išdu*, *foundation*, and אֲשֶׁר Nu 21<sup>15</sup>. It seems preferable, however, to see in אֲשֶׁר a vestige of מִשְׁרָשׁ (ו) (*And from the roots He overturneth them in His wrath*: cf. 28<sup>9</sup>).

The great disturbances of Nature, wrought by volcanic agency, earthquakes, and storms on land or sea, are ascribed, as usually in the OT, to the immediate action of God. They are cited as evidence of Power,

with which it were both vain and presumptuous for man to contend.  $\Theta$  ὁ παλαιῶν ὄρη, *Who aged the mountains*: not a different reading, but misinterpreting עָתָק in the Aram. sense of *growing old*, which occurs 217, instead of *moving* (14<sup>18</sup> 184).

v. 6. *out of her place*:  $\Theta$  ἐκ θεμελίων. The same paraphrase in 184, Is 13<sup>19</sup>. The 2nd stichus ועמודיה יתפלצון *And her pillars shudder* seems metrically short, and is, perhaps, otherwise doubtful. We have אָרֶץ and עמודיה again in Ps 75<sup>4</sup>, but meaning, as it would seem, 'the country' and 'its nobles'—a metaphorical use of 'pillars'. The word rendered 'pillars' in 1 Sa 2<sup>8</sup> is not the same. Moreover, 267<sup>b</sup> does not suggest that the poet believed the earth to be supported on pillars; but 261<sup>11</sup> does speak of 'the pillars of Heaven' (עמודי שמים). If the earth were shaken, these pillars (conceived as resting upon it) would certainly sway and tremble. Otherwise, we might read עמודי תבל *the pillars of the world*. (With the vb. יתפלצון ἄπ. λεγόμεν. cf. n. פלצות horror, 216. פלץ is app. cogn. with Assyr. פלח *to fear*, and נלד, נלת, *id.* Cf. Sum. LUĜ, Ch. li, lit, lik, *id.*, Giles 6976.)

v. 7. *Sol.* The Heb. is the rare הָרִם (see Ju 135 2<sup>9</sup> 813 1418), not the ordinary term שמש. It may mean the young or rising sun, and, as a Semitic etymology is wanting, we may compare the Egyptian  Har, Horus, in the like sense; a name which also appears in חרנפר Harnefer, 1 C 736, 'the beauteous Horus' (see my note in Ellicott's Comm. ad loc., London, 1883). (In 3 R 68, 64 we find mention of a Sumerian God 𒂗𒂊 GĀR, who is called KIN-GĒA DINGIR MAŠ-TABBA, 'The Messenger of the Twin God(s)'. His name is written 𒂗𒂊𒂗𒂊 god + bullock; which might indicate either a sun or a river deity.) The verb זָרַח *to rise*, of the sun, is cognate with Ar. شَرَق and Aram. ܕܝܚ; and the biliteral root of these and other kindred Semitic words may be recognized in the Sumerian LAG, LAĜ, RA (from RAG, RAĜ), and ZA-LAG, all values of the Sun-character, and all meaning *light, shine, &c.* (See CT xii. 6.)

The allusion is not only to eclipses, which are rare, but to the darkness of clouded and stormy skies (35), when neither sun nor stars are visible. *sealeth* (37?) *about the stars*: so that they cannot move on in their 'courses' (Ju 520) or appointed paths across the heavens. They are shut behind sealed doors in their celestial abodes. Cf. the Babylonian Epic of Creation, Tab. V for the fixed paths of the heavenly bodies in the solid vault of the firmament.

$\Theta^B$  adds: κατὰ δὲ ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ σκόλιόν τι ἐπενόησεν = ובמלאכיו ישים; תהלה; app. a marginal citation of 418, and a very clear instance of inept interpolation. It is quite possible that vv. 8-10 are also to be regarded as inauthentic additions to the Heb. text by some scribe who failed to notice that the context (vv. 5-7) deals only with the seemingly arbitrary



and capricious activity of God, and not with His beneficent creative work.

v. 8. *That spread the heavens*: Je 10<sup>12</sup> Is 40<sup>22</sup> Ps 104<sup>2</sup> ('like a curtain'). Cf. 26<sup>7</sup>. Should לְבַדוֹ alone be (ע)ל-בְּהוֹ over the Void? Or בָּרֶק, Is 40<sup>22</sup>? And treadeth upon the heights of the Earth. מַי has יָם sea instead of אֶרֶץ earth. But the phrase יַם בְּמָתוֹ high places of the sea is unparalleled as an expression for the swelling waves of the sea. בְּמָתוֹ always means either mountains, like its original the Assyrio-Bab. *bāmātē*, or as a t. t. of religion the high places, natural or artificial, which served as the sanctuaries of Canaan. (*Bāmah*, from בּוֹם; perhaps a labialized form of קוֹם stand up, rise, with which cf. GIN, a value of the Sumerian Mountain-character, Ch. k'in, high peaks, G 2113, and also GIN, *kānu*, כּוֹן. In Assy. *bāmātē šā šadē* is the tops or peaks of the mountains.) The st. seems to be borrowed from Am 4<sup>13</sup>, word for word (cf. also Mi 1<sup>3</sup>). Otherwise, we might read עָב clouds instead of יָם, with 3 Heb. codd., and compare Is 14<sup>14</sup> Na 1<sup>3</sup>. But the clouds are usually God's chariot, Is 19<sup>1</sup> Ps 104<sup>3</sup>.

v. 9. The three stellar groups עֵשׂ (עֵישׁ), כְּסִיל, and כִּימָה, are mentioned again, in reverse order, 38<sup>31,32</sup>. The same order obtains in Am 5<sup>9</sup> (עֵישָׁה כִּימָה וְכָסִיל); a passage of which the present may be a reminiscence. Θ ὁ ποιῶν Πλειάδα καὶ Ἑσπερον καὶ Ἀρκτοῦρον = עֵשָׁה כִּימָה וְכָסִיל וְעֵישׁ; but עֵשָׁה עֵשׂ כְּסִיל מַי = עֵשָׁה כִּימָה וְעֵישׁ וְכָסִיל = הוּא דִּעְבֵּר כִּימָה וְעֵישָׁה וְנִבְרָא Θ is strange. The Asyndeton may be corrected by reading עֵשׂ וְכָסִיל, c Θ Θ Θ; and עֵשׂ should doubtless be עֵישׁ, as in 38<sup>32</sup>, and as is indicated by the Syriac equivalent ܡܢܝܬܐ, on the ground of which it has been proposed to point the Heb. word עֵישׁ 'iyyûsh (perhaps rather עֵישׁ 'iyyôsh or עֵי 'ayyôsh). עֵשָׁה עֵשׂ כְּסִיל, however, looks as if עֵשׂ were a scribe's inadvertent repetition of the first two letters of עֵשָׁה. This would account both for the spelling עֵשׂ (instead of עֵישׁ) and for the Asyndeton כְּסִיל instead of וְכָסִיל. Then the first st. would be עֵשָׁה כְּסִיל וְכִימָה *That made Kesil and Kîmah* (cf. Am 5<sup>9</sup>). The second st., which is too short, might be completed by supposing that בִּזְיָה has fallen out after the somewhat similar כִּימָה: *That built the Chambers of the South*: cf. Am 9<sup>6a</sup>. *Inner Chambers of the Southern Sky* is not a probable name for a single constellation, like the other names of the verse. It must rather denote the whole southern quarter of the heavens, regarded as containing the fixed abodes or stations (Assyr. *manzalê*: cf. v. 7, 37<sup>9</sup>) of certain brilliant stars or groups of stars which become visible as one journeys to the South, e.g. the Southern Cross, of which the poet might have heard from travellers. The other names can hardly be identified with certainty. See Burney, EB s.v. STARS. But this no more affects the general sense than the absence of the names of particular stars in Is 40<sup>26</sup>.

The Syr. 'iyyûthā (= עֵישׁ) seems to be either Aldebaran, i.e. α Tauri, or Capella Aurigae; but Θ gives Arcturus, and Ա 'al-'Ayyûqa, i.e.

the star Capella, which follows the Pleiades ('al-Thurayyā = כִּימָה here). If כִּימָה be really the Pleiades (Ⓢ Saad.) or Hyades (Ⓢ), the name may be compared with Assyrio-Bab. *kīmu*, f. *kīmtu*, 'family', from *kamā*, 'to bind'; cf. our popular name 'The Seven Sisters'. According to classical myth the Pleiades were the seven daughters of Atlas, and sisters of the Hyades; who were pursued by the giant hunter Orion, until Zeus in compassion changed them and their pursuer into neighbouring constellations. It agrees with this that כַּסִּיל is rendered 'The Giant' by Ⓢ and Ⓢ ('*al-gabbāra*) and *Oriona* by Ⓢ. So also נִפְלָא (cf. הַנְּפִלִים Gn 6<sup>4</sup>). In 38<sup>31</sup> Ⓢ Ὠρίωνος = כַּסִּיל; but here, strangely enough, Ἑσπερον, *the Evening Star* or *Venus*, which in 38<sup>32</sup> does duty for עֵישָׁר! (on the ground of עֵישָׁר Ishtar?).

v. 10. Repeated from 5<sup>9</sup>, and prob. a marginal intrusion here. (5<sup>9</sup> וְאֵין חֶקֶר and *unsearchable*: cf. Ⓢ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστα Ⓢ *et incomprehensibilia*: *how* He does them, man cannot find out. עֵר אֵין חֶקֶר seems rather to emphasize their number; and the עֵר is due to the influence of st. ii.) Cf. Ps 136<sup>4</sup>.—The anarthrous Ptcpp. in vv. 8–10 should perhaps be pointed as Constr. States: cf. vv. 5–7.

v. 11. Behold: הִנֵּה; Ⓢ εἶδὼν, *If* (Aram. use): cf. 40<sup>23</sup> Ex 4<sup>1</sup> al. So ⓈⓈ. Perhaps a better sense: *If He pass along by me* (Gn 18<sup>6</sup>: or *over me*, Ps 42<sup>8</sup>), *I see Him not* (the following ו belongs to אֶרְאֶה: leg. אֶרְאֶהוּ, c ⓈⓈⓈ); *If He glide by, I perceive Him not*. חָלַף (v. 26 4<sup>16</sup> 11<sup>10</sup>), as v. 26 shows, implies swift passage. It is a poet. syn. of עָבַר, *pass over, through, by, onward*, the root of which may well be Sum. BAR, 'side' (*aḥātu, pādu*), so that it str. means *to go to the other side*; while חָלַף may be compared with ĠAL (חָל), *split, part, divide, run swiftly*, of water; (*zāzu, garāru ša mē*), also *to open (pitā)*, just as BAR is also *split, divide, open*, and *half (parāsu, pitā, mišlu, zūzu)*. The *sides* are the *dividers* and *boundaries* or *bounds (kamātu)* of things. Moreover, since BA means *rend, divide, half (našāru, zāzu, mišlu)*, חָלַף (= חָלַב) may perhaps = ĠAL-BA. For the connexion of ideas in חָלַף *pass on, away, through* (= *pierce*, 20<sup>24</sup> Ju 5<sup>26</sup>), *change, alter, substitute*, cf. also Sum. BAL (= BAR?), *axe, break through, pass over, change, alter* (a god's command; a temple-site), &c. (*pilaqqu, nabalkutu, ebēru, enā*).

God eludes human sight, even when His overwhelming Power is displayed in the more violent phenomena of Nature. Cf. 1 K 19<sup>11,12</sup>. In 23<sup>8,9</sup> this complaint of the elusiveness of God is repeated and amplified.

v. 12. *If He glide by* (or *fleet past, speed onward*), *who can turn Him back?* Leg. חָלַף, as in v. 11, instead of מִי יַחְתֵּף (*āti*), which is usually taken to mean *seizeth prey* (= יַחְטֵף); but this does not agree with יַשִּׁיבֵנו (which, in that case, would naturally mean *Who can restore it?* cf. Is 42<sup>22</sup>). Besides, the Obj. of the vb. is indispensable. Cf. 11<sup>10</sup> מִי יַשִּׁיבֵנו ... אִם יַחְלֵף (prob. an echo of this verse).

Ⓢ εἰν ἀπαλλάξῃ, τίς ἀποστρέψει; *If He remove or dismiss, who shall turn back?* (חָלַף in Syr. is *to break in pieces*; and Ⓢ here renders חָלַף,

which shows that it read יתחף, pointing prob. as Pi.). Leg. fort. יתחף  
break forth: cf. (6) Ex 19<sup>22</sup>; vel יחריב lay waste, vel יחרים destroy (Is 34<sup>2</sup>).

v. 13. *Eloah turneth not back His wrath*: cf. v. 12 a. (The repetitions of vv. 9-13 throw some suspicion on the text.) Nothing can arrest the course of Divine activity. His Anger is an all-subduing force. *Under It (or Him) were bowed of old the Helpers of Rahab*. That Rahab is a personification of the sea is evident from the similar allusions, probably to the same ancient myth, in 26<sup>11</sup>, Ps 89<sup>9,10</sup>. Rahab (the *wrathful, raging, passionate, or violent*; str. phps. *noisy, clamorous*, like the cogn. ריב: cf. Assy. *ra'dbu*, to be enraged, become furious, behave furiously) appears, in fact, to be the Canaanite or Hebrew name of the primal Deep, the chaotic mass of dark waters which existed before Heaven and Earth, out of which first the gods and afterwards all other things emerged or were created, and which in Assyrio-Bab. was usually called *Tiāmat* (= תהום, Gn 1<sup>2</sup>), i. e. the Sea (= *tiamtu, tamtu, tamdu*, pl. *tāmāle*, &c.). In the Babylonian Epic of Creation, which relates how *Tiāmat* warred against the gods, and was vanquished by Merodach, who built heaven and earth out of the two halves of her cloven carcase, she is also called 'the Mother *ĠUBUR*' (*um-mu ħu-bur*, *um-ma ħu-bu-ur* · Tab. II. 19, III. 81 al.), as well as *um-ma Ti-amat*, 'the Mother *Tiāmat*' (III. 73); a title in which a trace of the original Sumerian text of the poem is preserved, *ĠU-BUR* being a Sum. word meaning *hole, pit, bottom, beneath* (*šapliš*. *BUR* is *hole, well, pit*, &c.). Cf. Is 51<sup>1</sup> מַקְבֵּת בּוֹר. The *nāri ĠUBUR* was the River of the Underworld; i. e. 'the waters under the earth', the subterranean portion of *Tiāmat*, whom Berosus, in a well-known passage, calls Ὁμορωκα = Sum. *UMU-ĠUBŪRA* (cf. Μολοβοβαρ = *MULU-BABAR*, for the first element. As regards the second, *Ġ* or *ñ* = *K*, as sometimes in LXX; *B* = *W*, as in כּוּכַב from כּבֵּכַב, and *UWU* = *Ō*; while the Metathesis of the *K* and *R*, if not accidental, may be paralleled by Heb. רחל = Assy. *laḫru*, 'ewe'; Sum. *ADAGUR*, *adaguru*, Heb. אֲדָגֻר, &c.).

Such a line as 'Under Him bowed the Helpers of Rahab' seems to show that the poet was acquainted with the Bab. Epic of Creation almost in the form in which we have it; and the brevity of his allusions implies that his readers were equally familiar with the ancient story. Cf. Tab. IV. 105 ff. where we read:

'After he had smitten the leader, *Tiamat*,  
Her strength was crushed, her army broken up:  
And the gods, her helpers, marching beside her,  
Quaked, were terrified, turned their backs.

He took them prisoners, and shattered their weapons.  
In the net they lay, in the meshes they sate:  
The Four Regions they filled with wailing.'

(See *Light from the East*, p. 10.)

The root שחח *bow down, crouch* (38), cogn. c שוה *sink down*, whence שחח a *sinking* in the ground, *pit*, may be connected with נוח *lie down, rest* (N = S). Cf. also נוה (= רבץ), and שוה *lie flat, be level*, and Sum. NA, NU, *lie down, rest* (p. 146 *supr.*).

Θ *κῆτος τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανόν*, *the subcelestial sea-monsters*, appears to show knowledge of the primitive myth. So τὸ κῆτος = רהב 26<sup>12</sup>. Contrast the euhemeristic paraphrase of Θ<sup>2</sup> οἱ ἐρειδόμενοι ἀλαζονεία.

v. 14. Answering and arguing are a kind of opposition; and all opposition to the Omnipotent is futile. If superhuman beings failed (v. 13), the certain failure of a human opponent may be taken for granted. No distinction is drawn between physical and moral opposition. *With Him*: i.e. in argument with Him or, perhaps, in His presence. Awed and overwhelmed by the sense of God's Omnipotence, Eyob would be silenced if not convinced. Θ, missing the point, alters the Pers. of the verbs (*ὑπακούσεται* = יענה) and, further, reads יבחן (*διακρινεῖ*: 12<sup>11</sup>) instead of אבחר (cf. 15<sup>5</sup>). So also in v. 15 *εἰσακούσεται μου* = יעננו instead of אענה.

v. 15. Perhaps a marginal variant or interpolation. *Choosing words* might have been understood in the sense of careful entreaty or *supplication*. (אעננו would be clearer than אענה: cf. Θ, where γὰρ = אשר). St. ii is short. Perhaps אף כי למשפטי את *Yea, rather, I would entreat, &c.*, or, better, במורי למ' את *With my mouth would I entreat, &c.* (19<sup>16</sup>); instead of arguing his case against Him. (Θ τοῦ κρίματος αὐτοῦ, pointing למשפטי למשפטי, is no improvement, even if it were possible Hebrew. ΘΞ my judge, as if לשפטי; but the meaning required is rather *antagonist* or plaintiff in the case. משפט seems to occur in this sense, Zp 3<sup>16</sup>, if not also in Ps 109<sup>31</sup>.)

v. 16. The 'calling' and 'answering' seem to imply a citation or summons and the acceptance of it by the 'adversary', to trial of the case in a court of law. Θ<sup>B</sup> inserts a 'not' in st. i: 'And if I have called, and He hath not answered me, I do not believe that He listened to me.' This hardly betters the sense; and Θ<sup>NA</sup> omit the *μή*.

v. 17. Or *Who with a storm would sweep* (or *whirl*) *me away*: cf. 27<sup>21</sup>. שְׁעָרָה = סְעָרָה is prob. right. The שְׁעָרָה a (single) *hair* of ΘΞ, which reminds us of Gabriel carrying Mahomet by a single hair (cf. Ez 8<sup>3</sup>), is merely curious (Θ *Who on every hair of my head with force hath smitten me!*). The verb יִשְׁפְּנִי would *bruise me* (Aram. שוף), Gn 3<sup>15</sup>, does not suit (= Θ *ἐκτρίψη, rub out, Ξ conteret me*); nor does it agree with the || passages, 27<sup>20,21</sup> 30<sup>22</sup>. We might point יִשְׁפְּנִי = יִסְפְּנִי, and regard the verb as a Denom. from סופה *stormwind* (like שער 27<sup>21</sup> Ps 58<sup>10</sup>)—a favourite word in Job (21<sup>18</sup> 27<sup>20</sup>), which is coupled with שְׁעָרָה, Na 1<sup>3</sup>. (Θ *μη γόνμφ με ἐκτρίψη*; cf. 27<sup>20</sup> γνόφος = סופה!). The objection to יִסְפְּנִי *make an end of me*, from סוף, Am 3<sup>15</sup>, is that, as is evident from the context, killing

is not intended, but only such hurts as might be suffered by one caught up and dashed about by a sudden blast or hurricane: cf. st. ii. The same objection lies against the root אָשַׁף = אָסַף, Zp 1<sup>2</sup> Je 8<sup>19</sup>. The phrase of st. ii *would multiply my wounds (or bruises) for no cause* aptly describes the result of being blown about by the stormwind. And if we understand שָׁוַף in the Aram. sense of *rubbing and grinding*, יִשְׁפֹּףֵי may, after all, be the authentic reading, as indicating abrasions and contusions. Cf. 14<sup>10</sup> מִיָּא שְׁיִפֵּי.

v. 18. One would naturally be breathless, after being blown about by the wind. In st. ii בְּמַרְרִים (La 3<sup>15</sup>) is prob. to be restored, instead of the anomalous מַרְרִים. Elsewhere in Job the *fem.* plur. occurs: 13<sup>26</sup>. Cf. the sing. 20<sup>14, 25</sup>.

v. 19. The simplest emendation of the impossible Heb. of st. i is to read הוּא (so ㊄) for the meaningless הִנֵּה. A scribe may have mistaken הָאָ He for הָאָ Lo! in the unpointed text. Then, as a verb is wanting, we may suppose that אָמַרְתִּי *I speak or think* (vv. 22, 27), governing לִבִּי (Gn 20<sup>13</sup>), has fallen out before אֲמִיץ. (㊄ also read הוּא אֲמִיץ = κρατέῃ: cf. ㊄<sup>2</sup> κραταίως ἰσχύει. ㊄<sup>B</sup> ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἰσχύει, κρατέῃ, *For because He is strong He prevaieth*; but ㊄<sup>A</sup> ἰσχύς = לִבִּי of ㊄.)

The idea of the verse seems to be that God is an antagonist too strong to be vanquished, whether by main force or by process of law. St. ii. *Right*: or *Judgement* or trial by legal process.

*arraign*: or *summon*. Quis diem ei dicet? Read ויעידנו, c Suff. 3 Pers. (㊄), instead of 1 Pers., which might be due to a scribe's remembrance of Je 49<sup>19</sup> 50<sup>4</sup>, where Iahvah demands מי יעידני *Who will arraign Me?* i.e. appoint Me a time and place for trial. But the reading יעידני *bear witness for me* (29<sup>11</sup>) is perhaps preferable. So ㊄ nemo audet pro me testimonium dicere: 14 מן יסהיר עלי: Another possibility is ויעידנו *bear witness against Him* (1 K 21<sup>10, 13</sup>), which, however, comes to much the same thing. No man would dare to give evidence for Eyob against Iahvah. (㊄ τίς τὸν κρίματι αὐτοῦ ἀντιστήσεται; cf. Je 49<sup>19</sup> 50<sup>4</sup> καὶ τίς ἀντιστήσεται μοι;)

v. 20. *His mouth*: פִּי מִי my (own) mouth; as though terror might confuse Eyob's evidence, and turn it against himself. The emphatic position perhaps favours this. Moreover, *mouth* in Job always has a human reference, except in 22<sup>22</sup> 23<sup>12</sup>; and the words of Eliphaz וְלֹא אֲנִי יִשְׁעֶךָ פִּי *Thine own mouth condemneth thee, not I* (15<sup>5</sup>)—an apparent reminiscence of this passage—clinches the argument for פִּי, which has the support of all the Versions.

*It (or He) would make (prove) me perverted (or crooked)*. Read יַעֲקֹשֵׁנִי Pi. c. Weak Waw, or better, as parallel to יִשְׁעֵנִי, יִעֲקֹשֵׁנִי Hiph. (The 1 may be om. as due to preceding 1.)

v. 21. Eyob affirms his own innocence, regardless of consequences.

The distich is metrically defective (st. ii); and, so far from deleting תס־אני as an inadvertent repetition from v. 20<sup>b</sup>, we must satisfy metre and parallelism by supplying צַדִּיק or אֲצִדֵּק *I am righteous* in st. ii. Thus we restore as follows: תס־אני ולא־אדע נפשי אצֶרֶק ואמאס חיי. Cf. γ 15 10<sup>1</sup> 13<sup>14,15</sup>. Θ εἴτε γὰρ ἡσέβησα, οὐκ οἶδ' αὖτε ψυχῇ, Πλὴν (ὅτι) ἀφαιρεῖται μου ἡ ζώη = נפשי לא־אדע ואמ־רשעתי (v. 20, 10<sup>7</sup>), phps. a corruption of פִּשְׁעִי: *If I am guilty, I know not my fault; : But my life is being taken away* (cf. Ps 26<sup>9</sup>). This is at least good sense, and may approximate to the original text more nearly than M. But Σ *I am perfect and know (it) not; My soul hath despised my life*, and B Etiamsi simplex fuero, hoc ipsum ignorabit anima mea, et taedebit me vitae meae, make Eyob deny what he is always affirming, viz. his consciousness of entire innocence, while they do not imply any substantial difference from the text of M.

v. 22. We have transposed the two halves of st. i. *Therefore I say* (or *think*) naturally introduces Eyob's conclusion from the facts; and *'Tis all one* (or *It is the same thing*) is explained by *perfect and wicked He destroyeth* (treating all alike, without difference or discrimination).

Θ om. אחת היא, and app. reads רב וערין for תם ורשע, by confusion and transposition of similar letters, while for the Pron. הוא it reads (or substitutes) אף = ὀργή *anger* (הִיָּה); thus getting for the whole verse *Wherefore I said, Great man and lordling anger destroyeth*, and going far astray from the sense of the context. T has a good paraphrase of אחת היא, viz. חרא מכללתא היא ליה *He (God) hath but one measure*.

v. 23. a Scourge; or Plague. שׁוֹט *his Rod or Plague* (שִׁבְטָה). is a horsewhip, Pr 26<sup>3</sup>. Any general calamity, such as plague or famine, was held to be a Scourge of God. Is 10<sup>26</sup>; cf. Ez 14<sup>21</sup> 2 Sa 24<sup>13</sup> ff. 2 K 19<sup>35</sup>. A sudden outbreak of some epidemic, such as at all times has been frequent in Eastern countries, cutting off good and bad alike, seems to be intended here. And Eyob daringly asserts, not merely that God 'looks on unconcernedly' (Dr), but that He actually *derides* or *mocks* at the slaughter of the innocent.

*slaughter*: reading לְמַסַּת (see Is 10<sup>26</sup>, where פְּמַסַּת follows שׁוֹט). The word is also used of *plagues*, Dt 28<sup>59</sup> al. לְמַסַּת at the trial or testing (נִסָּה). Others derive the word from מָסַס *melt* intr., Niph. *faint, grow fearful*, and render *despair* (see on 6<sup>14</sup>), which hardly agrees with the context, not to mention philological objections. Not the feelings, but the destruction, of the righteous, is the object of the Divine Destroyer's mirth. And although the explanation of calamity as a *trial* or *test* of the righteous is revealed to us in the Prologue, it is altogether absent from the utterances of Eyob; the main ground of his complaints being that God's dealings with him are an inscrutable mystery. (נסה occurs in Job only once, 4<sup>2</sup>; and then only in the sense of *attempting*, not *tempting* or *trying*.)

Ⓢ *Because worthless men are in an extraordinary death, But righteous are derided*: prob. not due to theological prejudice, but to misreading of a more or less illegible Heb. text (= רשעים במוות מפלאות: cf. 22<sup>10</sup>, where ἐξάίσιος = פתאם, as here: 37<sup>16</sup> ἐξάίσια = מפלאות: st. ii ילעגו: cf. 27<sup>14</sup> 29<sup>21</sup> for the Prep., which suggests למו' = למות for למסח).

v. 24. Lit. *The land (or earth)—He hath given it to a Wicked (or Godless) One; The face of its Judges He covereth* (so that they fail to discern Right from Wrong and Truth from Falsehood. Cf. 12<sup>17</sup> 22<sup>13,14</sup> Pr 8<sup>15,16</sup> Is 11<sup>2-4</sup>). Point נתנה? He hath given her (with Ⓢ) for נתנה She hath been given. The Perf., after all the preceding Impff., is remarkable; and, taken along with the Sing. רשע a Villain, appears to present an historical datum, indicative of the actual state of things at the time. Ⓢ παραδεδόνται γὰρ εἰς χεῖρας ἀσεβοῦς. Jason, the Hellenizing High Priest, is called ὁ ἀσεβής, 2 Macc 4<sup>13</sup>, and οἱ ἀσεβεῖς (= הרשעים) denotes the Hellenizing faction in Judea, 1 Macc 3<sup>8,15</sup> 6<sup>21</sup> 9<sup>78</sup>.

(The verse is a triplet, and may be a later insertion, as may also v. 23, where the 'Scourge' might refer to one of the Syrian raids of the Maccabean period. It would, of course, be easy to supply a line, e.g. ולא יבינו רעת So that they discern not knowledge: cf. Pr 26<sup>7</sup>. But the two vv. 23, 24 do not hang together very well with the context on either side of them, in which the speaker considers his own case only. Eyob's previous words find a suitable conclusion in v. 22.)

*If not He, who else?* i.e. inflicts calamity, regardless of the deserts of its victims. Reading: אִם-לֹא הוּא מִיָּאפוּ. So Ⓢ εἰ δὲ μὴ αὐτός ἐστιν, τίς ἐστιν; and Ⓢ. But Ⓢ follows order of Ⓢ, and points אפו His anger, reading or guessing יפא for הוא, and rendering *But His anger who endureth?* Cf. also 24<sup>25</sup> Gn 27<sup>33</sup>.

v. 25. Resumes the personal note. *My days*. Om. introd. *And* (RV *Now*), c 2 MSS, ⓈⓈ. The 1 is only dupl. of the following י, as often. *A runner*: i.e. a courier, or King's Messenger. See on 7<sup>6</sup>. Es 3<sup>13,15</sup>. *without seeing*: lit. *and have not seen good* (leg. ולא c Ⓢ ⓈⓈ. Waw has fallen out of ו after preceding Waw). *To see good* is to experience happiness or prosperity: cf. Ps 4<sup>7</sup>. The statement is strange, in view of the Prologue, with its account of Eyob's former great prosperity. See also 7<sup>8,7</sup>, which this verse briefly repeats (esp. 7<sup>7</sup> Mine eye will no more see good). Perhaps יראו should be read for ראו: *and will not see good*. We might also render Ⓢ: *My days, they are swifter than a runner; They fly, they see not good*. But the Perf. seem more appropriate to a review of the past (cf. Gn 47<sup>9</sup>); and Eyob would hardly insist on the swift passage of the long hours of his hopeless misery (cf. 7<sup>2-4</sup>). Ⓢ om. טובה: *They ran away unawares* (lit. *and knew not*: cf. v. 5); but this cannot be right.

v. 26. *papyrus*: אֶבֶךָ here only. The Assy. a-bu, a-pu, means *bed of*

reeds or jungle; e.g. *qanē api*, 'reeds of the jungle' in Anp. al.; but we cannot be sure of the connexion. One would have expected to find an Egyptian source for the word. Freytag's *arundines* does not appear in Lane. ⑤ app. substitutes עקב *footprint* or *track* (ἵχνος ὁδοῦ) for אבה; remembering Ps 77<sup>20</sup> (⑤ 76<sup>19</sup>) and Wisd 5<sup>10,11</sup>; ① אלפיה רטיני מנריא *ships laden with choice fruits* (cf. Dt 33<sup>13</sup> Ct 4<sup>13</sup> 7<sup>14</sup>) and ② naves poma portantes, both equate אבה with Aram. אב *fruit* (Dan 4<sup>9</sup>); while ③, with its *great ships of enemies*, equates the word with איבה *enmity*!

It is evident from the context that light swift boats, like the old Nile-craft of papyrus, are intended, not heavy freight-boats. Cf. Is 18<sup>2</sup>.

*Like an eagle: or vulture. Swoopeth: or flieth down.* The אפ. טוש = Aram. טוש *to fly* (① Je 5<sup>7</sup>) may be akin to Heb. סוס *a (swift) horse*, Aram. סוסיא, Assyr. *sīsū*, and the homonym סוס, סוסיא, *a swift or swallow*. (⑤ st. ii: see Wisd 5<sup>11</sup>.)

v. 27. *I say or (have said) or think:* אֶמְרִי: so 1 MS, ⑤ pr אֶמְרִי. Cf. ① אֶמְרִי *If I shall say. I will relax:* אַעֲזֹבָה: lit. *let loose*: cf. 10<sup>1</sup> 20<sup>13</sup>. We should rather have expected *I will lift up*, אֶשָּׂא, or perhaps *אֶזְכֹּרָה* (cf. Gn 30<sup>20</sup> metaph. *lift up* = honour). ① has אֶשְׂכֵּךְ רוּנִי = *I will let go my wrath* (פני אפי pro אפי), which may be right (Ps 37<sup>8</sup>). ⑤ στυγνύσας τὸ προσώπῳ στενάξω, *With the face bowed down, I will groan*, gives the very opposite of the required sense. (στενάξω = *אֶבְכֶּה* instead of *אֶכְלִינָה*: cf. Is 19<sup>8</sup>. But the rare בלג Hiph. *shine, brighten up, smile*, or the like, which recurs 10<sup>20</sup> Ps 39<sup>14</sup>, is doubtless right. It may be compared with שֶׁלֶג *snow*, so called as *glistening* white, רֶלֶק *burn*, שָׂרָף *scorched* by the sun, Sum. ZA-LAG *shine, light* of fire, LAG *shine, light*. בִּלְגָּ = *to be a-shine or in shining*.)

v. 28. אֶמְרִי lit. *I dread all my pains*; i.e. app. he fears their return, and therefore dares not be cheerful. Instead of עֲצַבְתִּי (17) ⑤ seems to have read *עֲצַמְתִּי* *my limbs* (20<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>24</sup>), which is no improvement here. But ② opera mea = *עֲצַבְתִּי* (cf. Pr 5<sup>10</sup> עֲצַבְתִּי *thy labours*). ① אֶמְרִי *my pains* (cf. Gn 3<sup>16</sup>), and ③ 'And if I am quiet, I am afraid of all torment': a correct paraphrase. (① gives כִּנְשִׁית *I gathered* = אֶמְרִי for יִרְתִּי *I dread*.) Read perhaps מִפְּנֵי *because of* pro אֶמְרִי *all*: cf. 7<sup>15</sup> Dt 28<sup>60</sup> (but also 3<sup>25</sup>).

v. 29. St. i is too short in אֶמְרִי. An introductory אם *If*, or הֵן *Lo!* or perhaps both (so ⑤), may be restored: (*Lo*), *if I (emph.) am to be found guilty (or condemned)*, as is certain beforehand, *Wherefore should I labour in vain to establish my innocence?* Cf. ② Si autem et sic impius sum, &c. ⑤ ἐπεὶ ὁμολογῶ (δέ) εἰμι ἀσεβής, διὰ τί οὐκ ἀπέθανον; (= לָמָּה זֶה בִּלְ; אֲנֹנִי), *But since I am guilty, Why did I not die without further question?* A good sense in itself, but not in harmony with the context. Read perhaps אִם־אֲמֹנָם אֲנִי *If indeed I am to be guilty*.

v. 30. Snow is a natural emblem of perfect purity (Is 1<sup>18</sup> Ps 51<sup>9</sup>); but



people do not wash *with snow* (כִּי בָּמוֹ שֶׁלֶג), nor *with snow water* (בְּמֵי שֶׁלֶג; RV) to secure it. Read therefore בָּמוֹ like for בָּמוֹ *with*, in the sense *as white as*, and render: *Though I had washed me snow-white.*

St. ii. בְּרִיּוֹת is *purity of hands* in 22<sup>30</sup>; cf. Ps 18<sup>21, 25</sup>. Here בְּרִי must be the Obj. of the Trans. verb, and בְּרִ is not *cleanness* (so טֹהַר), but an alkaline substance used for cleansing, viz. *lye* (*Lauge*); a mixture of potash and water: cf. Is 1<sup>25</sup>. A syn. is בְּרִית, Je 2<sup>22</sup>. The common root is ברר Assy. *baráru*, *be bright, shine*, the Prim. Root of which is seen in Sum. BAR, *shine (namáru), light (nāru), the sun (šamšu)*, PAR, *bright (namru)*, &c., whence also כָּפַר *sunlike, bright, pure*, Trans. *wash, cleanse, purify*, &c. In the same way זָכָה, Aram. זָכָא, Assy. *zakú, be clean, pure*, and זָכָה *be bright, shining, pure*, זָךְ *pure*, may be traced back to Sum. DAG, *bright, shining, pure*, SHAG, *bright, purify metals*, ZA(G), *bright*, ZAĠ, *flame*, &c. (all akin to LAG, LAG, *bright*; ZA-LAG, *shining, light of fire*). The idea of moral purity thus found its original expression through the natural and beautiful metaphor of light.

v. 31. The Apodosis to v. 30.—וּבִשְׂחַת in the *pit*; cf. 17<sup>14</sup> 33<sup>22</sup> al. (of She'ol). A *pitfall*, Ps 7<sup>16</sup> 9<sup>16</sup> al. Nowhere app. a *ditch* (בִּג, 2 K 3<sup>16</sup>). בִּשְׂחֻחַת = וּ. טֹ in ῥύπος, in *filth* (ῥύπος = טָמֵא, *foul*, 14<sup>1</sup>; צִאָה *filth*, Is 4<sup>1</sup>. Cf. Zc 3<sup>3, 4</sup> ἰμάτια ῥυπαρά = בְּגָדִים צִוִּיִּם = שִׁסְבִּי sordibus. But טֹ נִמְצָא = נִמְצָא *pit*, Pr 26<sup>27</sup> al. There is no need to read נִמְצָא (Is 5<sup>25</sup>). טֹ render acc. to the sense. A cesspit or hole for refuse is meant.

*And my clothes would make me abhorred (or offensive).* People would turn away from him in disgust, as foul to sight and smell and, moreover, ceremonially 'unclean'. Cf. Ez 16<sup>25</sup> (for this use of תֵּעַב Pi.); Zc 3<sup>3, 4</sup>. It has been proposed to read שֶׁלֶמִי or מִשְׁלֶמִי (?), in the sense of *my friends* (*And my friends would abhor me*); but neither word occurs elsewhere in the book. See also 19<sup>17, 19</sup>. (תֵּעַב = TA Formative + ĠAB: cf. Sum. ĠAB, *bi'su, stinking, foul, bad*. Perhaps Tg. סָאִיב *pollute* = SA Formative, Saphel + ĠAB = *make foul*.)

v. 32. Something has gone wrong with וּ. The first st. seems too long, though כִּי-לֹא-אִישׁ—note the Maqqeph—might perhaps be spoken with a single stress (cf. כִּי-לֹא-יִכֶן, v. 35); and a barely possible rendering of the whole verse might be: *For One that is not Man, like me—can I answer Him? Shall we enter into Judgement together?* But we must at least restore ו before אֶעֱנֶנּוּ (Nu 23<sup>19</sup> al.) and prob. before נִבְרָא also (ט; cf. V nec), which has fallen out, as often, after ו and ו. Perhaps וְאֶעֱנֶנּוּ is an insertion: *For He is not human, like me, That we should enter, &c.* But the Pron. הוּא (for which ט supplies אָחָה, misled by vv. 28, 31) is wanted after כִּי-לֹא-אִישׁ; cf. ט. The change to 3 Pers. marks the beginning of a new paragraph, and agrees with what follows,

vv. 34, 35. (¶ neque enim viro qui similis mei est, respondebo, answers to ¶ word for word.) For לא איש, cf. 12<sup>10</sup> 32<sup>13</sup> Nu 23<sup>19</sup> Is 31<sup>8</sup>.

v. 33. Pointing לא (2 Sa 18<sup>12</sup>) = לא, לֹא, Opt. Pt. *Would that . . . , O that . . .*, c 13 MSS, ¶ (εἴθε or εἰ γάρ) ¶. But ¶ = ¶: *There is not an umpire, &c.* (¶'s rendering: *O that our Mediator were both arguing And hearing between both!* = שִׁמְעַת בֵּין שְׁנֵי: cf. Dt 1<sup>16</sup> for שמע בין of judges. איש בינינו, *our between-man* = δ μεσίτης ἡμῶν, Ga 3<sup>19,20</sup> Heb 8<sup>6</sup>. Cf. also 1 Sa 17<sup>4-23</sup> איש הבינים. Μεσίτης, *mediator, arbitrator, umpire*, does not occur elsewhere in ¶.)

*That he might lay his hand upon the twain of us!* as imposing his decision on both alike, and perhaps as reconciling them to each other.

v. 34. *His Rod*: שִׁבְטוֹ, c ט majore. So ¶ ῥάβδον, ¶ virgam, ¶ שבטה; but ¶ מחיה *His stroke or plague* = שִׁבְטוֹ: v. 23: cf. Na 3<sup>2</sup> Is 10<sup>26</sup>. This may be right.

*appal me*: ¶ με περισβείτω, *whirl about, distract me*; a word which recurs 13<sup>11</sup> 15<sup>23</sup> 33<sup>7</sup> (not elsewhere in ¶). בעת, Ar. بَغَتْ *fall upon a man suddenly, take him by surprise or unawares*, is prob. cogn. with פחד *be afraid*.

v. 35. ¶ transposes the two members of st. i: *And I will not be afraid, but will speak*. St. ii. ¶ כי לא בן אנכי עמדי: *'For not so (i.e. in a position to be in fear of Him) am I with myself (i.e. in my conscience). 'With' is in Heb. used idiomatically (cf. 10<sup>13</sup> 23<sup>14</sup> 27<sup>11</sup>) to express in the mind or knowledge of' (Dr).* In the three reff. עֵם appears to express intention or design rather than conscience or knowledge; and not one of those passages, nor any other that I know of, presents a real parallel to the strange *Not so am I with me*. The Pron. אנכי seems to require a verb, such as is, in fact, supplied by ¶ οὐ γὰρ οὕτω συνεπίσταμαι = כי לא־כן אנכי יורע: *For Unright (or Injustice) I know*; i.e. I know the difference between Right and Wrong (6<sup>30</sup>), Justice and Injustice. (עֵם pro יורע. The rare συνεπίσταμαι = אחזה, 19<sup>27</sup>.) For לא־כן *not right*, see 2 K 7<sup>9</sup> Je 8<sup>6</sup> al. The rendering of ¶<sup>ANCA</sup> οὐ γὰρ (οὕτω om. A) συνεπίστ. ἐμὰν τῶν ἀδικῶν, *For I am not conscious of wrongdoing*, is good sense, and seems to support our interpretation of לא־כן. Perhaps, however, we should read יִרְעֵנִי, in place of עמדי: *For Unjust I (emph.) know Him*; i.e. God is not just in dealing as He has done with me; I know, if you do not, that my miseries are altogether unmerited. Cf. vv. 21, 22, 10<sup>7</sup>.

Chapter 10. v. 1. Lit. *My soul feels loathing (or sickness) at my life*.

*I will give the rein to: or let loose*: אֶעֱזֹב, 9<sup>21</sup>. So ¶ ἐπαφῆσω; ¶ dimittam; ¶ אֶשְׁכַּח. But perhaps אֶשְׁכַּח *I will pour out* (עֲלֵי: Ps 42<sup>5</sup>) *upon me my complaining* (¶ groaning = שִׁחִי!), *I will loose against Him* (עָלָיו instead of עָלֵי) *my words*. But ¶ is preferable (Ps 42<sup>5</sup>), since *I will say unto Eloah* follows, v. 2. The redundant third line

*I will speak in the bitterness of my soul* looks like a gloss (from חַיִּי) on st. ii.

v. 2. *Treat me not as guilty: or Do not condemn me:* 9<sup>20</sup> 15<sup>6</sup> al. Θ *Μή με ἀσεβῆν διδάσκει, Teach me not to be wicked!* app. reading הרשע and connecting with it הוריעני (= δίδασκει, 13<sup>23</sup> al.) from st. ii.

v. 3. *Doth it please: or profit Thee: Is it any good to Thee?* Cui bono? As הַטּוֹב־לָךְ has but one stress, and as תַּעֲשֶׂךָ usu. has an Obj., we suppose that תָּם blameless has fallen out before תַּכְמִּים. But Θ: ἡ καλὸν σοι ἐὰν ἀδικήσω; (= רשעה for תַּעֲשֶׂךָ; app. read backwards!). Perhaps due to theological offence. St. iii is prob. an interpolation. Apart from the metrical objection, it is irrelevant to the argument here, though it agrees with 9<sup>24</sup>: see the note there.

*smiled: lit. shone:* 3<sup>4</sup> v. 22 37<sup>15</sup> Ps 50<sup>2</sup> 80<sup>2</sup> Dt 33<sup>2</sup>. The √פַּעַע, used only in Hiph. as here, is in Heb. poetic, and found only in Job, Pss, and Dt l.c. The corresponding Assyr. root is common both in poetry and in elevated prose, esp. in Shaph. (= Heb. Hiph.) and pass. Ishtaphal, in the sense of *causing to come or shine forth, making splendid or glorious, creating or bringing into existence*, and the corresp. passive meanings (*ušēpi, ušāpā; ušāpū, ušēpā, &c.*). The original idea was prob. that of *springing out and up, rising into light and sight* (cf. *napāhu*). The Assyr. šūpū (III 1. 2.) is the usual equivalent of the Sumerian PA-Ê, *shining + come forth*. This PA may be compared with PAR, *shining* (*namru*) and with PA, *a shoot or sprout* (*aru*), and with BAR, BA, *shine*. It may very well be the Primitive Root of פַּעַע, ופַּעַע, and its weaker cognate פַּה, as also of Ar. بَاعَ adultus, *grown up, grown tall*, of a boy, and Sab. يَفَع, *raise, heighten*. (Θ προσέσχες = הקשבת for הופעת: 13<sup>6</sup>: perperam.)

v. 4. Lit. *Hast Thou eyes of Flesh? Or like a Mortal's seeing seest Thou?* Cf. 1 Sa 16<sup>7</sup>. Art Thou liable to human errors of judgement? Hast Thou no more insight than my friends, that Thou treatest me so?

v. 5. Lit. *Are Thy days like a mortal's days, &c.* Cf. Ps 90 102<sup>24-26</sup> for the contrast between God's eternity and Man's mortality. But the connexion of thought between vv. 5, 6 is hardly obvious. The suggestion, however, may be that it is hardly worthy of an Eternal Being to pay so much attention to the behaviour of an ephemeral creature like man. A similar sequence of thought is observable in 7<sup>17 ff.</sup> In fact, chap. 10 may almost be called a mere expansion of 7<sup>16-21</sup>. Driver's paraphrase 'Art Thou short-lived, that Thou hastenest (vv. 6, 7) to find out my sin, even before it is committed, lest it should escape punishment?' seems improbable. The verses say nothing about 'haste' or search for sin 'before it is committed'.

v. 6. Both stt. seem metr. short. In st. i insert אַתָּה *Thou* emph.; in st. ii we might read וְאַחֲרַיִךְ, as 39<sup>6</sup>. For דַּרְשׁ c different construction, see 3<sup>4</sup> 5<sup>8</sup>. (בְּקִי, st. i, only here in Job.)

v. 7. *When (or Although) Thou knowest* (lit. *Upon Thy knowing*: 16<sup>11</sup> Is 53<sup>9</sup>) *that I am . . . And (that) there is not, &c.* But st. ii is no parallel to st. i.  $\Theta$  ἀλλὰ τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐξαιρούμενος; = וְיִמִּי מִיָּדִי is no better. The emendation  $\Theta$  בְּיָדִי מִיָּדִי (וְיָדִי) *And (that) there is no perfidy in my hand* makes a good parallel; but מִיָּדִי does not occur elsewhere in Job (21<sup>34</sup> is corrupt). Perhaps בְּיָדִי מִיָּדִי *And that there is no wrong in my hands.* (For מִן, cf. OL, p. 580, 3 c.; for עוֹל, 34<sup>10.32</sup> Ps 7<sup>1</sup>). The verse, however, is not necessary to the sense (see note on v. 5) and may be an exegetic interpolation.

v. 8. *Thine own Hands*; or *'Twas Thy Hands that framed, &c.* The word is emphatic. עֲצוֹנִי *framed or fashioned me.* עֲצַב Pi., Je 44<sup>11</sup> (?), compared by Buhl with Ar. عَصَب *cut off*, e.g. a limb, perhaps means to *cut out or carve* (cf. בָּרָא). Possibly, however, it may be to *bind, put together, combine, construct, or build* (cf. perhaps Ar. عَصَب *bind or tie round*); if we may judge by the analogy of Assyr. vbb. of binding, like *rakāsu* and *k(g)aqāru*, which are often used of building. Cf. also Assyr. *eṣēpu* (עֲצַפּוּ), *combine, put together, add.* (The rare Heb. עֲצַב Pi. as here used may be disguised under the meaningless form בְּעֲצָמַי, Ec 11<sup>3</sup>; where it seems plausible to restore בְּעֲצָב גֵּלָם *as it fashioneth the embryo* (Ps 139<sup>15</sup>) in the pregnant womb.)  $\Theta$  ἐπλασάν με יְצֹרֵי (יֶצֶר = πλάττω, Gn 2<sup>7.8.10</sup> et al.), *moulded me.* Cf. Ps 119<sup>73</sup>.

St. ii. *And afterwards* ( $\Theta$   $\Xi$ ) *will Thou turn round and swallow me?* reading יַחַר סָבִיב וַתִּבְלַעַנִי instead of  $\Xi$ 's impossible אַחֲרַי וַתִּבְלַעַנִי. *Together around; and Thou hast swallowed me up.* אַחֲרַי סָבִיב וַתִּבְלַעַנִי. *Afterwards Thou didst turn round and swallow me up* is of course equally possible, but has a prosaic sound, and does not agree so well with the pleading tone of the next verse.) In fact, Eyob had not yet been 'swallowed up' or annihilated (8<sup>18</sup>), though the Satan desired it (2<sup>3</sup>).

$\Theta$  μετὰ (+ δὲ  $\Theta^A$ ) ταῦτα (= וְאַחֲרַי) μεταβαλὼν (= וַתִּשָּׁב; or וַתִּשָּׁכ, v. 16)  $\Xi$  πῆσαι. The vb.  $\Xi$  πῆσαι, *Thou struckest*, is remarkable. This vb. usu. renders הָכָה, as in 2<sup>7</sup>. We might suppose a rg. וַתִּכְּנֵי for וַתִּבְלַעַנִי; but it seems possible that  $\Xi$  πῆσαι represents  $\Xi$  πῖσαι, *drankest up* (a false formation from πίνω), or even πῖσαι, *will drink up* (Lk 17<sup>8</sup>), or perhaps ἐπάσω, *didst eat*.

v. 9. *O remember that Thou madest me of clay!*  $\Theta$   $\Xi$  om. נָא Part. of Entreaty, *O or Pray!*  $\Xi$  quæso. *of clay* = חָמֶר, Accus. of Material: Gn 2<sup>7</sup> Ex 25<sup>18</sup> al.  $\Xi$  כְּחָמֶר *like the clay.* St. ii. *And (that) unto (the) dust (or earth) Thou wilt make me return*: a ref. to Gn 3<sup>19</sup>: וְאֵל-עֹפָר תִּשׁוּב. RV *And wilt Thou bring me into dust again?* as though it were unreasonable in God, after making him of 'clay', to resolve him again into his constituent material. ('Clay' and 'dust' are synonymous, both meaning earth (4<sup>19</sup> notes).) This will not do. Eyob simply begs God to desist from further persecution of a being who is not, like Himself,

eternal, but of earthly origin and mortal nature. He does not complain of the inevitable. He knows that, in any case, he must soon die: vv. 20, 21;  $\gamma^{6.7} 9^{25}$ .

v. 10. *pour me out*: Hiph. of נתך (see on 3<sup>24</sup>) *pour out*, intrans., str. flow = Assyr. *natāku*, and 'then melt' (Ez 2 2<sup>20-22</sup>). The root is prob. *lak*, which may be compared with *zak* in זכה, זכך, &c., and with Sum. DAG, *shining, pure*, SHAG and SIG, *bright, pure, purify, smelt, or refine metals*.

Whatever the legendary lore of his race had to tell of the origin of Man on the earth (v. 9; cf. notes on 4<sup>19</sup>) the poet knew well enough that it was only in a figurative sense that he himself could be said to have been moulded out of clay. The present verse obviously refers to the processes of natural generation; first, the emission of the milky semen, and then its coagulation in the womb, as milk thickens into curd or 'cheese' (בִּינָה;  $\alpha\pi$  in OT). And all these gradual processes of the growth and shaping of the body, which we call 'natural', he regards as due to the direct personal activity of the Eternal Creator (v. 11). Cf. Ps 139<sup>13-16</sup>. Nor can it be pretended that a more exact knowledge of protoplasmic matter and the evolution of germ and cell has solved for the modern world the ultimate mystery of life.

(The Versions miss the ref. to Generation; e.g.  $\text{פ}$  for תחיני gives יחי סננתא *purifiedst me*. Cf. Sum. SHEN, *ebbu, ellu, bright, or pure*.)

v. 11. We do not, of course, expect anatomical precision, but only a statement in poetic form of things open to ordinary observation. If the skin and the flesh, the outer and inner integuments of our mortal frame, may be called its 'clothing', what function is fulfilled by the bones and sinews or muscles? Clearly they are the strength and support of the whole structure. Accordingly,  $\text{ס}$  gives שררתי *Thou didst strengthen me or make me firm* (cf. שרירי *muscles*, 40<sup>16</sup>; Sum. SHER, *bind, bond*) for תשכנני; and it is quite conceivable that this old Aram. vb. stood in the original text.  $\text{ט}$ , however, has *ēvepas, entwinedst, intertwinedst, or didst string me together*, and  $\text{ז}$  אשתיני *wovest me* = תסבני Ps 139<sup>13</sup>; whence it is usually supposed that the  $\alpha\pi$  שכך = the  $\alpha\pi$  סכך *to weave or weave together*: cf. שרנ Pu. *intertwined*, of the sinews of the river-horse, 40<sup>17</sup>. On the other hand, שכך = סכך may perhaps be Poel of שוך = סוך *hedge or fence in*, 1<sup>10</sup> 3<sup>23</sup> 38<sup>8</sup> (the bones and sinews being regarded as the third line of the Self or Soul's defence). So Ps 139<sup>13</sup> *didst enclose me in my mother's womb*.

v. 12. *Compassion*: רחמים (Ho 2<sup>21</sup>) for חיים *life*; or perhaps it should be חן (incorrectly written חין, and then mistaken for חין = חיים) *favour*. It hardly suits the context to read וחיים *life and duration or continuance*, even if we accept שח (ט  $\xi\theta\upsilon\upsilon$  cf. 14<sup>5</sup>) for עשית; for such a phrase would most naturally refer to the life after birth (Ps 39<sup>6.6</sup> 89<sup>48</sup>),

and the ref. here is to Eyob's antenatal experience, viz. God's loving care of him as a babe in the womb: cf. v. 18. Besides, *Thou didst put life with me* (instead of *Thou gavest me life*) would be a strange expression; and חַלֵּה is not a Job-word (see on 11<sup>17</sup>). On the other hand, עֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד עִמָּךְ *deal kindly with, show kindness to* is a common phrase (Gn 19<sup>19</sup> al.). The st. has four beats, unless there is a crasis of vb. and prep. (we might perhaps read לִי enclitic pro עֲמַדִּי: cf. Ps. 18<sup>21</sup>).

v. 13. *And* (all the time of this assiduous care) *Thou wast cherishing these intentions* (in regard to Thy future dealing with me; viz. those described in vv. 14-16). Lit. *And these things Thou didst hide* (or *hoard, or treasure up*: צָפַן 15<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>19</sup> 23<sup>12</sup>; 14<sup>13</sup> Hi. 24<sup>1</sup> Ni.) *in Thy heart*. Malice lurked under the fair show of Divine favour. The Pronouns אֵלֶּה and זֶה thus refer to what immediately follows. But why are both used? It looks as if the meaning might be *These calamities—This, my present condition*. © ταῦτα ἔχων ἐν σεαυτῷ (= בלִבִּיךָ), οἶδα ὅτι πάντα δυνάσαι = יָדַעְתִּי כִּי-כָל חֹבֶל = 42<sup>2a</sup> (© adds the rest of that verse here). © I knew that this was in thy mind (פָּרַעְתִּיךָ = שָׁרַפְתִּיךָ with Thee). But © Licet haec celes in corde tuo, tamen scio quia universorum memineris (!), which suggests: יָדַעְתִּי כִּי בָל זֶה עִמָּךְ (cf. ©).

v. 14. *absolve me: treat me as pure or innocent, acquit me*: נָקָה Pi. Ps 19<sup>12</sup>. The Prim. Root may be NAG = Sum. SHAG, *bright, pure, purify*, DAG, *shining* (see note on 9<sup>30</sup>). And since there is a close connexion between the ideas of *brightening* and *cleansing* or *purifying*, while purification is commonly effected by *pouring* water on the thing to be purified, we may further recognize a relation to the Sum. NAG, *drink, drench, water land* (A.-S. *drincan, drencan*), drinking being a kind of *pouring*, viz. into the mouth or down the throat (figured as a bottle in the linear script). Hence Assy. *naqû, pour out water for the dead* (nāq mē, the man who does it), wine in libation to the gods, and met. sighing. Cf. Syr. نَقَف II. *pour a libation*, and Ar. نَقَى II. *cleanse or purify*.

v. 15. *woe to me!* אֵלֵּי לִי. So Mi 7<sup>1</sup>. Cf. Gk. ἀλαλή, ἀλαλά, *loud cry*, ἐλελεῦ, *war-cry, cry of pain*; Assy. elēlu, *to play* (and *sing*), elēlu, *woeful strain, lament, alālu, joyous shouting*, Sum. ELALU, ILU, *shriek, howl, sing*, ELLU, *joyous cry*, &c. UL, ULU, *rejoicing* (ullu, ulcu = עֲלָץ); Heb. הִלֵּל, יָלַל, &c. (Mostly, perhaps, onomatopoetic, like Eng. yell. But Sum. UL looks like a sec. form of ĠUL, ḥidūtu, *rejoicing*.)

St. iii is a self-evident marginal intrusion, violating the metre of the verse, and in itself unmetrical with its two or four stresses. Moreover, the second member וְרָאָה עֵינִי *and see Thou my affliction!* (© om.) is clearly corrupt, as out of construction with the preceding phrase. Lagarde's: דָּוָה עֵינִי *drenched* (lit. *watered*) *with affliction* agrees perfectly with שָׂבַע קֶלֶן *full-fed with dishonour*, and must be right. Cf. Is 51<sup>21</sup>, La 3<sup>15</sup>. Shame and humiliation are his abounding food and drink,

Ps 42<sup>1</sup> 80<sup>6</sup>. (Of course, רָאָה might be a later or Aramaized pronunciation of רָוָה; cf. נָאֵת = נֹחַ, Ps 23<sup>2</sup> al.) These marginal notes, consisting of more or less apposite quotations, exegetical glosses and various readings, may be taken as evidence of the popularity of the book from ancient times. In the instance before us, the annotator gives a reason (wrongly based on Eyob's present misery) why he would not 'lift up his head', i.e. dare to exhibit the confident bearing of security. Ju 8<sup>28</sup> Ps 83<sup>3</sup>.

v. 16. In immediate connexion with לֹא אֲשֵׁא רֹאשִׁי *I might not or durst not hold up my head* in the fearless confidence of conscious innocence (v. 15). Were I elated, lifted up in spirit; reading אָנֹם אֲנֵה (ו) pro וְ וִינֵה (cf. וְ וִינֵה). וְ is usu. rendered *And if it* (my head) *should lift itself up* (cf. RV); but the change of Obj. to Subj. is improb. חֲנָה *Thou wouldst exalt Thyself*, exhibit Thy superior Power, or 'triumph' (see Ex 15<sup>1.7.12</sup>), would be better. This verse, indeed, with its נֵה and פִּלָּא (st. ii), may be partly due to reminiscence of Ex. l.c., with its נֵה, נֶאֱנֶה, and עֲשֵׂה פִּלָּא. *like a lion* (שָׁחַל 4<sup>10</sup> 28<sup>8</sup>). *Thou wouldst hunt me*. Is the lion here the hunted, or the Divine hunter Himself? וְ supposes the former (ἀργεύομαι γὰρ ὥσπερ λέων εἰς σφαγήν = וְ לִהְיוֹת pro וִינֵה); and so וְ Et propter superbiam quasi leaenam capies me (*superbiam* = my defiant bearing in 'lifting up my head'). Hunting the lion (the frequent boast of Assyrian kings) is, however, unknown to the OT writers, with whom the king of beasts is always a symbol of surpassing strength and terror. On the other hand, Iahvah is 'like a lion' (בְּשָׁחַל, כְּמִשְׁחַל) in His destructive aspect (Ho 5<sup>14</sup> 13<sup>7</sup>). Perhaps we should emend וְ wouldst lie in wait for me (cf. Ps 10<sup>9</sup> La 3<sup>10</sup>), from צֹרֶה, 1 Sa 24<sup>12</sup>; a term which seems more appropriate to the activity of beasts of prey than צֹרֶה (cf., however, 38<sup>30</sup>). The st. may be an intrusion.

St. ii. *Thou* [leg. אַתָּה pro וְ] *wouldst again shew Thyself marvellous* (i.e. act strangely, mysteriously, or uniquely) *against me*. Cf. Is 29<sup>14</sup>. The פִּלָּא (Hithpa. here only) occurs most freq. in Niph. Ptcp. fem. plur. (of God's wonderful works, regarded as beyond human understanding, 42<sup>3</sup>), 5<sup>9</sup> 37<sup>5.14</sup>, and is most common in the Pss (about thirty times). The Prim. Root is prob. identical with Sum. BAL, *split, break through or into, divide, &c.* (cf. BAL, *axe, pilaggu*), which ramifies in the series פִּלַּח, פִּלֵּחַ, פִּלֵּחַ, פִּלֵּחַ, &c. Thus פִּלָּא a wonder is, strictly speaking, something *separate and apart from* other and ordinary things. וְ δεινός με ὀλέκεις is a paraphrase which does not imply any difference of reading (cf. ὁ θεὸς ἐθανύμαστος).

v. 17. Suspicious, as a tristich. *Thou wouldst renew Thy witnesses before me* is, indeed, grammatical, but the meaning is uncertain. The

<sup>1</sup> If εἰς σφαγήν = לִשְׁחַט, the latter may be a variant of בְּשָׁחַל; and then it will be true to say that וְ omits וִינֵה.

'witnesses' are said to be Eyob's 'sufferings', which were held by all to be glaring evidence of guilt. But Eyob himself stoutly denied this inference; how then can *before me* (נָנִיר) be right? ⑤ ἐπ' ἀνακαινίσζων ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἤν ἔρασίν μου (⑤<sup>A</sup> σου) = (נָנִיר) ⑤<sup>A</sup> Thou wouldst renew upon me Thy stroke (? נָנִיר Thy strokes: Gn 12<sup>17</sup>); cf. Ps 38<sup>12</sup> 39<sup>11</sup>. For ἔρασις, trial, examination, as a paraphrastic rendering of נָנִיר stroke, plague, see Gn 12<sup>17</sup> (נָנִיר . . . ויננע = καὶ ἤρασεν . . . ἔρασμοῖς). This simpler and more natural reading agrees better with the preceding line (*Thou wouldst again deal strangely with me*), of which it appears to be explicative (and with which it may form a distich, if 16<sup>a</sup> be an interpolation); while it also affords a better parallel to what follows: *And Thou wouldst increase Thine anger* (כַּעַשׁ = כַּעַס) *with me* (cf. Ps 85<sup>6</sup> עֲמָנוּ כַּעַשׁ).

St. iii מַעַי חֲלִיפוֹת וְצָבָא עִמִּי: Changes or reliefs, relays (1 K 5<sup>28</sup>) and a host or warfare are with me, is obviously corrupt, whatever way we take it. The author does not use the fig. Hendiadys; and if he did, it would not help us here, for how could 'a host in relays' be 'with' Eyob? In 7<sup>1</sup> צָבָא denotes a (time of) *hard service*; cf. 14<sup>14</sup>: *All the days of my service (צָבָא) will I wait, Until my relief (חֲלִיפָתִי) cometh*. In the sense of *army* or *warfare*, צָבָא does not occur in Job. (These three are the only reff.) At the end of the verse, עִמִּי, after עֲמָדִי, cannot be right. Read therefore: מַעַי חֲלִיפָת צָבָא עִמָּדִי *The relief of my service tarrieth* (עֲמָדִי, Gn 45<sup>3</sup>: *pro עִמִּי*), which may be a marginal intrusion. ⑤ ἐπιήγαγες δὲ ἐπ' ἐμὲ πειρασθήρια = : וחלִיפָת צָבָא עִמִּי *And wouldst bring fresh thralldom upon me*. For חֲלִיפָת see 4<sup>15</sup> 9<sup>11.26</sup>; and for צָבָא = πειρασθήριον, 7<sup>1</sup>. If the line is original, this (or something like it) may be right. Cf. ⑤ سَتَذَكُّ صَنْجَعًا لِي بِحَضْرَتِي *And hosts Thou changest (or renewest) against me; taking צָבָא (c ⑤) in the sense of an army of assailing troubles*.

v. 18. *I might have died: or should (or ought to) have expired* (3<sup>11</sup>). For the Prim. Root, cf. perhaps Sum. 𐎶𐎵 UG (GUG), *dead* > Ar. جَاع *be hungry* (though Eng. *starve* orig. meant *die*). Or is נָנִיר (Heb. only) = נָמַע, *gasp for breath*? cf. Aram. נָמַע *to swallow*. There is no need to insert ⑤ לֹא c ⑤ καὶ οὐκ ἀπέθανον. See ⑤, which give it rightly. We might perhaps render *Died I, no eye would have seen me*.

v. 20. Ketib: *Are not my days few? let Him cease!* (יִחְדָּל) *Let Him set* (His heart, 7<sup>17</sup>, or His face, Nu 24<sup>1</sup>) *away from me, that I may brighten up a little!* Qeri: *Are not my days few? then cease Thou* (יִחְדָּל); *And set* (Thy heart) *away from me, &c.* Both are ill-knit and barely grammatical. It has been proposed to read יָמֵי חֲלָדִי or יָמֵי יִחְלָדִי (!), on the ground of ⑤ ⑤ and Ps 39<sup>6</sup>; but חֲלָדִי does not seem to be a Job-word (see on v. 12 and 11<sup>17</sup>, where ⑤ gives ζῆ for the corrupt חָלַד, while ⑤'s word here is βίος). In the four other places where the word חֲלָדִי (P. חֲלָדִי) occurs in the present Heb. text, ⑤ nowhere renders it βίος or ζῆ



(Ps 17<sup>14</sup> מַחְלֵךְ = ἀπὸ γῆς; Ps 40<sup>2</sup> יִשְׁבִּי חֵלֶךְ = οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν οἰκουμένην; Ps 39<sup>6</sup> חֵלְדִּי = ἡ ὑπόστασις μου = οὐχ־אֲנִי מַחֲחֵלֶךְ Ps 39<sup>8</sup>; Ps 89<sup>18</sup> וְכִרְאִי מַחֲחֵלֶךְ = μνησθητι τίς μου ἡ ὑπόστασις, i. e. my ground of hope, my confidence, He 11<sup>1</sup>).  $\Theta$  ὁ βίος τοῦ χρόνου μου, *the life of my time*; a curious expression for which  $\Theta^A$  gives the more natural ὁ χρόνος τοῦ βίον μου, *the time of my life*. 'Ο βίος μου = יָמִי, 7<sup>16-18</sup> 8<sup>9</sup> 9<sup>20</sup>; but יָמִים is rendered χρόνος some sixteen times, e. g. 32<sup>6-7</sup> Gn 26<sup>1</sup> (בְּיָמֵי א' = ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ Α.). Perhaps  $\Theta^A$  = יָמִי חַיִּי *the days of my life*: so  $\Xi$  (cf. Pr 31<sup>12</sup> πάντα τὸν βίον = וְכָל יָמֵי חַיִּיהָ). Thus, reading שְׁעָה (cf. 7<sup>19</sup> 14<sup>6</sup> Ps 39<sup>14</sup>) for יֵשֶׁת, st. ii, we get *Are not the days of my life few? Look away from me, that I may brighten up (a little, or a while: omit? cf. 9<sup>27</sup>).* Perhaps, however, we should restore שְׁנָתִי *my years* for יֵשֶׁת (cf. Pr 5<sup>9</sup> σὸν βίον = שְׁנוֹתֶיךָ), and transpose it with חֵלֶךְ, pointing יָמִי instead of יָמִי: *Are not the days of my years few? Let me alone, that I may brighten up (a while: מעט: ? dittoqr.).* For the phrase מְנִי חֵלֶךְ see 7<sup>16</sup> ἀπόστα ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. (But  $\Theta$  ἔασόν με; cf. 7<sup>19</sup> οὐκ ἔῤῥε με = לֹא תִשְׁעָה מִמֶּנִּי; yet 14<sup>6</sup> שְׁעָה מִעֲלִי = ἀπόστα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, and Ps 39<sup>14</sup> מְנִי חֵלֶךְ = ἄνευ μοι.)

v. 21. Cf. Ps 39<sup>14</sup>, of which vv. 20, 21, are an apparent echo.

v. 22. As a triplet, the verse is suspicious; and the repetition of עֲלָמוֹת is improb., and still more so the duplicated כְּמוֹ אֶפֶל. The sense of the quatrain being complete with v. 21, this one may well be rejected as an interpolation. (ὁ εἰς γῆν σκοτὸς αἰωνίου = עוֹלָם אֶפֶל אֶרֶץ אֶפֶל (σκότος = אֶפֶל, as in 3<sup>6</sup>, although in eighteen other places in Job, as usu. elsewhere, σκότος = חֹשֶׁךְ; and עוֹלָם instead of עֲלָמוֹת); οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν φέγγος = וְלֹא-אֹר or בְּלֹא-אֹר (φέγγος = אֹר, 41<sup>10</sup>) or וְלֹא-נִהְיָה (φέγγος = נִהְיָה, 3<sup>4</sup>); οὐδὲ δρᾶν ζωὴν βροτῶν = אֶרֶם חַיִּי רְאוּת אֶרֶם (!). This at least gives us a distich instead of a tristich; while st. ii is good evidence that the text was already corrupt. וְכָמוֹ אֶפֶל looks like a dupl. of אֶפֶל, the ἀπ. עֲפָתָה (usu. referred to עֵיפָה, Am 4<sup>13</sup>) originating in אֶפֶל written backwards. The prosaic word סְרָרִים, *ranks* or *rows*, *series* (= שְׁרָרוֹת, 2 K 11<sup>8</sup>), for which  $\Theta$  has φέγγος, *light*, finds no support in OT conceptions of She'ol, the dark and dreary, but not disordered, world of the dead, where kings still have their thrones (Is 14<sup>9</sup>), and doubtless the classes below them retain their relative positions. Every spirit has 'his own place' (cf. Acts 1<sup>25</sup>). Neither the ancient Hebrews, nor the Babylonians from whom they derived so many of their cosmic ideas, conceived of the Underworld as a chaos. Lastly, we may note that וְכָמוֹ אֶפֶל *And it* (i. e. *the land* of the dead) *shineth* (v. 3 3<sup>4</sup>) *like darkness* is sheer nonsense. The land cannot be said to 'shine'. *And where the light is as darkness* (RV) could not be so expressed in Hebrew. We might read וְהָעֵרָה *And it is dim* or *murky* (cf. Is 8<sup>22, 23</sup>, but not 11<sup>17</sup>) instead of וְכָמוֹ אֶפֶל. The whole distich might have run somewhat thus:

ארץ עיפתה ולא-אור  
ותעף כמו אפל:

Or st. ii *לא תופיע עליה נהרה* (cf. 3<sup>1</sup>).

*The land of gloom and no light!; Yea, gloomy it is as night (or, And daylight shineth not on it).* See 12<sup>25</sup> for *ולא-אור*. *ἡ ὁὐδὲ ὁρᾶν ζῶν βροτῶν* is as interesting as it is perplexing. *ולא ראות* may have grown out of *אור* and *אורים* (?) in the previous line; but *ζῶν βροτῶν* = *חיי אדם* (or *חית אדם*) suggests a possible misunderstanding of *חיי kindreds, tribes* (1 Sa 18<sup>18</sup>) or of *חית communities of man* (2 Sa 23<sup>13</sup>). Cf. *ἡ*: *The land which is waste (ἡ ὁὐ)* as the Pit (*בְּחַיָּה*) for *אפל* in both places: Ps 69<sup>10</sup>) and the Shades of Death; And wherein there are no rows of homesteads (*סְדְרֵי יְדִירִין*); explan. of *סְדְרֵי*, *But it is wasted (ἡ ὁὐ)* like the Pit; also *ἡ*: *The land whose eyelids (ἡ ὁὐ)* = *עפעפיה = תימורהא* (! *עיפתה*) are like the darkness of the Shades of Death, without rows of human habitations (*וְלֹא סְדְרֵי יְתִיב בְּנֵי נָשָׂא*), And glooming (*מְפַעֲפֵא*) cf. 11<sup>17</sup>) like darkness. Both think of *דור* to dwell (cf. *דִּיר*, Is 38<sup>12</sup>) in connexion with *סדרים*; and neither refers *והפע* to *יפע shine forth*.

Chapter 11. First Remonstrance of Zophar the Minaean.

v. 2. *A master of words: or one abounding in words: pointing* *לב* pr. *לב*: cf. *ἡ*. A better parallel to *a man of lips*. (Did *ἡ* read *הדבר רבים*, dividing the letters differently?)

St. ii. *A man of lips: i. e. of fluent speech; here implying insincerity or want of conviction.* Cf. Ex 4<sup>10</sup> *a man of words* = an orator or ready speaker, and Is 29<sup>13</sup> (the contrast of lip-worship with heart-worship). *ἡ ἑλλᾶλος* = *ἡ* in Ex 4<sup>10</sup>, where, however, there is no implication of insincerity.

v. 3. *At thy babble: (ה)בְּבִידֶיךָ*: cf. *ἡ Tibi soli* (analysing the word wrongly, as if it were from *לבד alone*). For *ל* cf. Nu 30<sup>5,8</sup>. The Ptc. Interrog. *ה* derives some support from *ἡ* *Lo! ἡ* *בְּבִידֶיךָ* is not, however, indefensible: see 41<sup>4</sup>, where *החריש* is *to be silent about, to pass over in silence*, as here. The verb is never 'Causative'. *ἡ Tibi soli tacebunt homines?* *ἡ* *Lo, on thy words the dead will be silent* (mispointing *מֵתִים* men, v. 11 al., as *מֵתִים* dead. With *מֵתִים* men, str. males, cf. not only Assy. *mutu*, husband, but also Sum. MESH, MUSH, MU, MISH, MEZ, ME, male, man). *ἡ*, after misreading *בִּידֶיךָ* (thy babble, idle talk: *ἡ* in Job: cf. Is 16<sup>6</sup> 44<sup>23</sup>) as *בְּרִיךְ* *εὐλογημένος*, continues with *γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ὀλιγόβιος* = *יָלִיד אִשָּׁה קָצֵר יָמִים*, cf. 14<sup>1</sup>; a queer perversion, or perhaps rather an interpolation, since it is followed by a distich which may be partly accounted for by misreading of *ἡ* (confusion of similar letters): *ἡ πολλὸς ἐν ῥήμασιν γίνου, ὁ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀντικρινόμενός σοι* = *אל תרב במלים*, cf. 14<sup>21,22</sup>; or even *רב* = *ואין ענה עליך*: or *כי אין משיב מלים*; (באמרים חהיה). The *אל* may

indicate אֶל- (or עַל-; so ㊤) as the true reading at the beginning of the verse (אל-ברוך).

St. ii. Lit. *And thou scoff* (pointing וְחִלָּצְנִי), *and there be none shaming* (or *no reprover*). הַבְּלִים, which only recurs once in Job (19<sup>3</sup>), means *to shame* or *mortify*, *confound* utterly (cf. 2 Sa 10<sup>6</sup>). The prim. mg. may be *to cut* and *wound*, as we speak of 'cutting words'; cf. Aram. ܦܬܬ, *to cut* and *to threaten*, and נָרַף Pi. NH *cut*, *wound*, *revile*, and חָרַף *taunt*, *reproach*, which also perhaps orig. meant *cut* or *pierce* (cf. חֲרִיפָא, the sword that *cuts*, *the sharp sword*; Syr. חַרְפָּא, *sword*), all of which may be cogn. with כָּלַם and Ar. كَلَّمَ *cut*, *wound* (not in Lane). Possibly חָרַם *to ban*, *devote*, was orig. *to cut off*, *separate*, and so *consecrate*. It seems needless to adopt ㊤ לָהּ דְּכִלְיָא לָהּ *who restraineth thee* or ㊤ מְבַיֵּחַ *who refuteth thee*. מְבַיֵּחַ = דְּמַכְכֵּם.

v. 4. וְתֹאמַר נָע. וְתֹאמַר. *And thou say (?)*. In any case, the question is continued.

*I am pure*: וְנָע אֲנִי: cf. 8<sup>6</sup> 33<sup>9</sup>. וְנָע *my lore* or *teaching is pure*. But Eyob never speaks of his 'teaching' or doctrine, as if he were a Rabbi sitting in a group of disciples. Nor is לָקַח (9 occ.) usu. qualified by an epithet (ל' טוב once, Pr 4<sup>2</sup>). Moreover, וְנָע describes persons and conduct (Pr 20<sup>11</sup> פָּעֵל וְנָע; 16<sup>17</sup> תַּפְלִיתִי, cf. Ps 66<sup>18</sup>) > matter of instruction. We might also read וְנָע פָּעֵלִי *my conduct is pure*: cf. ㊤ ὅτι καθαρός εἰμι τοῖς ἔργοις = אֲל תֹּאמַר זֶה פָּעֵלִי (פָּעֵל = ἔργα 36<sup>9</sup> Pr 21<sup>8</sup> al.). Other possible readings are וְנָע אֲרָחִי or וְנָע דְּרָכִי *my way is pure* (ἔργα 13<sup>27</sup> 34<sup>21</sup> 36<sup>28</sup>), but not וְנָע לִבִּי (לִבִּי 34<sup>4</sup> only; לִבִּי 1 K 2<sup>8</sup> only), which finds no support in ㊤.

*in His sight*: so ㊤ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ (= בְּעֵינָיו: 15<sup>16</sup> 25<sup>6</sup> 32<sup>1</sup>). Cf. 10<sup>7</sup>. But the conjecture בְּעֵינָי *in my own eyes* is favoured by 32<sup>1</sup>, and by the fact that Zophar has not yet mentioned God.

v. 5. St. i is too long (four stresses). Omit אֱלֹהֵם and read יִדְבַר instead of Infin. דָּבַר (6<sup>6</sup> 14<sup>13</sup> 31<sup>31</sup>) or וִידְבַר (19<sup>28</sup>). The י was perhaps mistaken for י' (יהוה) and אֱלֹהֵם substituted.

*with thee*: i.e. in converse with thee. The עִמָּךְ belongs in 'sense to both members, since עִמָּךְ is to *speak with*, Ex 19<sup>9</sup> (Subj. usu. God). Not *against thee* (RV).

v. 6. A tristich with a more or less corrupted text. St. ii seems too short, and st. iii is certainly too long, besides being mere prose.

*tell or declare to* (Gn 3<sup>11</sup>) *thee the hidden things* (concr., as 28<sup>11</sup> of what is hidden in the ground; Ps 44<sup>22</sup> in the heart, secret sins) *of Divine Wisdom*; esp. its infallible means of detecting sin, whether conscious or unknown. Cf. Ps 19<sup>13</sup> 90<sup>8</sup>. Perhaps תַּעֲלָמוֹת חֲכָמָה = *the hidden things* (i.e. thy 'secret sins') *known to Wisdom* (cf. עֲלֻמֵּינוּ Ps 90<sup>8</sup>).

*For It* (the Divine Wisdom) *is marvellous in resource* (or *insight*: see on 5<sup>12</sup>). וְ For (It is) *double in resource*: כַּפְלַיִם *double* (Is 40<sup>2</sup>). The

statement admits of no satisfactory explanation. The suggested כְּפִלָּאִים *like marvels* is objectionable on the grounds that the Subj. is not indicated, and that כְּפִלָּא is not a Job-word (*אֲפִלָּאִים* adv., La 1<sup>9</sup>). Read therefore נְפִלְאָתָא (Dt 30<sup>11</sup>) or נְפִלְאָתָהּ (2 Sa 1<sup>26</sup>). The allusions to Heaven and the sea, vv. 8, 9, may be further reminiscences of Dt 30<sup>11-14</sup>. The line may be a marg. gloss on תַּעֲלֹמוֹת חֲכָמָה, unless st. iii be considered an interpolation, as may very well be the case.

St. iii, as it stands, is doubtful Heb. Lit. *And know thou that Eloah maketh forget for thee* (some) *of thy iniquity*. Whom does He 'make forget'? cf. 39<sup>17</sup>, for the Hiph. of נִשָּׁה c Accus. Pers. et Rei. (Hiph. not elsewhere in OT, nor does the Root recur in any form in Job.) As to the exegesis, it is gen. assumed that Zophar here asserts that 'God is really not punishing him as much as he deserves' (Dr); that his guilt is so heinous as to merit far worse calamities than those which have befallen him. This, however, is not borne out by the rest of the chapter (cf. v. 14). Indeed, there is no other trace of such an extreme assertion in any of the speeches of the Friends. They merely try to wring from the sufferer an admission that his woes are the penalty of past misdoing: δράσαντι παθεῖν.

As regards the Versions, ⑤ δύναμιν σοφίας = תַּעֲלֹמוֹת חֲכָמָה; and so תַּעֲלֹמָה = δύναμιν, 28<sup>11</sup>, wrongly connecting the word with Aram. עֲלָם *to be strong*. "Οτι διπλοῦς ἔσται (⑤ ἔστιν) τῶν (א\* τῷ) κατὰ σέ = כִּי כְּפִלָּאִים *that* (He is) *double as compared with thee* (or לִפְנֵי שְׂלָל?) = misreading of מֵ' *לְחֹשֶׁה*. (But אֲרוֹם כּוֹפֵלָא לְחֹכְמָתָא and כְּפִלָּא מִטּוֹל רֵאִיתָ כֹּה קְפִלָּא = מֵ'. B et quod multiplex esset lex eius: a rabbinical paraphrase of מֵ'. B כִּי כְּפִלָּא *duplex* is explained by *multiplex*, manifold; and the Law is the embodiment of the Divine Wisdom.)

For st. iii, ⑤ gives καὶ τότε γνώσῃ ὅτι ἀξία σοι ἀπέβη ἀπὸ Κυρίου ὧν ἡμάρτηκας = : יְהוָה בְּעֵינֶיךָ לֵךְ שָׁוָה בִּי וְיָדַע בִּי שָׁוָה (or הִשָּׁוָה, or Impf. יִשָּׁוָה, or יִשָּׁוָה, pro יִשָּׁהּ, and בְּעֵינֶיךָ pro מֵ'. Cf. esp. 33<sup>27</sup> ⑥, where καὶ οὐκ ἄξια ἦτασέ με ὧν ἡμαρτον = מֵ' לֹא שָׁוָה לִי : (ו) וַיִּשֶׁר הָעֵינִי (וַיִּשְׁרָ?). See note on that passage, and on 30<sup>1</sup>. The meaning of שָׁוָה (cogn. c בָּ *lie down flat?*) is *to be or become flat, level, aequus*; c אֵ *equal with*, Pr 3<sup>15</sup> 8<sup>11</sup>; and so *to be like*, Is 40<sup>25</sup>, Caus. *to liken*, Is 46<sup>8</sup> Hiph. (Pi. *to level or flatten out the soil for sowing*, Is 28<sup>25</sup>.) The word is not used of recompense or requital (שָׁלַם), nor is it found in Job outside the Elihu-section, where also it is prob. spurious. The orig. st. here may have been כִּי וְיָדַע בִּי שָׁוָה : וְיָדַע בִּי שָׁוָה *And that thou mightest know that God hath requited thee acc. to thy iniquity* (cf. Ps 62<sup>13</sup>), or reading פָּעַלְךָ for מַעֲוֹנְךָ *hath requited thee thy doing* (34<sup>11</sup>). (The author of the Elihu-section may be responsible for this and other apparent interpolations of the original text.)

v. 7. Lit. *The limit of Eloah findest thou, Or unto the end of Shaddai arrivest thou?* חָקַר Act. *searching*, Ju 5<sup>16</sup> ch 5<sup>9</sup> (9<sup>10</sup>); *exploring, searching*

and finding, end or limit of search, 34<sup>24</sup> 36<sup>26</sup> Is 40<sup>28</sup> Ps 145<sup>3</sup> and so *Object of search* or investigation, 8<sup>8</sup>. [Our Eng. 'search' = chercher = Lat. circare, *go round* or *about*, which may perhaps be the prim. sense of חִקֵּר (and the labialized בִּיקֵּר, בִּיקֵּשׁ); cf. Ju 18<sup>2</sup> (|| רגל). The Sum. GAR is to surround; GAR is also a fetter, as surrounding; IN-GAR is a surrounding wall (cf. KAR, wall); ĠAR is enclose, confine, and GISH-ĠAR bounds, limits (e. g. of Heaven and Earth). Cf. also קיר wall, נר *go round*, and other kindred words.]

the end, תכלית, i. e. the boundary or limit, 26<sup>10</sup> 28<sup>3</sup>. God is boundless or infinite: 'Pater immensus' (*Ath. Creed*). Ad fin. we must read תבוא come (cf. ὁ ἀφίκου, and Pr 1<sup>27</sup><sup>3</sup>) or תאחה (3<sup>25</sup> 16<sup>22</sup> al.) instead of the second תמצא. The verse may be an interpolation, since it seems to interrupt the connexion between v. 6 and v. 8.

v. 8. *It is higher than Heaven*: נבהה משמים pro נבהי שמים *Heights of Heaven!* (so Da); an unparalleled expression. Besides, the plur. of גבה is found nowhere else (cf. 22<sup>12</sup>), and the עמקה משאל || demands the change (cf. Ὡ Excelsior caelo est). What is it that is 'higher than Heaven and deeper than She'ol'i' Apparently, the Wisdom of God (v. 6), upon which both depend. Grammatically, of course, these fem. predicates might refer to the תכלית שרי (v. 7).

v. 9. Lit. *Longer than the Earth in measure* (pointing מדה Accus. pro מדה *its measure*, which should rather be מרתה). The Earth was conceived as rectangular, its globular shape being unknown to antiquity. It rested upon pillars (9<sup>6</sup>? 38<sup>6</sup>; cf. also 1 Sa 2\* Ps 75<sup>3</sup>), as, acc. to the Hindu myth, it rests upon an elephant, and the elephant upon the back of a tortoise. In like manner, the solid firmament or arch of Heaven was upheld by pillars (26<sup>11</sup>) rising from the ends of the Earth.

v. 10. Corrupt, unmetrical, and prob. spurious. Cf. Ὡ, which recalls 9<sup>12</sup>. Lit. *If He glide past* (4<sup>10</sup> 9<sup>11</sup>) and *deliver up* (16<sup>11</sup>) or *shut up*, *confine* (12<sup>14</sup> Le 13<sup>5-11</sup>) and *assemble* (vb. קהל not elsewhere in Job: קהל assembly once, 30<sup>28</sup>) and *who shall turn Him back?* In whatever sense we take this, it is neither lucid, nor coherent with the context, nor poetical, even if the Obj. required by the vbb. יסגיר and יקהיל could be supplied. Ὡ ἐὰν δὲ κατασπρέψῃ τὰ πάντα, τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ τί ἐποίησας;

This omits יהלף and prob. reads וימנר or וימנר (Ps 89<sup>46</sup>; Ezr 6<sup>12</sup> Aram. = κατασπρέψαι) pro וימנר, while substituting הקהל (as if it could mean *the multitude*) or perhaps rather הכל = τὰ πάντα for ויקהיל. Possibly also κατασπρέψῃ = יסלף (12<sup>10</sup><sup>3</sup>) *overthrow*. In any case, a more tolerable couplet results, if we read ומריאמר אליו *If He hurl down (overthrow) All, who can turn Him back? Or who can say unto Him, What dost Thou?* (9<sup>12</sup>).

v. 11. *For HE*. The Pron. is emphatic: He knows, whoever else may fail to know. *The wicked*: lit. *men of naught* (ישוא): see note on 7<sup>9</sup>.

*without effort*: lit. *and attendeth not closely*. He needs no scrutiny to discover sin; He discerns it at sight. But ὁ ἰδὼν δὲ ἄτοπα οὐ παρόψεται = וְלוֹ יִתְבּוֹן: and it He heedeth; doth not let it pass unnoticed and unpunished.

v. 12. The form of the verse suggests a popular proverb. The sense is obscure, as is often the case with proverbs. The phrase איש נבוב occurs nowhere else in OT. It appears to mean *a hollow man*; i. e. one who is empty or devoid of intelligence (לֵב, לֵבָב); one who 'has nothing in him', as we say; an *inane* fellow. The word נבוב *hollowed, hollow* (not solid), is used of the altar, Ex 27<sup>a</sup> 38<sup>7</sup>, and of the two 'pillars' before the temple, Je 52<sup>21</sup>. It is natural to compare it with Assyr. *imbūbu* (*imbubu*), *flute* (a hollow reed) = Aram. אֲבִיבָא (*anbūba*), and Horace's *Ambubaiarum* collegia, 'gilds of flute-girls', as well as Ar. 'unbūb, 'unbūba, part of a reed between the knots (which is hollow), a pipe or tube. The Pred. יִלְכֵב (note the Assonance with נִכְיֵב!), as a Denom. from לֵבָב heart, mind, intelligence, cannot possibly mean *is void of understanding* (RV), but rather *will become wise* (cf. AV) or *show himself intelligent*: cf. Ar. لَبَّ he was, or became, possessed of understanding or intelligence. (Since לֵבָב heart is also courage, the Denom. לֵבָב Pi. may mean *to encourage, inspirit, comfort*, as in Syriac; cf. Ct 4<sup>9</sup>; but that use is unsuitable here, although 𐤇 adopts it in rendering *And the man who is pure* (void scil. of evil) *laketh heart*. Nor does the Assyr. *labābu, nalbubu, to be heart-stirred, spirited, full of courage and ferocity, to rage and fume*, or the like, help us further than by adding another illustration of the manifold but perfectly natural extensions of the simple primitive idea involved in all these various idioms, viz. *the heart*, regarded as the seat of both thought and feeling.)

𐤇 ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἄλλως νήχεται λόγοις *But a man in vain* (taking נבוב as Adv. *emptily*) *swimmeth with reasonings* (= יִלְכֵב; qs *reflects or reasons*); but 𐤇 θρασύνεται, *is courageous or speaks boldly* = 𐤇.

In st. ii עֵיר פֶּרָא should prob. be pointed עֵיר-פֶּרָא (cf. עֵירָה *his ass-colt*, Gn 49<sup>11</sup>), c עֵילָא רְמִרְדָּא and 𐤇 pullum onagri. For יִלְדָּא point יִלְדָּא (יִלְדָּר), if we may thus far sacrifice symmetry to sense. Then we may translate the verse: *But a willess wight will get wit, When a wild ass's colt begets a man*: i. e. never. Zophar sarcastically suggests that Eyob's blindness to commonly recognized truth is congenital and hopeless. With this he drops the subject of Divine and human intelligence, assuming a more friendly tone in the next paragraph.

If we keep to the traditional pointing, st. ii will be: *When a wild ass's colt is born a man* (RV marg; cf. 15<sup>7</sup> Ec 4<sup>14</sup> Pr 17<sup>17</sup>).

Others would connect the verse with what precedes it by rendering: *And so* (or *Thus*) *an empty man gets* (or *may get*) *understanding, And a wild ass's colt is* (or *may be*) *born* (anew as) *man*: that is to say, the Divine chastisements are potent to subdue headstrong untameable natures

like that of the wild ass (39<sup>5-8</sup> Gn 16<sup>12</sup>)—and Eyob himself, and to bring them to reason and submission. But the idea of *regeneration* is thus read into the Heb. In view of the possible meanings of לָבַב, וְ perhaps admits of the rendering: *An empty fellow will be daring* (or *defiant*), *And man is born* (i. e. is by nature) *a wild ass colt* (i. e. ungovernable by reason). Cf. Vir vanus in superbiam erigitur, et tanquam pullum onagri se liberum natum putat. (For st. ii, שׁ gives: *And He Who is Mighty helpeth a man*; app. reading פֶּרֶק שְׂרִי pro פֶּרֶא and omitting וְיֹלֵד! ὁ βροτὸς δὲ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ἴσα (Θ<sup>A</sup> om.) ὅς ἐρεμύτι = וְעִיר: פֶּרֶא אִרְם יֹלֵד אִשָּׁה. See 14<sup>1</sup>.)

v. 13. The Pron. *thou* is emphatic; as though the speaker were turning from generalities to the particular case of Eyob. This would seem to favour the last view of v. 12. Or the implication may rather be: *If thou* (guilty as thou art); *if thou* (with all the proofs of thy sin upon thee) *shalt have prepared* (ordered aright, Ps 78<sup>8</sup>; or *directed*, 1 Sa 7<sup>3</sup> c אל<sup>3</sup> cf. st. ii) *thine heart, And outspread thy palms* (פָּרַשׁ כַּפַּיִם Ex 9<sup>29</sup> 1 K 8<sup>38</sup>) *towards Him*; scil. in prayer, in which it was customary to *lift up the hands* (נִשָּׂא יָדַיִם Ps 28<sup>2</sup> 63<sup>3</sup> 141<sup>2</sup>), with the palms spread out towards the Deity. (καθαράν ἔθου = הַיָּדוֹתֶיךָ shalt have purified (9<sup>30</sup>) pro חֲבִינוֹתַי which, however, seems preferable.)

v. 14. *Evil* (עוֹלָה v. 11) perhaps meaning idolatry (Ho 4<sup>16</sup> 12<sup>2</sup> al.), while *Wrong* (עוֹלָה) is injustice towards man. It is questionable whether *אם* can mean *If evil be in thy hand* (= *אם-יִשְׁאֹן בְּיָדְךָ* or *אם-יִהְיֶה בְּיָדְךָ*). The *יִשׁ* may have fallen out; cf. Ps 7<sup>1</sup> *אם-יִהְיֶה עוֹלָה בְּכַפִּי*; also Ps 26<sup>10</sup> *אם-יִהְיֶה עוֹלָה בְּכַפִּי*; Ps 66<sup>14</sup> *אם-רָאִיתִי בְּלִבִּי*.

*away with it! or put it far off; banish it!* The Hiph. of the vb. רָחַק *to be or become distant, far from*, c מִן (5<sup>4</sup> 21<sup>16</sup> 22<sup>18</sup> 30<sup>10</sup>) occurs four times in Job, always in the Trans. sense of *removing* or *putting far away*: viz. 11<sup>14</sup> 13<sup>21</sup> *כַּף מִעַל הָרַחֵק Thy Hand from upon me remove Thou!* 22<sup>23</sup> *חֲרִיק עוֹלָה מֵאֵלֶיךָ (if) thou remove wrong from thy tents*, and 19<sup>13</sup> (see the note there). It would improve the connexion to read here *אם-אֵין מִיָּדְךָ: הָרַחֵק עוֹלָה* *If thou banish Evil from thine hand, And give Wrong no place in thy tent.* (Instead of the Caus. תִּשְׁכֵּן. וְ point תִּשְׁכֵּן a needless change. Otherwise וְ is good: Si iniquitatem, quae est in manu tua, abstuleris a te et non manserit in tabernaculo tuo iniustitia.)

*in thy tent:* בְּאֶהְלֶיךָ c 41 codd. and וְ בְּאֶהְלֶיךָ pro וְ בְּאֶהְלֶיךָ *in thy tents.* Cf. 22<sup>23</sup> and 5<sup>24</sup>. The word is always Sing. in Job when it means the abode of an individual: see further 8<sup>22</sup> 18<sup>6,14,15</sup> 20<sup>26</sup> 21<sup>28</sup> 19<sup>12</sup> 29<sup>4</sup> 31<sup>31</sup>: cf. plur. 12<sup>6</sup> 15<sup>74</sup> (all). On the other hand, אִישׁ לְאֶהְלָיו *a man to his tents*, Ju 7<sup>8</sup> 1 Sa 4<sup>10</sup> means *each to the tents of his army or company*.

v. 15. St. i is metr. redundant. For כִּי-יֵאָדָּן *Surely then*, see 22<sup>26</sup> 2 Sa 2<sup>7</sup> 19<sup>7</sup> (in Hypoth. clauses). To *lift up the face* is to hold up the head

fearlessly; the sign of a good conscience (2 Sa 2<sup>22</sup>): cf. also 10<sup>15</sup>. A *fallen*, lowering, or downcast face is also a sign of mortification, while *lifting the face* may denote the recovery of cheerfulness: cf. Gn 4<sup>5,6,7</sup>. This last may be the meaning here: cf. ⑤ *For so shall thy face shine again* (ἀναλάμψει) = יאורו for חשא (cf. Ec 8<sup>1</sup>). But ⑥ *And then thou shalt lift up thine hands* (!). The addition in מן ממום from blemish, ⑦ ללא מום without blemish, stain, or sign of shame (cf. Le 21<sup>17</sup> al. Pr 9<sup>7</sup>), ⑧ absque macula, may be om. c ⑨. ⑩ ὡς περ ὕδωρ καθαρὸν = כמים. This word, originally due to the scribe's eye having wandered to the next verse, was afterwards altered in מן to ממום, in order to secure a tolerable sense, instead of being expelled from the text, as would have been done had ancient revisers understood their business. (מום = מאום 31<sup>7</sup> Dn 1<sup>4</sup>, a later double Triliteralization of the Root, Aram. מוקא, is prob. cogn. c מאוכה a thing, anything, Assyr. mamma, mimma, mumma, any one or thing, Sum. NIG (NING), NIN, MIM, AM, IM, res, quidquid, &c. From meaning *anything whatever*, מאום, מום, naturally came to mean *anything amiss*. When we say 'If anything happens', we gen. hint at unfavourable contingencies.)

*steadfast*: מן מצק mollen or cast, str. of metal (37<sup>18</sup> 1 K 7<sup>16,23,33</sup>; cf. ⑪ et eris stabilis, et non timebis. Possibly *refined* or *purified* would be more accordant with analogy (so ⑫ מן מובילא purified from the hurtful. מניא is mollen, cast, in 37<sup>18</sup>). Perhaps מן מוקק = מוקק (Ps 12<sup>7</sup>) was written מן owing to an error of dictation. In Qal מצק is to pour out, e.g. water, oil, blood, melted ore (= to cast), and the Pass. Ptcp. מצק means cast, and then met. solid, firm, hard (e.g. crocodile's skin and heart, 41<sup>15,16</sup>), as though made of cast metal; as we say 'a cast-iron man', which is perhaps the import of the Hoph. Ptcp. here, although מן מצק is not so used where it recurs in Job (31<sup>18</sup> cast, of a metal mirror; 38<sup>38</sup> app. lump or clod or solidified mass of earth), nor elsewhere in OT. The Impf. מצק (22<sup>16</sup>), usu. rendered is poured out, may bear that meaning, but the context is doubtful.

Some would replace מן מצק in 11<sup>15</sup> by the questionable מן מצק far from distress (Dn 9<sup>25</sup>), following ⑬ ומן עקא לא תרחל And of distress thou shalt not be afraid. The word should at least be מן מצקה or מן מצקה (15<sup>24</sup>). ⑭ paraphrases: ἐκδύσῃ δὲ ῥύπον (9<sup>31</sup> 14<sup>4</sup>) καὶ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς, while thou shalt doff impurity, and shalt not fear; taking מן מצק in the sense of purified. Upon the whole, if we do not read אן מן or מן מן, it may be better to restore מן מצק set up or stablished (Gn 28<sup>12</sup>. At Na 2<sup>2</sup> pro העצ leg. הער urbs).

v. 16. *For thou, even thou*: כי אתה. Or read simply ואתה And thou (wretched as thou art at present). The Pron. is emph. ⑮ And then (as in v. 15) thou shalt forget thy trouble. ⑯ καὶ τὸν κόπον ἐπιλήσῃ = 'וְעָמַל ת' makes the st. too short. In st. ii, ⑰ gives καὶ οὐ πτοηθήσῃ,





v. 18. *thou shalt feel secure: or be confident*, 6<sup>20</sup> Ju 18<sup>7</sup>. Perhaps יורעת (בהיות) כי יש (not ובטחת, on account of) and the following לבטח, which a scribe may have anticipated here. *And thou shalt know that there is indeed ground of hope*. Light is associated with hope, Is 8<sup>20</sup> 9<sup>1</sup> 59<sup>9</sup>. All the Verss. reproduce מ in st. i. With st. ii textual doubts meet us again. וּחִפְּרָת לִבָּטָח תִּשְׁכַּב מ And *thou shalt dig (or search for, 3<sup>21</sup> 39<sup>29</sup>)—no Obj. expressed!—in security shalt lie down*. It is clear that וּחִפְּרָת will not do. If it means *look carefully* about thee before going to rest (OL; RV), it is in ludicrous contrast with the promise of complete confidence with which the verse opens. Accordingly, the Verss. exhibit a curious variety of interpretations. 𐤓 And *thou shalt prepare a burial-place* (an impossible expansion of מ's וּחִפְּרָת and *thou shalt dig*); *in security shalt thou lie down*. So 𐤔 et *defossus securus dormies* (qs reading וְחִפְּרָת or וְחִפְּרָה): cf. Syr. ܡܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ a grave cited above. 𐤌 omits לבטח, and renders: *And thou shalt sleep and rest without one waking thee* (v. 19). 𐤌 ἐκ δὲ μερίμνης καὶ φροντίδος ἀναφανεύεται σοι εἰρήνη. The opening phrase is almost certainly a paraphrastic equivalent of וּמִפְּחַד And *from dread* (וּמִפְּחַד = וּחִפְּרָת; מ, כ, ר, as often): cf. 3<sup>23</sup> ἐφρόντισα = פָּחַדְתִּי, and 21<sup>10</sup> בָּתֵּיהֶם שָׁלוֹם מִפְּחַד Their homes are safe from alarm. And since ἀναφαίνομαι (Job only), which recurs 13<sup>18</sup> 40<sup>8</sup>, is used by the translator as a complementary verb in both passages (δικαίως ἀναφανοῦμαι = אֲצַדֵּק, δίκαιος ἀναφανῆς = תִּצְדַּק), it is not unlikely that ἀναφανεύεται σοι εἰρήνη = חֵשֶׁלֶם (pro מ' תִּשְׁכַּב) Thou shalt be safe (8<sup>6</sup> 9<sup>1</sup>). It may, of course, be merely a loose paraphrase of לִבָּטָח תִּשְׁכַּב *thou shalt lie down in security*: see Is 14<sup>30</sup>, where לִבָּטָח יִרְבְּצוּ = ἐπ' εἰρήνης ἀναπαύσονται (for the Heb. phrase, cf. Ho 2<sup>20</sup> Ps 4<sup>9</sup>): or possibly it represents another reading, e.g. יִרְבֵּץ שָׁלוֹם לְךָ for *thee shall peace arise* (cf. Ma 3<sup>20</sup>). Upon the whole, וּמִפְּחַד לִבָּטָח תִּשְׁכַּב was prob. the orig. text of מ'. Cf. also Pr 3<sup>24</sup> לֹא תִפְחַד אִם תִּשְׁכַּב If *thou lie down, thou shalt not dread*.

v. 19. St. i is a virtual repetition of 18<sup>b</sup>, and some would omit it as a gloss. Allowing for the change of Pers., it is identical with Is 17<sup>2b</sup> וְרַבְּצוּ וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד. Cf. also Le 26<sup>6</sup> וְשִׁנְכַתְּם וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד. But the st. supplies a link with what follows. Not only shalt thou dwell in peace, with none to molest thee, but many will court thy favour: cf. 𐤌 μεταβαλόμενοι δὲ πολλοὶ σου δεηθήσονται.

St. ii. Pr 19<sup>6</sup>. The phrase חֲלֵה פָּנַי, usu. explained *to sweeten or make pleasant the face of any being*, Divine or human, by comparison with Aram. חֲלֵי to be sweet (of taste) and Ar. حلو be sweet, met. pleasing, opp. to مر bitter, may perhaps rather be connected with Assyr. ḫalû, be bright, shining, a syn. of namdru (Shamash, e.g., is called muṣaḫlû amu, Brightener of Day). This agrees with the analogy of בָּלוּ (9<sup>27</sup> 10<sup>20</sup>) and esp. the phrase הָאֵיר פָּנַי to make the face shine upon one (Nu 6<sup>25</sup>, cf. Ec 8<sup>1</sup>). Cf. also Ps 104<sup>15</sup>.

v. 20. A triplet, where we might have expected a quatrain. The text is still uncertain: see ④, which connects st. ii in sense with 19<sup>b</sup>, and concludes with st. i. Thus: (19<sup>b</sup>) *But changing sides* (μεταβαλόμενοι: or *turning round*: cf. 10<sup>8</sup>), *many will beg help of thee*; (20) *But deliverance will forsake them: For their hope is perdition* (ἀπώλεια), *But eyes of impious ones will melt*. ⑤A adds a 4th st., viz. (For) *with Him are Wisdom and Might*, = 12<sup>13</sup> עֲמוֹ חֵכְמָה וְגִבּוֹרָה (כִּי). Cf. also 12<sup>10</sup>. This gloss, app. intended to sum up Zophar's argument by insisting upon his two main points, viz. that by His omniscience God is always aware of sin wherever it is present (v. 11), and by His omnipotence is always able to punish it, has a very abrupt effect and can hardly be original. Nor does the transposition of its members really improve the verse. Some such line as וְיָנוּחוּ בְּאִפְסָם כִּסְלָה יָנוּחוּ *Without hope will they die*, or כִּי מֵאֵם אֱלֹהִים מִבְּטָחָם *For Eloah disdaineth their trust* (8<sup>14.20</sup> 10<sup>8</sup> 18<sup>14</sup> 31<sup>24</sup> Je 2<sup>37</sup>), may have fallen out after וּמָנוֹס אֲכָר מֵנָהֶם. Cf. Pr 14<sup>26</sup> for the connexion of thought.

St. i. *the eyes of the godless shall fail*: or *waste, pine away*, with looking in vain for help. The same phrase, 17<sup>8</sup>: cf. Ps 69<sup>4</sup> La 4<sup>17</sup>. The כָּלָה Assy. *kalû* is *to stop, end, finish, cease*, Trans. and Intrans. = Sum. GUL (*kalû, abātu*); cf. ⑤ GAL, ⑤ GIL, ⑤ GUL, *destroy*. (⑤ נִחְשְׁכַן shall be darkened; qs חֲכִמָּהּ for חֲכִלָּהּ.) St. ii. *refuge*: or *place of refuge*, or simply *flight, escape*. Same phrase, Am. 2<sup>14</sup> Je 25<sup>35</sup>. ① שִׁיבּוּחָא = ⑤ σωτηρία. ① uses the same word in Nu 35<sup>6.11</sup> (Cities of Refuge). ⑤ חֲקִפָּהוֹן *their strength* (= מָנוֹס *place of refuge* pro מָנוֹס). St. iii. Fort. leg. כְּמוֹ ante מִפֶּה: *And their trust is as an expiring breath or last gasp*; lit. *breathing out of soul* (here only; cf. Je 15<sup>9</sup> ch 31<sup>39</sup>); which ② explains *abominatio animae*, as if the idea were *blowing or sniffing at* in token of contempt (cf. Ma 1<sup>9</sup>). ⑤ has only *And the hope of their souls*, omitting מִפֶּה.

Chapter 12. Eyob's Answer to Zophar.

v. 2. *ye are knowing*: יָרְעִים *clever*, or *the wise* (Fc 9<sup>11</sup> Pr 1<sup>2</sup> 17<sup>27</sup>). אֲנִי אֶתְּמַר אֲתָם עִם אֶתְּמַר could only mean *ye are common people*; and חֲכָמָה in the || st. requires some term denoting the possession of wisdom. ⑤A ἀνθρώποι μόνον (the) *only men* is an attempt to meet the difficulty. So ② ergo vos estis soli homines. Others have suggested עֲרוּמִים *crafty* (5<sup>12</sup> 15<sup>6</sup> only), which seems less suitable, as too restricted in scope. Cf. v. 9 and 13<sup>2</sup>. (① חֲבֵרָיָא *companions* = רֵעִים 2<sup>11</sup>, perhaps יָרְעִים here?).

v. 3. *sense*: or *intelligence*: lit. *a heart*. The verse has 3 stt., of which ④ omits both the second (rightly; = 13<sup>2b</sup>) and the third.

St. iii. Lit. *And with whom are there not (things) like these?* viz. which thou hast been saying; his commonplaces about the Wisdom and Power of God. Cf. 15<sup>9b</sup>. ⑤ לִמֶּנּוּ הָיָה אִיךְ הָלִין (om. אִין), *To whom have things like these happened?* but ① correctly לִי אִיךְ דְּכִמְתָּ אֵלַי *And with whom are there not things like these?* ② paraph. Quis enim haec quae nostis ignorat?

v. 4. Again a triplet, and otherwise corrupt. Θ δίκαιος γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἄμμεπτος ἐγενήθη (Θ<sup>A</sup> ἐγενόμην = M) εἰς χλεύασμα (-όν) = כִּי אִישׁ צַדִּיק קרא לאלה ויענהו. One that called unto Eloah, and He answered him; which may be either a gloss upon אִישׁ צַדִּיק a man just and blameless, or intended as a specimen of the mocking words addressed to the sufferer: *He called (קרא?) upon Eloah, &c.*, cf. Ps 22<sup>8,9</sup>. Θ also om. לרעהו to his friend, and app. read אִישׁ a man instead of the 2nd שחוק a derision (La 3<sup>14</sup> Je 20<sup>7</sup>), besides supplying the necessary Conj. with תמים, and transposing the stichi (1, 3). Σ To whom have happened such things, and he hath become a derision to his friends and called upon God and He answered him, Who hath pleasure in just men without blame? שחוק לרעהו אהיה מע A derision-to-his-friend (= one that is a laughing-stock) I become; but the change of Pers. is really intolerable. If we keep אהיה, we must read לרעי to my friend (31<sup>9</sup>) or לרעים (16<sup>20</sup> 19<sup>21</sup>) to my friends. If we retain לרעהו (Σ לחברוי = לרעים plur. 32<sup>3</sup>; 16<sup>21</sup> sic leg. et 42<sup>10</sup>), we should also adopt יהיה (Θ<sup>B</sup> Σ). It is difficult to choose between these alternatives. Perhaps we should read: שחוק לרעי אהיה I become a derision to my friends (cf. 30<sup>1</sup>); They deride the just and blameless (or in st. ii: ואני צדיק ותמים Though I be a man just and blameless). שחוק לרעהו יהיה | אִישׁ צַדִּיק וְתָמִים does not afford a quite satisfactory couplet, even if (with Θ) we invert the two members. Nor is it quite clear how Eyob considers that he has become a jest to his friends. Certainly neither Zophar nor the others have expressed contempt for his misfortunes. Zophar, however, has suggested that he is a mere empty-headed babbler, blind to notorious truth, and as obstinate as a wild ass.

v. 5. לפיר בו לעשתות שׂאנן מע, which RV boldly renders *In the thought of him that is at ease there is contempt for misfortune*, can only mean *A torch of contempt hath the thought of one at ease*. So W Lampas contempta apud cogitationes (עשתות) divitum, and X A torch (אִירָא) which is despised hath the godless one from thought secure. Nonsense as this may be, it shows that the corrupt text of מע lay before the translators. There can be little doubt that we should point לפיר (RV?) or rather restore על-פיר Upon ruin or calamity (30<sup>24</sup> 31<sup>29</sup>; see on v. 6). And if, further, we read ישפוך poureth, or the Plur., after v. 21 (שופך בו על נדיבים) instead of the very questionable לעשתות מע, the sentence will take a more prob. form and gain in coherence and clearness of expression. Upon Ruin (the ruined) the prosperous (שאנן; perhaps a gloss) poureth contempt. (פיר is compared with Ar. فاد, فود, die, pass away, depart, also used of property. The Prim. Root may be cogn. with Sum. — BAD, far, be or go far, depart, dead.) In st. ii, מע נכון למוערי רגל It (i.e. contempt) is ready for them whose foot slippeth, קלון dishonour (for נכון ready) would give a better parallel: קלון על מוער רגל (He poureth) dishonour upon the fallen. (Leg. fort. למוערי poet. form of cst. like אפרי Gn 49<sup>11</sup>.) Θ, treating the





all the Verss. rightly give equivalents of יְהוָה (Θ *χρὶς κυρίου*). It is surely significant that the poet, whose hero is a non-Israelite, and who makes Eyob and his friends designate the Supreme by more general names common to the other Semitic peoples, such as El (Assyr., Phoen., Aram.), usu. explained 'the Mighty One', but perhaps rather 'the bright' or 'shining One' (cf. Sum. EL, *bright, pure*, UL, *to glitter*, of stars, MUL (WUL), id., *a star*); Eloah (Ar., Aram.), 'the Awful' or 'Fearful One', orig. perhaps denoting *ghost, spirit* (plur. Elohim, 5<sup>8</sup> 28<sup>23</sup> 34<sup>9</sup> 38<sup>7</sup> only); and Shaddai, 'the Mountain' (Assyr. *šadû, šaddê*, Sum. SHAD? SAD? SATI, *bāmātu*), should here, and here only, introduce the special name of the God of Israel. In so doing, he not only betrays his own nationality. He also reveals his purpose of comforting his people during a period of national calamity, by assuring them that their affliction is the work of no hostile heathen deity, but of the God of their fathers, Whose Hand both smites and heals.

v. 10. *human flesh*: lit. *flesh of man* (אִישׁ, as opp. to the brutes, Ex 11<sup>7</sup>, and to God, 9<sup>9</sup> 32<sup>13</sup>). If all living are in His Hand, whatever happens to them must be His doing. (The verse, with its prosaic אִשְׁר בִּידוֹ, may be an interpolation.)

v. 11. *test or try the quality of words*; whether they are true or false, wise or foolish, sense or nonsense: just as the palate discriminates between various kinds of food by their taste, whether they are pleasant or nauseous, wholesome or hurtful. The meaning seems to be: As you cannot deny that I possess the same organs of perception and discrimination as yourselves, how can you pretend to be so much wiser than I? (cf. v. 3, which this verse might very well follow.) Instead of οὗς ear (Θ has νοῦς *mind, intelligence* (= לֵב 7<sup>17</sup> al; רִיחַ Is 40<sup>13</sup>). Cf. 13<sup>1</sup> and Assyr. *uznu, ear, sense, intelligence*.

v. 12. St. i seems too short with two stresses. Some word or words may have fallen out; as we may also conclude from the difficulty of discerning the relevance of the words in Eyob's mouth. Acc. to Dr 'the experience of the aged is mentioned by Job as a second source of the knowledge of God's rule of the world'. But see note on v. 9. Eyob does not admit that wisdom is an invariable attribute of age (v. 20). Eliphaz, on the other hand, claims the support of the aged for his own views (15<sup>10</sup>). Bildad's appeal to tradition (8<sup>8-10</sup>) does not seem to be quite the same thing. Nor is the RV marg. 'With aged men,' *ye say*, 'is wisdom' satisfactory, as Dr points out. None of the friends had said so.

Θ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ σοφία | ἐν δὲ πολλῷ βίῳ ἐπιστήμη. Cf. 32<sup>7</sup>, where ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ ἔτεσιν = רַב שָׁנִים *And a multitude of years*. This suggests the reading יָמִים אֲרָךְ for בִּישׁוּשִׁים here, in better agreement with the parallel יָמִים אֲרָךְ *length of days*. If Eyob says *And many years are* (i. e. bring or imply) *wisdom, And a long life is discernment*, he may mean: I not only

possess the same faculties as you (v. 11), but like you I can boast the wisdom acquired by years of experience. It is also possible that הָלֵא should be restored at the beginning of the verse, as question after question is quite in the author's manner; and רַב־שָׁנִים gives but a single stress (32<sup>7</sup>). הָלֵא רַב־שָׁנִים חֲכָמָה וְגו' *Do not many years bring wisdom?* &c. Am I not old enough to know as well as you? Less probably, but still possibly, the question might be a sarcasm: Have not years brought you wisdom or common sense? = You are old enough to know better.

v. 13. May be an interpolation suggested by the previous verse: *wisdom* and *discernment* occur in both, and in the same relative positions. Moreover, this verse is hardly suitable as an introd. to the long illustration of God's apparently capricious use of His omnipotence in the world of man (vv. 14-25). The passage suggests the arbitrary exercise of irresponsible and irresistible power rather than government by wisdom and justice. (In st. ii leg. עֲצָקָה *strength*, Is 40<sup>29</sup>, instead of עֲצָה *counsel*, for the sake of parallelism. Throughout the book, even in 38<sup>2</sup>, the latter is always used of human, never of Divine, wisdom.)

v. 14. We have to go back to v. 9 for the subject of the verb, viz. Iahvah; a fact which confirms our suspicion that v. 13 is spurious, and that the quatrain vv. 11, 12, originally followed v. 3.

*He (Iahvah) breaketh down*; הָרַס: of walls and cities, met. of men; opp. to בָּנָה *build* or *rebuild*, acc. to context. Je 1<sup>10</sup> Ps 28<sup>5</sup> Ex 15<sup>7</sup>. As Obj. עִיר *a city* or בֵּית *a house* might be supplied, since הָן+verb makes but a single stress in v. 15. (הָרַס is cogn. with II רָסַם Aram. רָסַם and prob. סָרַם ✓ of רָצִין, רָצִין, רָצִין, &c.) and *there is no rebuilding*. וְלֹא יִבְנֶהָ lit. *and he is not rebuilt*. This can hardly be right. RV *and it*, &c., implies יִבְנֶהָ 3 fem. It is better to point יִבְנֶהָ 'Lo, He breaketh down, and (re)buildeth not.' Cf. Ps 28<sup>5</sup>. וְ if *He have thrown down, who shall build?* taking הָן as Hypoth. = אֵם (23<sup>8</sup> 40<sup>23</sup>), which may be right, and reading מִי יִבְנֶהָ. Cf. הָאֵן סָחַף מִנִּי בָנָא וְ לֹא יִבְנֶהָ *Lo, if he pull down, who rebuildeth?* So וְ in st. ii also. *He prisoneth a man*: or *closeth in upon a man*: cf. Ex 14<sup>3</sup>. Perhaps *closeth* (doors) *against a man* = וְ לֹא יִפְתָּהּ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων. *there is no release*: lit. *and he is not opened*, i. e. *loosed*: Is 51<sup>14</sup>. Perhaps we should point יִפְתָּהּ c וְ לֹא יִפְתָּהּ: *and openeth not*. All the havoc and ruin wrought by man, e. g. the razing of Samaria and Jerusalem and the imprisonment of their kings (2 K 17<sup>4,5</sup> 24<sup>15</sup> 25<sup>6-10</sup>) are ascribed to the personal action of Iahvah (cf. 2 K 17<sup>18,23</sup> 21<sup>12,13</sup> 24<sup>2-4</sup>).

v. 15. *stoppeeth*: *holdeth in* or *back*. עָצַר, cogn. c צֹר *besiege*, and צָר *bind* (the Prim. sense of all three: cf. Sum. SAR, *bind*, *bond*). Cf. Dt 11<sup>17</sup> 1 K 8<sup>35</sup>. When 'waters' or floods (Gn 8<sup>3</sup>) dry up (Gn 8<sup>7</sup>), it is due (not to absorption by the soil or evaporation) but to the *binding* or *restraining* Hand of Iahvah. וְ incorrectly: ἐὰν κωλύσῃ τὸ ὕδωρ, ξηρανεῖ τὴν γῆν, *He will dry up the earth*; pointing וְ יִבְשׁ Hiph. and Sing., and adding אֲרֵץ



from st. ii, which it renders: *But if He have let loose* (ἐπαφῇ: scil. upon it), *He destroyed it by overturning*; app. pointing וַיִּשְׁלַח וַיַּהֲפֹךְ אֶרֶץ. Torrential rains and floods 'overturning' the land are characteristic of Babylonia rather than of Palestine. But the allusion of the verse may be, as Dr says, to destructive droughts and floods generally.

v. 16. In st. i מִי עִמּוֹ עֹז וְחָכְמָה With Him are Strength and Sound Wisdom (or Insight, Sagacity). Cf. v. 13. ⑥, however, παρ' αὐτοῦ κράτος καὶ ἰσχύς, which is really more suitable to the context, since the whole passage, vv. 13-25, demonstrates not the Wisdom but the Omnipotence of Iahvah. Moreover, חָכְמָה, which occurs twelve times in OT acc. to מִי, is nowhere ascribed to God (see on 11<sup>6</sup>) in Job, if indeed elsewhere, though He may endow man with it (Is 28<sup>29</sup>). Leg. fort. עֹז וְחָכְמָה Strength and exceeding Might (Intens. Plur., see the same phrase Ps 68<sup>36</sup>) = Omnipotence. St. ii Misled and misleader: שֶׁגֶגַּע וְמִשְׁגָּעָה lit. he who goes astray and he who causes to go astray. The two closely kindred Roots are used of sinning unwittingly (Le 4<sup>13</sup> 5<sup>18</sup>); here app. of erring in judgement. They do not imply deceit. (Driver neatly suggests לוֹ שֶׁגֶגַּע וְמִשְׁגָּעָה To him belong the erring one and he who causeth him to err.) In this and the following verses the ruin of nations (meaning prob. Israel and Judah), and the political mistakes and delusions which were the cause of it, are described as the work of Iahvah, in the exercise of His sovran will or caprice. Both the blind guides and their misguided followers are alike 'His'—pawns in His stupendous game, and absolutely subject to His control. If there is any deceiver in question, it is Iahvah Who deceives both: cf. Je 4<sup>10</sup> 20<sup>7</sup> Ez 14<sup>9</sup> Is 19<sup>12-14</sup> 29<sup>9,10</sup>. ⑦ quite differently: αὐτοῦ ἐπιστήμη καὶ σὺνεσις = (?) לוֹ שֶׁבַל וְהַשְׁבַּל cf. vv. 12, 13, 34<sup>35</sup>. ⑧ His are strength and redemption (!). (The Prim. sense of שָׁנָה, שְׁנִיָּה, and שָׁנַע, Assyr. šēgū, mad. frenzied, is prob. drunkén; cf. שָׁנָה Is 28<sup>7</sup> Pr 20<sup>1</sup> and Sum. NAG = SHAG, שָׁקָה drink.) It is, however, possible that the Neg. Ptc. לֹא not has been confused here, as elsewhere (Is 9<sup>3</sup> Ps 100<sup>3</sup>), with לוֹ to Him. St. ii might then be: *He erreth not, nor is made to err* (pointing + מִשְׁגָּעָה for מִשְׁגָּעָה); His judgement is unerring, infallible, and cannot be blinded or hoodwinked by human dissimulation or hypocrisy. This would favour חָכְמָה in st. i. Lastly, since what follows obviously relates to national catastrophes, we may perhaps further suggest לוֹ שָׂרַר וְנִשְׂרָר His are both waster and wasted. Je 4<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>26</sup>.

v. 17. מִי מַרְכָּדָה or leadeth off; scil. into exile (Je 32<sup>6</sup> 2 K 24<sup>15</sup>). disrobed: שׁוּלָל Mi 1<sup>8</sup>. The phrase recurs, v. 19. ⑨ renders שׁוּלָל (only found in these three locc.) αἰχμαλώτους, captives, prisoners-of-war, here, correctly giving the general sense, and doubtless deriving the word from שָׁלַל to drive off captives, to spoil; but in Mi 1<sup>8</sup> ἀνπόδετος, unshod: cf. Is 20<sup>2-4</sup>: as captives appear in the sculptures of

Assyrian conquerors. The term seems to be more general than *יָחַף* *barefoot* (Is 20<sup>2</sup>); meaning *stripped* of all but a loincloth. Cf. 24<sup>10</sup> Is 20<sup>4</sup>. *א* *משחלשלין* *enchained*, qs from *שלשלתא* *chain*. *ס* (*בחמהא* *in amazement*) and *נ* (*in stultum finem*) seem to have read or guessed *שומם* for *שולל*. It must be admitted that *מ* is not satisfactory; st. i is a poor parallel to st. ii. *מולך* may be due to the scribe's eye having wandered to v. 19, and this word may have displaced *עצת*; just as *ס* gives *kings* (from v. 18) instead of *counsellors* in this line. It might even be that the Aramaic equivalent of *עצת*, viz. *מלך* or *מלכת* (see 38<sup>2</sup> *מילכא* *counsel*), orig. stood here, and the unrecognized Aramaism was purposely altered. Now, if the verse began thus, a verb is needed in place of *שולל*. This may well have been *שכל* (= *סכל*, 2 Sa 15<sup>31</sup> Is 44<sup>26</sup> || *יהולל* as here); with *ש* = *ס*, as in *שכלות* = *סכלות*, Ec 1<sup>17</sup> cf. 2<sup>3</sup>. *The counsel of the Counsellors* (of State) *He maketh folly* (or *stultifieth*) is a good parallel to *And the Judges of the Land He befooleth* (or as *ס* *crazeth*). For the Perf. *שָׁקַל* cf. v. 18 *פָּתַח*. In st. ii, which is metr. curtailed, read c *ס* (*κρίτὰς γῆς*) *שפטי ארץ* pro *שפטים*.

v. 18. *מִסֵּר מְלָכִים מוֹסֵר* *chastisement* or *discipline* (5<sup>17</sup> 20<sup>3</sup> al.) *of kings* can hardly be right. *א* *שִׁשְׁלִיתָא דְּמַלְכֵינָא* *the chain or bond of kings*, pointing *מוֹסֵר*; but Plur. required as in 39<sup>5</sup> (c *פָּתַח* as here; Is 52<sup>2</sup> Ps 2<sup>3</sup> 116<sup>18</sup>): Sing. not found. *נ* *Balteum* (swordbelt) *regum dissolvit* (= *א*). We might read *מוֹסְרִי* (Is 52<sup>2</sup>) and render: *The bonds of kings He looseth*; but this will not suit st. ii, whether we understand *bonds laid on kings* by their conquerors (cf. 2 K 25<sup>27</sup>), or *bonds imposed by kings* on their captives (Ps 2<sup>3</sup>). Since, however, *פָּתַח* is used of *putting off* clothing (Is 20<sup>2</sup> Ps 30<sup>12</sup> *שָׁק*), harness, armour (1 K 20<sup>11</sup>), as well as bonds (38<sup>31</sup> 39<sup>5</sup> Is 58<sup>6</sup>), some term for clothing may have stood here, e.g. *כסות* (Sam. Gn 49<sup>11</sup> ch 24<sup>7</sup> 31<sup>19</sup> || *לבוש* in all 3 locc. Dt 22<sup>12</sup>) or even the rare and easily mistaken syn. *מְכַסָּה* (Is 14<sup>11</sup> 23<sup>18</sup>). The letters *כ* and *ר*, *מ* and *ת*, are sometimes confused with each other (*כסות* read backwards = *מוֹסֵר*!). The verse might thus have been: *The clothing of kings he removeth, And bindeth a waistcloth on their loins*: scil. as prisoners-of-war (cf. Is 3<sup>24</sup>). *ס* *καθίζανων βασιλείς ἐπὶ θρόνους* (*ס* *καθίζων* *ס* *θρόνων*) = *מְשִׁיב מְלָכִים עַל כִּסֵּא*: see 36<sup>7</sup> *ס* Hg 2<sup>22</sup> 1 K 2<sup>24</sup>; or *כִּסֵּא מְלָכִים עַל כִּסֵּא* *Who placeth kings on the throne* (or *כִּסְאוֹת thrones*): see Pr 18<sup>16</sup> *יִנְחֵנו* = *καθίζει αὐτόν* Gn 8<sup>4</sup> *וַיִּנְחֵנו* = *καὶ ἐκάθισεν* 2 K 17<sup>6</sup> 18<sup>11</sup> *הִנִּיחַ* syn. of *הוֹשִׁיב*). The word *כסות* or *מכסה* might easily be confused with *כסא*, *כסה* (Plur. *כִּסְאוֹת*) *throne* (cf. Pr 12<sup>23</sup> *כִּסֵּה* = *θρόνος*!). *ס* points *פָּתַח* *He maketh kings go down to the gale* (*מַחַת* = *מַנְחַת* 21<sup>18</sup>), which may confirm *מְנִיחַ*.

(*מִסֵּר מְלָכִים* may have been influenced by *מִסֵּר*, v. 20. It is also perhaps possible that *ס* read the word *מִסֵּר* Pi. *Who appointeth*, 1 C 9<sup>22</sup>, and like *ס* pointed *פָּתַח* or Paus. *פָּתַח* *Who appointeth kings in the gate*; a good sense, of which their rendering might be regarded as a paraphrase.

Cf. 2 Sa 19<sup>9</sup>.  $\mathfrak{G}$  might even have read מַסִּיר and understood מַשִּׁיר q<sup>s</sup> *Who maketh kings reign*: cf. Ho 8<sup>4</sup>. The second st. also is not free from difficulty. 'The waistcloth,' says Driver, 'is named as the badge of a captive.' אָזוּר is always associated with words denoting the loins (מִתְנִים, חֲלָצִים), as here; a fact which renders the suggested rg. אָסִיר from Ju 15<sup>14</sup> abortive. In 2 K 1<sup>8</sup> it is Elijah's leathern girdle; in Is 5<sup>27</sup> Ez 23<sup>15</sup> the girdle of Assy. and Chaldean warriors; in Is 11<sup>5</sup> a king's girdle; and in Je 13<sup>1,4,6,7,10,11</sup> a linen girdle worn by the prophet-priest. The captive women of Is 3<sup>24</sup> are to wear a *rope* (נֶקֶפֶה) instead of the usual girdle (חֲנוּרָה): cf. 1 K 20<sup>31</sup>. Since the אָזוּר was a recognized part of the king's apparel (Is 11<sup>5</sup>),  $\mathfrak{G}$  καὶ περιέθηκεν ζώνην ὀσφύας αὐτῶν prob. means that Iahvah invested him therewith; which agrees with  $\mathfrak{G}$ 's version of st. i. But the pessimistic tone of the whole context is against this interpretation.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Balteum regum dissolvit, et praecingit fune renes eorum, seems much more natural. Perhaps we should read ויסר for ויאסר and om. ב before מִתְנֵי: *The raiment* (perhaps סריוֹן *armour*) *of kings He looseth, And removeth the girdle of their loins* (so that they become powerless for action: cf. 38<sup>3</sup>).

v. 19. St. i: see notes on v. 17.  $\mathfrak{G}$  ἐξαποστέλλων = מְשַׁלַּח (14<sup>20</sup> 22<sup>9</sup> 30<sup>11</sup> 39<sup>3</sup>: so usu. in OT). An ancient various reading.

St. ii.  $\mathfrak{M}$  וַיִּתְּנִים יִסְלֶף RV *And overthroweth the mighty*: Dr 'Rather, *them that are firmly established*—men holding long-established, hereditary dignities.'  $\mathfrak{S}$  וַלְעִשְׂגָּא מִשְׁפַּל And *bringeth low the strong* (warriors).  $\mathfrak{J}$  וַתְּקִיפֵי מַקְלָקֵל And *maketh naught of the mighty ones*.  $\mathfrak{B}$  et optimates supplantat. But אִתְּנִים does not recur with such a meaning. In Mi 6<sup>2</sup> הָאִזְנוֹ Give ear! must be read for הָאִתְּנִים, which in 1 K 8<sup>2</sup> appears as the Heb. name of the seventh month (Tisri); which is not certainly identical with our word, although it is usually assumed to be so, and explained 'month of *steady flowings*', or month when water is found only in *overflowing wādys*: an unlikely designation of a dry month, when the harvest was gathered in (Le 23<sup>39</sup>). The word may have a mythological reference. (In spite of the trad. vocalization, which app. connects אִתְּנִים with אִיתָן—note, however, the absence of י—it is conceivable that אִתְּנִים is related to אִתָּן asina, Assy. *atānu*, Sum. ANSHU, ὄσνος, ὄνος, as the ass was a theanthropic animal, and sacred to the Sun. Cf. Smythe Palmer, *Samson Saga*, pp. 123 sqq. A Sum. syn. of ANSHU is SHAKAN, written with the Det. of Deity, which I have elsewhere compared with the name of Shekem ben Hamor.) The present, then, is the only certain occurrence in  $\mathfrak{M}$  of the Plur. אִתְּנִים; and we may perhaps see further reason to regard it as questionable here. The Sing. אִיתָן (doubtful in Gn 49<sup>24</sup>, and cert. corrupt in Pr 13<sup>10</sup>) occurs in 8 or 9 other locc. as a Subst., mostly in the Genit. Case. (The phrase נָחַל אִיתָן torrens perennitatis, Dt 21<sup>4</sup> Am 5<sup>24</sup>, should be comp. with נִהְרֹת אִיתָן amnes

perennitatis = amnes perennes, Ps 74<sup>16</sup>. So גוי איתן gens perennitatis = gens perennis = גוי עולמים, Je 5<sup>15</sup>, 'an immemorial people'; ניה איתן pascuum perennitatis, Je 49<sup>19</sup> = 50<sup>44</sup>, 'an unfailing pasture'; and the sea returns לאיתנו ad perennitatem eius, Ex 14<sup>27</sup>, 'to his everlasting flow' or continual state.) In Nu 14<sup>21</sup> איתן מושכך Perennitas sedes tua = sedes tua perennis est, 'Thine abode is eternal' or imperishable (as hewn out in the cliffs, Je 49<sup>16</sup>). איתן, 33<sup>16</sup>, is doubtful: see the notes there. Apart from the very dubious existence of the Plur., we should not have expected איתנים, perennitates, as a designation of a class of men, without some qualifying term (cf. Perennitas tua, as a form of address to the later Roman emperors). Θ δυνάστας δὲ ἡγῆς κατέστρεψεν (= חלף 9 הפך 1110<sup>10</sup>). Perhaps אירי עם (Ju 5<sup>25</sup> Ps 16<sup>3</sup> app. of priests) or אילי ארץ (2 K 24<sup>16</sup>); which would give the stichus the normal 3 stresses. Θ poss. read יחלף. He causeth to pass away (ח and ס may be confused). יסלף is of uncertain meaning. In Aram. Tg. סלף is *twist, wrest, distort, turn awry*. The word appears to be an S-form of the Root סלף, seen also in לפית *twist, turn*, 6<sup>18</sup>; cf. Ar. لَفَّ he twisted or wrung his neck; he turned him aside, to right or left; Assy. lapātu, *turn, overturn or destroy*; Ar. لَفَّ he rolled or wrapped up one thing in another. In Ar. سَلَفَ (סלף) is *it or he passed, or passed away, came to an end or to naught; he or it went before, preceded*; but also *he turned over the ground for sowing*. For the Heb. use, cf. Ex 23<sup>8</sup> Dt 16<sup>19</sup> *The bribe blindeth the eyes of wise men, 'ויסלף דברי צדיק' and twisteth the words (or subverteth the cause) of just men; or maketh naught of the pleas of just men; either distorteth their evidence, or garbleth their case. But 'צדיק', like חכמים, may refer to the judges: a bribe distorts the decisions or sentences of men who would otherwise be just. Cf. Pr 22<sup>12</sup> where it is said that the Eyes of Iahvah (unblinded by bribes) keep knowledge (keep to truth and fact), And He bringeth to naught (defeateth) the words of the treacherous. Cf. also Pr 19<sup>3</sup>: A man's folly twisteth or maketh devious or overturneth his way (Ps 1<sup>6</sup>); and the more or less corrupt Pr 13<sup>5</sup> 21<sup>12</sup>.*

It is evident from the use of איתן in other passages that איתנים is no more likely than עולמים (Je 5<sup>15</sup>) as an epithet descriptive of a class of men, although acc. to Ex 29<sup>9</sup> the office of priest was eternal (cf. Ps 110<sup>5</sup>); nor acc. to Heb. usage would סלף be appropriate in such a connexion. And since priests and prophets are commonly associated, and the Obj. of סלף is דברי in 3 of the 6 other locc. where the word is found, we may perhaps restore the short stichus to normal rhythm and sense by reading ודברי נביא יסלף *And the words of the Prophets He bringeth to naught* (1 K 22<sup>22</sup> Ez 14<sup>9</sup> cf. Je 20<sup>7</sup> 22<sup>26</sup> 5<sup>31</sup> La 2<sup>14</sup> al.). 'נביא' was misread 'נחיא', by the common confusion of ב, ת, and then the meaningless word was read backwards as 'איתנ', i.e. איתנים. Cf. Is 19<sup>18</sup>, where Θ (ἀ)σεδες = סדה(ה) = חדרם(ה), the true reading of the Heb. (ח = κ, Gn 22<sup>4</sup>

טבח = ταβεκ). This agrees well with what follows, v. 20 (cf. also Is 28<sup>7</sup> 29<sup>10</sup>).

v. 20. Lit. *He removeth the lip* (= language, power of speech) *to faithful ones or the trusty*; i.e. makes them speechless. For נאמנים *faithful, trustworthy*, see Nu 12<sup>7</sup> Sing. (poet. fragm. contrasting ordinary prophets with Moses); Ne 13<sup>15</sup> Plur. (of storekeepers); נאמני ארץ Ps 101<sup>6</sup> *men of integrity*; עדים נאמנים *trustworthy witnesses*, Is 8<sup>2</sup>. Plur. of men not elsewhere. 'Eloquent and trusted ministers find their powers fail them' (Driver). But does eloquence imply trustiness, or trustiness eloquence? ⑤ indeed χέλη πιστῶν: but perhaps we should read נבונים *the intelligent* for נאמנים. Cf. Pr 10<sup>13</sup> 16<sup>21</sup> 17<sup>28</sup>; and for Iahvah's part, Ex 4<sup>11</sup>. Is 29<sup>14</sup>. Instead of יקה *He taketh away*, st. ii, ⑤ ירע = ירע.

v. 21. St. i is identical with Ps 107<sup>40</sup>. *the girdle: or belt: מע*, which should perhaps be מִיֹּחַ = מִיֹּחַ, Ps 109<sup>19</sup> only. Cf. Assy. *mezah*, syn. of *mesirru*, *strap, thong*. Iahvah *lettleth down or causeth to drop* (רפה, a stronger word than פתח, v. 18: see note on Repha'im, 26<sup>5</sup>) *the belt of mighty ones* (אבירים, 24<sup>22</sup> 34<sup>20</sup>, pro אפיקים; al. תקיפים *the strong*, an Aramaism). ⑥ וחליצותהון רחיקא *And the strength of mighty ones He weakeneth*; ⑦ ותקוף מלכיא מחליש *And the strength of the kings He weakeneth*. But ⑧ ταπεινους δὲ ἵασατο = ואביונים רפא (om. מזיח, rg. אביונים pro אפיקים, and confusing רפה *let drop* with רפא *heal*).

v. 22. The nobles are app. disgraced by exposure. (But vv. 22, 23 may both be add. to the orig. text.) The *deep* things appear to be political intrigues and machinations, which are naturally kept close by their authors until their success is known. Cf. Is 29<sup>15</sup> 30<sup>1</sup>; Ps 64<sup>7</sup>. St. ii. Fort. leg. נעלמות pro צלמות *And bringeth forth secrets (hidden things) to light*. Cf. Mi 7<sup>9</sup>. Or תעלמות: 11<sup>6</sup> 28<sup>11-21</sup>. Pr 26<sup>4</sup> נעלמים *dissemblers*.

v. 23. מִשְׁגִּיאָא *He maketh grow or increaseth, maketh great*: an Aramaism (Qal 8<sup>11</sup> Hiph. *magnify*, 36<sup>24</sup>). So ③ ④; but ⑤<sup>abba</sup> πλανῶν ἔθνη (καὶ ἀπολλύων αὐτά), which ⑥<sup>B</sup> accid. om., and ⑦ מסעא לעממא = מִשְׁגִּיאָא, Aramaism = מִשְׁגִּיָּה *Who misleadeth nations, or causeth them to go astray* (Qal 6<sup>26</sup> 19<sup>4</sup> see on v. 16). So 7 codd. and Aq. Theod. This perhaps harmonizes better with the general tone of the section, which is one of unrelieved gloom: cf. what follows. Iahvah purposely misleads the nations with a view to destroying them. Cf. however, v. 15. ⑧ *He increaseth the nations and (then) destroyeth them* (so RV) would amount to the somewhat milder charge of caprice or fickleness. (Perhaps משיע לנזים *He saveth nations*. For constr. cf. Ju 10<sup>14</sup>.)

St. ii. ⑨ καταστρωννύων ἔθνη καὶ καθοδηγῶν αὐτά = שטח לנזים שטח (pointing ל pro ל, which is preferable in both stt.). ⑩, not understanding שטח, inserts מצודתא *the net: He spreadeth the net for the nations* (אומיא var. עממא, as in st. i), and leadeth or driveth them away

(ודברנו). שטח *He spreadeth out the peoples* (Heb. perhaps ללאמים) and *leaveth them*; pointing וינחם (cf. 1 Sa 22<sup>4</sup> Je 14<sup>9</sup> Ps 119<sup>121</sup>). In all other locc. נחה Hiph. is used of friendly leading or guidance (31<sup>18</sup> Ps 23<sup>3</sup> et saep.). Here, on the analogy of מוליך, v. 19, it might perhaps mean *leadeth them away*, scil. into exile. Otherwise, pointing וינחם, we may render (c ע) and *forsaketh them*, or and *layeth them low* (a classical mg. of καταστρωννύων): cf. Am 5<sup>7</sup>. The vb. שטח is not altogether beyond suspicion. It is nowhere else used of the expansion of nations, but always of *spreading things out* in a lit. sense (on the ground, Nu 11<sup>33</sup> Je 8<sup>2</sup>; on a well-cover, 2 Sa 17<sup>10</sup>; once of spreading out the palms in prayer, Ps 88<sup>10</sup>). Perhaps שחט לאמים וימחם *He slaughtereth peoples and wipe them out* (cf. Nu 14<sup>16</sup> וישחטם = Θ καὶ κατέστρωσεν αὐτούς); or משהח *He felleth, ruineth, &c.* (Pi. or Hiph. Ho 11<sup>9</sup> 2 K 19<sup>12</sup>. c ל Obj. Nu 32<sup>15</sup>. שחת prim. mg. *to fall* = Assy. *šahdū*: cf. Ju 20<sup>21</sup>, and Burney ad loc. מ om. after מ.)

v. 24. There is something wrong with the metrically redundant st. i: *He taketh away the heart* (i. e. either *sense* or *courage*) *of the heads* (chiefs) *of the people of the land*. 'The people of the land', i. e. the common people, 2 K 25<sup>19</sup>, might well be mentioned here after the various classes of their rulers. Deprived of their natural leaders, they wander about in hopeless bewilderment. If we interpret so, we must omit ראשי *heads*. Θ διαλλάσσω καρδίας ἀρχόντων γῆς app. om. עם *people*; but 1 Sa 9<sup>2</sup> העם = τὴν γῆν Is 63<sup>11</sup> [מעם] מים = ἐκ τῆς γῆς, and it is possible that ἀρχόντων γῆς (not τῆς γῆς = הארץ) represents ראשי עם, for which phrase see Nu 25<sup>4</sup> Dt 33<sup>5,21</sup>.

St. ii is identical with Ps 107<sup>40b</sup>. (Θ gives διαλλάσσω, *changing*, for מסיר in v. 20 also; but in 5<sup>12</sup> for מפר. ע משטא *besotteth* or *crazeth*, Ψ immutans, refer the 'changing' to madness: cf. 1 Sa 21<sup>13</sup>.)

v. 25. Lit. *They feel darkness*: cf. Ex 10<sup>21</sup>. Perhaps בחשך *in darkness*: cf. 5<sup>14</sup> בצהרים: Dt 28<sup>29</sup>. Read לא-אור *lightless*, as epithet of חשך, om. !; cf. לא-דרך *pathless*, v. 24.

St. ii is metr. short. For ויחעם (rep. from v. 24) read ויחעו מִדְרָגָה *And they wander from the way*. (Θ πλανηθείσαν = ויחעו Niph.) Cf. Is 19<sup>14</sup> 28<sup>7</sup> Pr 21<sup>16</sup>.

With the rhetorical form of vv. 17–24 cf. Is 44<sup>24–28</sup>, which the passage appears to imitate. How far it is genuine, we do not venture to pronounce.

Chapter 13. After thus demonstrating by salient examples Iahvah's absolute Power in the world of man, Eyob continues his speech without a break.

v. 1. *it all*: lit. *all these things*: כל-אלה (12<sup>9</sup>) pro כל מ. So 12 codd., ע. perceived it: or understood it. Θ om. ע om. לה (for ל see 9<sup>11</sup> 14<sup>21</sup>), which is hardly necessary to the sense.

v. 2. *I fall not below or away from you.* Ὡ nec inferior vestri sum; and I am not less than you (בְּצִיר מִנְּכֹן); וְ לֹא אֲנִי פָּרִישׁ אֲנִי מִנְּכֹן and I am not separated from you. The use of נָפַל to fall seems to be unique in Heb. and must be pronounced doubtful. ὁ ἀσύνετος = נָבָל foolish, Dt 32<sup>21</sup> (cf. fem. 2<sup>10</sup>) may be right: *And I am no more a fool than you.* (The ו of וְלֹא has fallen out after ו, as often.)

v. 3. Lit. *But I* (emph.), *to Shaddai would I speak.* The emph. Pron. אֲנִי overweights the stichus, is not really wanted, and may be an inadvertent rep. from v. 2<sup>a</sup>. Eyob says in effect: 'For all that—for all you have said, which is common knowledge—I am still fain to speak directly to Shaddai, the All-powerful Author of my ruin; to justify myself to Him, not to you.' St. ii. וְהוֹכַח אֶל-אֱלֹהִים אַחֲפַיִן. For the vb. and constr. cf. v. 15 15<sup>3</sup>. The root יָכַח, cogn. c נָכַח, prob. means *be in front or before*; Facilitive, *to put in front or before*, and so *to argue*, and (its consequence) *convince, convict* (of error in thought or conduct), or, in a milder sense, *to chide, reprove, and correct*, which involve setting a sinner's faults before him. Cf. Ar. وَجَّهَ face; وَاجَهَ face or confront a man, face or encounter him with speech or words. (וָהָה cogn. c יָכַח. Cf. perhaps Sum. KA, mouth, face.)

Ὡ bene ut saep. *Sed tamen ad Omnipotentem loquar, et disputare cum Deo cupio.* Ὡ (perhaps objecting to the idea of 'reproving' God) ἐλέγξω δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ἐὰν βούληται = וְאִוָּכַח (וְהוֹכַחְתִּי) לֹא אִם יִחְפֶּן.

v. 4. Om. אֲוִלָּם (scribe's rep. from v. 3), c Ὡ ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε ἰατροὶ ἄδικοι: an interesting trans., as giving a better || to st. ii than the usual interpretation. 'Plasters' (ἐμπλαστρα, Galen) are known to medicine as well as building (cf. Le 14<sup>42,43</sup>); and Ὡ seems to have taken טַפְלֵי שָׁקַר in the sense of pseudo-physicians, applying worthless plasters to Eyob's wounds. טַפַּל to plaster (cf. תָּפַל Ez 13<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>28</sup>) or daub on or over (Ps 119<sup>69</sup>), is, no doubt, the Assyr. *tapālu*, which is used fig. of slander, in Sargon's phrase *amāt tašqirti lāpilti Ullusunū ana Daiakku idbub*, 'A word of slander (שָׁקַר) besmirching (beplastering) Ullusun to Deioces he spoke' (Sarg. Ann. 76); cf. the gloss on תָּפַל, Dt 1<sup>1</sup>, in J I שָׁקַר אֵל מִלִּי שָׁקַר אֵל and ye bedaubed him with words of slander. Our phrase טַפְלֵי שָׁקַר, *quack-plasterers* or *slander-plasterers*, may allude to both meanings. (In 5 R 21 19, 20 Sum. EME-SIG, *destroying tongue*, is explained *garçu*, slander, and coupled with . . AN-GAR taš-gi-ir-tu, i.e. *tašqirtu*, as a syn. With ✓GAR, QAR, cf. perhaps Chinese ka, kia, false, unreal, to pretend, Giles 1160.)

worthless physicians: רַפְּאֵי אֲוִלָּם *healers of naught or no worth.* אֲוִלָּם is perhaps akin to Assyr. *alālu*, to be feeble, *ulālu*, weakling, feeble-minded, 'a poor creature', syn. *enšu* (אֲנִשׁ); or (and?) to אֵל, Assyr. *ul*, not; cf. our 'naught', 'naughty' (= good-for-nothing; Pr 6<sup>12</sup> AV), 'not'. But (1) καὶ ἰατρὰ κακῶν πάντες, i.e. רַפְּאֵי אֲוִלָּם (cf. Ὡ Pr 6<sup>18</sup> 10<sup>30</sup>), or אֲוִלָּתָהּ

foolish physicians (cf. ⑤ Pr 14<sup>26</sup> 15<sup>2,15</sup>), either of which might be right. ⑥ healers בלא מרם without anything are ye (= ③).

v. 5. St. 2: lit. *And that it might become* (or *And let it be for*) 'wisdom' to you. Silence often passes for wisdom. ⑤ καὶ ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν σοφία, *And it would turn out in your case to be wisdom.* Cf. RV.

v. 6. *the reproof of my mouth*: rg. תוכַּחַת פִּי = ⑤ ἄλεγχον τοῦ στόματός μου: ③ תוכַּחַתִּי *my reproof* (or *argument*). Metre and parallelism justify the addition. *contention*: or *pleading* or *remonstrance*. רִיבָה = ⑤ κρίσιν. 9 codd., and ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ also Sing.; ③ Plur. The reproof or remonstrance follows, vv. 7-12.

v. 7. ⑤ *Are ye not speaking before Iahvah?* App. הלא לעיני יהוה חדרבו? *utter*: or *pour out*: חביעו (Ps 94<sup>1</sup>) = ⑤ φθέγγεσθε: ③ rep. חדרבו *will ye speak?*

v. 8. St. i is too short metr. ③ פניו *His face* may represent orig. פני י, i.e. יהוה *the face of Iahvah* (or שרי of Shaddai, as in v. 3). Lit. *The face of I. will ye lift up?* 32<sup>21</sup> 34<sup>19</sup>; i.e. treat him with personal favour or partiality, as an unjust judge might do. Cf. Dt 10<sup>17</sup>. ⑥ πρόσωπον λαμβάνετε; cf. Ma 1<sup>8,9</sup> 2<sup>9</sup> ⑤, and NT προσωποληπτειν, προσωποληπτης, προσωποληψία (not in ⑤), 'respect of persons'. ⑤ ἡ ὑποστολείσθε; *Will ye dissemble* (or *prevaricate*)? cloaking your real thoughts from fear. It seems, however, prob. that πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ has fallen out of the Gk. text, and that we must render *Will ye shrink from His Face?* Cf. Dt 1<sup>7</sup> Wisd 6<sup>7</sup> and Goodrick's excellent note. St. ii in ③ is also too short metr. אתם you, emph., may have fallen out after אם (ואם?). Cf. Ju 6<sup>31</sup> האתם תריבון *Will you plead for the Baal?* So here: *Will you plead for El?* ⑤ ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτοὶ (⑤ αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς) κριταὶ γένεσθε = ואתם תריבון (cf. Is 3<sup>13</sup> 6<sup>3</sup> רב טוב = κριτὴς ἀγαθός!). ⑤<sup>A</sup> adds a gloss καλῶς γε λαλοῦντες ('as you are such fine speakers') = מְטִיבִים דְּבַר. Perhaps we should read ריב תריבון, *will you really plead?*

v. 9. You are exposing yourselves to the peril of a Divine exposure. God sees through you, and knows your real motives. RV may be right: *Is it good that He should search you out?* St. ii. *like a mere mortal*: lit. *like mocking at a (mortal) man*. For the vb. הָחֵל, see Gn 31<sup>7</sup> Ju 16<sup>10</sup> 1 K 18<sup>27</sup> (וַיִּהְיֶה הָחֵל; cf. on 17<sup>2</sup>) Je 9<sup>1</sup>. Like Lat. *illudere* it seems to mean *playing* or *sporting with* a thing, and then *making sport* or *game of*, *mocking* or *jeering at* a pers. or thing (c dat. or *in aliquem* or *aliquo*); cf. also *deludere*, *mock*, *deceive*, *delude* (e.g. *amantem*). ⑤'s curious rend. seems partly due to an illegible text. εἰ γὰρ (⑤<sup>A</sup> καὶ) τὰ πάντα ποιοῦντες προστεθήσεσθε αὐτῷ (⑤<sup>A</sup> ὁδῶ αὐτοῦ), οὐθὲν ἤττον ἐλέγξει ὑμᾶς = הוכח ונו' (Dt 13<sup>5</sup> ⑥) אם הכל עשים חרבקו בו. This makes v. 10<sup>a</sup> the apodosis to 9<sup>b</sup>. Here, as often, ⑤ betrays complete unconsciousness of the metrical arrangement. ⑥ substitutes (ב) אתהרין *go to law with* for החל *to mock*. (The Prim. Root may be recognized in Sum. (GISH) TAL-TAL,



*taltallum*, a part of the palm-tree, *gišimmaru*, viz. the *hanging* spathes or flower-sheaths, Heb. חללים, and in the derivv. חלה, רלה, חלל, דלל, דל, דל, &c. The prim. idea seems to be that of hanging or dangling, swaying or swinging about; whence letting down or lowering, e.g. a bucket into a well, and so throwing down or prostrating, whence *daldu*, *humble*, *worship*, דל *poor*. The Sum. DAL is to *fly*, because flying birds are as it were *suspended* in the air, or because flight is a swinging and swaying motion. So Ar. دَلَّت is used of the amorous play or dalliance of a woman, her swaying movements and gestures, talking and jesting in a pleasing manner; and החל is to play or trifle with, and then to mock, delude, and the like.)

v. 10. *punish*: or *reprove* or *convict* (הוכיח; v. 3). Cf. 42<sup>7,8</sup>.

*partial*: so ὁ πρόσωπα θαυμάσεσθε. But 𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤔𐤗𐤁 *accept His face*; פניו *pro* פנים *to*. See note on v. 8. Burney thinks the couplet weak and unoriginal.

v. 11. *His Terror*: אימתו (v. 21) or יראתו *His fear*. So רחלחה, and perhaps ὁ δεινά [ΔΕΙΝΑ], scrib. error for δέιμα [ΔΕΙΜΑ]? αὐτοῦ. But 𐤕𐤕𐤕 *when He is raised on the throne of judgement, will not His terror* (רתיחה) *dismay you, And His terror* &c. seems to be conflate. 𐤕𐤕𐤕 *Statim ut se commoverit* = שאתו *His uplifting or uprising*. Cf. 31<sup>23</sup>; 41<sup>17</sup>. If 𐤕𐤕𐤕 is right, it may mean either *His uprising* or *His loftiness, majesty*. The proposed שאתו (30<sup>3,14</sup> Pr 3<sup>25</sup>), *His devastation*, does not seem likely, though involving only a change of points. (Δεινός is very rare in ὁ. In 2 Sa 1<sup>9</sup> the ἄπ' השבין, qs 'the horrors', is rend. σκύτος δεινόν, 𐤕𐤕𐤕 *רתיחא*, ut hic. 𐤕𐤕𐤕 *twisting, writhing, terror*, like חיל Ex 15<sup>14</sup> joined with אחו Is 13<sup>8</sup> al. So פלצות 21<sup>6</sup>.)

v. 12. *your saws*: or *aphorisms*: str. perhaps *memorized sayings, reminders*: זכרניכם. So here only. 𐤕𐤕 *Memoria vestra*, as if Sing. So 𐤕𐤕. ὁ τὸ ἀγαυίαμα ὑμῶν, *your insolence* (Ba 4<sup>34</sup>) = זדונכם. 𐤕𐤕 confounds משה *proverbs* with משה *likeness* (41<sup>23</sup>): 𐤕𐤕 (v. 𐤕𐤕𐤕) 𐤕𐤕𐤕: 𐤕𐤕 with משה *ruler*.

St. ii. 𐤕𐤕 *For bosses of clay are your bosses*; or *Your bosses become* (or *prove*) *bosses of clay*. But ὁ τὸ δὲ σῶμα πῆλινον, *while your body is of clay*, or *And your body will prove to be* (ἀποβήσεται) *clay* = 'זכרניכם' (Aram.). The word 𐤕𐤕 *back* appears to be used for the *boss* of a shield in 15<sup>26</sup>. The Heb. text, however, is not above suspicion. 'Bosses' is not a good parallel to the doubtful 'memories'; 𐤕𐤕 is strange; and משה *maxims* or *similitudes* is not elsewhere found with a qualifying Genitive, except to denote the author of the sayings. 𐤕𐤕 *Remember that your sultan is of dust, And beside the clay is your dwelling-place*. Cf. 4<sup>19</sup> 10<sup>9</sup>. It is quite probable that the verse began with זכרניכם *Pray you remember* . . . It may have continued with 𐤕𐤕 *that ye dwell in dust* (or שכיני עפר *ye dwellers in the dust!*), ובתי חמר

בתיכם *And your houses are houses of clay!* (or כי בתי *That your houses, &c.*), or something similar, as an ironical reference to 4<sup>19</sup>. (ⓈⓈ suggest rather זכרונם כִּי־מִשְׁלָכֶם אפר *Remember that your likeness is ashes: cf. 30<sup>19</sup> 41<sup>25</sup>; ועל־גב חמר* *And hard by the clay, &c.*). Such a reference to human frailty makes a better connexion with the sense of the last verse.

v. 13. *Be silent that I too may speak: or and I too will speak.* Emph. Pron. Ⓢ bene אף אנא אפ. Ⓜ החרישו ממני Be silent *from me*: i.e. leave off talking to me: so Je 38<sup>27</sup>, where, as here, Ⓢ om. ממני. Cf. also 1 Sa 7<sup>6</sup>. Here it seems to overload the stichus, while st. ii is perhaps too short.

St. ii. Lit. *And let aught pass over me!* Cf. 2 Sa 18<sup>22, 29</sup> Ps 42<sup>8</sup>. I.e. Let what will befall me! scil. in the way of Divine Wrath. But מה *What?* (34<sup>3, 33</sup>), *How?* is not so used elsewhere in the book; and Ⓢ has καὶ ἀναπαύσωμαι θυμοῦ, *and that I may desist or rest from anger* = מחמה ואכליגה חמה: see 2<sup>26</sup> 10<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>1</sup> 19<sup>29</sup>. Perhaps: ותעבר עלי חמה *And let Wrath pass over (Ps 42<sup>8</sup> al.) me!* or ויעבר עלי חמה *And let Him cause Wrath to pass over me!* Let Him deluge (or overwhelm) me with His Wrath! Burney suggests מאומה *anything* pro מה.

v. 14. Ⓜ prefixes על־מה *Upon what or Wherefore?* which is, however, only a scribe's erroneous rep. of מה (על־י) from the end of the last verse, spoiling the metre (4 stresses for 3). Eyob says that he will run all risks in affirming his own innocence to the face of the Divine Judge. *I will take up (or carry) my flesh (my body or myself) in my teeth*; as a wild beast (or even a cat) at bay will snatch up its young and, so hampered, face its enemy. See on 19<sup>20</sup>. This vivid metaphor occurs here only. That of st. ii recurs Ju 12<sup>3</sup> 1 Sa 19<sup>5</sup> c כף Sing. ut hic. Ⓢ<sup>B</sup> ἐν χειρὶ Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> ἐν χερσίν. Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> ἐν χερσίν μου: so a few codd., ⓈⓈⓈ. Cf. 16<sup>17</sup>.

v. 15. *If (or Though: הֲ 40<sup>23</sup> Is 54<sup>15</sup>) He slay me in His Wrath at my daring, I will not wait (14<sup>14</sup>, cf. 6<sup>11</sup> Mi 5<sup>6</sup>) any longer; but will at once proceed to prove (אוכיח st. ii: see on v. 3) 'my ways'—my manner of life—to His face or before Him.* The Ketib לֹא *not* is prob. right here. Qerī לֹא *for Him I (will) wait.* Ⓢ εἰάν με χειρώσεται (38 only) ὁ δυνάστης, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἤρκαται, ἥ μὴν λαλήσω καὶ ἐλέγξω ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ = הֲנִי יִטְלֵנִי הֲנִי יִטְלֵנִי | אֶל בִּי הַחֵל | אֶל בִּי הַחֵל *If El slay me (for He hath begun) | Yet will I speak to His face and argue* scil. my case. Here אֶל evidently springs from לֹא; so that Ⓢ must not be adduced as supporting the Qerī.

Ⓢ *If He kill me, for Himself alone am I waiting or looking (לֹא הִי) (מסכת־אנא); Because my ways are before Him. Ⓢ Behold, if He kill me, before Him (לֹא) will I pray; But my ways before Him will I argue (= Ⓜ).* Ⓢ Etiamsi occiderit me, in ipso sperabo: verumtamen vias meas in conspectu eius arguam. For the confusion between לֹא and לֵא see on 12<sup>16</sup>. The rendering *Lo, He will slay me; I have no hope* is also

possible, so far as the mere words are concerned; but, apart from the unusual division of the stichus into two independent sentences, it does not agree so well with the context.

Eyob is not insisting here on his expectation of speedy death, but on his determination to speak out, even if it provoke Iahvah to kill him for his presumption (as his friends, no doubt, assumed and as he himself feared would be the consequence).

[The rare קטל *to kill* (Jb 13<sup>15</sup> 24<sup>14</sup> Ps 139<sup>19</sup> קטל n. Ob 1<sup>o</sup> all), which in Ar., Old Aram., Eth., and Sab. has ח Rad. Med., is cogn. c קטן *small*, str. *cut short*, cf. Assy. *qatnu*, *short*, e.g. *sūqu qatnu*, *a short street*, *qattan*, *cut short*, of hair; קטב *cut off*; קיץ, קצב, קצה, קצין, קצר, &c. נזר, נזל, נז, נוח, &c., all denoting various kinds of cutting. Cf. Sum. GAZ, *kill*, ĠAŠ, *cut off*, *kill*, *smash*; KUD, *cut*, *cut off*.] The יחל (Heb. only), used mostly in Pi. (some twenty-five times) and about twelve times in Hiph. (Niph. app. twice; Gn 8<sup>12</sup> leg. וַיִּחַל or וַיִּחַל; cf. 1 Sa 13<sup>8</sup>; Ez 19<sup>5</sup> corrupt), always means *to wait*, *continue expectant*, and is usu. joined with ל indicating the Pers. or Thing waited for (about twenty times; יחל thrice). In eight or nine instances it is used Abs. The Temporal implication comes out clearly in 6<sup>11</sup> 14<sup>14</sup> 29<sup>23</sup> 30<sup>26</sup> 32<sup>11.16</sup> Mi 5<sup>6</sup> Gn 8<sup>12</sup> 1 Sa 10<sup>8</sup> 13<sup>8</sup>. It may be cogn. c חל, חיל *to be strong*, *firm*, and so (20<sup>21</sup>) *enduring*, *lasting*, *abiding*. Cf. perhaps Sum. GAL, *ašābu*, *kānu*, *bašā*. Possibly, after all, since Eyob really longed for death (3<sup>21</sup> 6<sup>8.9</sup> 7<sup>15</sup>), the verse should be rendered: *Behold, He will slay me and for Him* (וְלִי; 1 exc. post 1) *I wait* (expecting His blow); *Only my ways to His face I will argue* (or *before Him I will lay*).

7. 16. Also He (emph.; cf. 7<sup>11</sup> 12<sup>3</sup> 16<sup>1</sup>) *must be my salvation* (or *will become my salvation* or *deliverance*; lit. *to me will be for s.*, as Ex 15<sup>2</sup>). Here and elsewhere Eyob expresses confidence that Iahvah, who knows the truth and is well aware of his innocence, will one day vindicate him (16<sup>19</sup> 19<sup>25</sup>). If only He would grant him an audience, and listen to his pleas, He could not deny the justice of his arguments, but must needs pronounce him guiltless (23<sup>6-9</sup>). Θ καὶ τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν which would require יהיא at least (rather וְהָיָה). B recte Et ipse erit salvator meus; C ואף הו נהוא לי פרוקא And also He himself will become to me a saviour; D לחוד הוא לי לפורקנא But He will be to me for salvation (= D).

For an apostate (or dissembler; חנף: see on 8<sup>13</sup>) *would not come before Him*. Lit. *For not before Him will* (or *can* or *doth*) *an apostate come*. The reference may be general (cf. Ps 5<sup>6</sup>), or particular: *For it would not be an apostate that came before Him*; i.e. I am no חנף, but a man sincerely pious and upright, and therefore He is bound to save me. For חנף Θ gives δόλος (= רמיה, v. 7; מרמה, 15<sup>36</sup>, where 'ΑΘ ὑποκριτής, as also 20<sup>5</sup> and so Θ 34<sup>30</sup> 36<sup>13</sup>). C סבל is an error for סבל = D. B omnis

hypocrita. דִּילטור = delator: so 15<sup>34</sup> al. Perhaps we should read חנף-אני or חנף-אנכי; thus gaining the more direct and less ambiguous sense: *For not before Him (emph.) am I a renegade(?)*. [אני may be a disguise of אנכי written backwards!] This would be quite in the manner of Eyob's frequent assertions of his own integrity (9<sup>21</sup>, cf. 11<sup>4</sup>).

v. 17. St. ii is short, and אהותי *my declaration* (Aram. Aph. Infin. of חָי to tell, declare) is almost certainly corrupt. Θ ἀναγγελῶ γάρ = אֲנִי אֶגְדֶּה. The missing word after this may be either יָדָעְתִּי (Ps 19<sup>9</sup>) or דָּעִי *my knowledge* (32<sup>10,17</sup>) or the Pers. Obj. אתכם *you* (emph. 32<sup>6</sup>; cf. 15<sup>17</sup> 36<sup>2</sup>). These are the only occurrences of this Aram. rt. חיה in Heb. Cf. Dn 2<sup>11</sup>. וְתוֹחֹתִי אֶמַּר קִרְמִיכִן And my declaration *I will speak before you*. The translators felt that all was not right with the text. (The verse looks like an insertion of the Elihu-editor.)

v. 18. *my case* or *cause*, to be presented for judgement. מִשְׁפָּטִי c Suff. pro מִשְׁפָּט מִי. So 1 cod., ΘΣ. Cf. 23<sup>4</sup> 1 K 3<sup>11</sup>. Eyob's arrangement of his case, or marshalling of his main points, is briefly stated in vv. 23 ff. For עֲרַכְתִּי struxi, e.g. verba, copias, etc., Θ seems to have read קִרְבְּתִי ἐγγύς ἐμι (τοῦ κρίματός μου). Cf. 17<sup>12</sup>.

v. 19. Is any one ready to meet and confute my statements? for if that be so (כִּי עַתָּה *For now* = for then, for in that case), I will say no more, but resign myself to death.

v. 20. Lit. *Only, two things do not Thou unto me!* This is in strictly logical connexion with v. 21<sup>b</sup> (*And Thy Terror, let it not scare me!*), but not with 21<sup>a</sup> (*Thy palm from off me remove!*), at least according to our idiom. But the sense is clear enough: Let not Thy heavy Hand remain upon me! For the mode of expression, cf. Pr 30<sup>7,8</sup>. *Then from Thy Face I will not hide*; I will not shrink from facing Thee, as a guilty man might: Gn 3<sup>8-10</sup>. With vv. 21, 22, cf. 9<sup>34,35</sup>.

v. 22, st. ii. Θ *Or Thou shalt speak, but I to Thee will give an answer*. Prob. not a different reading; but substituted on the ground of reverence. Insert אֶתָּה *Thou*, emph. before הַשִּׁיבֵנִי metr. grat. Cf. also the parallel st. i.

v. 23. Lit. *How many have I errors (v. 26) and failures*; i.e. in conduct and behaviour. Θ reverses the order: αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἀνομίαι μου. Usually, though by no means uniformly, עון = ἀνομία and חטאת = ἁμαρτία (e.g. 10<sup>6-14</sup> 14<sup>16</sup>). Cf. 1 Jn 3<sup>4</sup> ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. Etymologically, עון is an *erring* or *straying from the right way* (עוה = Ar. عَوَى *he erred*; *deviated from the right way or course, or from that which was right*; *was disappointed, failed of attaining his desire*; Lane). Cf. perhaps Sum. NAM, annu, arnu, 'sin' or 'misdeed' (ngam = GAM, GAV, bend). חטאת a *missing of one's aim or mark, goal or way*, fr. חטא *to miss the mark* (Ju 20<sup>16</sup> Hi. ? Qal ? Pr 19<sup>2</sup>), *to miss the path of right, to fail in duty, to sin* against God or man, is well represented by the Greek word ἁμαρτία,

the idea of *miss, mistake, error, failure, loss* (cf. Gn 31<sup>39</sup>), being predominant. Cf. Assy. *hiṣṣu*, pl. *hiṣṣāti*, a *sin*, against a god or a king. It will be seen that, in their original sense, חטא, עון, and שגגה or משגה are not far apart; all three denoting error or mistake rather than guilt or wickedness.

The two plur. here are obviously supplementary to each other; although we might well om. וחטאות as overloading the st., and since חטאות follows in st. ii. The rg. עון ופשע suggested for st. i is bad Heb. (We could hardly say כמה לי עון ופשע: cf. Gn 47<sup>8</sup> 1 K 22<sup>16</sup>); and to omit פשעי in st. ii would make the line metr. defective. In the first member Eyob asks what is the total number of his sins; in the second, he demands to know what special or particular sin is laid to his charge.

v. 24. St. i; cf. 34<sup>29</sup> Ps 10<sup>11</sup> al.

St. ii. *foe*: אֹיִב: an apparent play or pun on his own name אִיּוֹב: see note on 1<sup>1</sup>. Cf. 1 Sa 25<sup>25</sup>. The same thought recurs 19<sup>11</sup>.

v. 25. *scare*: or *dread*; Trans., as 31<sup>34</sup> c accus. Heb. תערין *to awe or overawe*, Is 2<sup>13.21</sup>. Cf. adj. פָּרִיץ 6<sup>22</sup> 15<sup>20</sup>. If the root be that which we see in רָצַח רָצִין *break, crush* we may compare the transition of ideas in חתח *shattered, broken, dismayed*. Possibly, however, פָּרִץ is akin to Aram. פָּרַץ *flee, flee away* (a natural effect of fear). Then עָרִיץ will be a man who puts others to flight or from whom they flee; one who *scares* them away. *driven*: נָרַף: scil. by the wind: Ps 1<sup>4</sup> Is 19<sup>7</sup> Le 26<sup>36</sup> Is 41<sup>2</sup>.—St. ii. *Or*: rg. וָאֵם, for which וַע presents the scribal error וָאֵת. a *stalk*: קֶשׁ Coll *stubble*, or the like: Ex 5<sup>12</sup> Is 40<sup>24</sup>. Cf. Syr. קֶשָׁא *stubble, dry stalks, grass or leaves*. [The קֶשׁ = בֵּשׂ = *dry*; cf. קוֹם = *high*. The transition from *dry* to *hard, firm, strong*, is easy: cf. קָשָׁה *hard, fierce*; קָשָׁה *endured it; struggled against troubles or difficulties*; Assy. *kaššu, strong, kašūtu, mighty one, kiššūtu, power, might, &c.*, with which Aram. קִישִׁי *old, elder, orig. full-grown, grown up* (Syr.) > *dried up*, may be connected (cf. our 'old', *altus*, i.e. *grown up*). Cf. perhaps also Syr. קֶתָּמָא *firm, fixed*, Pa. *cause to wither* (Lexx); and עָזָא (Syr.) *endure*, עָזָא *powerful, forceful, strong, fierce*, Assy. *ezézu, ezzu*. קֶשֶׁת = *bow*, however, may be str. a *strung bow*: cf. Sum. KESH, *to bind*; unless קֶשֶׁת = קֶשֶׁת from GAM, *to bend, to bow*, in which case קֶשֶׁת = *thing for bending*; c Sum. Postpos. SHU, *for*.]

v. 26. Lit. *For (or That) Thou writest upon me bitter things*. Possibly an allusion to the visible marks and scars of his disease, graven upon him by 'the Finger of God', and read by his friends as Divine testimony to his guilt. ☉ *That Thou didst write down (or record) against me evils*; perhaps meaning didst register the 'sins of my youth', st. ii. If כתב *to write* means *to decree* in this passage, כתבת *Thou hast decreed* would seem more suitable than הכתב: cf. the Ptcp. pass. Ps 40<sup>8</sup>. But כתב על is usu. *to write upon a tablet or the like*. The word מְרִירָה, 20<sup>14</sup>, denotes

*venom, poison* (of serpents), and in 26<sup>25</sup> a man's *gall* or gall-bladder (cf. מִרְרָה 16<sup>13</sup>). The plur. מִרְרֹת recurs Dt 32<sup>32</sup> (unless we should point מִרְרֹת : cf. the parallel רוש ענבי, where *clusters of poisons* = poisonous clusters. Comparing Is 44<sup>5</sup>, it is conceivable that we should render: *For Thou writest on me 'Poison'* (Plur. intens.) or (rg. מִרְרֹת, cf. 24<sup>13</sup> 1 Sa 20<sup>30</sup>) 'Rebellion' (so ㊄). Or should we point תִּכְתֵּב and render: *Thou makest harsh decrees for me* (Is 10<sup>1</sup>)?

St. ii. Lit. *And makest me possess the errors (or faults) of my youth.* ㊄ *And rememberest against me, &c.* Cf. Ps 25<sup>7</sup>. ㊄ *And wiltest to consume me with, &c.* ㊄ וְחֹרֵישֵׁנִי does not seem quite satisfactory; but the meaning may perhaps be: Thou treatest the forgotten faults of a time long past as though they still belonged to me, characterized my present conduct. ㊄ περιέθηκας δέ μοι νεότητος ἀμαρτίας. Cf. 39<sup>20</sup> περιέθηκας αὐτῷ pro וְחֹרֵישֵׁנִי (!). Perhaps we should read וְחֹרֵיעֵנִי *And makest me know the sins of my youth*; recognize them as sins now, if I failed to do so then; or וְחֹזֵכֵנִי *and rememberest against me* (㊄). In any case, it is evident that Eyob does not claim absolute sinlessness; but only that his conduct, since he had arrived at years of discretion, had not been such as to merit the calamities which had befallen him.

v. 27. *the stocks*: סָרָא = Syr. סָרָא (so ㊄). Prob. a sort of heavy wooden clog which the prisoner might drag about a little; not like our old English stocks, which confined the offender to a sitting posture. Akin to Assy. šadādu, *to drag or draw*? or Ar. سَد close up, block, obstruct? This line and the next are quoted for comment, 33<sup>11</sup>. ㊄ κώλυμα, *impediment*, ㊄ ἔσλοπέδη, ㊄ ποδοκάκη; but in 33<sup>11</sup> the classical ἔσλον. ㊄ in nervo, recte. ㊄ בְּשֵׁיעַ in cement (as if the Heb. word were שִׁיד = סִיד lime!).

St. ii. Leg. על on pro ㊄ כל all (also at 33<sup>11</sup>): cf. 14<sup>16</sup>. But the Verss. are against this. As the verse is a triplet, and as watching his 'ways' would be needless if his feet were in the 'stocks', this st. may be omitted (interpolated from 33<sup>11</sup>).

St. iii (2). ㊄ על־יִשְׂרָשִׁי רַגְלִי תַחְתָּקָה On the roots of my feet Thou gravest Thyself. Besides the solitary instance of Hithpa. here, only the Pu. Ptcp. מַחְתָּקָה occurs (1 K 6<sup>35</sup> Ez 8<sup>10</sup> 23<sup>14</sup>), in the sense of *carved, graven, carved work*. If the strange phrase 'roots of my feet' might, as is usually supposed, mean 'soles' (lit. bottoms? cf. 28<sup>9</sup>; 36<sup>30</sup> is corrupt), and if, as is prob., תַּחְתָּקָה is a scribal error for תַּחְתָּקָה Thou gravest (Pi. here only); On the soles (כַּפּוֹת elsewhere) of my feet Thou gravest might be a metaph. allusion to the galls and even wounds conceivably caused by wearing the Sad. (For the constr., see Ez 11. cc. מַחְתָּקָה עַל־הַקִּיר *carven on the wall*). But since the חָק suggests also drawing, marking out, or setting bounds or limits (חָק Pr 8<sup>27.29</sup>; חָק 26<sup>10</sup> 38<sup>10</sup>), our stichus has been rendered: 'Thou gravest Thee a graving (= markest a line) for (i.e. about) the soles

of my feet, fixest limits for them' (OL). Apart, however, from other objections, the meaning assumed for שרש is very questionable; and the repetition of רנלי from st. i may also be a mere dittography. We should expect something like חק ועל-אשורי חשת חק *And upon my steps Thou settest a bound* (cf. 23<sup>11</sup> 31<sup>7</sup> 38<sup>10</sup>). ו Et vestigia (= אשורי 23<sup>11</sup>) pedum meorum considerasti = חחח ועל-אשורי רנלי חחח *And on the strength* (app. rg. שרירי for שרש: cf. 40<sup>16</sup> and Syr. שריר firmus, solidus, durus) of my feet Thou lookest (cf. ו considerasti). חחח might represent חחח (18<sup>9</sup>): *On the steps of my feet Thou keepest hold*: as the Sad would do. ז על סמיני רנלי חחח *On the traces* (= vestigia; עקבות?) of my feet Thou makest marks or gravest. Neither ו nor ז nor ו appears to have read (or been satisfied with) שרשי. ט, however, has it: εἰς δὲ ῥίζας τῶν ποδῶν μου ἀφίκου = שרשי רנלי חחח (or 'ועד-שר' And (even) unto the roots of my feet Thou reachest (cf. 4<sup>5</sup> 15<sup>8</sup> Gn 28<sup>12</sup>). Perhaps ט read חחח Thou searchest (v. 9) instead of the dubious חחח. Possibly the orig. stichus ran וְכָל-שְׁרִירֵי רִנְלִי חֲנִיחַק *And all the sinews of my feet Thou snappest* (cf. ו and 40<sup>16</sup>); i.e. with the weight and strain of the Sad or cangue. But, something may also be said for וְעָלִי שְׁרִירֹתַי חֲחֹק *And upon me Thou makest firm Thy fetters* (cf. Ju 3<sup>12</sup> Is 22<sup>21</sup>): for although שְׁרִירֹתַי happens to occur elsewhere in OT only in the sense of decorative chains (Ex 28<sup>14</sup> 1 K 7<sup>17</sup> al.), the Assyr. šaršarratu, which exactly corresponds to it, is used of a penal chain or fetter (Sum. SAR-SAR, c Det. Pr. URUDU, Copper; i.e. made of copper: cf. Ju 16<sup>21</sup> La 3<sup>7</sup>).

v. 28. RV: *Though I am like a rotten thing that consumeth, Like a garment that is moth-eaten* connects the verse with what precedes (cf. ו), but is not justified by the Heb. which, as the marg. states, lit. runs: *And he (emph.) is like, &c.* We may well ask, Who? The only obvious way out of the difficulty is to suppose that הוּא (הָאָדָם or הַנֶּפֶשׁ) refers to Eyob's feet, as affected by his disease and gradually wasting away (cf. 1 K 15<sup>23</sup>): *And they are like, &c.* (So ἡ οἱ παλαιῶνται ἵσα ἀσκαῶ, Which grow old like a wine-skin.) Further, חחח like rottenness or decay (of bones, Pr 12<sup>4</sup> 14<sup>30</sup> Ha 3<sup>16</sup>; cf. חחח to rot, of wood, Is 40<sup>20</sup>; met. Pr 10<sup>7</sup>; חחח rottenness, of wood, Jb 41<sup>19</sup>) is somewhat dubious, on account of the Pred. חחח which weareth out (Is 51<sup>8</sup>): cf. Ho 5<sup>12</sup>, the only ref. for חחח: *And I will be like the moth to Ephraim, And like the rot to Judah*, i.e. the rot caused by the moth: where, indeed, some syn. of moth, e.g. חחח (Is 51<sup>8</sup>) would yield a closer parallel. Here, possibly, we have an Aramaism, and חחח = Syr. חחח a skin or leathern bottle (so חחח uterculus marcidus, and חחח ἵσα ἀσκαῶ).

Otherwise, we might suggest חחח (= חחח, Ju 5<sup>20</sup>) a brodered or figured cloth or robe. *And they, they are like a brocade that frayeth* is a good parallel to *Like a garment the moth hath fretted*. The verse may have been transposed from an original position after 14<sup>2</sup>, as some

suppose; but this assumption is hardly necessary, if we make the slight change indicated above and virtually supported by 𐤒𐤕.

Chapter 14. After a pause, Eyob resumes his remonstrance with God, basing his appeal on the brief and troubled course of man's life and the hopeless finality of death (vv. 1-12).

v. 1. Lit. *short of days*: only here. Cf. קצר אפים *short of temper*, Pr 14<sup>7</sup>. *trouble*: or *unrest, disquiet*: רָנָו: cf. 3<sup>17,20</sup> 37<sup>2</sup> 39<sup>24</sup>. The root is cogn. with רנש, רעש *shake, tremble* and prob. also ראש, from which comes ראש *head*, the *shaker*, as קרקר, *qaqqudu*, is the *bower* or *nodder*.

v. 2. *he cometh forth*: not elsewhere Abs. Cf. Dt 14<sup>22</sup> הוצא השדה *what cometh forth of the field*; Ju 13<sup>11</sup>; ch. 28<sup>3</sup>. יצמח *he shoots, sprouts, or springs up* (usu. of plants and trees) has been proposed; but יציין *he flowers or blossoms* (Ps 90<sup>6</sup> 103<sup>16</sup> כנ יציין השדה) seems better. Cf. 𐤒 𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓 𐤀𐤋𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓, *as a flower after flowering*. But 𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓 read 𐤔𐤏𐤓. *and fadeth*: pointing 𐤕𐤓𐤔. For the vb. cf. 18<sup>16</sup> and Ps 37<sup>2</sup>: *For like grass they quickly fade* (𐤕𐤓𐤔); *And like green herbage they fall away or wither and fall* (𐤕𐤓𐤔𐤏). Cf. also Ps 90<sup>6</sup> מולל Pol. [The Prim. root of this מלל is prob. the same as that of אמלל, *droop, languish, become weak and powerless*. And since MAL = BAL, PAL, נפל, *may also be regarded as cogn.* Cf. Sum. MAL in KA-ŠU-MAL = KA-ŠU-GAL, *labānu appi*, 'to throw down the face', i.e. prostrate oneself, face downwards in prayer; KI-AN-BAL (place + high + low), *šapiltum u elitum*, 'upper and lower side'; IM-BAL, a *wind that downs things*, a hurricane (*nabbaltu*); *nabālu*, also written *napālu*, to 'down', *throw down, destroy*, cities; *nabultum*, a *prostrate body*, a *corpse*, Heb. נבלה; perhaps *nabālu*, *land*, as opp. to *tāmtu*, the sea, str. the *low*, the *bottom, ground, fundus* > the *dry*, which would connect it with *nablu* = Sum. BIL, BAL, *fire*, a different word. The Assy. *labānu*, to 'down', may be a phonetic variation of *nabālu*, *throw down*. (So מלל *to say, speak*, is akin to Sum. BAL, *to speak, say, tamū, dabābu*.)] 𐤒 𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓; cf. Is 40<sup>7,8</sup> ציין נבל = τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέτεσεν, Is 28<sup>1</sup> נבל ציין = τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐκτεσόν: but Ps 37<sup>2</sup> shows that we need not substitute יבול for its syn. ימל here. 𐤒 𐤕𐤓𐤔 and 𐤕𐤓𐤔𐤏 *and withers and dries up*.

St. ii. *fleeth like a shadow*. So 𐤒 𐤕𐤓𐤔𐤏 (runneth away) 𐤔𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓. usu. compared with Ct 2<sup>17</sup> ונסו הצללים, where, however, 𐤒 𐤕𐤓𐤔𐤏 (and the shadows) *stretch out or lengthen*—as they do towards evening, when the sun sinks lower and lower in the heavens. Since the shadows only lengthen slowly, *fugit* does not seem very appropriate as a description of their motion. (It is prob. akin to Aram. פרח *to fly*; Syr. פרחתא *bird, insect*). But the ref. may be to the quick play of the shadows thrown by moving objects (e.g. clouds and foliage on a windy day), which appear and vanish from moment to moment. Cf. 8<sup>9</sup> Ps 102<sup>12</sup> 109<sup>23</sup> and esp. 144<sup>1</sup>



כצל עובר like a passing shadow. (An ופרח בעץ ולא י' And sprouteth like a tree, and endureth not? פרח || ציץ, Is 27<sup>6</sup> al.)

v. 3. Leg. אם Interrog. pro אף (cf. v. 5, which should precede this vs.). Lit. Upon this (being) hast Thou opened Thine eye? scil. to watch and judge him. Cf. ו taken account of him; 7<sup>17</sup> Ps 8<sup>5</sup>.

St. ii. Lit. And him dost (or wilt) Thou bring into Judgement? Reading ואתו c ופס pro ואתי And me, and om. עמך with Thee ad fin., as overloading the stichus, and as opposed to the speaker's meaning, which is not the sentiment of Ps 143<sup>2</sup>. Eyob earnestly desired to come before God, and argue out his case with Him, face to face (13<sup>3-22</sup>). He considers that he has been judged and punished without trial, by One against whose Power there is no appeal. Otherwise we might read ואתו תבוא And with him wilt Thou enter . . . ?

v. 4. The verse is incomplete, and otherwise dubious. One cod. om. The phrase מי יתן is a common formula of wishing, v. 13, 6<sup>8</sup> 11<sup>5</sup> 19<sup>23</sup> al.; and st. i ought to mean: Oh that a pure might come out of an unclean one! lit. Who will give (yield or make) a pure one out of an unclean (or defiled, tainted) one? Cf. Nu 11<sup>29</sup>. The Adj. are both masc. (RV marg. Oh that a clean thing could come out of an unclean! not one is incoherent and incorrect.) ו Quis potest facere mundum de immundo conceptum semine (an exeget. gloss)? nonne tu qui solus es? So י: Who will give a pure one out of a man who is defiled with sins, if not God who is One, Who forgiveth him? ו For who shall be pure from uncleanness (ῥῦπος, filth, 9<sup>31</sup> 11<sup>10</sup>)? why, none, If his life on the earth (be) even one day; connecting with v. 5. This = יטור מטמאה לא אחד לא אחד יום בארץ ימי The words לא אחד would seem to have been written twice in ו's MS.; and the translator pointed the second לא as לא if. Further, חרצים was misread בארץ, and ימים is often βίος, life in ו (v. 6, 7<sup>6-10</sup> 8<sup>9</sup> al.). The verse, which is prob. an interpolated comment on v. 3, may be restored somewhat as follows: ויטהר מטמאתו מי יטהר מי ויטהר מטמאתו Who can become pure from his uncleanness? cf. ו (app. a reminiscence of Ez 24<sup>13</sup> 36<sup>23</sup> where the same phrase occurs); אחד לא אדם מבני אדם Of the sons of man not one. Cf. Ps 14<sup>2-3</sup> 53<sup>1</sup> Ex 9<sup>6-7</sup>. (For st. ii, ו Nonne tu qui solus es? suggests אחד אתה הלא: cf. אחד in Is 51<sup>2b</sup>.)

v. 5. Also: or I'ea: אף pro ו אם, which belongs to v. 3. determined: or decided. Verbs of cutting or cutting off, like חרין (cf. Le 22<sup>22</sup>), נר Aram. (cf. 22<sup>26</sup>), are met. used in the sense of deciding, decreeing, &c. his days, i.e. the term of his life. with Thee, i.e. in Thy mind. (The Conj. ו must be restored before מספר the number. It was om., as often, after the ו preceding it.) The exact length of a man's life is predetermined by His Maker. (ὁ παρ' αὐτοῦ = איתו with Him.)

St. iii. His boundary or limit (Ketib חקו recte) Thou hast set (שפת pro עשית Thou hast made. See v. 13, 26<sup>10</sup> 38<sup>10</sup>. So θου and θ consti-

tuisti, but cf. 28<sup>26</sup>), and *he passeth not*. Ⓢ εἰς χρόνον ἔθου. So χρόνος = חק, v. 13. Ⓢ נמוסא *a law*. The stichus adds nothing to the sense of the previous distich, and violates the metrical scheme. It is prob. an addition.

v. 6. *And let him alone*: חרל-קוניהו (מפני) *cease from him*, pro ויחרל *and let him cease*, which would give a diff. mg. (e.g. v. 7). So one cod. Cf. 7<sup>16</sup>. Ⓢ and let his plague cease. Ⓢ ונפיש *and let him stay or cease* (= ו). Ⓢ ἵνα ἡσυχάσῃ = Ⓢ ut quiescat = ו. But חרל does not mean *to rest* (שבת, 3<sup>17.26</sup>). *Take Thine eye off him*: or *Look away from him*, 7<sup>19</sup>. *Until he make good* (pointing ירצה Hiph. pro ו Qal), *like a hireling, his day* (of toil, i.e. his allotted term of life). Cf. 7<sup>1</sup>, acc. to which man's life is a time of hard service, like that of a hired labourer who has to work from morning to night under the eye of a jealous master, and longs for the evening hour which will end his toil. For the meaning of ירצה, cf. Le 26<sup>34.41.43</sup> and Is 40<sup>2</sup> (where נרצה עונו *her guilt is made good* or satisfactory to the Deity, scil. by the expiation of suffering, is parallel to מלא צמא *her hard service is completed*). Ⓢ עד ירצה יומו cannot mean lit. *Till he shall accomplish his day* (RV), Ⓢ יכלה, 21<sup>13</sup> 36<sup>11</sup>. It could only signify *Till he be pleased or satisfied with his day*. Hence Driver: '*Till he can enjoy, as a hireling, his (finished) day* (cf. 7<sup>2</sup>), i.e., here, the evening of his life.' This ingenious interpretation reads too much into the text. There is no suggestion about enjoying the evening of life, either here, or in 7<sup>2</sup>. The general sense is simply, Let him alone until his brief day is done. In the case of a hireling's task it is the master, not the man, who has to be pleased or satisfied with the work. We might point ירצה (cf. Is 40<sup>2</sup>), which would yield the sense: *Till his day, like that of a hireling, be accepted, or made good, or satisfactorily accomplished*. Ⓢ Until he run (נרהט), *like a hireling, his days*, i.e. the course of his life: reading ירין for ירצה (cf. Ps 19<sup>6</sup> 119<sup>32</sup>). This may be right; for the hireling (in desire) hastens to the end of his task. Ⓢ Until he receive his wages, *like the h., in his day*. Possibly יומו = his day's work, i.e. the reward of it (פעלו, 7<sup>2</sup>, which might even be the orig. text here also); although any idea of satisfaction seems to jar with the context, the tone of which is one of unrelieved melancholy.

(The word רצה *to be pleased or satisfied with* a person or offering, *to regard with favour, accept favourably* (33<sup>20</sup>), like other Heb. words of similar meaning, orig. denoted pleasure as evinced by the brightness of the face: cf. האיר פנים Nu 6<sup>25</sup>; חרה Assy. ḥadû, *to be glad, str. to shine, be or look bright*, from Sum. ĠAD, *bright, shining*. The Sum. KA-ZAL, *face-shine* is explained tašiltu, *pleasure*. So the Prim. Root of רצה may be recognized in Sum. RAZ, RUZ, SHU-RUZ, kabûbu, kubûbu, *sparkle, glitter, shine*, whence kakkabu, *star*, פִּזְכָּב.)

v. 7. A tristich in ו and Verss. Some such words as we have

ventured to supply may have fallen out. For קציר *boughs, branches* (|| יונקת Ps 80<sup>12</sup>) cf. v. 9, 18<sup>16</sup> 29<sup>19</sup> Is 27<sup>11</sup>; for יפריח or יפריח v. 9, Ps 92<sup>14,15</sup>. Thus we get עור יחליף ויפריח | אם יפריח לו קצירו (The ו prefixed to עור in 9 is really the Suff. of קציר or some word of like meaning, which, with its Suff., has fallen out of the text followed by 9 9 9.)

v. 8. in the soil: בעפר in the dust. 9 εἰν (ἐν recte Bab<sup>(suprās)</sup> 9) δὲ πέτρα: cf. 30<sup>6</sup> πετρῶν = עפר וכפים; 39<sup>1,28</sup> πέτρας = סלע. 9 θερσιμόν confounds קציר *boughs* with קציר *harvest* (5<sup>9</sup>).

v. 10. a man (emph.). Str. a strong one; vir: mostly poet. in Heb., but common in Aram. (גברא, גבר). The word is not directly derived from Assy. *gabrū*, *opponent, equal, a copy, an answer* (from the Sum. compound GAB-RI), but is prob. cogn. c Heb. אבר and כבר *strong, great or mighty*. The Prim. Root of all three words, however, may perhaps be Sum. GAB, *breast*; since to 'breast' a thing is to meet, encounter, or oppose it (= GAB-RI, *mahāru*), which is the natural function of the male.

and becometh powerless: ויחלש. Cf. Is 14<sup>10</sup> 'Art thou made weak—like us?'; said of the dead in She'ol. Cf. also Jo 4<sup>10</sup> 'Let the weak (החלש) say, "I am a mighty man" (גבור)'; Is 14<sup>12</sup> 'Weakener of all the nations'. An Aramaism: חלש *be slackened, weakened*; Pa 12<sup>21</sup> = רפה. 9 אחמקמק *dissolveth or falleth away*; 9 בלא *weareth or wasteth away*. But 9 ὥχeto = ויהלך v. 20; cf. 19<sup>10</sup> ואלך = καὶ ὥχόμεν; 30<sup>15</sup> ὥχeto = תחלה (or עברה). Either ויחלה (9<sup>26</sup> Is 2<sup>18</sup>) or ויהלך would suit here.

where is he? ואי. So 9 9; but 9 οὐκέτι ἐστίν, *he is no more*: 9 ויהיה *and he is not* = ואינו Gn 37<sup>30</sup> 42<sup>36</sup>. This is prob. right. Eyob had no doubt *where* the dead were; viz. in She'ol (v. 13, 7<sup>9</sup> 10<sup>21</sup> 11<sup>8</sup> 26<sup>5,6</sup>). One cod. ואין.

v. 11. App. a marginal note, based on Is 19<sup>5</sup> which refers to the drying up of the Nile, there called a 'sea' (ים; cf. also Is 27<sup>1</sup> Ez 32<sup>2</sup> Plur. of Nile-arms; Je 51<sup>36</sup> Sing. of Euphrates). Water hardly fails the sea proper; but a very low Nile is not unknown. Of course ים might denote a lake (ים כנרת); cf. NT use of θαλάσσης; but that is not the mg. in Is 19<sup>5</sup> with which this vs. almost coincides (st. ii is identical in both). The vb. אזל *go, go away, be gone* ('all gone', 1 Sa 9<sup>7</sup>), is Aram. rather than Heb. (Sam., Syr., Tg.). Cf. Ar. 9, *he passed along quickly, he ran, slipped along or away, &c.*, and perhaps Sum. SIL, SUL, ESIR, *road, street, SIR, depart* = סור, Tg. זור (R = L).

parcheth: or is scorched up: יתחרב. Ps 106<sup>9</sup> Is 37<sup>25</sup> 50<sup>2</sup>. תרב (Heb. and Aram.) is cogn. c תרה, תרי, *burn, kindle, be hot with anger*, תרים *the sun, burn* (30<sup>30</sup>), *be scorched, parched*, Assy. *arāru, become burnt, scorched, dried up*, of crops, *aratu, drought, arūtu*, id. (Cf. perhaps Sum. GISH, *fire*; D. GISH, *the Sun*; Assy. *Girru*, the Fire-god; NIM-GÍR, 'Heaven's Fire', *lightning*. GISH = GIR, GAR?)

v. 12. A tristich. The third st. may be an addition, as the sense is complete without it. Others would transfer st. 1 to follow v. 19, which also is a tristich, as it stands.

*till the Heavens wear out or decay*: rg. בָּלוֹת (or pointing בָּלְתִי, as a poet. form of the same word) instead of בָּלְתִי *not*. So 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏. Cf. Ps 102<sup>27</sup>. 𐤁𐤏 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 𐤁𐤏 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏, *whilst Heaven (endureth)*; the vb. being accidentally omitted: 𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏, *he will not be stitched together* (cf. 16<sup>15</sup> 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 = תפרתי!). 𐤁𐤏 seems to have misread בָּלְתִי as יִתְּפֵר, partly reversing the order of the letters, and to have transferred it to the place of (יִצְּקוּ), which 𐤁𐤏 𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 connects with st. i, and then more correctly replaces 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 by 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 which is evidence for בָּלְתִי: see 13<sup>28</sup> 𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏 = בָּלָה.

*he will not wake*: rg. יִקִּץ Sing. pro 𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤏 Plur. So 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤏; but in st. iii only 𐤁𐤏 supports the Sing. It renders the two st. thus: donec atteratur caelum, non evigilabit, nec consurget de somno suo. If the two lines are genuine, not a marginal intrusion, this must be correct.

*be roused out of his sleep*: יִעַר מִשְׁנָתוֹ. So Zc 4<sup>1</sup>.

The phrase *until the Heavens wear away*, in this context, prob. means *for ever*. Cf. Ps 89<sup>30</sup>: *I will establish . . . his (David's) throne as the days of the Heavens*: i.e. it shall endure for ever. There is no hint in the entire book that 'Heaven and Earth will pass away', as in Ps 102<sup>26-28</sup> Is 34<sup>4-5</sup> 1<sup>6</sup>, and that a new world 'wherein dwelleth righteousness' will be created in their stead (Is 65<sup>17</sup>). There is no trace of Apocalypse or Eschatology in the book of Job. Eyob expects and receives his complete vindication in the present life (see the Epilogue).

v. 13, 14<sup>a</sup>. *O that in Hades Thou wouldst hide me,—Wouldst screen me till Thy wrath turn away! Wouldst set me a term, then to remember me,—If a man may die and come to life* (חַיָּה 2 K 13<sup>21</sup>; Is 26<sup>14</sup>). The tristich is made a tetrastich, and the metrical balance restored, by help of the first st. of v. 14 which, as it stands, is also a tristich. *O that in She'ol (Hades) Thou wouldst hide* (צָפִן Hiph. Ex 2<sup>3</sup>; Ps 27<sup>5</sup> || יִסְתִּירֵנִי as here: cf. סָפַן *cover* = Assy. *sapānu*, *šapānu*, *cover*) *me!* Eyob longed for death as the end of his sufferings (3<sup>20f</sup>. 6<sup>8f</sup>. 7<sup>1,2</sup>); but here he seems to wish to be allowed a temporary refuge in Hades from the Wrath which now pursues him, until it 'turn away' (Gn 27<sup>45</sup> of Esau's resentment): and then, when the period of danger is over, to be recalled to the land of the living. But, since that cannot be, he will resign himself to waiting for the inevitable end (v. 14): *All the days of my hard service* (7<sup>1</sup> = man's earthly life) *will I wait* (13<sup>15</sup>), *Until my relief* (חֲלִיפָה 10<sup>17</sup>; or *successor*, cf. 8<sup>19</sup>) *cometh*. Then it will be too late to pity me (7<sup>8,21</sup>); I shall be beyond the reach of help (v. 15): *Thou wilt call, but I (emph.) shall not* (לֹא from v. 16<sup>b</sup> where it is needless) *answer Thee; Thou wilt regret* (תִּכְסַּף *miss and yearn for*: Gn 31<sup>30</sup> Ps 84<sup>3</sup>) *the creature of Thy own hands* (cf. 7<sup>21</sup>).

In v. 13 *that Thou wouldst set me a term or limit of time* (חֶק) *and remember me* implies that he wishes to be out of God's mind for a time, to be forgotten in the obscurity of Hades (cf. Ps 31<sup>19</sup>), in 'the land of forgetfulness' (Ps 88<sup>11-13</sup>); and then, when the Divine anger is appeased and the prescribed time has expired, to be thought of again (Gn 8<sup>1</sup>) and recalled to the light of day. (Ps 139<sup>7,8</sup> might almost be an answer to this strange aspiration.) *℣ bene*: Et constituas mihi tempus in quo recorderis mei. In v. 14 וַיְחִיָּה may be right, instead of וַיְחִי, the suggestion adopted above. *If a man die* (or *were to die*), *can* (or *might* or *could*) *he revive* (or *come to life again*)? A negative answer is expected (פֶּסֶק). *Θ* ἐὰν γὰρ ἀποθῇ ἄνθρωπος, ζήσεται, συντελέσας ἡμέρας τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ ὑπομεινῶ ἕως πάλιν γένωμαι = יָמֵי צָבָאוֹ (36<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>13</sup>) וַיְחִי וַיָּבֵל (ו?) יָמָיו נָבַר (א) אִם יָמוֹת נָבַר (ו?) יָחִיָּה וַיָּבֵל (36<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>13</sup>) יָמֵי צָבָאוֹ = אִיחָל עַד בּוֹא חֲלִיפָתִי. The paraphrase ἕως πάλιν γένωμαι, *Until again I come into being*, shows that *Θ* interpreted חֲלִיפָה in the light of יְחִיָּה (v. 7), as if it meant *sprouting again*, like a tree, *renewal of life*; but the express contrast between the tree and man, vv. 7-10, proves that this view is erroneous. The idea of the word חֲלִיפָה seems rather to be that of a person or thing which takes the place of a preceding pers. or thing as substitute or successor (cf. Ar. خَلِيفَة successor, Khalif or 'Caliph', with which in form it exactly corresponds. That the חֲלִיפָה was so used in Heb. is proved by MI. 6 וַיְחִלֶּנּוּ בָנָהּ וַיְחִלֶּנּוּ בָנָהּ and *his son succeeded him*. Cf. also Is 9<sup>9</sup> *substitute*). Thus it denotes a *change* of clothing (i.e. a dress worn as substitute for another or in succession to it), and a *relay* or body of relief-troops, succeeding to the post of others (see on 10<sup>17</sup>). The clue to the mg. here is given by 8<sup>19</sup>. Death makes no gap in human life. The coming of the new generation is the signal for the departure of the old (cf. Ec 1<sup>1</sup>). Eyob will patiently wait till his turn comes and his successor appears.

The question (v. 14<sup>a</sup> or 13<sup>d</sup>?) *If a man die, shall he live again?* looks like a marg. note on v. 13. The principle of parallelism is conspicuous by its absence, whether we connect it with the previous or the following lines. And if we read וַיְחִיָּה (?) וַיְחִי and render *If a man may die and survive*, the passion of the previous utterance is weakened by this prosaic condition which really goes without saying. Besides, the speaker believed in a continuance of life in Hades. What he longed for was a return to the present life after temporary seclusion in Hades. Corruption of the text may have gone farther than is generally supposed. נָבַר יָמוֹת may be due to נָבַר יָמוֹת (v. 10). We might secure a parallel to the preceding line by restoring וּמִמָּוֶת אַחֵר תְּחִיָּה אִתִּי (תְּחִיָּה?) *And from Death thereafter wouldst revive me!* or even אַתָּה תְּחִיָּה וַיְחִיָּה אִתִּי [פֶּסֶק] *For it is Thou that killest and makest live!* (1 Sa 2<sup>6</sup> Ps 71<sup>20</sup> Dt 32<sup>30</sup>).

The objection to RV and Driver's version of vv. 14<sup>b,c</sup> 15 is that *my warfare* can only refer to the present life (7<sup>1</sup> 14<sup>1</sup>). There is no 'warfare'

in She'ol. And חליפה can hardly mean 'change' or 'release' from 'the weary darkness of the grave to a new life'. Eyob longs for the grave as a place of perfect rest from earth's weariness (3<sup>13.17</sup>); and when he speaks of 'waiting' (אֵחָל 13<sup>15</sup>) he means waiting for death. Verse 15 is clearly (like 7<sup>8</sup>) a suggestion that his Creator may hereafter miss his faithful servant and, when it is too late, regret having persecuted him to the death.

v. 16. *For*: the ordinary meaning of כִּי. The 'But' of RV was necessitated by its interpretation of the previous verses. Eyob longed to escape from God's anger, because his present life of inquisitorial supervision had become intolerable. His every movement was watched, and every fault noted and treasured up for punishment. St. ii cannot be a question, as RV; while taken affirmatively it contradicts st. i. (ס inserts a Neg. Pic. in st. i also.) If we keep the Neg. here, we must read חַשְׁמֹר = Θ παρέλθῃ (so 6<sup>15</sup> al.) pro וְ חַשְׁמֹר; and prob. עַל-כָּל-חַטֹּאתַי; cf. Θ καὶ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ σε οὐδὲν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου, and none of my sins escaped Thee; but the mg. of the corresp. Heb. is *And Thou passest over none of my sins*: cf. Mi 7<sup>18</sup> Pr 19<sup>11</sup>. (ΘΣ point חַטֹּאתַי as Plur. parallel to צַעֲרִי st. i.) We might also read חַשְׁמֹר עַל-כָּל-חַטֹּאתַי *Thou keepest watch over all my sins*. Cf. 10<sup>14</sup> 13<sup>27</sup> 33<sup>11</sup>.

v. 17. *Thou hast sealed up*: חֲתַם מִן חֲתָמֶיךָ Pass. Ptcp. (is) *sealed up*. (ת om. between the two sim. letters מ, ב, with both of which it is often confused in codd.) So Θ ἐσφράγισας and Σ. (Σ Imper. in both stt.)

*in a bag*: בְּצִרְוֹר Θ ἐν βαλαντίῳ = class. βαλλαντίῳ, *in a bag or purse*. Σ in sacco. Or *bundle*. צִרֹר from צָרַר I. *to bind* (cf. Sum. SAR id.). But Σ *in a book of memoranda*! The idea of both stt. is that Eyob's offences are carefully preserved or treasured up as evidence against him. Ho 13<sup>12</sup>. The Sing. nouns in both stt. should prob. be Plur. as Σ. Read פְּשָׁעֶיךָ and עֲוֹנוֹתַי. Cf. 13<sup>23.26</sup>. Σ Plur. in st. ii; ΘΣ in st. i. (Point perhaps עֲוֹנוֹתַי. *set a stamp*: leg. וְחִטְבַּע (Arabism? cf. طَبَعَ *to stamp or seal*) pro וְחִטְבַּל and *hast plastered over* (13<sup>4</sup>). Cf. also Heb. טַבַּעַת *signet-ring*. Θ recte ἐπεσημήνω δέ. Since, however, the st. is metr. short, and וְחִטְבַּל requires an Object, we might insert חֲמֶר (seal-) *clay* And *plastered clay over my misdeeds*. Cf. 38<sup>14</sup>.

v. 18. Lit. *But a mountain may utterly fall, or fall to pieces*: leg. c Θ (πίπτον διαπεσεῖται) נֹפֵל וְנֹפֵל pro וְנֹפֵל וְנֹפֵל, which is nonsense (*A falling mountain may fade!*). *be removed*: יֵעָקֵב: 9<sup>5</sup> 18<sup>1</sup>.

v. 19. And (+ quod exc. p. 1) *water hath worn away* (or *powdered, pulverized, reduced to dust*) *even stones* (emph.). Θ<sup>A</sup> recte ἐλέαεν, *levigavit*. Ps 18<sup>48</sup>. With שָׁחַב Heb. Aram. Ar. cf. Sum. SAGAR, *dust* (עפר, עפר).

St. ii. For סִפְיָהָ read סִפְיָהָה a *downpour* or *outpouring* of water; either heavy rain or a river-flood; a *deluge*. Cf. Ar. سَفَحَ *to pour out*, of water, Trans. and Intrans. But as √ ספח or שפח is not elsewhere so

used in OT (cf., however, מִשָּׁפָה Is 57), we may prefer to read סְחִיפָה, and compare the common Assy. *saḥāpu* (also written *ṣaḥāpu*), *to throw down*; e. g. *kīma til abūbi ašḥup*, 'like a storm-heap I overthrew', *kīma lib mēḥe aṣṭiq-ma kīma imbari ašḥupšū*, 'like the onset of the south wind I blew, and like a hurricane overthrew him'. Thus סְחִיפָה may be supposed to mean a *tempest* or *stormflood*, which *washes or sweeps away* (חֲשַׁף Is 28<sup>n</sup>, cf. שָׁטַף 38<sup>25</sup>, root not elsewhere in Job) the soil. Cf. Pr 28<sup>3</sup> סָחַף *a rain that lays or prostrates the grain*. Θ καὶ κατέκλυσεν ὕδατα ὑπὲρ τοῦ χώματος τῆς γῆς *And washed down (or away Je 47<sup>2</sup>) sloping parts of the dike* (χῶμα = עָפָר five times in Job; 17<sup>10</sup> al.) *of the land* (ὕδατα = מַיִם dittogr. from st. i). Ὑπτιος (ἄπ· in Θ; cf. ὑπτιάζεις = ! פָּרִשְׁתָּ 11<sup>13</sup>) *supinus, turned downside up, bottom uppermost*, perhaps favours סְחִיפָה > סְחִיפָה. Θ might also be rendered: *And waters upturned have washed away of the soil of the earth* (Partit. Gen.). B et alluvione paulatim terra consumitur. מַיִם שָׁטַף סְחִיפָה, which could only mean *She inundates* or *Thou inundatest* or *washest away her self-growths* (Le 25<sup>11</sup>), cannot possibly be right in this context. There is no visible ref. for vb. or suff., and וְחֲשַׁף (cf. Θ) is almost necessary after שָׁחַקוּ. Θ may represent 'יִשְׁכַּח' מַיִם כְּחֹפִי' (מ) עָפָר הָאָרֶץ. The st. may be a marg. intrusion, as it makes a tristich of the verse. (The √ סָפַח or שָׁפַח *to pour* is obv. cogn. c שָׁפַח = سَفَحَ, and שָׁפַח, Assy. *ṣapāku, tabāku*, id., *labāku*, Aram. נָבַן, Heb. נָבִי. 38<sup>16</sup>, נָבַע, בָּקַע, &c. It is a Shaph. or Saph. formation from a Prim. BAG, akin to Sum. BAL, *pour out*. Cf. also בָּכַח.)

v. 20. This verse also is prob. an interpolation. The sense is complete without it; and it violates the strophic arrangement.

St. i. מַיִם תַּחְתָּפוּהוּ לְנֶצַח *Thou overpowerest him for ever, and he hath gone*. The Aramaism תַּחְתָּפוּ (cf. Ec 4<sup>12</sup>), found in Dan, Ec, Es, only recurs once in Job (15<sup>24</sup> also dubious). The 'for ever' would go better with וְיִהְיֶה (cf. 23<sup>7</sup>). Does it here mean 'victoriously' (Aram.)? Θ ὥσας αὐτὸν εἰς τέλος, καὶ ἔχρετο, *Thou hast thrust him away for ever &c.* = וְיִהְיֶה לְנֶצַח (18<sup>16</sup>), which may be right. For לְנֶצַח we might read לְחוּץ *to the outside, out*: see again 18<sup>16</sup>. St. ii. מַיִם פָּנֵי מַיִם = B immutans faciem eius: referring to the pallor of death. Θ seems to have read בְּבֹשֶׁת פָּנֵי *with the shame of his face*. Θ ἐπέστρεψας αὐτῷ τὸ πρόσωπον, reading מִשְׁפָּח (4<sup>20</sup>) or חֲשֵׁם (Θ<sup>A</sup> καὶ ἐπεστρεψεν) *pro משנה, altering*. (? leg. תִּשְׁנֶה *Thou alterest*.)

v. 21. Cf. Ec 9<sup>5</sup> 'The dead know not anything'; scil. that passes in the world above them. It will be remembered that Dante is eagerly questioned by the spirits in the Inferno for news of the living, of whom they know nothing, although partly able to foresee their future.

'His sons grow up that bear his name,  
Some grow to honour, some to shame,—  
But he is chill to praise or blame.'—*Tennyson*.

יִכְבְּרוּ. Point יִכְבְּרוּ (so also in Ez 27<sup>25</sup> Is 66<sup>5</sup>). Qal is *to be heavy*,

lit. and met. Cf. Is 43<sup>4</sup> al. ⑩ takes this word and its parallel to mean *become numerous* and *few*, respectively.

v. 22. *Only his flesh upon him* (⑩<sup>B</sup> om. contra metr.: ⑩<sup>A</sup> ἐπ' αὐτῷ) *is in pain* (יָכָאֵב Pr 14<sup>13</sup>; physical, Gn 34<sup>25</sup>, Hiph. 5<sup>18</sup>; cf. subst. 2<sup>13</sup> 16<sup>6</sup>). Prim. Rt. perhaps Sum. GIB, dialectic form of GIG, *sick, painful* (cf. NU-GIG = MU-GIB, *qadištum*); cf. GIG-BA (i. e. GIBBA?), *kibtu, pain, grief*.

The verse seems to say that the departed spirit, while cut off from all knowledge of the world it has left, is conscious of pain in its decomposing body (its 'flesh', lying in the grave), and of mourning in its 'soul' which still haunts the body, or is in some way still associated with it. Cf. note on 4<sup>15</sup>. Is 66<sup>24</sup> Judith 16<sup>17</sup> Ecclus 7<sup>17</sup> Mk 9<sup>48</sup>. In Egypt, as we know, the utmost care was taken for the preservation of the body after death; and various forms or elements of the composite soul were believed to visit it or abide with it at pleasure. (See Budge, *Book of the Dead*, Introd., p. lix sqq. on the *ka*, the *ba*, the *khu* or *ih*, &c.) Cf. ⑩<sup>1</sup> *But his flesh from the worms upon him smarieth* (פָּאֵב), *And his soul in the House of Judgement upon him mourneth*. ⑩<sup>2</sup> *But his flesh, before the gravestone is closed* (עַד לֹא נִלְלָא מִסְתַּחֵם), *during the seven days of mourning, upon him mourneth in the tomb* (בְּבֵית קְבוּרָתָא).

Chapter 15 opens the second round of discourses, the speakers following each other in the same order as before. And first Eliphaz reproaches Eyob with impious irreverence of language, which is itself sufficient evidence of inward corruption (vv. 1-6).

v. 2. If you were 'wise', as we are, and as you also claim to be (12<sup>8,12</sup> 13<sup>1,2</sup>), you would not vent such windy ideas and heated replies. Your wisdom is as unsubstantial as wind (cf. 7<sup>7</sup> 8<sup>2</sup>), without solid content. In fact, you 'feed on wind' (Ho 12<sup>2</sup> Pr 15<sup>14</sup> Ec 1<sup>14</sup> 4<sup>6</sup> al.), and that (st. ii) the burning blast of the desert (the Sirocco): an allusion to the indignation which had blazed out in some of Eyob's protests against their injurious assumptions (6<sup>15,27</sup> 13<sup>4f. 7-12</sup>). St. i has four stresses. Perhaps רַעַת should be omitted.

St. ii. Lit. *And fill his belly* (or *womb*: cf. v. 35) *with the east wind*? Cf. ⑩ et implebit *ardore* stomachum suum? ⑩ *And fill his belly with wrath* (חִמָּתָא). ⑩ πόνον = עָמַל *trouble* (3<sup>10</sup> 5<sup>6</sup>).

v. 3. *Arguing*: ⑩ הִוִּיחַ Infin. Mod. An leg. הִוִּיחַ. *Should he argue?* ⑩ ἐλέγχων (= ⑩, ut saep.?). cf. ⑩ רַמְכַּסִּין = מוֹכִיחַ; at ⑩ לְמַכְסִּין = לְהוֹכִיחַ *to argue*: so ⑩ Arguis. *with speech*: בְּרַבֵּר. ⑩ ἐν ῥήμασιν = בְּרַבֵּר (i. e. בְּדַבְרִים).

*serves: benefits* or *is of use or profitable*: ⑩ יִסְכֵּן 22<sup>2</sup> 34<sup>3</sup> 35<sup>3</sup>: Hiph. 22<sup>21</sup>. Cf. TA *u liskin šarru ana mātišu*, 'and let the King be helpful to or have care for his land!' Its occurrence in TA shows that סָכַן is an old Canaanite word. It is prob. a double of שָׁכַן, Assy. *šakānu*, *fi.x, put*,



place, make, and a Saph. (= Shaph.) formation from כּוּן, Assy. *kānu*, be fixed, firm, right, &c., so that סָכַן is str. to make or put right, arrange, prepare or provide for, and so to serve a man's purpose. The Prim. Rt. will thus be Sum. GIN, *kānu*, *kunnu*. St. ii. with words: leg. וּבְמִלִּים. 𐤁 om. 𐤁. 𐤅 ἐν λόγοις.

devoid of profit. Lit. with which he profits not: לֹא יַעֲיֵל 21<sup>16</sup> (30<sup>13</sup> is corrupt) 35<sup>3</sup>. 𐤀 מִשְׁטָא בָהוֹן in which there is nothing tangible or real; 𐤅 in which there is no profit (יִיתָרְן); 𐤅 οἷς οὐδὲν ὄφελος. יַעֲיֵל favours הַיּוֹבִים ad init., but in any case we need not read הַיּוֹבִים (Infin.).

v. 4. Thou, indeed: אַף אַתָּה (emph. Pron.). dost violate: or breakest up, makest naught of: תַּפַּר 5<sup>12</sup> 40<sup>8</sup>, cf. 16<sup>12</sup>. reverence or fear: i.e. Fear of God or 'religion' (6<sup>14</sup> 28<sup>28</sup> Gn 20<sup>11</sup>). Cf. 4<sup>6</sup> thy piety; 22<sup>4</sup>. Abs. only here.

dost away with: תִּקְרַע. Perhaps lit. clippest, cullest off (cf. Is 15<sup>2</sup> Je 48<sup>37</sup>); cf. Aram. ܩܪܥ *shave* head (cogn. c ܩܪܥ, ܩܪܥ). Not Ar. جرع which is akin to בָּלַע. The trans. to idea of taking away, withdrawing, 36<sup>27</sup>, is not difficult. But 𐤅 συντελέσω δὲ ῥήματα τοιαῦτα κτλ. = וְתִגְמַר (Ps 77<sup>3</sup>), and hast put an end to . .

prayer: or complaint, or musing, meditation: שִׁיחָה fr. שִׁיחַ, which in Aram. and NH is to speak. Cf. שִׁיחַ complaint, 7<sup>13</sup> 9<sup>27</sup> 10<sup>1</sup> and vb. 11<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>8</sup>; and שִׁיחָה Ps 119<sup>97.99</sup>. (With this somewhat baffling root שִׁיחַ the Ar. شح to open the mouth may be cogn. Thus to speak might be the orig. meaning in Heb. The Prim. source is perhaps Sum. ZAG, *tamēlu*, 'wording' of an inscr., 'address' to a god, and the 'oracle' in reply; SAG, *māmīlu*, 'exorcism', i.e. spoken charm; cf. also SA = SA-G, SIM = SING, 'call', 'name'; DUG, 'speak'; and, for the other meaning of שִׁיחַ, SA, SIG, SI, 'to be troubled', 'grieve', 'to mourn'. Moreover, since SAG may spring from NAG, cf. also Assy. *nagû*, and *nagāgu*, 'to cry or call to a god'.)

v. 5. Sin inspires your sinful words and shift evasions (cf. 5<sup>12</sup> Gn 3<sup>1</sup>). instructeth: יִלְמֵךְ. 33<sup>33</sup> 35<sup>11</sup>. Pr 22<sup>26</sup> Qal (to learn). Aramaism (not found al. in OT).

𐤅 quite differently: ἐνοχος εἰ ῥήμασιν στόματός σου, Thou art liable (ἀπ. in Job) for the words of thy mouth. Perhaps a loose paraphr. of For thy mouth teacheth thy guilt (another way of taking the Heb.—so 𐤅𐤅). Οὐδὲ διέκρινας ῥήματα δυναστῶν = וְלֹא תַחְבֵּן לְשׁוֹן עֲרִיצִים (cf. v. 20, 12<sup>11</sup> 6<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>20</sup> al.), And thou discernedst not the tongue of tyrants! (Confusion of sim. letters.)

v. 6. Thy language supplies unconscious evidence of thy wickedness. The verse should perhaps follow v. 12.

vv. 7-8 make the ironical suggestion that Eyob must have derived his novel and startling opinions, which contradict the traditional doctrines,



gently (לֵאֵט in or acc. to gentleness: cf. Gn 33<sup>11</sup> Is 8<sup>6</sup> 1 K 21<sup>27</sup>) with thee? An elliptic expression is more natural in the brief charge, 2 Sa 18<sup>5</sup>. In the other 3 locc. אֵט or לֵאֵט qualifies a vb. of motion. Cf. Pr 25<sup>11</sup> דָּבַר דָּבַר a word spoken; but this would overload our line. A possible st. would be: לֵאֵט מְאֹד: מְאֹד מְאֹד And is Elohah's Word too little for thee? (לֵאֵט = אל read backwards; and the ך is a relic of מִמֶּךָ, which is not necessary in st. i: cf. Gn 30<sup>15</sup>).

יְדַבֵּר בְּחַיָּה (Levy, HWB) And speaking in quiet is proper to be with thee = מ. Ⓢ (Restrain from thee the threatenings of God,) And speak in quietness with thy soul = מ in st. ii, at punct. יְדַבֵּר pro יְדַבֵּר, et suppl. verbum desideratum. (In st. i, autem, Ⓢ punctavit הִמְעִיט diminue!, et legit לוחמוהי = minas eius.) It is evident that Ⓢי both had עִמָּךְ לֵאֵט before them. Not so B Numquid grande est ut consoletur te Deus? Sed verba tua prava hoc prohibent (st. i paraphrase of מ: st. ii = (יְדַבֵּר עִוְנֶךָ יִכְלֵא (?). Ⓢ differs from all: ὀλίγα ὧν ἡμάρτηκας μεμαστίγωσαι. Μεγάλως ὑπερβαλλόντως λελάληκας, For few of the sins thou hast committed hast thou been scourged (Ex 5<sup>14,16</sup> Ps 73<sup>5,14</sup>); Greatly, excessively (ὑπερβ. ἀπ. in OT) hast thou spoken. But the first words here may represent מְעַט מְאֹד (cf. 11<sup>15</sup> 31<sup>1</sup>); μεμαστιγ perhaps stands for נחמת or התנחמת thou hast rued (c אל ut Praep. ad init. translatum!) = אל תנחמות אל, so that even Ⓢ may confirm מ; while st. ii = עִבְרָה מֵאֵד יְדַבֵּר (reversing the order of the words: עִבְרָה = עָבַר; מֵאֵד = לֵאֵט!).

v. 12. carry thee away. Ez 3<sup>14</sup>. Ⓢ τί ἐτόλμησεν; cf. Es 7<sup>5</sup>, which suggests ימלא fill thee. יְלַמֵּךְ teach thee (cf. לִמְדָה teaching); B te elevat; Ⓢ Why is thy heart lifted up?

St. ii. And why are thy glances haughty? (lit. eyes uplified?): rg. ירמו c cod. Kenn. 89, pro ירמונ, for which 5 codd. and Ⓢי read ירמון wink; an Aramaism (רָמַן wink, make signs, with eyes or fingers); a sense which hardly agrees with what follows, for which reason Dr suggests that the strange word in מ means gleam with passion. This is better; but Eliphaz is accusing Eyob of pride or arrogance; an attitude hateful to God (Ps 131<sup>1</sup> Pr 6<sup>17</sup> 30<sup>13</sup>). Ⓢ ἡ τί (Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> σοι) ἐπήνεγκαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου, Or what (upon thee) brought thine eyes (that thou didst break out in a rage against Iahvah? v. 13) &c. cannot be alleged in favour of this rg. (Both stt. appear metr. short. Is the verse an intruder?)

v. 13. That thou blowest thy breath at El. Rg. תְּפִיב (Ps 147<sup>10</sup>) pro תְּפִיב turnest. רוּחַ הַשֵּׁב means to draw in or recover thee breath, 9<sup>14</sup>. Words are but breath or wind (v. 2; 8<sup>2</sup>). Ⓢ ὅτι θυμὸν ἐρρηξας ἐναντι κυρίου. רוּחַ is sometimes temper, passion, e. g. 21<sup>4</sup> Pr 16<sup>32</sup>; but not here. ἐναντι = 13<sup>7</sup> 19<sup>28</sup>. מ. אל. Ⓢ app. read תִּשְׁנֶנּה thou exaltest (thy spirit). St. ii, cf. 8<sup>30</sup>, and esp. Ec 5<sup>1</sup>. There is no need to read מְרִי rebellion pro מְרִי words (6<sup>26</sup> al.). Ⓢ ῥήματα τοιαῦτα, paraphr. correctly. It was

addressing such free, not to say daring, language to the Supreme that scandalized Eliphaz.

v. 14. Eliphaz repeats his former argument, with merely verbal variations, 4<sup>17</sup>. Insert הוּא before יוֹנָה metr. grat. *born of a woman*: 14<sup>1</sup> 25<sup>1</sup> (all). Poet. syn. of *man*. In Chinese the clan-name or surname (*sing*) of an individual is written 姓 *woman-born*; and *wan sing*, 'the myriad clan-names', means mankind.

v. 15. *His Holy Ones*: His Angels: see note on 5<sup>1</sup>.

v. 16. *a foul and tainted thing*: lit. *one abhorred and corrupted or stinking*. The √חעב appears to be a ה-formation from the Prim. Bilit. which we see in the Sum. GAB, *bad, foulsmelling or offensive* (Assyr. *bīšu*). It is prob. akin to Tg. סאיב *to defile, or make foul*. (Sum. G = ע saep.) Thus the Pi. lit. means *to regard as foulsmelling, to loathe as stinking or offensive, and to make so*, 9<sup>31</sup>. The rare √אלח (Pss 14<sup>3</sup> 53<sup>1</sup> only) is a syn. Lane does not give Ar. الح with which it has usu. been compared. In Assyr., however, we have *alahiš*, 'into stench'; a syn. of *daddariš*, id. Both words, in fact, occur in a line of the Babylonian parallel to our book: *Ašnan TAG-ma daddariš alahiš*, 'Corn (or bread) turned to reek and stench' (5 R 47. 53 a: where the gloss *bu'sānu* = בִּשָּׁא is added to da-da-ru, i.e. *daddaru*). A disease is called *murūṣ daddari*, 'the ill-smelling malady' (4 R 3. 30 b). There may be a brutal allusion to Eyob's malady as well as to his assumed moral corruption: cf. st. ii, which seems to be a direct accusation (34<sup>7</sup>). (Addit. note on אֵלֶּח. The Sum. IN-IN explained *ulluḫū* is perhaps akin to IM *to dye, stain, šanū*; cf. Chinese *fm, jan, dye, taint, infect, vitiate*, Giles 5562; and *ald ulluḫū qarradūtu* may mean *a demon infecting valour*.)

Ἐ ἔα δὲ ἐβδελυγμένος καὶ ἀκάθαρτος, *Let alone (= Not to mention) a loathed and unclean one!* (St. ii om. אִישׁ ad init. metr. grat.?)

v. 17. Metrically defective. We might read אֲחֹךְ וּשְׁמַעֲנִי אֵלִי *I will tell thee; and pray listen unto me!* The vב. חוה, an Aramaism which occurs four times in the Elihu-section (32<sup>6.10.17</sup> 36<sup>2</sup>), and besides only in Ps 19<sup>3</sup>, and thus not elsewhere in the original part of Job, reflects some suspicion on the verse. It might well be followed by דָּעִי = *what I know*, here as in 32<sup>6.10.17</sup> (or רַעֲתִי id., as in Ps. 19<sup>3</sup>), by way of parallel to *what I have seen* in st. ii. We might thus restore the balance of st. i by reading אֲחֹךְ רַעֲתִי וּשְׁמַעֲנִי *I will tell thee what I know, hearken to me!* (The Aram. √חוה fr. חו may be compared with Sum. GU, *šasū, qibū*, 'to speak' &c.) In st. ii om. ו ante אספרה c ᠓᠖.

v. 18. *Facts which . . . or That which . . .* But the Rel. Pron. אשר refers to the זה *what* of v. 17, which may be Plur. in sense (as a Rel. Indecl.): cf. 19<sup>19</sup> where it is equivalent to *those whom*. St. ii כְּחֵרוֹם כְּחֵרוֹם (c מ as Suff. to vb.; masc. pro fem.) instead of מֵאֲבוֹתָם. ᠓ can only mean: *And they concealed (them) not from their fathers.*

RV is impossible, unless we transpose the order of the Heb. words, and violate the natural division of the stichi. Possibly כְּחֹדֶם = *concealed from them*; the Suff. including a Prep., as is the case with some other verbs. Cf. 27<sup>11</sup> Is 3<sup>9</sup> for כָּחַד sine Praep., and 8<sup>8</sup> for the gen. sense of the verse.  $\Theta^B$  οὐκ ἔκρυψαν πατέρας αὐτῶν contains an obvious scribal error, corrected by the πῆρες, i.e. πατέρες of  $\Theta^{AC}$ .  $\Theta$  rectè: *And their fathers have not concealed.*  $\mathfrak{B}$  om. אֲשֶׁר ad init. Sapientes confitentur, et non abscondunt patres suos (cf.  $\Theta^B$ ): an excellent sentiment, but quite irrelevant to the context.

v. 19. St. i is overloaded with four stresses, as in the English equivalent *To thém (or To whom) alóne the lánd was gíven.* This app. means *to the 'Fathers'*; but whose 'Fathers'? It seems most natural to understand the Fathers of Israel (cf. Gn 12<sup>7</sup> al. Ex 13<sup>6</sup>), and to translate st. ii *And no foreigner passed over amongst them*; i.e. no alien passed over the Jordan with the Chosen People into the Promised Land: the Fathers from whom the traditional wisdom was transmitted were a pure race, uncontaminated by admixture with foreign elements, and so their doctrine was pure and undefiled. The sense is not materially altered if we render, as we might, *And no foreigner passed through their midst.* (Is לְבָרִם a var. lect. for לָהֶם?) This may seem a strange reference in the mouth of a Temanite; but if Eyob is really 'a type of the godly suffering Israelite' of some period of trial and trouble after the Return from Babylon, we can understand it. The distich may, however, be an interpolation.

v. 20. ff. purport to state the Wisdom of the Ancients which has been handed down from the beginning. *torments himself*: i.e. is a prey to anxious fears: or simply *is anxious*. So  $\Theta$  *All the life of an impious (man) is in anxiety* (ἐν φροντίδι: rare in  $\Theta$ : cf. vb. ἐφρόντισα = פָּחַד *I dreaded*, 3<sup>18</sup>) =  $\Theta^A$  ἐν ὀδύγῃ, *in pain*. Cf. Polel, *wait anxiously for* ... 35<sup>14</sup>. This agrees better with the context than  $\Theta^S$  ἀλαζονεύεται, *makes false pretensions or plays the braggart* =  $\Theta^B$  ματαιοῦται, *deals foolishly* (cf. 1 Sa 26<sup>21</sup>),  $\mathfrak{B}$  superbit,  $\Theta$  מתרורב *magnifies himself, behaves arrogantly*, all of which seem to imply מתחולל pro מתחולל.

St. ii. Lit. *And (during) the few years* (cf. Ec 2<sup>5</sup>, ch. 16<sup>22</sup>) *that are reserved for the tyrant* (עֲרִיץ: see on 13<sup>25</sup>). If this is right, the introd.  $\mathfrak{B}$  *And* seems needless. (RV *Even*; a convenient but doubtful rendering.) It is more natural to render *And but few years are reserved for the tyrant*. Both stt. have four stresses. Leg. fort. כָּל-יְמֵי רָשָׁע מִתְחוֹלֵל *All his days the wicked is anxious*; and om. נִצְפָּנוּ in st. ii.

v. 21. His uneasy conscience takes alarm at every sound (cf. Is 24<sup>18</sup> Pr 28<sup>1</sup> Ps 53<sup>5</sup>). *When all is well*: lit. *in the peace*, i.e. in time of peace (cf. 1 K 2<sup>5</sup> anarthrous, בְּשָׁלוֹם): *the destroyer or spoiler (שׂוֹדֵד) comes upon or assails him*; i.e. in his distempered fancy. שׂוֹדֵד is perhaps str. *to drag away spoils and captives*; cf. Assy. šadādu, 'drag', 'draw', a cart,

timber, &c.  $\Theta$  ἡ καταστροφή (= אִיר, 21<sup>17</sup>; or perhaps שׁוֹר plenè); but al. σκύλευσις = שׁוֹר.  $\mathfrak{B}$  benè: Et cum pax sit, ille semper insidias suspicatur.

v. 22. *He is not sure of return out of darkness.* For constr. cf. Ps 27<sup>13</sup>. This may mean either that the wicked oppressor has no hope of recovery from the ruin he anticipates (so Dr); or that, when darkness falls, he has no confidence of surviving till the return of day. Cf. 24<sup>22</sup>. He is afraid of being cut off in the night. St. ii.  $\mathfrak{M}$  וְצָפִי or צָפִי (some codd. and Qerî), 'watched', is corrupt. OL's 'spied out (and brought) to the sword' is improb. Read צָפֶה (Ps 37<sup>22</sup>) or מְצַפֶּה (Ps 5<sup>4</sup> La 4<sup>17</sup>): *And he looketh out for or expecteth the hands of the sword* (after  $\Theta$  ἐντέταλται γὰρ ἡδὴ εἰς χεῖρας σιδήρου). For the curious expression אֶל-יְרֵי חֶרֶב cf. Ps 63<sup>11</sup>, and the freq. פִּי הַחֶרֶב *mouth of the sword*.  $\mathfrak{E}$ ντέταλται implies a rg. מְצַוָּה (cf. 36<sup>32</sup> 37<sup>12</sup>), *given in charge unto the hands &c.* Cf. Am 9<sup>4</sup>. Ewald's ingenious צָפֶן (And he is reserved for the sword) finds no support in  $\Theta$ , and is less suitable than מְצַפֶּה in a description of imaginary terrors. Cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$  circumspectans undique gladium.  $\Theta$  הוּא לְחֶרֶב looking to the sword also confirms our view.

v. 23.  $\mathfrak{M}$  lit. *He wanders or is wandering* (i. e. in his dream of coming evil) *about for the bread*—'Where?'; *He knows that ready at his hand (side) is a (the) day of darkness.* The incoherence of st. i, and the metrical overweight of st. ii, must be corrected from  $\Theta$ , which has preserved the true text of the verse. κατατέταται δὲ εἰς σῖτα γυψῖν, *and he hath been appointed for food to vultures*; prob. Heb. נֶתַן הוּא לְלֶחֶם לְאַיָּה. Cf. Ez 35<sup>12</sup>. For κατατάσσω = נתן see 35<sup>10</sup>. (In 7<sup>12</sup> = שִׁים.) The suggested rg. וְנֶעַר is improb. (2<sup>11</sup>). אִיה prob. means *kites*.

St. ii. οἶδεν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ὅτι μένει εἰς πῶμα (= רָם, cf. v. 29) פִּירוֹ  $\mathfrak{M}$  פִּירוֹ *he knows that he is ready for calamity* (אִיר 18<sup>12</sup> 21<sup>17.30</sup> 31<sup>3</sup>). But פִּירוֹ *his ruin* more nearly resembles  $\mathfrak{M}$  בְּיָדוֹ *in his hand*, and is more suitable here as a stronger term than אִיר *overburdening, distress* (see 10<sup>3</sup> in Lane): 12<sup>5.6</sup> 21<sup>20</sup> 30<sup>24</sup> 31<sup>29</sup>. יוֹם חֹשֶׁךְ *a day of darkness*, which overloads the stichus, might perhaps be a gloss on פִּיר, but is better connected with v. 24, as in  $\Theta$  *A dark day dismayeth him* (though this makes a tristich of the verse). Point וְיִבְעָתָהּ; or read וְיִבְעָתָהּ. For בעת *fall upon, startle, terrify*, see 3<sup>5</sup> 9<sup>34</sup> 13<sup>11.21</sup> al. In st. ii leg. צָרָה (27<sup>9</sup> Zp 1<sup>16</sup>). The 'darkness' is prob. physical. He is terrified by a gloomy sunless day, regarding it as a portent of evil. *Straits and distress overpower him*: point וְתִקְפָּהוּ (yet  $\Theta$  καθέξει). He is paralysed with fear. For the Aramaism תקף see on 14<sup>20</sup>.  $\mathfrak{B}$  vallabit eum = תִּקְפָּהוּ; so  $\mathfrak{L}$ . This may point to תִּקְפָּהוּ as the authentic text.  $\Theta$  καθέξει = תְּחַוִּיקוּהוּ *seize him* (Je 6<sup>24</sup>): so  $\mathfrak{S}$ .

v. 24. St. iii. *Like a king ready for the fray*: כַּמֶּלֶךְ עָתִיד לְכַדּוֹר. The third word here is an obscure ἄπ\*, rendered by  $\mathfrak{S}$  לְקָרֵב (38<sup>23</sup>), which is perhaps the orig. rg. (ק misread as כ; ר = ר; both not infreq. errors:

ר = ב). So *ad praelium*; and *ללכת* (But *They surround him like a king who is ready—ετοιμος*) *לְלִינֶדֶק* for a litter (or footstool: Levy, HWB, suggests a *bier*). It is, of course, possible that *כִּירוֹר* was an ancient or archaic term for *battle*, although its complete isolation renders it suspicious. *Ὡς περ στρατηγὸς πρωτοστάτης πίπτων* (or *πρωτωκὴς*). The word *πρωτοστάτης* is found here only in *Θ* (cf. Acts 24<sup>8</sup>). 'Standing first' or 'in front' may represent *עֹמֵד לְקֶדֶם*, which is an easy perversion of *עָתִיד לְקָרֵב* *ready for the battle*. The *πίπτων* may be merely a gloss due to a scribe of *Θ*. The stichus prob. does not belong here, but is to be regarded as a marg. gloss on v. 25. *at*: *אֵל*. But perhaps *עַל* against should be read in both st. The two Preps. are often confused with each other by copyists. vv. 25, 26 contain a hardly veiled allusion to the daring language of *Eyob*. *stretched out*: *נָטָה*. *Θ* *ἤρκεν*, *lifted* = *נָשָׂא* (? *נָשָׂא*): 6<sup>2</sup> 21<sup>3</sup>. Cf. sim. error in *Je* 43<sup>10</sup>.

v. 25. *would match his might*; lit. *show his might*: *יִתְנַכֵּר*: 36<sup>9</sup> *Is* 42<sup>13</sup> (*עַל*). *Θ* *ἐτραχηλίασεν*, *arched his neck proudly*, like a horse (*ἄπ.* in *Θ*).

v. 26. *with his buckler*: reading *בַּצִּנֹּתוֹ* (*Ps* 35<sup>2</sup>) pro *בַּצֹּואָר* *with neck* (which perhaps suggested *Θ*'s *ἐτραχηλίασεν* in 25 b). The *צִנָּה*, a large shield covering the whole body, is a better parallel to *מָגֵן*, st. ii, than *כַּנּוּכֹר* *like a warrior* (16<sup>14</sup>). *Θ* *ἔβρε* = *בָּנָאוֹן* (35<sup>12</sup> 37<sup>4</sup>); unless the translator thought of *עֹתָק*, *Ps* 75<sup>6</sup> (so *RV*).

St. ii. Lit. *with the thickness of the backs* (supposed to mean *bosses*) of his shields. So *Θ* (with Sing. for Plur.) *ἐν πλάχει νότου ἀσπίδος αὐτοῦ* = *בַּעֲבֵי גֵב מִנְנוּ*. But *עֲבֵי* *thickness* (2 C 4<sup>17</sup> only), cf. *עֲבֵי* (1 K 7<sup>26</sup>), seems rather dubious in this connexion; and the *גֵּב* of a shield is not mentioned anywhere else in OT. *בְּכֹבֶעַת* *with helmet* is an attractive correction of *בַּעֲבֵי* (cf. *Ez* 23<sup>24</sup> 27<sup>10</sup> 38<sup>4,5</sup>), and *נָבִי* may be *גִּבּוֹר* *warrior*, if it be not a Heb. equivalent of *Assyr. gababu* (also *qababu*), *shield* (of wood, covered with leather). Thus, reading (*Θ*) *בְּכֹבֶעַת גִּבּוֹר וּמִגְנֹו*, we get the good sense *With a warrior's helmet and shield*. The whole verse might be read more simply: *יְרוֹן עָלָיו בַּצִּנָּה וּבְכֹבֶעַת גִּבּוֹר וּמִגְנֹו*.

v. 27. *Rg.* *חָלַב* pro *חִלְבוֹ* his *fat*. The *ו* seems to be an anticipation of the following *ו*. For the figure, see *Dt* 32<sup>15</sup> *Ps* 17<sup>10</sup> 73<sup>7</sup> 119<sup>70</sup>.

St. ii. 'Made (i. e. produced, e. g. *Gn* 1<sup>11</sup> *Ho* 8<sup>7</sup>) flesh' is a common English phrase; but the *אֵם* *פִּימָה* appears to be a syn. of *חָלַב* *fat*. *אֵם* *arvina*, 'grease', 'fat', 'lard'; *אֵם* *רוֹמָא* 'sap', 'marrow', 'suet', 'fat'. (*Θ* went astray through misreading *פִּימָה* as *כִּימָה*, and pointing *בְּסָל* instead of *בְּסָל*: see 9<sup>3</sup>.) The word seems to be an offshoot of the *פִּי* *mouth*; cf. *Aram. פִּי* *mouth* = *Ar. fam, fum, fim*, *id.* = *Assyr. pû*, *Heb. פִּה*, *פִּי*. The ideas of *feeding* and *fattening* are naturally associated with the mouth, and expressed by words which are offshoots of the same root. Hence, with Internal Trilateralization, *Ar. فَاَم* *fa'ama*, 'fill the mouth with food or drink', 4. 'fill a vessel', 'widen a waterskin', *مُفَاَم* *muf'am*, 'fat, and

wide within', &c.; Eth. fa'em, 'mouth or hole of a tunic' (περιστόμιον so 6 here; 30<sup>18</sup> = פ), and 'a morsel', 'small mouthful'; 'af'ama, 'to feed', 'give food to a beggar'. The Sum. PE-SH, PI, 'widen' or 'broaden'; 'extend', 'increase', 'fat', 'plump', 'stout', 'strong', 'pregnant' (= filled out or enlarged, 'big with child'), and the Ch. fei, p'i, bi, 'fat', 'plump', 'robust', 'fertile'; pi, pwi, 'pregnant', may belong to the same Bilit. Root. (Cf. also the Aryan √PI, 'to swell', Gk. πῖος, πίων, πῖαρ, πιαρός, πιμελή—so 6<sup>2</sup> here—Sansk. pīvan, and Engl. *fat*.)

v. 28. *ruined*: נכחדו: 4<sup>7</sup> 22<sup>20</sup>. Str. *hidden, covered up*, scil. with rubbish and soil. The √כחד, cogn. c כחש *deceive, deny* (cf. 6<sup>10</sup> c Ho 9<sup>2</sup>), is a K(G)-form of בנר, which also denotes both *covering* and *deceiving* (cf. Sum. GAD, kitū, 'cloth' or 'linen').

*which none should inhabit*: understanding ישבו in sens. indef. But the Sing. ישב (*he should not inhabit* = he ought not to have inhabited) would seem better. For לָמוֹ cf. 2<sup>13</sup> לארץ. The idea might be sitting or settling on to the ruined site. Cf. Is 13<sup>20</sup>, where the same two verbs occur; a passage which, however, suggests the mg. *which should not be inhabited*, and the substitution of לנצח (or לעולם or לעד) for ever pro לָמוֹ (6 app. בוא = εισέλθοι, *May he enter!* 6's Optatives in both stt. are due to pointing וישבון instead of ויש' &c.). Ruined sites lay under the eternal ban of Heaven; and to rebuild or inhabit them entailed the curse of God (Jos 6<sup>26</sup> 1 K 16<sup>34</sup>). Cf. 3<sup>14</sup>.

St. iii. *which were* (had been) *made ready* (התעתדו), i. e. destined, for *heaps* (Plur. of גֵּזַ, 8<sup>17</sup>); i. e. to become and remain ruinous mounds. Prob. a gloss on the genuine verse. 6 ἃ δὲ ἐκείνοι ἡτοίμασαν (6<sup>2</sup> c. a 6<sup>A</sup> Sing.) ἄλλοι ἀποίσσονται, *But what they (or he) prepared, others will carry off*; taking the ἀπ. (ו) התעתדו in the Reflexive sense (*sibi paravit*), and rg. לְזָרִים for *strangers* (*it shall be*) pro מִן לְזָרִים for *heaps*. Ἄλλος = זָר, 19<sup>27</sup>; but perhaps 6 really means לְזָרִים. It is possible that vv. 27–8 are an interpolation or, as some think, even vv. 25–8. Certainly v. 29 might very well follow immediately on v. 24.

v. 29. מִן lit. *He shall not be(come) rich, and his wealth shall not stand*. Might the verse continue the representation of the godless man's fears (vv. 20 ff.)? *He will not be rich, nor can his wealth endure*. Read perhaps לֵא (לֵא 16<sup>3</sup>) *If he be (or become) rich, his wealth &c.*

St. ii. מִן לְזָרִים; a vox nihili. RV *their produce*; marg. *their possessions*. The Plur. Suff. alone would make the word dubious. We should expect מְנוּלו parallel to חִילו. 6 words = מלים or מלין (not מלתם, as OL); Ar. kalāman, id. מִן לְזָרִים = מִן לְזָרִים (ought) of theirs; merely dividing the word. מִן is more sensible: Nec mittet in terra radicem suam, 'Nor shall he take root in the earth'. This is quite congruous with what precedes, as it expresses the idea of instability under a different



figure. It is also favoured by the association of שרש *his root* with ינקו *his sucker* or *shoot* (v. 30) in 8<sup>16,17</sup> 14<sup>7,8</sup> Is 53<sup>2</sup> Ho 14<sup>6,7</sup> (cf. also Ps 80<sup>10-12</sup>). The word שרש or שרשה does not look much like מנלם; but if we suppose that the scribal error is very ancient, originating in the old writing in which מ (𐤌) and ש (𐤑) do resemble each other, the difficulty practically disappears. A more obvious solution is to suppose that the three κέραται, Mi 5<sup>16</sup>, of מנ, the מ being partly effaced and broken (נו), suggested to B that the two letters were one, viz. ש. ש, however, has οὐ μὴ βάλην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν σκιάν = phps. (40<sup>22</sup>) על־ארץ (cf. שׁ ? יטל ?) ולא־יטֶה וְלֹא־יִטֶּה (יטל ?) And he shall not cast his (protecting) shadow over the land. Here again we may note that, while צ and ש are distinct enough in the modern character, they might perhaps be confused in the ancient script, and ל is sometimes mistaken for נ. For the figure cf. Ez 31<sup>6</sup>.

The רשע, whose fortunes the poet is describing, is not a person of no social importance, but a tribal chief (cf. v. 34) or prince, whose fate involves that of his dependents. Hence we might read שלום for מנלם, and the whole st. would be וְלֹא־יִטֶּה לְאַרְצָא שְׁלָם And he shall not extend prosperity to the land—as he would, if he were a good man and, consequently, Heaven blest his rule. For the phrase cf. Is 66<sup>12</sup> (נַטָּה אֱלִי שְׁלֹמֶה). In any case, שבלים *ears of corn* (Dillmann; 24<sup>24</sup>) or מלילת id. (Dt 23<sup>26</sup>) and Driver's 'Neither shall his ears bend to the earth,—his fields will bear no heavily-laden crops', seem very unlikely. Eyob's wealth consisted of cattle and slaves (1<sup>3</sup>), and nothing is said of cornfields. Some reject the verse, along with v. 30 a. (בְּאַרְצֵי נִצְרוֹ) וְלֹא־יִטֶּעַ בְּאַרְצֵי נִצְרוֹ seems also possible: *Nor shall he plant his scion in the soil* = establish his offspring in the land. Cf. Is 60<sup>21</sup>.) But we get a better parallel to st. i by reading וְלֹא־יִטֶּעַר אֶצְרוֹ וְלֹא־יִטֶּעַר אֶצְרוֹ nor shall he keep his treasure for ever.

v. 30. A tristich. Prob. st. i is spurious. *He shall not depart out of darkness* looks like a gloss on v. 22. The sense offers no parallel to either of the following stichi. The line is at least out of place here.

Flame: i. e. sun-glare. Cf. Ez 21<sup>3</sup> (20<sup>47</sup>). שלהבת, an Aramaism; here and Ez l. c. and Ct 8<sup>3</sup> only. Another kindred form is Tg. צלהב *to burn* (Ps 50<sup>3</sup>), and Heb. ולעפה, pl. ולעפות, *burning heat* of the sirocco, Ps 11<sup>6</sup>, or famine, La 5<sup>10</sup>, may also be cogn. If B is right in v. 29<sup>b</sup> (*Nor shall he strike his roots*—? שְׁרָשָׁיו יִכֶּה, cf. Ho 14<sup>6</sup> or יִשְׁלַח שׁ Je 17<sup>8</sup> = ש βαλε τὰς ῥίζας αὐτοῦ in both locc.—*in the soil*), the metaph. of the tree is continued from the last verse. For שלהבת ש gives ἀνεμός, i. e. the hot wind of the desert, the sirocco. (But it om. ברוח in st. ii.)

st. ii. Rg. ויבול בְּרוּחַ פָּרוֹחַ pro וינסר בְּרוּחַ פִּי תַע And he shall depart by the breath of His mouth. Cf. Is 40<sup>7,8</sup> 28<sup>1</sup> נבל יבש שׁ ἀπέσσυτο δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄνθος: cf. v. 33<sup>b</sup>, and see note on 14<sup>2</sup>. Perhaps בְּרוּחַ פָּרוֹחַ וְיִשָּׁל בְּרוּחַ פָּרוֹחַ And his fruit shall drop off in the wind would be better: cf. Dt 19<sup>5</sup> שׁ 28<sup>40</sup>. ἀπέσσυτο = ישלך v. 33. (ש = ש; ר = ל.) But וינסר (cf. Ho 13<sup>3</sup>) comes

nearer to ויסור : *And his flower* (leg. c פרוו) *shall be stormed away by the wind.* Cf. וישערהו, 27<sup>21</sup> 1<sup>19</sup>.

v. 31. As it stands in M, this verse can only be regarded as an awkward interpolation, interrupting, as it does, the connexion of v. 30 with 32 ff. which continue the metaph. of the tree. What it says is: *Let him not trust in Vanity being misled (?) ; For Vanity shall his exchange be!* This has an air of proverbial wisdom, but is far from lucid in the context. The verse, however, becomes quite relevant, if we read אליאמן בעת נשא כרשואה תהיה זמורתו *Let him not be confident in the time of bearing, For his vine-twigs will become a wreck.* Cf. Is 17<sup>10,11</sup> 18<sup>5</sup>. Or perhaps אליאמן נטעו בבכר (במר) *Let him not trust in his plant's unripe fruit* (v. 33), &c. (See Duhm. But בשוב, cf. v. 22, will not do; and בטוא Ps 89<sup>10+</sup> pro בנשוא is dub.); or better תהיה (באשמים) | כי־נשא תעה | *Let him not trust in a gadding vine* (Is 5<sup>2</sup> 16<sup>8</sup>); *For naught (ill grapes?) will his produce be(come)!* Cf. also Je 2<sup>21</sup>. Or read נצחו *his blossom* instead of *his produce* (cf. ט).

v. 32. St. i is too short. תמרו *his palm tree* exc. post זמורתו (31. וזמורתו); cf. כפתו *his palm branch* in the parallel st. ii. Or supply קצירו *his bough* (18<sup>10</sup>). ט η τομ το αὐτοῦ πρὸ ὥρας φθαρήσεται = זמורתו | *His vine-branch, ere his day* (cf. 22<sup>16</sup>), *falls off* (see note on 14<sup>2</sup>). In Ct 2<sup>12</sup> τμή appears to mean *pruning* = זמיר. For the vb. see also Is 24<sup>4</sup> and ט. We must, of course, read תפל (or יפל) instead of תפלא; cf. 18<sup>16</sup>. ט יבש *dry, wither.*

St. ii. *flourish*: or *be fresh, green.* רענן as vb.(?) here only. Cf. Ct 1<sup>16</sup>. As adj. epithet of trees, twelve times. Of oil, *fresh* or *rich*, Ps. 92<sup>11</sup>. Of persons, *flourishing, healthy*, Ps 92<sup>15</sup> Dan 4<sup>1</sup> (Aram.). Not identified in the other Semitic languages. (Ar. عَفَن is *to be foolish, stupid, lax*; and רענן Dan 4<sup>1</sup> is prob. a Hebraism.) In Sum. we have RIG (RING) *green*, in U-RIG, *urqitu*, 'greens', and RIN, RIM, 'bright' (*ellu*); cf. Chinese luk, Jap. ryoku, *green*. This brings רענן into apparent connexion with ירק Assy. *argu*, 'green'.

v. 33. Cf. La 2<sup>6</sup> Is 18<sup>5</sup>. יתר היד נפנא ביסריה *He shall let fall, like a vine, his unripe grapes.* It is said that the vine does not cast its abortive fruit, as the olive does (Dt 28<sup>40</sup>); but perhaps absolute accuracy is hardly to be expected in a poetical simile. Cf. Ma 3<sup>11</sup>. (The חמס treat *hardly* or *with violence* is perhaps akin to חמץ Ps 71<sup>4</sup> Is 17<sup>17</sup> Assy. *hamāṣu*, 'oppress', Shaph. *ṣuḥmuṣu*, 'violate', e.g. women. Cf. also Assy. *hamāṣu*, *hummuṣu*, 'crush', 'grind', e.g. corn, Sum. GUM, LUM, Chinese lung, 'grind', 'a mill', yen, ngien, 'grind'. GUM = GUM in ŠE GUM-GUM *hummuṣu*, 'grind corn'; cf. GUM, *hašdlu ša šeim*, 'pound corn'. The connexion of ideas between 'crushing' or 'grinding' and 'oppressing' is evident in Is 3<sup>15</sup>, with which we may perhaps compare Sum. GIGUR-GUMGUM, *ḥarāṣu ša pāni*, 'smash' or 'grind the face'.)

Possibly חָמֵס in connexion with the vine should be compared with חָמַץ *sour*, Aram. חָמַץ; so that the meaning will rather be *He will sour his immature grape, like the vine.*

*will cast*: Heb. *let him cast*; Jussive Mood of vb. perhaps due to preceding אֶל־יָצֵא. Point תִּשְׁלַךְ? But the Juss. may express the strong assent of the speaker to the event described. (The √ שָׁלַךְ *throw*, 18<sup>27</sup> 29<sup>17</sup> (i); is str. *cause to go*, and is akin to the weaker שָׁלַח *let go, send, shoot*. Ar. سَرَحَ *drive to pasture, send*, Aram. תִּלַּךְ *throw*, קָלַק = לִקְלַק id., as well as הָלַךְ *go, walk*, Assy. alāku, id., and Ar. سَلَكَ *go along a road, go into a place*, also Causative in both senses; سَلَى *throw supine*, and other Semitic words. It is a Shaph. formation from the Prim. Bilit. preserved in Sum. LAĠ, *lead, lead off, drive to pasture, bring*, &c. = *cause to go or come*, RA [from RAG], alāku, &c.)

*his bloom*: נִפְתָּהוּ. 𐤔 𐤇𐤃𐤁𐤀𐤁 *his plant*. 𐤔 has the same equivalent for תְּמֹרֵהוּ, v. 31 ad fin.; and this may perhaps be regarded as a vestige of the original reference of that enigmatical verse.

v. 34. *company*: cf. Nu 26<sup>9</sup> *the c. of Korah*; i.e. the whole body of his clients or tribal dependents and retainers, including his 'family' or kindred of all degrees. (𐤔 infelicitè μαρτύριον = עֵרָה de עֹר; nostr. עֵרָה ex עֹר oritur; 𐤔 𐤃𐤁𐤁𐤀 rectè.) *barren*: or *stone-barren*: 3<sup>1</sup> 30<sup>3</sup> (i) Is 49<sup>21</sup> (all). An Arabism. (𐤔 θάνατος = מוֹת = גְּלוּמֹר, half-effaced. 𐤔 rectè *sterilis*; 𐤔 𐤁𐤀 a desert.) The st. alludes not obscurely to the greatest of Eyob's misfortunes, the sudden destruction of all his children (1<sup>19</sup>). St. ii may refer to 1<sup>16</sup>. v. 34 may almost be called an interpretation of the metaphors of vv. 30-33. Cf. 18<sup>15-21</sup> 21<sup>28</sup>. The suggestion that he has corrupted justice by giving or accepting bribes ('the tents of bribery'; 𐤔 *the dwellings of the unjust*) is implicitly contradicted by Eyob in 29<sup>11-17</sup> and repeated by Elihu, 36<sup>18</sup>. Perhaps שָׁחַר Ptcp. *the briber or bribe-giver* 6<sup>22</sup> Ez 16<sup>32</sup>. The word seems to be of Aram. origin; שָׁחַר *to bribe*, which may be compared with אָחַר *to take in the hand* (Sum. GAD, *hand*), so that שָׁחַר = *cause to take or accept*. (The Sum. IGI-SA, 'gift', is suggestively written 𐤀- 𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 *eye-judgement*!)

v. 35. *Big with mischief, and bringing forth misery*. For the Infin. Abs. cf. Ho 4<sup>2</sup>; but the idiom is doubtful in Job. We should rather expect וְיָלַד . . . הָרָה *He hath conceived . . . and brought forth*. 𐤔 *He will conceive . . . And vain things will issue for him* (= 31<sup>b</sup> ap. 𐤔!) וְיָלַד . . . or וְיָלַד אֵן (Points). St. ii, *And his* (so 𐤔 𐤁; 𐤓 *their*) *womb* (cf. st. i and v. 2) *prepareth guile* (or *treachery*: Ps 17). 𐤔 𐤇𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤀𐤁 *containeth*: see on 4<sup>2</sup>; Am 7<sup>10</sup> 𐤔. So prob. 𐤔 (*And their bellies are filled with guile*). If בְּרָמָה has its usual mg. of crafty or deceitful dealing with others (cf שָׁקַר in Ps 7<sup>16</sup>, which is a perfect parallel to this verse), the speech is brought to a rather lame conclusion. But if 'deceit' may mean *disappointment* for the wicked schemer himself, as Driver takes it, the idea

will be that the machinations of the godless issue in their own destruction. Cf. 4<sup>s</sup> Is 33<sup>11</sup>. But the angry speaker may be merely intending an insinuation that Eyob has habitually perverted justice by wiles and hypocrisy.

Chapter 16. Eyob replies to the foregoing.

v. 2. Lit. *I have heard many things like those*. The phrase מְנַחֲמֵי עָמָל, taking up a word (עָמָל *toil, trouble, 'mischievous'*) which Eliphaz has just used, might be rendered *mischievous* or *harmful comforters*. He means, *Your comforting hurts, and is no comfort*; 'is 'sorry' comfort.

v. 3. *words of wind*: an allusion to 15<sup>2</sup>: a *Tu quoque* for Eliphaz. (U has ἰάξῃς = יָצָא again, 28<sup>3</sup>.) *aieth thee*: or *aggrieveth* or *annoyeth thee*: יַמְרִיץְךָ. See note on 6<sup>25</sup>. U ἡ τί παρενοχλήσει σοι, *Or what will annoy thee greatly*, &c. Cf. U Ju 16<sup>17</sup> Ps 35<sup>19</sup>. Cf. also Mi 2<sup>10</sup> Je 14<sup>17</sup> Heb. (for connexion of the ideas of *sick* and *sore* or *grievous*). *Urgeth* would seem more suitable here: cf. Ju l.c. (= יִצְרֶךָ). Possibly יַפְרִיץְךָ *maketh thee break out* (not found elsewhere). I יְבַסְמִינֶךָ *pleaseth thee* = יְמַלִּיץְךָ (cf. Ps 119<sup>103</sup>).

v. 4. st. ii. Lit. *If your soul were in the place of my soul*. נַפְשׁ *soul* = self, as often. *compose speeches*: or *join words together*. Cf. 'shake with my head' = shake my head, *infr.*; 'gnash with my teeth' = gnash my teeth, v. 9 (Ps 22<sup>7</sup> 35<sup>16</sup>). חָבַר *Hiph.* here only (but cf. on 6<sup>27</sup>). The constr. with בְּ might denote either instrument or accompaniment: make a *joining* or *alliance* or *union* with words. The word most commonly signifies alliance or association. The Root-mg. seems to be to *bind*. U ἐναλοῦμαι ὑμῖν ῥήμασιν, *leap on or attack you with w.* (= הִוָּכִיחַ 19<sup>9</sup> לְבַשׁ 16<sup>10</sup>). B *consolater vos*; U *proved you* (with words); not understanding the phrase.

v. 5. M *I would* (or *could*) *strengthen* (or *encourage, comfort*) *you with my mouth*. But as בְּמִוְפִי has but one stress, we may complete the st. by restoring בְּמִוְפִי *with the utterance of my mouth* (Je 17<sup>16</sup> Ps 89<sup>85</sup>); which also affords a better parallel to *solace of my lips*. (The letters צא exc. p. 'אֲמַצְעַי.) Or we might read בְּמִוְפִי *with the words of my mouth*. In st. ii M is evidently corrupt. וְיִרְשָׁתִי יִחְשֶׁךְ cannot possibly mean *And the solace of my lips should assuage your grief* (RV). U κίνησον δὲ χειλέων οὐ φείσομαι. *And the motion of (my) lips I will not spare* involves only the change of one letter (חֲשֶׁךְ pro אֲחֶשְׁךְ) with the add. of the Neg. לֹא. The latter feature, however, and the dubious אֲנִי *motion* or *comfort*, lead us to prefer וְיִרְשָׁתִי שְׁפָתִי אֲחֻקֶּכֶם *And with a word of my lips would I sustain* (or *strengthen*) *you*; a closer parallel to st. i. Cf. 4<sup>3</sup> Dt 32<sup>8</sup> Is 36<sup>6</sup>. Leg. fort. נִיר *consoling*; *sympathizing* or *condolence*: cf. 2<sup>11</sup> Ps 69<sup>21</sup> Is 51<sup>19</sup>.

v. 6. The verse seems superfluous. It interrupts the connexion between vv. 4, 5, and 7: *If you were in my place . . . But as it is* &c. U οὐκ ἀλγήσω τὸ τραῦμα (μου) = לֹא אֲכַבֵּא (cf. 14<sup>22</sup>); app. om. יִחְשֶׁךְ, as

belonging to v. 5 b. St. ii. מֵה מְנִי יִהְיֶה לִּי; but Ὁ τί ἐλασσον τρωθήσομαι = מֵה מְנִי אֶחְלֶה (Ct 2<sup>5</sup>) or מֵה מְנִי אֶחְלֶה (cf. Pr 7<sup>26</sup>). Cf. also 20<sup>24</sup>. מֵה מְנִי לִי who will enlarge (i. e. relieve) me? (מֵה preferable, but not above suspicion.)

v. 7. Both stt. are metr. short. In st. i the Subj. אֵל El (כָּאֵל dolor meus) exc. post הֲלֹאֵנִי: But now (= as it is) El hath exhausted me. לֵאמֹר (4<sup>2.5</sup>) be weary or overcome, faint; akin to לָהֶה, Aram. לָהִי, and perhaps Assyr. lā'ū, lāū, 'small', 'weak'. Cf. Sum. LAL, LA, 'weak' (enšū), 'decrease', 'become less' or 'weak' (ma'ū). (Ἦ But now He hath made me κατὰκοπον, very weary; 3<sup>17</sup>.)

st. ii. Reading וַיִּבֶל עֹדִי, after La 3<sup>1</sup> וַיִּבֶל עֹדִי, instead of וַיִּבֶל עֹדִי. הַשֵּׁם gives μῶρον, σεσηπότα. μῶρον = נָבֵל Is 32<sup>5.6</sup> σαπῶσι = יָבֵל 33<sup>21</sup> = יָבֵל? The second Gk. word may be a gloss or variant of the first.] The use of הַשֵּׁם in such a sense is, however, questionable; see 17<sup>8</sup> 18<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>5</sup> acc. to which locc. we might propose הַשֵּׁם He hath confounded (or appalled, astonished) all my company at me. For 'company' see 15<sup>34</sup>. Cf. also 19<sup>13.14</sup>.

v. 8. מֵה לְעֵד הִיא: lit. And Thou didst grasp me; he became a witness. This, to say the least, hardly justifies RV. The first word (Aram. קָטַם lay hold of, grip, contract or shrink: see 22<sup>16</sup>) is obviously corrupt, and renders the st. incoherent; while st. ii is overloaded and metr. redundant. The phrase וַיִּקְטֹּלֵנִי, st. ii, appears to be a marg. variant or correction of וַתִּקְטֹּלֵנִי. Accordingly, st. i might be וַיִּקְטֹּלֵנִי לְעֵד הִיא And He hath raised up for a witness against me (my) Ruin (for הִיא = הוּא, see note on 6<sup>2</sup>). Then st. ii יַעֲנֵה בְּפָנַי וַיִּשְׁמַע And my Sorrow to my face replieth, follows quite naturally. In Aram. נַחֲשָׁא, no doubt, is leanness (cf. Ps 109<sup>24</sup>?); but that word does not seem to be a specially happy description of Eyob's disease, and, moreover, in 6<sup>2</sup> נַחֲשָׁא is the parallel to הִיא (הוּא), as here.—It would perhaps be better, in view of st. ii, as a closer parallel, to restore st. i thus: וַתִּקְטֹּלֵנִי לְעֵד הוּא And my Ruin rose up against me as a witness (Ps 27<sup>12</sup>).—Ἦ gives a lit. trans. of Μ: καὶ ἐπελάβον μου εἰς μαρτύριον ἐγενήθη καὶ ἀνέστη ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ ψεῦδος μου, κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου ἀνταπεκρίθη.

v. 9. and slain me (i. e. in intention): rg. וַיִּקְטֹּלֵנִי (cf. Ἦ κατέβαλόν με = וַיִּשְׁמַתֵּנִי pro וַיִּשְׁמַתֵּנִי (30<sup>21</sup>) and bore a grudge against me (Gn 27<sup>41</sup>) or assailed me (30<sup>21</sup> Ps 55<sup>4</sup>). Ἦ also uses καταβάλλω for שָׁחַת let fall, throw down (Ex 26<sup>4</sup>), which would suit here. Ἦ פָּשַׁח rent me (cf. 2 K 9<sup>3</sup> שָׁמַח = פָּשַׁח! whence some would read וַיִּשְׁמַתֵּנִי and dropped me or threw me down here). שָׁמַח, str. bind, shackle, shut up, close = Syr. شام, cogn. c פָּתַם and שָׁמַח, is a Shaph. or Saph. formation form √TAM, TAN, with which cf. Sum. DIM, bind fast, close, a rope or cable, &c.

Satan is the 'Binder' (cf. Lk 13<sup>10</sup>).

gnashed or ground his teeth: in rage or hatred. Ps 35<sup>16</sup> 37<sup>12</sup> 112<sup>10</sup>

La 2<sup>16</sup>. As it stands, the verse is a tristich; but 6 restores the balance by add. here the st. βέλη (6<sup>1</sup>) πειρατῶν (25<sup>3</sup>) αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἔπεσεν = חֲצֵי נִדְרָיו נָפְלוּ עָלַי *His raiders' arrows have fallen upon me*. There is no trace of this in the other versions, but 6's Heb. text must have had it.

St. iii (iv). 𐤓 lit. *My Foe sharpens His eyes at me*. An isolated use of 𐤗𐤌𐤔 *whet* or *sharpen* implements (1 Sa 13<sup>20</sup>) and weapons (Ps 7<sup>13</sup>). Cf. our metaph. 'whetting the appetite'. As, however, שָׁנִי might easily have been misread עֵינַי, the st. was perhaps orig. a variant or gloss on st. ii, *He grinds upon me with His teeth*. 𐤗𐤌𐤔 for 𐤗𐤌 (6 *My enemies fixed their eyes upon me*). 𐤔 also points צָרִי *my foes*, with following plurals; connecting the st. with v. 10, where the plur. comes in very abruptly, but would be quite natural, if the st. added by 6 were authentic, as a reference to נִדְרָיו *His raiding bands* (cf. 15.17). 6 ἀκίσιν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐνήλατο, *With the barbs (or arrows) of (His) eyes He struck (or attacked)* = צָרִי עֵינָיו יִלְטֹשׁ *The blades of His eyes (i. e. His cutting looks) He sharpens*. For צר cf. Ex 4<sup>25</sup> Ps 89<sup>44</sup> (flint knife). (ἐνήλατο is perhaps a scribal error in 6 for ἐνηλάσατο.) There is much reason to regard vv. 9–14 as considerably interpolated, although it is no longer easy to distinguish the original from the later elements.

v. 10. Another tristich. St. i may be a marg. intrusion. As the vb. פָּעַר *open wide* (only of the mouth) is trans. everywhere else (29<sup>22</sup> Is 5<sup>14</sup> Ps 119<sup>131</sup>), leg. פִּיהֶם sine ב כ c 9 codd. et 678. Cf. the sim. phrase Ps 22<sup>14</sup> La 2<sup>16</sup> al. (ב = פ rep.? or is the unus. constr. a mark of the interpolator's hand? Cf., however, note on v. 4 c.) St. ii. *In scorn: בחרפה*: or *with a taunt*. See La 3<sup>30</sup>: *He will offer the cheek to the Smiler,—Will be full-fed with scorn*. Cf. also Ps 3<sup>8</sup> for the constr. (Mi 4<sup>14</sup> 1 K 22<sup>24</sup> c 𐤗𐤌). 6, however, read אַל (eis) or עַל (ἐπὶ 6A) here also. For the whole st. it gives: ὁξεῖ ἐπαισέν με eis τὰ γόνατα (6A\* γονατας. A scribal error for γέννας or γένεια, neither of which is a 6 word, or more prob. σιαγόνα, 1 K 22<sup>24</sup>). ὁξεῖ = פָּחַדָּה: see Is 49<sup>2</sup> Ez 5<sup>1</sup> Ps 57<sup>5</sup> (all פָּחַדָּה a sharp sword: it is not prob. that חרפה here is an Aramaism = Syr. חרפא *harpā* or *herpā*, 'blade' or 'sword').

St. iii. 𐤓 יתמלאן עלי יחד is unsatisfactory. יתמלאן *they gather themselves together* (RV), or *mass themselves*, denom. fr. מִלָּא *multitude* (OL), is improb. It should mean *they fill themselves* or *are filled*. It is most likely that יחד (which 678 seem to have read חָרִי) conceals the Obj. of the vb., viz. *burning anger* or *fury* (La 2<sup>3</sup>). Leg. חרִי־אף, 𐤔, חמתא, 𐤔, כנסא (var. כנסא).

v. 11. *giveth me up to . . .*, Dt 23<sup>16</sup> (a slave to his owner). 11<sup>10</sup>.

*the unjust*. Leg. עֲלִים (18<sup>21</sup> 27<sup>7</sup>) pro עֲוִיל which should mean *a boy* (19<sup>18</sup> 21<sup>11</sup>). Plur. as parallel to רשעים, st. ii (assuming the distich to be original. If, as seems prob., it be an interpolation, the Sing. might be a ref. to an unjust ruler of the period to which it belongs); 6 ἀδίκου

Sing. (ס); Plur. *hurleth me*: ירטיני, a doubtful word in Heb. Recurs app. Nu 22<sup>32</sup> ירט, where, however, ירע or ירע is almost certainly the true rg. The Ar. رط (Pi.), usu. compared, has the usual reek of the camel in it, and does not help us much. It is said to mean *He made him fall into* رطه, *warta*, i.e. *thin mud or slime* (also a *deep hollow or pit*), from which he could not extricate himself (see Lane). ט ερριψέν με (Θ<sup>2</sup> β<sup>2</sup> α<sup>2</sup> ε) suggests ירטיני (Ex 15<sup>1,21</sup>) or ירני (30<sup>19</sup>). Possibly ירטיני (see note on v. 9; cf. Je 16<sup>13</sup> 22<sup>28</sup>), or even ירטיני *lifts* (and *lays*) *me* (La 3<sup>26</sup>). ט gives אשלם *delivered up to* . . . in both stt.

v. 12. Another tristich; but st. iii may really belong to v. 13 as its first stichus. *At ease was I*. 3<sup>26</sup> 12<sup>6</sup> Je 12<sup>1</sup> La 1<sup>5</sup> Ps 122<sup>6</sup> (all). Perhaps rather שלם *whole* (cf. Josh 8<sup>31</sup>), which agrees better with the violent ויפררני *and He shattered me* (Pilp. here only) and ויפצצני *and He dashed me in pieces*. ט εἰρηνεύοντα (cf. 5<sup>24</sup> 15<sup>21</sup> = שלום).

St. ii. Leg. אָחוֹם om. ו (due to prec. י). So ט ב ט. *He seized me by the nape* or back of the neck (ערף). ט ῥῆς κομηῆς, *by the hair* = פָּרַע (Ez 44<sup>20</sup>) = ערפ read backwards! Cf. also Nu 6<sup>5</sup>. (Therefore not due to thinking of Ar. عرب *a mane*.) St. iii. Cf. La 3<sup>12</sup>; 1 Sa 20<sup>30</sup>. The statement is obv. connected with what follows, as beginning a different simile from that of the preceding distich. *He setteth me up*: om. ו (due to prec. י) c ט ט.

v. 13. *His marksmen* or archers; רבני. So Je 50<sup>29</sup> רבנים (cf. Gn 21<sup>10</sup> רבה, 49<sup>23</sup> רבו, Ps 18<sup>15</sup> רב). Since רבה, *to shoot*, are really *voes nihili*, leg. רבני (cf. Je 4<sup>29</sup> Ps 78<sup>9</sup>). ט λοχαῖς = רמח (Ez 39<sup>8</sup> Ne 4<sup>19</sup>), partially confirming רמיו.

*cleaveth*: i.e. with His arrows (יפלה): Pr 7<sup>23</sup>. All verbs in vv. 13, 14 are plur. in ט. With st. i cf. La 3<sup>13</sup>, and with st. ii כברי *My liver is poured out on the ground*, La 2<sup>11</sup>. See also note on 20<sup>25</sup>.

v. 14. על פני פריץ *upon the face of breach*. The superfluous פני is simply an erroneous anticipation or misreading of the following פריץ; or perhaps a mistaken substitute for it (pointing פני *my face*), as the third letter γ is a minuscule (written small as if it were conjectural). Cf. 2 Sa 5<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>8</sup>. ט They threw me down (Pr. 25<sup>28</sup> עיר פרוצה πτώμα ἐπὶ πτώματι, *fall upon fall*). The figure represents Eyob as an assaulted fortress.

v. 15. *my hide*. גִּלְרָה here only. Prob. an Aramaism; cf. Syr. גִּלְרָה *skin, hide*; גִּלְרֹנָא *a little skin*; גִּלְרִנָּא *leathery*. Cf. also Assy. gildān, *a hide* (c Det. of leather); Ar. جِلْد the *skin* of any animal (and plur. the *body and limbs* of a man). So ט ἐπὶ βύρσῃς μου, ט על משי *on my skin* (= Assy. mašku).

(and) *I have thrust*. The ו may be om., as due to prec. י. The vb. עללתי *I have made to enter, put into*, is another Aramaism only found here; cf. Old Aram. עלל, Syr. ܠܠ enter = בוא. *my horn*: a natural

symbol of pride and strength: cf. Dt 33<sup>17</sup> Ps 75<sup>5,10</sup>.  $\text{ט}$   $\tau\acute{o}$   $\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}n\acute{o}s$   $\mu\omicron\nu$ . (For the verb  $\text{ט}$  gives  $\epsilon\sigma\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta$  *was quenched* = תנחע, cf. 4<sup>10</sup>, or תכנע, cf. 40<sup>12</sup>, either of which might = עללח misread backwards. The more usual equivalent of  $\epsilon\sigma\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta$  is, of course, הרעך: 18<sup>5,6</sup> 21<sup>17</sup>: but apart from the question of the *ductus litterarum*, 'quenched' does not suit the sense here. We may suspect a corruption in  $\text{ט}$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta$  having perhaps arisen out of  $\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$  or some similar form.)

v. 16.  $\text{ט}$   $\eta$   $\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho$   $\mu\omicron\nu$   $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$   $\kappa\lambda\alpha\upsilon\theta\mu\omicron\upsilon$ , *My belly is burnt up from weeping*: rg. בטני ( $\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho$  = בטן eleven times in Job) for פני; no doubt under the influence of La 1<sup>20</sup> 2<sup>11</sup>, מעי חמרמי *My bowels are in a ferment* or 'work': see חמר I = Ar. خمر. Here, however, the Root seems to be חמר IV = Ar. حمر *it became احمر red* ( $\acute{a}\pi$  in OT). It looks as if the poet had misunderstood La ll. cc. עיני *my eye* (or *eyes*?) would give a better parallel to 'eyelids'; and if pointed as Sing., would account for Ketib חמרמה: cf. v. 20, La 3<sup>19</sup> Ps 6<sup>8</sup> 88<sup>10</sup>. The eyes do redden with weeping; and in seven of the ten locc. where עפעפים *eyelids* occurs עינים the *eyes* are also mentioned (the exceptions are 3<sup>9</sup> and Pr 6<sup>25</sup>). Leg. therefore עיני חמרמי *Mine eyes are red with weeping* (vb. as Qerî).

St. ii is metr. short, as the first two words (the Prep. and its Noun) involve only one stress. Add נפלה before צלמות: *And upon mine eyelids Darkness is fallen*: cf. Gn 15<sup>12</sup>, and see note on 3<sup>5</sup>. There is no reference here, nor in 12<sup>22</sup> 24<sup>17</sup> 28<sup>3</sup> 34<sup>22</sup>, nor in any of the eighteen locc. where צלמות occurs, to the shadow that falls on the face of the dying. The word simply means *intense darkness*, and is a stronger syn. of חשך, in combination with which it is naturally used to describe the gloom of She'ol, the dark world of the Dead, 10<sup>21</sup>.

v. 17. Perhaps should follow v. 14. St. i. על לא חמס בכפי. For the constr. cf. Is 53<sup>9</sup> עשה על לא חמס *Although he had done no violence*. Cf. also for על 10<sup>7</sup> 34<sup>6</sup>. (1 C 12<sup>17</sup> בלא חמס בכפי: בלא = על לא.)

St. ii is metr. too short. After ותפילתי we might insert the somewhat similar לפני *before Him* (*And my prayer before Him was pure*); cf. Ps 18<sup>1</sup>: or we might read ותפלת שפתי זכה *And the Prayer of my lips was pure* (i. e. sincere); cf. Ps 17<sup>1</sup> 40<sup>10</sup> 51<sup>17</sup>. The latter expedient provides a parallel to בכפי, st. i.

v. 18. O Earth, cover not my blood! Perhaps דמי plur. as in Gn 4<sup>10</sup>: *Hark! thy brother's outpourings of blood are crying to Me out of the ground!* ( $\text{ט}$  *the blood of my flesh*: add. בשרי.) Even the blood of wild animals snared or shot for food had to be poured on the ground and covered with soil (Le 17<sup>13</sup>), since the blood was the life, alike of man and beast, and, as such, a sacred or forbidden thing (*tapû*). If left uncovered, the blood of a murdered man was believed to call down the vengeance of Heaven on the murderer. The prayer *And let there not be a place* (6<sup>17</sup>)



for my cry! is an entreaty that the appeal of his blood for vengeance may not be stifled by imprisonment underground (covered in, as it were, on the spot where it had been shed), but may rise unhindered to the ear of God. מָקוֹם a standing-place, station, a place of stay or abode (21<sup>11</sup> 7<sup>10</sup> 6<sup>11</sup> 9<sup>6</sup> 8<sup>18</sup> 27<sup>21</sup> 28<sup>12</sup> al.), means, not so much a 'resting place' (RV), as a place of fixed abode (= Ar. مَقَامٌ *maqām*). Cf. the *maqāms* of buried Moslem saints. Such a home in the earth was supposed to appease and silence the 'crying' or protesting blood.

The addition ap. ὁ τῆς σαρκός μου makes the st. too long. If it were authentic, the allusion would not be to Eyob's death, as that of a man unjustly slain, but rather to the bloody ooze of his sores (7<sup>6</sup>), which drops from his tortured body on the ground. V. 22 ('a few years') shows that he is not expecting immediate death.

v. 19. The Heb. is in partial disorder. Consequently, st. i is too long, and st. ii too short metr. Either נִשְׁעָתָה or הִנֵּה must be transferred to st. ii. The former seems preferable: *Behold, my Witness is in Heaven; And even now my Testifier is in the Heights!* The Aramaism שְׁהִיר (אֲפִי), is merely a poet. syn. of עֵר (st. i). Cf. שְׁהִירוּתָא *Testimony*, Gn 31<sup>47</sup>. שְׁהִירָי my witnesses in st. i; שְׁהִירָי my acquaintance, st. ii. Cf. ὁ δὲ συνίστωρ μου ἐν ὑψίστοις = Et conscius meus in excelsis, Soph. Philoct. 1293, ὡς θεοὶ συνίστορες, 'As the gods are witnesses!'

v. 20. St. i metr. short, prosaic, and ill-coherent with st. ii. Lit. *My scorers* (or *interpreters*, 33<sup>23</sup>) *are my friends; Unto Eloah mine eye hath dropped or dripped* (RV supplet *tears*). ἀφίκοιτό μου ἡ δέξις πρὸς Κύριον | ἐναντὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ στάζει μου ὁ ὀφθαλμός = ולפניו | יצאתי תֵּנֶע אל-יהוה רלפּה עיני *My prayer* (Aramaism = צִלּוּתָא), *it cometh unto Iahvah* (cf. 4: Jon 3<sup>6</sup>); *And before Him mine eye droppeth tears*. This may be right.

v. 21. Lit. *That He may argue* (or *reason*) *for a man with Eloah* (i.e. with Himself), *And between* (leg. בֵּין pro בֵּן c 5 codd.) *a mortal and his fellow*. Perhaps בֵּין בְּנֵי אָדָם *And between a son of man*. The likeness of the two words might have easily led to the omission of one of them. It will be seen that the verse thus represents the thing prayed for (v. 20). ὅ takes ויוכח as an Optative (of ὅ), and so breaks the connexion with the previous verse: *But would that a son of man might convince* (or *confute*) *God, as a man his fellow!* = ויוכח בן אדם עם אלוה: כנבּר לרעהו: (app. transposing the two synn. for *man*). ἥ *Is it possible that a son of man argue with God, even as* (והִיךְ) *a man with his fellow?* Cf. also 3.

v. 22. Eyob still expects a few years of life (though only a few) before the inevitable end, according to the normal course of his malady. The words are not those of one 'feeling that he is about to die', as Driver supposed.

Chapter 17. The opening verses are extremely corrupt, if not hope-

lessly so. V. 1, to begin with, is incoherent, unmetrical, and expressed in dubious if not impossible Hebrew. Lit. it runs, or rather halts: *My spirit is broken* (Is 10<sup>27</sup>? or *destroyed, ruined*)—*my days are quenched—graves for me!* Forcible as this may sound to an English reader, it is too disjointed both in form and sense. Moreover, חבל is never used of the spirit, which comes from God (Gn 2<sup>7</sup> 6<sup>3</sup> 7<sup>22</sup> Job 10<sup>12</sup> 27<sup>3</sup> 32<sup>8</sup> 34<sup>14</sup> Ps 104<sup>29,30</sup>) and at death 'goeth upward' (Ec 3<sup>21</sup>), that is, app., returns to God. The idea of 'destroying' רוח is quite alien to Heb. thought. In Assy. *habālu* Pa. is to *destroy* buildings. Cf. also the word חבל app. *dead*, common at the end of the Palmyrene epitaphs. In Ar. we have خَبِلَ *be, or become, corrupted, unsound, vitiated, or disordered*, abs. (cf. Ne 1<sup>7</sup> ch. 34<sup>31</sup>), and esp. in mind, *deranged or insane*, and Trans. خَبِلَ *corrupt or render unsound, &c.*, also *restrain, withhold, or debar* a man from doing something. ὀλέκομαι (cf. 32<sup>18</sup>) πνεύματι φερόμενος | Δέομαι δὲ ταφῆς καὶ οὐ τυγχάνω, *I am perishing, carried away by the wind, While I beg a grave and obtain it not* = נָדָה בְּרוּחַ נִדָּה (13<sup>25</sup> Le 26<sup>36</sup> ⑤); or, since φέρω usu. renders הָבִיא (over 130 times), φερόμενος may indicate מוֹבֵא instead of נָדָה: וְנִעְזְבוּ קְבָרִי וְאִי־לִי. But although this brings us nearer to a normal distich, apart from objections to the implied Heb., it does not agree with Eyob's anticipation of a few more years of life expressed in the preceding verse (16<sup>22</sup>). Duhm's רוחו חבלה ימי *His spirit* (i.e. *temper, animosity*, Ju 8<sup>3</sup>) *hath destroyed my days*, לִי נִעְזְבוּ קְבָרִים *The graves are left to me*, though attractive, is far from certain. He assumes a non-existent נָעַץ = φερόμενος and supposes that δέομαι = בִּי a Particle of Entreaty, as in the Hexateuch; and then combines the two into נִעְזְבוּ, referring to Is 18<sup>6</sup>. But that passage hardly justifies the required mg. נִעְזְבוּ. Eyob does not mean *The graves are abandoned or wholly given up to me*. And there is an obvious rhetorical pause at 16<sup>22</sup>, which is violated by connecting this distich closely with that verse, as Duhm finds himself obliged to do. Besides, the δὲ = ו must not be ignored (יְבִי does not seem possible). We suggest רוחי חבלה מאמר *My mind is too disordered for speech* (אמר Ps 19<sup>1</sup> or אמר Infin.); cf. the Ar. use of the root חבל: *Words* (קברים pro דברים) *are abhorrent* (נִעְזְבוּ pro נִעְזְבוּ) *to me*. Or we might read נִדָּעוּ c 10 codd. and ⑤ for the otherwise unknown נִדָּעוּ: *Words are extinct to me* (6<sup>17</sup> 18<sup>5,6</sup> 21<sup>17</sup>). He feels too ill and weary to continue a futile argument.

v. 2. RV is enough to suggest a suspicion of corruption here. What is the mg. of 'mine eye abideth in their provocation'? It is difficult to attain to even a relative certainty of text. ⑤'s Heb. appears to have been very defective here. Instead of אֵם לֹא הָחִיל עִמִּי וַעֲמִי it presents us with λίσσομαι κάμνων, καὶ τί ποιήσας (-σω); as if remembering Is 16<sup>12</sup> לֹא תִפְלֵל נִלְאָה and reading or guessing עֲשֵׂה וְמָה (א)עֲשֵׂה וְמָה (א)עֲשֵׂה from a collocation of ill-written and partly effaced letters. This hardly

helps us; but it is instructive to note the confusion of letters involved in עשה = עמדי (W pro מ; ה = די conjunct.), and the letters of לאה occurring in that order in לא ה'.

For st. ii instead of מ's highly problematical חלן עיני ובהמרותם חלן And mine eye must rest on their display of rebellion (?), ט gives us ἐκλεψαν δέ μου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀλλότριοι = וורים גנבו אוני And strangers have stolen my goods. Here אוני clearly corresponds to עיני; while ורים (or ונכרים) suggests a possible orig. ובמזבים And on lies, which would be a suitable parallel to החולים deceptions, mockeries.

But since ננב may mean to deceive or delude as well as to steal (Gn 31<sup>27</sup> al.), it seems possible that it stood in the original text here and that ט, misunderstanding this use of it and desiderating an object of the supposed theft, misread or altered עיני into אוני = τὰ ὑπάρχοντα μου. As a tentative restoration of the Heb. text we may therefore suggest: מלא מהחלים עמדי | ובמגנבים חלן עיני | A mob of sophists is with me; | And mine eye resteth on (19<sup>i</sup>) deceivers. For מלא a multitude or crowd, see Gn 48<sup>19</sup> Is 31<sup>4</sup>. But perhaps we should retain אמילא Verily (1<sup>ii</sup>, cf. 6<sup>iii</sup>). (In my old notes I find ובהמרותם for ובהמרות, with a reference to chap. 13<sup>26</sup>. I mention the fact because Duhm reads בתמרורים on the basis of the same passage. Leaving the rest of the distich as it stands in מ, we thus get the sense: Verily deceptions or mock-arguments, mockeries, are with me; And mine eye dwelleth on bitternesses. This, however, does not agree so well with the preceding distich; and for the sake of the parallelism it would be better to read ובמרותם and on deceits, wiles; 15<sup>iii</sup> Gn 27<sup>35</sup> 34<sup>13</sup> Ps 10<sup>7</sup> 35<sup>20</sup>.)

v. 3. Appoint, I pray, a surety for me with Thyself, For (בי omitted after י?) who is he that will pledge himself for me? Here, with Reiske, we point ערבני my pledge = surety or bail for me, instead of ערבני מ surety for me (Is 38<sup>14</sup>). The elliptic use of שימה Appoint (a pledge) is hardly probable. In what follows, st. ii, the expression is unusual: lit. Who is he that will strike himself (i.e. his own hand) for my hand? But read יתקע (י?) מידו-אלי יר. Cf. Pr 6<sup>1</sup> 17<sup>16</sup> (ט apparently יקשר = σπένδω for יתקע). It omits the first stichus of the verse altogether. What does Duhm mean by טמני?)

v. 4. מ lit. For their heart (i.e. the heart of his friends) Thou hast hidden from insight (cf. Ps 31<sup>21</sup>). OL strangely: 'Thou (God) hast treasured up their heart away from understanding, kept it therefrom.' If we transpose the Prep. (the usual const. Ps. 31<sup>21</sup>) we get the more natural sense For Thou hast hidden insight from their heart. St. ii has only two stresses (the Qínah-measure, of which we have had so many apparent examples). Moreover, if the points of מ are correct (תרימים), the trans. vb. lacks an Obj. This might be קרנם their horn (1 Sa 2<sup>10</sup> Ps 75<sup>11</sup> 89<sup>18</sup> 92<sup>11</sup>), and תרימם may be the remains of תרימם(?) which would

complete the distich. Cf. also 16<sup>15</sup>. (ראשם *their head* is also possible: Pr 3<sup>1</sup> 27<sup>6</sup>. The couplet reads like a psalm-verse, and may be an interpolation.)

v. 5. מ is really meaningless. לַחֲלֹק יָגִיד רָעִים *For a share (of the feast or booty?) he reporteth (informeth agst.? cf. Je 20<sup>10</sup>) friends* is an unlikely statement in this context, even if the Heb. could signify so much, which is more than doubtful. ט varies the vowels of רָעִים: ῥῆ μερίδι ἀναγγελεῖ κακίας (i.e. רָעִים): while in st. ii it gives ἐφ' υἱοῖς = עַל-בְּנָי for בְּנָי. For ἐτάκησαν = תְּכַלִּינָה see 11<sup>20</sup>. The distich may possibly be a mere variation of 6<sup>21</sup> (*They cast the lot over their friend, And over the orphan they bargain*, or the like). The *ductus litt.* will, however, be followed more closely if we emend יַחֲלִיקוּ לְגֵר רָעָה *They apportion evil to the stranger* (31<sup>32</sup>); leaving st. ii almost or altogether as it stands in מ: *And the eyes of his (the gér's) children fail*. It is true that such an indictment of Eyob's friends does not seem specially appropriate here; and the verse may be a marginal quotation which has intruded into the text. Duhm, regarding it as such, hazards the following version of מ: 'Whoso informs against a friend on account of a pledge, His children's eyes do pine'; a proverbial saying (משל) which he compares with 6<sup>14</sup>, referring to 2 Sa 20<sup>2(1)</sup> for the sense of חֲלָק and paraphrasing our verse: 'He who causes an insolvent friend to be distrained upon at law, his children will rue it!' Ingenious as this interpretation may be, it is questionable whether לַחֲלֹק can bear the mg. put upon it. A better connexion of thought with the sequel would be gained by reading חֲלָקִי לְהַגִּיר דְּמָעָה | וְעֵינֵי בְּכֵי תְּכַלִּינָה *'Tis my lot to pour down tears, And mine eyes fail with weeping* (cf. ט<sup>AC</sup> ὀφθαλμοὶ δέ μου = וְעֵינֵי). This would also obviate rejection of the verse.

v. 6. מ וְהִצִּינִי. Either omit the ו, as seems better, read c ט (ἐθου δέ με), וְהִצִּינִי *And Thou hast set me for (= made me) a byword of peoples* (point לְמִשַׁל instead of the ἀπ. לְמִשַׁל—an old scribal error), or perhaps of the tribes in Eyob's neighbourhood. In st. ii חִפָּת *spittle (?)* is very doubtful. ℣ *Gehenna*; identifying the word with 'the Tophet' in the valley of ben Hinnom (2 K 23<sup>10</sup> Je 7<sup>31</sup> al.); ℥ תַּחֲפִיתָא a *veil* or *covering*; ℞ exemplum (= מִפֶּת?); ט γέλως an object of *mirth*, a *laughing-stock* (connecting the word with חֶף *timbrel*, 21<sup>12</sup>). In the similar passage, 30<sup>9,10</sup>, the term for spittle is רִק, as also in Is 50<sup>9</sup>. The existence of a √חף or חֶף or חוּף to *spit* may perhaps be inferred from תִּפַּל and Ar. تَفَّلَ *to spit a little saliva*, as well as from Eth. tafēa, spuit, exspuit, inspuit; but if our stichus means *And I become one in whose face they spit* (Duhm: Ein Spei-ihn-an, a Spit-in-his-face), would be a more natural way of expressing it than וְתַפַּת פָּנִים אֲהִיָּה cf. Is 53<sup>3</sup>. Instead of לְפָנֵים, however, ℥ suggest לְפָנֵיהֶם *before them*; and ℞'s version of the stichus *Et exemplum sum coram eis* perhaps supports the apt conjecture מִפֶּת in place of חִפָּת: *And I become a sign (or portent, or*

wonder) before them.  $\Theta$  αὐτοῖς = לָהֶם unto them; the more usual constr. (see Ez 12<sup>6</sup> 24<sup>24.27</sup> Ps 71<sup>7</sup>). As affording a better parallel to עַמִּים we may suggest לְלֵאמִים (cf. Assyr. li-i-mu, syn. of *kintu*, 'family') to nations instead of לַפְּנִים: And I become a sign (portent or wonder; cf. v. 8 Ps 71<sup>7</sup>) to nations. The verse, in any case, seems more appropriate to Israel in exile than to a suffering individual (cf. מִשַׁל עַמִּים and Dt 28<sup>46</sup>) and may not have belonged here originally. It interrupts the connexion between vv. 5, 7, and should perhaps follow the latter verse. The words מִפֶּת and לֵאמִים (Pss Pr) are not found elsewhere in Job.

v. 7. כַּעַשׁ (5<sup>2</sup> 6<sup>2</sup> 10<sup>17</sup>) vexation, anger, here means grief, sorrow, as כַּעַס in Ps 68 31<sup>10</sup>. The eyes are dimmed (Gn 27<sup>1</sup>) by weeping. Cf. v. 5.

St. 2.  $\mathfrak{B}$  et membra mea quasi in nihilum redacta sunt. Hence the usual rendering: *And my limbs are all like a shadow*. But צִרִי my limbs is a dubious *ἀντ.* We might read צִרִי (= צוּרִי) after Ps 49<sup>15</sup> Q. *my form*; thus vindicating another occurrence for a rare word; or we might point יִצְרִי my frame, Ps 103<sup>14</sup> (cf.  $\Theta$  my thoughts, pointing יִצְרִי my 'frames of mind', purposes).  $\Theta$ 's πεπολιορκημαι μεγάλως ὑπὸ πάντων, *I have been besieged greatly by all* (confusing צוּר to fashion or draw, Ez 43<sup>11</sup>, with צוּר to besiege) seems to favour יִצְרִי. (In 30<sup>30</sup> מעָלִי = מעָלִי! Here it stands for כַּעַל, perhaps misread כַּעַל. Thus  $\Theta$ 's version of the st. may represent יִצְרִי וְעָלִי בָלֵם. For בָּלֵם read בָּלָה is wasted (7<sup>9</sup> 33<sup>21</sup>). Another possible and perhaps probable emendation of the st. is בָּלָה וְעָלִי בָלֵם (the first word perhaps written defectively וְעָלִי = וְעָלִי) *And my flesh is as worn as a shadow* (cf. Pr 5<sup>11</sup> Ps 73<sup>26</sup>).

vv. 8-10 interrupt the connexion of vv. 7, 11 sqq. We might render v. 8<sup>a</sup> *Upright men would be confounded at this*; understanding the words as an insinuation that the Friends were not honest and sincere; had they been so, they must have been confounded at the sight of Eyob's unmerited sufferings. The second stichus, as it stands, cannot be translated so as to agree with this. But a slight correction gives the sense: *And an innocent one might be moved to impiety or apostasy* (reading לְחִנְיָ Is 32<sup>6</sup>, or לְחִנְיָ Je 23<sup>16</sup>, or Infin. לְחִנְיָ; cf. Is 64<sup>6</sup> בֶּן לְחִיּוֹק bestirring himself to lay hold on Thee). Then v. 9 will be: *But the righteous* (i.e. I myself) *will hold fast his way, And the guiltless become more resolute* (lit. *And the clean-handed adds or will add strength*: אֶמְצֵן? אֶמְצֵן Infin.). The greater his sufferings, the stronger Eyob's determination to affirm and to abide by his own innocence (cf. 2<sup>3b</sup> 27<sup>6a</sup>). At best, however, the verses remain an interruption; and v. 11, which resumes the tone and tenor of v. 7, is hardly a natural continuation of them. On the other hand, Bildad's echo of them, 18<sup>20</sup>, goes to prove vv. 8, 9, authentic. Possibly, therefore, vv. 8-10 should be transferred to the end of the chapter, to which they would form a not unsuitable close. After avowing his own despair, Eyob defies his friends to produce any argument that can shake

his inflexible consciousness of innocence. (Duhm thinks that vv. 8–10 express the point of view of Eyob's friends rather than his own, and may have been transferred hither from chap. 18.)

v. 8. If with ㊦ we transpose the two nouns in st. ii, we get for the verse the excellent sense: *Upright men are confounded at this* (i. e. the spectacle of his sufferings), *And the impious triumpheth over the innocent* (cf. 31<sup>20</sup> for this mg. of the vb.); as is quite natural, and often happens. To this v. 9 adds that, however baffling to reason the dealings of Providence may prove to be in individual cases, they will never cause the good man to swerve from the way of righteousness.

v. 9. For צדיק *righteous* ㊦ gives πιστός (ἁ<sup>9</sup> δίκαιος), the usual equivalent of נאמן *trustworthy* (12<sup>20</sup>); perhaps a variant in the Heb. text. In st. ii ㊦ misread app. יסבל (ἀναλάβοι θάρσος cf. Is 46<sup>4</sup>) for יסיר.

v. 10. St. i is metr. too long and more or less corrupt. The line will still be unmetr., if (c 5 codd. et ㊦) we read כלכם *all of you* for ㊦'s ungrammatical כלם *all of them*. The var. יבאו (K<sup>Or</sup>) for ובאו indicates perception of the difficulty, but only half remedies it (! תשבו). The simplest way of restoring both sense and metre is to omit כלם as dittogr. (from v. 7 *end*) or as having grown out of אלם repet., and to read ואלם שובו בארנא *But, pray you, come on again!* Cf. Is 21<sup>13</sup>. See further at 18<sup>4</sup>. (㊦ ἐπειδὴ = תפשו! Cf. Pr 30<sup>28</sup>.)

v. 11. This and the following verse are again extremely corrupt. AV and its margin fairly render ㊦'s text of v. 11; but the triple division of the words sets the metre at naught. ㊦ at least gives us a distich: 'My days did pass in uproar; And the joints of my heart were broken.' Ἐν βρόμῳ, *in din*, or *fury*, suggests a storm; as if ㊦ read or guessed בָּרוּם (24<sup>8</sup>; cf. Ps 90<sup>5</sup>), which might represent an original בָּרוּם *like the rain-storm*. Possibly, however, ἐν βρόμῳ = בועם or בועף *in fury* or *raging*. ㊦ ἐν δρόμῳ, *at a run* = בְּמַרְצָה. Βρόμος may, however, stand for βρωμος, *foul smell, stink*, as in 6<sup>7</sup>. Possibly, therefore, ㊦ connected זמתי (or whatever corresponded to it in ㊦'s exemplar) with the √זם (Heb., Aram., Ar.) *to be foul* or *stinking* (33<sup>20</sup>). 'My days pass in noisomeness' gives an adequate sense (זמהמות?). But inasmuch as the √זם in Aramaic (Syriac) may signify *sound* and *noise*, ㊦ may, after all, have had זמתי in its Heb. text. We would restore נצמתי *are ended*, after 6<sup>17</sup> 23<sup>17</sup>; La 3<sup>63</sup>. (Duhm: צמתי.) Those who desiderate a simile in stichus i, may prefer to read כַּמֶּן עֵבֶר יוֹם *like chaff*; comparing כַּמֶּן עֵבֶר יוֹם Zp 2<sup>2</sup> Is 29<sup>5</sup>: see also 21<sup>18</sup> Ho 13<sup>3</sup>. יַפְתִּי *my purposes* might have been orig. a marginal gloss on מורשי לבבי, which Buhl and Duhm explain *the wishes of my heart*, deriving מורש from √ארש, Assyr. éréšu, *to wish, ask for*. With such a verb as נחש, however, one would expect something more concrete and physical, e.g. *my heart-strings* (מיתרי לבבי); and we may even perhaps suspect the presence of an Aramaism, and interpret the ἄπ. λεγόμεν. מורשי

in the sense of *beams* (Aram. מרישא *a beam*, 1 K 6<sup>36</sup>). The phrase לִבִּי מ' may thus be analogous to, and perhaps a later equivalent of Jeremiah's קירות לִבִּי *the walls of my heart* (Je 4<sup>19</sup>), which might very well be corrected into קורות ל' *the beams of my heart*. Our distich would thus become

*My days pass away* (6<sup>16</sup> 11<sup>16</sup>) *like chaff*;  
*The beams* (or strings?) *of my heart are snapped asunder.*

For the meaning *strings* or *cords*, we might compare another Aram. term, viz. the Syriac ܡܢܬܐ, ܡܢܬܐ *hempen rope, cable*. In either case, the second stichus is preserved without alteration. But I cannot refrain from mentioning another expedient which I find in my old notes, viz. to read מורשי for שרשי ( $\text{w} = \text{w}$ ), and to render *Torn up are the roots of my heart*.

v. 12. There is great diversity in the attempts to explain or emend this verse. The general sense appears to be that God turns Eyob's day into night.

*Night for day I* (or *He*, i.e. Eloah: vss. 3, 4, 6) *put* (*putteth*);  
*And my* (*the*) *light* (or *dawn*) *is dim* (*murky*) *with darkness.*

The first stichus recalls Isaiah's לֹאֹר שָׁמַיִם חָשֶׁךְ, and is probably a reminiscence of that passage (5<sup>20</sup>). For שִׁים וְאוֹר read שִׁים וְאוֹר (א)(י)שִׁים. Instead of מִפְּנֵי we suggest מִנִּי, as in 6<sup>16</sup>, although מִפְּנֵי might mean *because of, through*. Cf. also וְקֹרֶר עֲלֵיהֶם הָיוּ (Mi 3<sup>6</sup>). 𐤓 supports 𐤓: νύκτα εἰς ἡμέραν ἔθηκεν (A), Φῶς ἐγένετο ἀπὸ πρὸς ὧτος σκοτόν. We can say in English, *And the light is wellnigh darkness*; but it is doubtful whether מִפְּנֵי could be so used in Hebrew. We might also emend: וְאוֹר יִקְרִיב בְּמִרְחָשֶׁךְ *And the light He joineth to darkness (makes them one*: cf. Is 5<sup>8</sup> שְׂדֵה בְּשֶׁדָּה יִקְרִיב). Duhm reads וְאוֹר מִפְּנֵי חָשֶׁךְ | לֵילָה לַיּוֹם אֵשֶׁת and translates 'Die Nacht mache ich zum Tage, | Und Licht ist vor mir Finsternis.' But is not the poet's meaning rather that Eyob's day is turned into night (cf. the parallel stichus)? and can מִפְּנֵי express 'vor mir', *before me* (לִפְנֵי)? Would not מִפְּנֵי rather mean 'from my presence', or else 'because of me'? Moreover, the metre of Duhm's second stichus is rather halting, and the disyllable קֹרֶר, which he rejects as a distortion of קִרְרָתִי, a supposed gloss on אֵשֶׁת, is not metrically redundant. It is probably a disguise of some word (e.g. קֹרֶר or בֹּקֶר) in the original text. But אֵשֶׁת, the first pers., may be preferred to שִׁים, which I conjectured independently many years ago. We might then read אוֹרִי *my light* instead of וְאוֹר. Lastly, in view of 7<sup>1</sup>, we may suggest the distich לֵילָה לַיּוֹם חָשֶׁךְ | אוֹרִי בֹקֶר וְאֵפֶן לַחֲשֶׁךְ *Night for day I put; Dawn shineth, and I look for darkness.* Gn 44<sup>3</sup> Hg 1<sup>9</sup>.

- v. 13. *Yea, I hope for She'ol as my home,  
In (the) Darkness I (have) spread my couch;*  
v. 14 *To the Pit I cry, 'Thou art my father!'—  
'My mother and sister!' to the maggot.*

In v. 13<sup>a</sup> מ has אם *if* (ἢ εἰ), for which אף *yea, also, besides* seems better. Duhm: 'If I hope, She'ol is my house' &c. But the verb קוה requires an Object (7<sup>2</sup> 30<sup>26</sup>): and here Eyob is looking forward to death as the end of his sufferings. V. 14 *end* ט paraphrases רמה, the corpse-devouring *maggot*, by σαπρίαν, *rotteness* (so 21<sup>26</sup> 25<sup>6</sup>) in curious agreement with the √רמס = Ar. رَمَ to rot, decay, whence רמה *maggot* is derived.

- v. 15. *And where, then, is there (other) hope for me?  
And my good, who can descry it?*

תקותי *my hope* = hope for me. In st. ii מ ותקותי is obviously a scribe's erroneous repetition. Read טובתי *my good* (22<sup>21</sup>) = ט τὰ ἀγαθὰ μου, with Merx, Bickell, Duhm. ט's ὁψομαι is a reminiscence of 7<sup>7</sup>.

- v. 16. *Will they descend with me into She'ol?  
Or shall we go down together into the Dust?*

So ט: ἢ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς ᾗδην καταβήσονται, | ἢ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ χώματος καταβησόμεθα; = וְאִם-יֵחָד עַל-עֶפְרָה נִחָה | הָעֶפְרָה שֶׁאֵל תִּרְדָּנָה. מ has: *To the bars (str. poles or staves) of She'ol will they descend; Or together on the Dust (will there be) rest?* But the particle וְ is almost necessary to the construction (a Disjunctive Interrogation) at the beginning of stichus i; and it might easily have fallen out after the preceding ה. When the ו also had disappeared, the meaningless מדי became ברי (Ho 11<sup>6</sup>). But the usual expression is not *bars*, but *gates* of She'ol (Is 38<sup>10</sup> Ps 9<sup>13</sup>; cf. chap. 38<sup>17</sup>). The difference between נִחָה (Pausal form נִחָה) *rest* and נִחָה *shall we go down*, in stichus ii, is merely a matter of points; and the verse as a whole affords an excellent instance of the preservation of the authentic text by ט. (מ's In profundissimum infernum = בְּרִי שֶׁאֵל.)

- Chapter 18. *In answer Bildad of Shuah said:  
How long wilt thou not make an end?  
Hold! that we too may speak.*

So ט: Μέχρι τίνος οὐ παύσῃ; Ἐπίσχες, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ λαλήσωμεν. The original text may have been—

עַד אַנָּה לֹא תִשֵּׁם קֶץ  
תִּבֹּל וְאִנְחָנוּ נִרְבֵּר;

קץ *set or put an end*; sc. to words, as implied by the context. Cf. 16<sup>3</sup>. תִּבֹּל *finish!* or *have done!* Cf. לְרַבֵּר, Gn 18<sup>30</sup> Je 26<sup>9</sup>. We might also point תִּבֹּל *hold in!* cf. Je 6<sup>11</sup> 20<sup>9</sup>; or read תִּחַדֵּל *cease!* (= ἐπίσχες. cf. 1 K 22<sup>6,15</sup>). Better perhaps לֹא-תַעְצֹר בְּמִלִּין *How long wilt thou not restrain words?* Cf. 29<sup>9</sup> ט; 4<sup>2</sup> 12<sup>6</sup>



The text of **מ** cannot be original, for it violates both sense and metre. It is usually rendered: 'How long will ye set snares for words? Attend (or Understand) ye, and afterwards we will speak.' But the plur. verbs in addressing Eyob are manifestly inappropriate; the meaning *snares* for the once-occurring קנצי has no better basis than comparison of the Ar. vb. قنص catch, ensnare; the grammar of st. i is bad (קנצי should be קנצים), and st. ii is really nonsensical. As Duhm observes, Bildad was not going to speak 'afterwards', but immediately. It is evident that st. i is overloaded, and that something must be sacrificed for the sake of the metre. Duhm rejects ער אנה, as added from 19<sup>1</sup> after the verse had already become corrupt, and reads simply חשם קין למלין *Put an end to words!*, which barely satisfies rhythm and metre, besides diverging too far from both **ט** and **מ**, and making too abrupt a beginning.

v. 3. *Why are we regarded as cattle—  
As the beasts that perish—in thine eyes?*

In st. ii **מ** gives: נטמינו בעינינו, usually taken to mean, (*Why*) *are we treated as unclean* (נטמאנו = נטמינו) *in thine eyes?* But the Niphal of טמא is not so used elsewhere, and hardly makes good sense here. **ט** perhaps read נרמנו (= σεσωπήκαμεν); see 29<sup>21</sup>; 41<sup>4</sup> for רמם = σιωπάω. [It reproduces only one of the two verbs of the verse. Possibly it misread נחשבנו in st. i as החרשנו (= σεσωπήκαμεν: see 41<sup>4</sup> **ט**).] In any case, it is clear that the stichus, with its two words, is metrically too short. כעיר might easily have fallen out after its syn. בהמה. I have therefore ventured on נרמו בעיניך כבעיר (cf. Ps 49<sup>13,21</sup>); or we might read נמשלנו לבעיר בעיניך (Ps 49, l. c.), thus getting the sense:

*Why are we regarded as cattle—  
Are we like to the beasts in thine eyes?*

**ט** rightly implies the sing. suffix with its ἐναντίον σου (cf. note on v. 2).

v. 4. [*O render of himself in wrath!*] Cf. 16<sup>9</sup>. **ט** renders vb. by χράομαι, as in 16<sup>9</sup>. (ἀέχρηται σοι ὀργή, *anger possesses (?) thee.*) This line being only half a distich, it is evident that (if it be genuine) another line at least has been accidentally omitted either before or after it. Accordingly Duhm transfers the five stichi, ch. 17<sup>8-10a</sup>, to this place; remarking that they form two complete tetrastichs when thus prefixed to the three stichi of 18<sup>1</sup>. He rejects 17<sup>10b</sup> as added, possibly, by the same hand as 17<sup>4</sup>, in order to complete the distich in its new position. Then he links 17<sup>10a</sup>, which he reads ואלם חשב ובא נא, with 18<sup>1a</sup>; thus getting the distich:

*But come back hither, I pray,  
O man that rendeth himself in his wrath!*

It must, however, be admitted that the statement *Upright men are dumbfounded at such talk* (as thine: על זאת; cf. 8<sup>2</sup>, על אלה), *And the pure*

*risers up against the unholy, And the righteous holds fast his way, And the pure-handed becomes all the firmer!* does not seem to follow naturally on the indignant question *Why are we regarded as cattle, As the beasts that perish, in thine eyes?* (18<sup>a</sup>). The unaccommodating passage, in fact, interrupts the context here almost as violently as in ch. 17; and style, tone, and spirit are quite different. Moreover, if *טַרְף נַפְשׁוֹ בְּאִפּוֹ* were directly addressed to Eyob, it would prob. have been otherwise expressed; viz. *טַרְף נַפְשׁוֹ בְּאִפּוֹ*, c suff. 2 Pers. > 3 Pers. The line may be a marginal comment on Bildad's angry bearing. But more prob. it belongs to v. 13: see the note there.

*Shall the earth be dispeopled for thy sake, (Is 61<sup>2</sup> 71<sup>0</sup>.)*

*And the rock remove from its place (site)? (Cf. Jb 9<sup>5</sup> 14<sup>18</sup>.)*

¶ paraphrases st. i: *τί γάρ; ἐὰν σὺ ἀποθάνῃς, ἀοίκητος ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανόν;* *What! if thou die, will all under heaven be uninhabited?* (Perhaps reading הלמעותך for הלמענך.)

In st. ii ¶ gives: *ἡ καταστραφήσεται ὅρη (A: ἡ γῆ) ἐκ θεμελίων;* *Or will mountains (the earth) be overturned from foundations?* = *וְהָיָה הָאָרֶץ כְּמִסְדֵּי* 9<sup>5</sup> 12<sup>10</sup> 28<sup>9</sup>, *הָאָרֶץ = καταστρέψω* מוֹסְדֵי צוּר (Dt 32<sup>22</sup> Ps 18<sup>8</sup> מוֹסְדֵי הָרִים; *הָרִים = מוֹסְדֵי אָרֶץ*, Ps 82<sup>5</sup> al.). *צוּר = ὄρη*, as here, 29<sup>6</sup>; cf. Nu 23<sup>9</sup>. Duhm reads *יִנְתַּק מִמוֹסְדָיו*, because of the previous occurrence (14<sup>18</sup>) of the stichus in *וְיִ*, which seems an insufficient reason; and the use of *יִנְתַּק* is questionable. ¶ possibly read *יִנְתַּק צ' מִמוֹסְדָיו*.

v. 5. *Yea (or Yet) the light of the wicked goeth out,*

*And the flame of his fire doth not shine.*

In st. i read *דָּשַׁע* sing., c B, as implied by *אִשׁוֹ* in st. ii, and by the Sing. of the following verses. For the statement, see 21<sup>7</sup>, Pr 13<sup>9</sup>. In st. ii *שִׁבְיָב* = *Aram. שְׂבִיבָא*; Ecclus 81<sup>0</sup> 45<sup>19</sup>. Cf. also Assyr. *šabbu*, 'shining' (syn. *namru*); *šabābu*, 'to blaze', 'burn'. ¶ *καὶ οὐκ ἀποβήσεται* (¶ *ἀναβήσεται*, *go up*) *αὐτῶν* (¶ *αὐτοῦ* recte!) *ἡ φλόξ*, *And their flame shall not go off* (*succeed?* but ¶ *go up*). Perhaps an error for *ἀπο(ἀνα)-φανήσεται*.

v. 6. *The light is darkened in his tent,*

*And his lamp over him (29<sup>3</sup>) goeth out.*

For *tent* (*אֹהֶל*) ¶ gives the curious word *διαίτα*, which means *way of living*, and then *dwelling, abode, room*. So again in v. 15, as also in 82<sup>22</sup> 11<sup>14</sup> 22<sup>23</sup>. (As D passes into Z, the roots of *διαίτα* and *ζάω*, *live*, may be related.) The verse looks like a variant of v. 5, perhaps taken in from the margin. Such variants from different recensions or editions abound in ancient poetry; e.g. in the Babylonian Epic of Nimrod.

v. 7. *His footsteps are cramped in his way (or as he goeth);*

*And his own counsel throweth him to the ground.*

¶ *צַעְרֵי אוֹנוֹ*, *the steps of his wealth* (20<sup>10</sup>) or *of his vigour* (Gn 49<sup>3</sup>), as Duhm takes it (*die Schritte seiner Manneskraft*). But in any case the

phrase is a strange one. Moreover, צעד (sing. or plur.) usually has a suffix, Ps 18<sup>37</sup> (14<sup>16</sup> 31<sup>4.37</sup> 34<sup>21</sup>); and the constr. plur. is found nowhere else in OT. Read בארְחוּ in *his going* (34<sup>8</sup>) = בלכּוּ in Pr 4<sup>12a</sup>, of which this stichus might be called a variation. Leg. prob. יצרו (יצר) צַעְרוּ (צַעֲרוּ) בַּאֲרָחוּ.

*Throweth him (down)*: a late use of השליך; Dan 8<sup>7</sup> (adds ארצה *to the ground*). In st. i ט misread אונּו יצרו יצרו = θηρεύσαισαν ἐλάχιστοι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. St. ii is too short. Perhaps we should read וּבְלִכְתּוֹ תִּכְשִׁילֶהוּ עֲצוֹ (וּבִדְרָכּוֹ) *And when he walketh, his own counsel maketh him stumble*. Cf. ט σφάλαι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἢ βουλή. 4<sup>a</sup> כושל = σφαλέντας. Or חוּ וּתְכַשִּׁיל כּוֹ עֲצוֹ *And his counsel weakeneth his strength*.

- v. 8. *For he is rushed into the net by his own feet;  
And he walketh himself into (upon) the toils.*  
v. 9. *The trap catcheth him by the heel;  
The gin (hunting-net?) layeth hold upon him. (Ne 10<sup>30</sup>.)*  
v. 10. *His snare is hidden in the ground,  
And his springe upon the path.*

*He is rushed or hurried or sped*; שָׁלַח, as in Ju 5<sup>16</sup>. But בגליו here is used in a different sense apparently (*instrumental*). Hence Du reads רָגַל . . . שָׁלַח *For his foot rusheth into the net* = ט ἐμβέβληται δὲ ὁ ποὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν παγίδι. (ⓈⓈ make the verb active: שָׁלַח.) Ⓢ renders יתהלך by ἐλιχθείη. This does not necessarily imply the different reading יתגלל (Kittel; cf. Is 34<sup>4</sup> Ⓢ), as ἐλίσσσομαι may mean *to turn hither and thither, to go about*, like התהלך: see II. xii. 49.

In v. 9 read עקבו *his heel*, ⓈⓈ; Ki. Cf. Gn 25<sup>26</sup>; ch. 16<sup>12</sup>. In st. ii ⓈⓈⓈ confuse the isolated צמים, which Ⓢ renders διψῶντας, with צָמִים *thirsty* (plur.). In 5<sup>5</sup>, as we have seen, צמא *the thirsty one* is right, although Ⓢ has צמים as here. Perhaps קצוד, as in 19<sup>6</sup>.

- v. 11. *All around (Je 6<sup>25</sup> 20<sup>3</sup>) Terrors alarm him,  
And Fearfulness dogs his heels (behind him).*

Reading in st. ii וּפְלִצוֹת בָּאָה (הִלָּכָה) לְרִגְלָיו; cf. Ⓢ and Is 21<sup>4</sup> פלצות באה; Ps 55<sup>5</sup>. The line is too short in Ⓢ, some word having fallen out. Or we may suppose the loss of a single letter from והפצהו *and scatter him*, a verb which demands a plur. obj., and read וּפְלִצוֹת אִיִּים (וּפְלִצוֹת אִיִּים) and *Fears* (20<sup>26</sup>) *affright him behind*: cf. 9<sup>6</sup> 21<sup>6</sup> for פלץ, which certainly agrees better with the context than פוץ. Ⓢ has πολλοὶ δὲ περὶ πόδα αὐτοῦ ἔλθοισαν = וּרְבִים בָּאוּ לְרִגְלָיו (or וּרְבִים בָּאוּ לֵי). Cf. Hab 3<sup>5</sup>. For לרנלי *after him*, cf. Gn 30<sup>30</sup> (contrasted with לפני); Is 41<sup>2</sup> (see Box *ad loc.*).

v. 12. אֵנִי יְהִי רָעֵב אֲנִי *Let his (manly) strength become hungry* (i.e. *fail*: OL); but this is hardly satisfactory, although Ⓢ so understood the line: Attenuetur fame robur eius. Ⓢ: ἔλθοι(σαν) ἐν λιμῷ στενῶ =

יִהְיֶה רָעָב אֹנִי. And hunger shall be his sorrow = יִהְיֶה רָעָב אֹנִי, which is possibly right:

*Famine becometh his trouble;*

*And Ruin is ready to swallow him up.*

לְצַלְעוֹ, for his limping or stumbling; Ps 38<sup>18</sup>, לְצַלְעִי For I am ready for stumbling; cf. Ps 35<sup>15</sup> Je 20<sup>10</sup>. But Ruin is ready for his stumbling seems an unnatural phrase; and לְבָלְעוֹ to swallow him is an easy and natural correction, the term being a favourite with the poet (2<sup>3</sup> 8<sup>18</sup> 10<sup>8</sup>; cf. 7<sup>19</sup> 20<sup>15</sup> &c.). St. i may perhaps be restored, יִכְלֶה רָעָב אֹנִי, *Famine consumeth his strength* (9<sup>22</sup> 31<sup>16</sup> Gn 41<sup>30</sup>). ט read the second line apparently, וְאִיר נֶכֶן לוֹ פְתָאֵם And Ruin is ready for him suddenly (ἐξαισιον, violent, extraordinary = פְתָאֵם ט, 9<sup>28</sup> 22<sup>10</sup>: see also 4<sup>12</sup> 20<sup>5</sup>, where the Heb. words are different). Duhm restores st. i, לִי הָיָה רָעָב אֹנִי, *Mischief is hungry for him* (cf. Je 42<sup>14</sup>, לֶלְחֶם for bread). But why not יִרְעַב (cf. Je l. c.)? Cf. also Am 8<sup>11</sup> (לְשֹׁמֵעַ) (רָעָב). (ט runs v. 11<sup>b</sup> and v. 12<sup>a</sup> together, perhaps reading or guessing יִבְאֹר בְּרָעָב צַר, (וּנְפִוצִים לְרַגְלוֹ יִבְאֹר בְּרָעָב צַר.)

v. 13. *He teareth himself in his rage; (4<sup>a</sup> trans. hither!)*

*For famine he devoureth his own flesh.*

We have replaced נִפְשׁוֹ בְּאֹפִי טָרַף here from v. 4<sup>a</sup>. The starving wretch gnaws his own flesh for food, as if he were a wild beast and his own body his prey. Cf. Is 49<sup>26</sup>. As the verse stands in ט it evidently consists of two variants of a single stichus:

יֹאכֵל בְּדֵי עוֹרִי

יֹאכֵל בְּדֵי בְכוֹר (ט)ו(ח):

*He devoureth the limbs (41<sup>i</sup>) of his skin (!);*

*Devoureth his limbs the Firstborn of Death.*

בְּכוֹר מוֹת, which occurs nowhere else, is usually taken to mean the deadliest of diseases, and is compared with 'the firstborn of the poor', i. e. the poorest, in Is 14<sup>30</sup>, which, however, itself is rejected by the best critics (see Box *ad loc.*). Probably בְּכוֹר is a disguise of some synonym of עוֹר, possibly בָּשָׂר *flesh*; and מוֹת may be a marginal note. K<sup>Or</sup> gives בְּדֵי in sickness for בְּדֵי his limbs; perhaps a reminiscence of 6<sup>7</sup>. We suggest בְּשָׂרוֹ He devoureth through famine his own flesh; which harmonizes well enough with the supposed parallel, v. 4<sup>a</sup>. ט βρωθεισας αὐτοῦ κλωνες ποδῶν, | κατέδετα τὰ ὠπαῖα αὐτοῦ θάνατος = יֹאכֵל נְשָׁפְרוֹ מוֹת יֹאכֵל בְּדֵי רַגְלָיו. יֹאכֵל בְּדֵי is rendered *twigs or shoots* (Ez 17<sup>6</sup>), and רַגְלָיו is evidently due to the translator's eye having wandered back to the end of v. 11. In the second stichus ט omits the repeated בְּדֵי, and gives τὰ ὠπαῖα αὐτοῦ, his beauties, for בְּכוֹר. Perhaps the translator misread בְּשָׂרוֹ his flesh as Aram. שְׁפִיר (i. e. ὠπαῖα; of leaves, Dan 4<sup>9</sup>).

v. 14. *His cords are broken away from his tent;*

*Terrors chase him like a king (lion?).*

For מִבְּטחוֹ *his confidence* read מִיתָרָיו *his cords*, Je 10<sup>20</sup>, or חֲבָלָיו *id.*, Is 33<sup>20</sup>, of course with plur. יִנְחָקוּ. ט̄ *taos* = מְרַפֵּא *healing*. In st. ii for מִצְעָרָיו I have substituted תְּצִירָהוּ, cf. 10<sup>18</sup>. A similar statement occurs 27<sup>20</sup> וְתִשְׁנֶהוּ כַּמִּים בְּלָהוֹת *And Terrors overtake him like a flood*. Perhaps, indeed, this is the true reading here (כַּמִּים = כַּמֶּלֶךְ).

At all events, כַּמֶּלֶךְ *like a king* (B quasi rex) is more probable than מִלְּמֶלֶךְ: cf. 15<sup>24</sup>. One is reluctant to sacrifice a phrase which has passed into general literature; but מֶלֶךְ בְּלָהוֹת *the King of Terrors* (= Death personified), however familiar to the modern ear, is isolated in Hebrew, although בְּלָהוֹת occurs five times in our book; and besides, the entire statement of מִ It makes him march to the King of Terrors, whether 'It' be a vague reference to 'an unseen Power' (Di al.) or 'Destiny' (Buhl), or to Eyob's disease, which is assumed to be leprosy (Duhm), is a strange way of saying *It* (the 'Firstborn of Death' = the most malignant of maladies) *kills him*. Moreover, those who interpret thus are obliged to cancel 14<sup>a</sup> as a gloss possibly on 15<sup>a</sup>. B gives Et calcet super eum, quasi rex, Interitus! *And let Ruin trample upon him, like a King!* pointing וְיִצְעָרָהוּ and app. reading כַּמֶּלֶךְ. The figure is that of a conqueror setting his foot on his enemy; a well-known subject of Assyrian sculpture. The curious version of Γ σχοίη δὲ αὐτὸν ἀνάγκη αἰρία βασιλικῇ = (1) וְתִצֵּר לוֹ בְּעֶלְתָּ (ה) פֶּלֶךְ (v. 7 Ju 10<sup>9</sup>; see 15<sup>24</sup> צַר = ἀνάγκη, and Dan 6<sup>9,6</sup> for Aram. עֵלָה = αἰρία) shows that Γ read the verb without y and confused י with ר, as often. Cf. La 4<sup>18</sup>, where מִ has צָרוּ instead of צַר. The rest of Γ's text is plainly a distortion of מֶלֶךְ בְּלָהוֹת. (A comparison of 10<sup>16</sup> 19<sup>22</sup> suggests the possibility that מִלְּמֶלֶךְ originated in (א) כְּלוֹנִי or לְבִי כְּמוֹ *like a lioness*. Indeed the חֲצוֹרִי of 10<sup>16</sup> favours something similar here; as מ and ש, i.e. מ and ש, are liable to confusion, and מַחֵל might have become מֶלֶךְ by way of correction.)

v. 15. *The Vampire* (Is 34<sup>14</sup>) *haunteth his tent*;

*Brimstone is sprinkled* (leg. 'חֹר' *upon his habitation*

(5<sup>3,24</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> Is 34<sup>9,19</sup>). 'The Vampire', Heb. לִילִית as I conjectured from the ἐν νυκτὶ αὐτοῦ (= בַּלַּיִל) of Γ many years ago. מִבְּלַיִל is really impossible as the subject of תִּשְׁכֹּן; and is, besides, very prosaic, whether translated *something of that which is not his, what is naught of his* (Hitz OL)—such a perfectly problematical and indefinite reference to the new denizen of Eyob's dwelling being wholly unparalleled—or *It* (terror) *shall dwell in his tent, so that it is no more his* (Ges). The language of the verse is obviously coloured by reminiscence of Is 34 (נִפְרִית Is 34<sup>9</sup>; נִה Is 34<sup>13</sup>; לִילִית Is 34<sup>14</sup>). In accordance with his theory that the whole passage, vv. 13–15, contains a brutally direct reference to Eyob's malady, Duhm reads בְּלִיעַל, which he takes to mean *incurableness* ('Wörtlich: das Nichtaufkommen' = not getting well), and explains as the malignant kind of house-leprosy, which made a house uninhabitable (Lc 14<sup>44</sup>). But

our passage speaks of an אהל, a *tent*, not a *house* (בית) of stone and plaster; and the meaning assumed for בליעל is very doubtful (see the note on 34<sup>18</sup> *infra*). Omitting 13<sup>a</sup> and 14<sup>a</sup> as spurious for the reasons assigned, Duhm renders vv. 13-15 as follows:—

‘There fretteth his limbs the Firstborn of Death  
And maketh him walk to the King of Terror,  
There dwelleth in his tent Incurableness,  
Strewn upon his dwelling-place is brimstone.’

(Ὁ τὰ εὐπερηγῇ αὐτοῦ confuses נוה *abode* with נאה *comely*; cf. Je 6<sup>2</sup>.) But the following verses show that Bildad is harping on the fate of the wicked in general, not the affliction of Eyob in particular.

v. 16-17. *Beneath—his roots dry up, (Am 2<sup>9</sup>)  
And above—his branches wither. (14<sup>2</sup> 24<sup>24</sup> 14<sup>9</sup> 29<sup>19</sup>)  
His memory perisheth from the land,  
And he hath no name in the street.*

*His branches wither.* Ὁ ἐπιπρεσέεται θερισμὸς αὐτοῦ = יפל קצירו (מ confused with פ as often). *in the streets or in (over) the open country*; reading the plur. חוצות 5<sup>10</sup> Pr 8<sup>26</sup>. But Pr 24<sup>27</sup> בחוץ || with בשרה.

v. 18. *God thrusteth him out of light into darkness,  
And maketh him flee out of the world. (20<sup>8</sup>.)*

There might seem to be no need to alter the indefinite plur. of the two verbs, as is done by Du Ki following the Keîb. If we do so, we must suppose the Subject of the verbs to be God, not men. And this perhaps agrees better with the matter of the verse; cf. 19<sup>8</sup> 30<sup>26</sup>, and with st. ii especially (Gn 4<sup>22-14</sup>). Ὁ has the sing. (ἀπώσκειν cf. 2 K 4<sup>27</sup>) in st. i. It omits st. ii. ℣ gives sing. in both; ℣ plur. in both. (Since st. ii is metr. short, אלה *God*, the Subj. of both stts., might be restored at the end after ינדהו.)

v. 19. *Nor chit nor child hath he among his people,  
And there is no survivor in his place of sojourn. (Ps 55<sup>16</sup>.)*

נכר . . . גין, an alliterative phrase, used in traditional formulas, e.g. the oath of friendship, Gn 21<sup>23</sup>, and the Divine ban, Is 14<sup>22</sup> (נכר גין). We might imitate with *son or scion, offshoot or offspring* (Var. Bibl.), *chick or child*. Cf. also our *kith and kin*. If נן means *propagate, increase*, of offspring (Ps 72<sup>17</sup>), גין may very well be represented by our ‘chit’, an old word for *shoot, sprout, child*. Cf. also the Sumerian NUNU, ‘sprout’, ‘offspring’, ‘child’ (*bdbu*; *lipu*), CT xii 19b. Ὁ αὐτὸς ἔσται ἐπὶ γένεστος ἐν λαῷ αὐτοῦ, app. misreading נכר . . . גין for נכר . . . גין (see Ὁ Pr 14<sup>8</sup> ἐπιγνώσεται = גין; La 4<sup>6</sup> ἐπεγνώσθησαν = גין). For st. ii Ὁ gives: οὐδὲ σεσωσμένος ἐν τῇ ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ. ἡ ὑπ’ οὐρανόν = ארץ *the land*, in v. 4, and ἐν τῇ ὑπ’ οὐρανόν = בכל-הארץ in 42<sup>15</sup>. Ὁ therefore

seems to have read בארץ מגוריו *in the land of his sojournings* (Gn 17<sup>a</sup> 28<sup>a</sup> &c.), which looks as if it might be right. (שרי = σεσωσμένος, Jos 8<sup>23</sup>.)

v. 20. *At his Day* (ע At him) *his juniors are appalled,*  
*And his elders horror seizeth.*

*At his Day*; the day of his doom or retribution. (ע may perhaps be right with ἐπ' αὐτῶ = עלימו = עליו as I conjectured before looking at ע. Cf. 17<sup>a</sup>.) נשמו *were appalled or confounded*, is doubtless correct; see 17<sup>a</sup>, to which this passage evidently refers. ע ἐστέναξαν, app. pointing נשמו *panted*.

*His juniors* or those who come after; lit. *after ones*: cf. 19<sup>25</sup>? Ec 11<sup>4</sup><sup>10</sup>. ע ἔσχατοι, *the last or latest generation*. ו In die eius stupebunt novissimi, et primos invadet horror. ו קדמונים *former ones*; i.e. Eyob's elders; the previous generation. Cf. 1 Sa 24<sup>14</sup>. Eyob is not yet reckoned as an old man himself. The theory of his friends involved the idea of premature death for the wicked. Eliphaz at least was his senior. ע rectè πρώτους δὲ ἔσχεν θαῦμα (rg. אחו Sing.; so ו prob. ע ו; cf. Ex 15<sup>15</sup> יאחזמו רעד). Ewald suggested that אחרנים and קדמונים meant *western* and *eastern* people. So Duhm: 'die im Westen . . . die im Osten.' But there seems no reason why eastern and western folk should be specified rather than northerners and southerners, and the Heb. terms are not so used elsewhere.

v. 21. 'Surely this was the abode of a wrongdoer,  
*And this the place of one that knew not El!*'

The reflection or exclamation of all who gaze upon the signal desolation of the evildoer's ruined homestead. ו introduces the verse with *And they will say*. We might, however, also render the words as expressing the conclusion of Bildad himself: *Surely* (or *Only*) *such are the dwellings of the unjust; And such is the place of the godless.*

Chapter 19. *But Eyob answered as follows:*

*How long will ye weary my soul,*  
*And crush me with mere words?*  
*Ten times over ye insult me;*  
*And are not ashamed of giving me pain (or wronging me).*

v. 2. *Weary me*. So ע ἡκοπον ποιήσετε = תוֹנִיעַני; Is 43<sup>23</sup>; cf. Ec 1<sup>8</sup>. ו תוֹנִיעַני *make me to sorrow* (Is 51<sup>23</sup> Ec 1<sup>12</sup> 3<sup>32.33</sup>) seems less appropriate here, and is not found with an independent object elsewhere, nor at all in Job. The ונע occurs 10<sup>8</sup> 20<sup>18</sup> 39<sup>11.16</sup>. In st. ii καθαιρεῖτε, *ye pull down or destroy* (= הרס), is merely an inexact rendering and hardly implies a different reading. The stichus seems too short. בלידעת *without knowledge* may have been omitted after במלים (which בלי resembles).

v. 3. ו עשר פעמים תכלימוני ו has four stresses and is metrically redundant, unless we suppose a Crasis of the first two words and

pronounce *zèser* for *zè 'èser*. Ὁ γνῶτε μόνον ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐποίησέν με οὕτως apparently makes matters worse; but really it only represents *זה עשה עמי* *this He did with me*; an evident corruption of *זה עשר פעמי* *these ten times*. (The γνῶτε μόνον ὅτι ὁ κύριος is due to the scribe's eye having wandered to v. 6.) For the doubtful Heb. לִי תַחֲכֹרוּ (3 codd. תַחֲכֹרוּ; 4 codd. Kennicott בִּי pro לִי) ὁ gives ἐπίκεισθέ μοι, *ye press upon me*, i.e. either with entreaty or attack (Hdt 5. 104; ib. 81). In 21<sup>27</sup> ἐπίκεισθέ μοι = עָלַי תִּתְחַסְמוּ *ye are hard upon me or do me wrong*; and such a sense would suit the present passage. Olshausen's conjecture לִי תִתְחַפְּפוּ *taunt me*, gives a good parallel; but the constr. is doubtful (see 27<sup>6</sup>). Adopting the reading of 3 codd. תַחֲכֹרוּ we might (with Ewald, Duhm, al.) compare Ar. حَكَّ he wronged (him), behaved injuriously towards (him), or with bad fellowship impugned his character, &c. (Lane). ὁ ἁλίσθη *ye make me sad, grieve me*, suggests an Aramaism = תִּתְחַבֵּר תִּתְחַבֵּר Hiph. of חָבַר = כָּרַא. Possibly also תַחֲכֹרוּ is an error of pronunciation (dictation?) for תַעֲכֹרוּ *trouble me*.

v. 4. *But even had I in sooth gone astray (really erred),  
With myself would my error abide.*

So ὁ. Read ὁ or rather ὁ ἡ (or ὁ ἡ ἡ metr. grat.) instead of ὁ's ἡ. Cf. OL, which renders ὁ *And even indeed (if) I have erred . . .* ὁ ναὶ δὴ = ὁ. Its version is Ναὶ δὴ ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐγὼ ἐπλανήθην, Παρ' ἐμοὶ δὲ αὐλίζεται πλάνος, *Yea, in truth, I did err, And with me lodgeth error*; to which it adds the explanatory distich Λαλήσαι ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἔδει, Τὰ δὲ ῥήματά μου πλανᾶται καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ καιροῦ, *by speaking words which one ought not, And my words err and (are) not in season*. This is probably an old gloss which ὁ found in its Heb. text.

לֹא יִסְבֹּן דְּבַר לִי  
וְאִין־בָּעַת :

Cf. 15<sup>3</sup> Pr 15<sup>23</sup>. As v. 4 appeared to contain an admission of guilt on the part of Eyob, and thus to be altogether inconsistent with his attitude throughout the poem, this gloss was added to put a different construction upon his words.

v 5. ὁ ἁμנם ὁ can hardly be right. ἁμנם is repeated from v. 4. ὁ does not repeat ἐπ' ἀληθείας, and seems to have read ὁ (ἐα δὲ ὅτι ἐπ' ἐμοὶ μεγαλύνεσθε). As it gives no good sense to connect the verse immediately with the next (so AV, RV), we emend ὁ *But ye* (emphatic Pron.), or perhaps rather ὁ *But*, which occurs at least ten times in the book :

*But ye deal arrogantly with me (take the high hand with me), (Ez 35<sup>13</sup>)  
And make my misery (reproachful state) proof against me.*

Cf. ὁ At vos contra me erigimini, Et arguitis me opprobriis meis.



In st. ii  $\Theta$  ἐνάλλεσθε δέ μοι ὀνειδεῖ, *And ye leap (or rush) on me with reproach*; as if reading  $\Theta$  בְּחָרְפָּה עָלַי וְתָכַרְוּ (see 6<sup>27</sup> ἐνάλλομαι = עָלַי כָּרָה).  $\mathfrak{M}$  is preferable.  $\mathfrak{M}$  חַרְפְּתִי *my reproach* = that with which I am reproached, viz. my ruin, which is regarded as retributive of secret sin, and therefore made a matter of reproach instead of sympathy.

vv. 4-5. *But even if I really have erred* ( $\Theta$  exc. inter  $\eta$   $\Theta$  et  $\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta$ ), *Mine error abideth with myself* (i. e. it does not affect you). *But you* (leg.  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  At vos) *against me talk big, And urge against me my reproach* (as though by sin I had caused my own misery). Duhm renders as follows: 'And have I then really erred, With me must error abide? Or will ye against me deal arrogantly (*gegen mich gross thun*) And against me argue with abuse?' He reads  $\mathfrak{M}$  מִשְׁנִינָה at the end of v. 4 (cf.  $\Theta$ ), and then  $\mathfrak{M}$  וְאִם עָלַי תִּגְדִּילִי, which is barely adequate for the rhythm, with  $\mathfrak{M}$  בְּחָרְפָּה at the end of the verse, after  $\Theta$ . Besides, such a version would require the readings  $\mathfrak{M}$  וְאִתִּי . . .  $\eta$   $\mathfrak{M}$  in v. 4 and  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta$  v. 5.

v. 6. *Know then that it is Eloah who hath bent me,  
And hath closed his net in upon me!* (2 K 6<sup>14</sup> La 3<sup>5</sup> OL.)

$\Theta$  ὁ παραβάς (με) = עוֹתֵנִי, as in 8<sup>3</sup> 34<sup>12</sup> La 3<sup>3</sup>. Instead of  $\Theta$  מצורו הקים *hath raised his rampart or siegework* (Zc 9<sup>3</sup> Pr 12<sup>13</sup>).  $\delta\chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὕψωσεν. My ruin is not self-caused, but, a direct (and arbitrary) infliction of God, against whose omnipotence protest is unavailing. Cf. v. 21.

v. 7. *Lo, I cry 'Wrong!', and am not answered;  
I shriek for help, but there is no justice!*

$\Theta$ 's variations, though incorrect, are critically instructive.  $\Theta$  ἰδὸν γελῶ ὀνειδεῖ καὶ οὐ λαλήσω, *Lo, I laugh at reproach and will not speak*. γελῶ =  $\mathfrak{M}$  אַצַּח pro  $\mathfrak{M}$  אַצַּע; a confusion of sound (not form) apparently between  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$ . (This so far favours  $\mathfrak{M}$  עָכָר for  $\mathfrak{M}$  חָכָר in v. 2; see note *ad loc.*).  $\Theta$  ὀνειδεῖ is prob. due to the scribe's eye having wandered to the end of v. 5. λαλήσω implies only a difference of pointing:  $\mathfrak{M}$  אֶעֱנֶה for  $\mathfrak{M}$  אֶעֱנֶה.

vv. 8-9. *My way he hath walled up, so that I cannot pass; (La 3<sup>3</sup>)  
And on my paths he setteth darkness.*

In st. ii  $\Theta$  ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου =  $\mathfrak{M}$  עָלַי פָּנַי *on my face*. (Variant text? But  $\Theta$   $\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .)

*He hath stripped me of my glory, (22<sup>6</sup>)  
And removed the circlet of my head. (La 5<sup>16</sup>.)*

v. 10. *He demolished me all round, and I am gone;  
And he (hath) pulled up my hope like a tree.*

$\mathfrak{M}$  יִתְצַנִּי. Read  $\mathfrak{M}$  ויִתְצַנִּי, with Waw Conversive. The  $\mathfrak{M}$  fell out after  $\mathfrak{M}$ . Cf.  $\Theta$  διέσπασέν ( $\mathfrak{M}$   $\alpha\delta\epsilon$ ) με.

v. 11 *And his anger burned against me, (על c; usu. c ב.)*  
*And he reckoned me as a foe.*

In st. i ויחר is merely a scribal error for the common ויחר: 𐤔𐤕. In st. ii כצרו as *his foes*. 𐤔𐤕 כצר, which is best after לו. So Du. 𐤔𐤕 כצרו, quasi *hostem suum, as his foe*.

v. 12 is an interpolation, or intrusion from marg.

*Together come his troops,  
 And have cast up their way (approach) against me,  
 And have encamped around my tent.*

A line of the tetrastich is missing. 𐤔, reading ויבלי for ויבלי (Is 57<sup>14</sup>) and apparently omitting the strange לאהלי (would forces of any kind lay regular siege to a 'tent'?), presents a distich:

δομοθυμαδὸν δὲ ἦλθον τὰ πειρατήρια αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμοί,  
 ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου ἐκύκλωσαν ἐνκάθετοι.

ויחר באו נרודיו עלי  
 ויסבו דרכי בארב:

*And together came his troops against me,  
 And beset my ways with an ambush (31<sup>9</sup>).*

Better though this may be, it still suggests an excrescence which has grown out of the expression כצר *like an enemy*, as if צר *foe* (from צרר) meant צר *besieger* (from צור). 𐤔 has πειρατήριον for נרוד in Gn 49<sup>19</sup> (but πειρατής 25<sup>3</sup>) and for צבא, 7<sup>1</sup> 10<sup>17</sup>. Here it uses ἐγκάθετος, *suborned*, as equivalent to ἐγκαθημένος, *lying in ambush* (ארב). So also 31<sup>9</sup>; cf. Ps 9<sup>30</sup> 𐤔.

v. 13. *My fellow-tribesmen he hath put far away from me.* הרחיק is so used, Ps 88<sup>9,10</sup>, and is trans. in the three other places where it occurs in our book (11<sup>14</sup> 13<sup>21</sup> 22<sup>20</sup>). So 𐤔. Cod. K<sup>80</sup> 𐤔<sup>AS</sup> connect with the following ו and read הרחיקו intrans., as in Gn 44<sup>1</sup>: *My f. have gone far away from me.* (So Du Ki al.) The second stichus is doubtful. ורעי אֶחָדָרִי מִמֶּנִּי is usually rendered *And my acquaintance are wholly estranged from me*. But ירעי (Ps 87<sup>4</sup>) is unlikely, if only because of מירעי in the next verse; and אֶחָדָרִי is a suspicious collocation, if only because of its resemblance to אֶכָּרִי (30<sup>21</sup>), *cruel, fierce* (41<sup>2</sup>), אֶכָּרִי, *id.* *Indecl.* (Je 30<sup>14</sup> 50<sup>42</sup> Pr 12<sup>10</sup> c plur. subj.). Read perhaps לִי ורעי אֶכָּרִי *And my friends are cruel to me*; or לִי נכובו have *proven false to me* (cf. 41<sup>1</sup>). Possibly, however, ורו = סרו; *And my friends have wholly departed from me*. The ממני seems to belong to the next verse, 14, the first stichus of which is too short in ורעי ממני חרלו כרובי *My neighbours have left me to myself* (cf. 7<sup>16b</sup>), *And my acquaintance have forgotten me*. 𐤔 has a double version of v. 13<sup>b</sup>: ἔγνωσαν ἀλλοτρίους ἢ ἐμέ = ורעי מִמֶּנִּי *They regarded aliens more than me*, which, apart from the confusions of

ו and י, differs from the letters of מ only in omitting אך; and φίλοι δέ μου ἀνελεήμονες γεγόνασιν = לִי אֲכֹרִי (לִי) וְרָעִי (הִי) (2<sup>11</sup> 6<sup>27</sup> v. 21; 30<sup>21</sup>; Pt 5<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>10</sup>), or וְרָעִי אֲכֹרִי לִי, which may be the authentic reading. (V. 14<sup>b</sup> prob. supplies the correct reading of Ps 88<sup>19b</sup>, viz. : מִיָּדַעִי שָׁכַחְנִי : *my acquaintance have forgotten me*. The final נִ run together was misread מ, and then the letters rearranged into מַחֲשָׁךְ.)

v. 14 is too short in both members. With חָדְלוּ *have ceased*, מִמֶּנִּי *from me* is certainly required; and if not taken from v. 13, may be repeated after חָדְלוּ. In st. ii כלם *all of them* may be inserted: *And my acquaintance have all forgotten me*.

v. 15. St. i is much overloaded in מ. ט presents a stichus of normal length: γείτονες οἰκίας θεραπείαι τέ μου = שְׁכֵנִי וְאִמְהָתִי (גֵּיטוֹנִים, neighbour = שְׁכֵנִי, 26<sup>5</sup>; שְׁכֵנָה, Ex 3<sup>22</sup>, וּמִגֵּרַת בֵּיתָהּ, fr. her neighbour and the guest of her house: שְׁכָנַי dwellers may have been a variant of גֵּרִי guests in this passage) This omits לִזְרֹת שְׁכֵנִי, which might conceivably be a phrase based on vv. 11<sup>b</sup>, 13<sup>b</sup>, and introduced here to get rid of the anacoluthon: *The dwellers (sojourners) in my house and my bondmaids—A stranger am I become in their eyes* (= ט's ἀλλογένης ἡμῶν or ἐγενόμην ἐναντίων αὐτῶν). But the association of guests with bondmaids seems odd; and ור and נכרי are parallel (cf. Ps 69<sup>9</sup> Is 28<sup>21</sup>). Upon the whole, therefore, it may be better to divide vv. 14, 15 differently, making לִזְרֹת גֵּרִי the close of v. 14 instead of the beginning of v. 15:

*My neighbours (Ps 38<sup>12</sup>) and mine acquaintance have ceased;*

*The guests of my house have forgotten me.*

Duhm ingeniously suggests מִיָּדַעִי for וְיָדַעִי, thus getting the sense *My neighbours have ceased from knowing me*; an excellent parallel to st. ii.

- But יָדַע is not so used elsewhere (in 32<sup>6.10.17</sup> 36<sup>3</sup> it means *opinion*, and the plur. יָדָעִים is *knowledge*, 37<sup>16</sup>, Elihu-speeches); while יָדָעָה (Is 11<sup>9</sup>) and יָדַעַתְּ (Je 22<sup>16</sup>) are both found with a personal object.

*My bondmaids reckon me (take me for) a stranger,*

*A foreigner am I become in their eyes.*

If we adopt this arrangement of the text, we must also give the preference to the reading of v. 13<sup>b</sup> which finds support in ט': וְיָדַעִי זָרוּ מִמֶּנִּי *and they who knew me have turned away from me* (זָרוּ = סָרוּ; ? Aramaism). This is מ, merely omitting אך, with ט.

v. 16. *My slave I called, but he would not answer;*

*With my mouth I must needs beseech him.*

v. 17. *My breath is repulsive to my wife (foul, loathly, hateful: contrast Ct 7<sup>9</sup>). Cf. the old Sumerio-Babylonian Family-law V: Šumma aššātu mussu izír-ma U! muti alla iqlabi, ana náru inaddušu, 'If a wife hate her husband and say, Thou art not my husband, they shall cast her into the river.'* See Haupt, SFG: Hommel SL, p. 110. (Sum. GUL =

*limnu*, *bi'su*, *ziru*, 'bad', 'hostile', 'foul', 'hateful'.) 𐤔 omits 𐤒𐤕𐤕, connecting v. 16<sup>b</sup> with 𐤒𐤕𐤕 thus: *στόμα δέ μου ἐδέετο, καὶ ἰκέτευον τὴν γυναῖκά μου, but my mouth was begging, and I was supplicating my wife* = 𐤒𐤕𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤕; cf. Dan 6<sup>12</sup> 𐤒𐤕𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤕 𐤒𐤕𐤕.

*I am offensive to my homeborn slaves.*

𐤒𐤕𐤕 *I stink*; II 𐤕𐤒 = Arab. 𐤕𐤒. x. *foetorem emisit* (puteus); so Freytag, but Lane does not give this meaning, which is accepted by OL, after Ew De Di, but *to snuffle*, and to have 𐤕𐤒 *a kind of disease of the nose*. OL compares also Syr. 𐤒𐤕𐤕 *ḥanninā, rancid*. The existence of a √HAN, *smell, stink*, is established by the Heb. word 𐤒𐤕𐤕 *stench*, Jo 2<sup>20</sup> (hence Du would read 𐤒𐤕𐤕 in the present passage), which implies a √𐤕𐤒, i.e. 𐤕𐤒 = 𐤕𐤒 or 𐤕𐤒 *to make or emit odour*; and this HAN (KHAN) is probably a weakened form of the primitive Asiatic root KAN(GAN), which we seem to see in the Sumerian GIN, *sweet, pleasant* (*libu*; cf. Je 6<sup>20</sup>), KU(N), *sweet*, and in the Chinese kan, kam, keiñ, kö, *sweet*, which Edkins regarded as the source of hōng, Jap. kyō, kom, *incense, sweet-smelling* (*Rad.* 186). We might read 𐤒𐤕𐤕 and *my stink* (cf. Jo 2<sup>20</sup>).

In st. i perhaps 𐤒𐤕 *my smell or odour > my breath*: cf. Gn 27<sup>27</sup> Ct 7<sup>3</sup>. In st. ii 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 *might perhaps mean sons of my mother*: cf. 3<sup>10</sup> 𐤒𐤕 *doors of my womb* = doors of the womb that bare me. In Mi 6<sup>7</sup>, however, we have the expression 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 *fruit of my body (belly)* as parallel to 𐤒𐤕 *my firstborn*; so that we might perhaps prefer to render *the sons of my body*. The Prologue tells of the sudden death of Eyob's sons, i.e. the sons of his principal wife; but 'the sons of the concubines' or secondary wives (cf. Gn 25<sup>6</sup>) might be intended, although these are not otherwise mentioned. Eyob still had 𐤒𐤕 (Gn 20<sup>17</sup> 21<sup>10,12</sup> 30<sup>3</sup> al.). It is thus that 𐤔 understands the phrase: *προσεκαλούμην δὲ κολακείων υἱοὺς παλλακίδων μου, but I would entreat with flatteries sons of my concubines* = 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕: cf. 11<sup>19b</sup>. In 20<sup>15</sup> 𐤔 reads 𐤒𐤕 for 𐤒𐤕; and it seems possible that 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 *the sons of my house* (cf. 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 Gn 14<sup>14</sup>) was the original reading here.

v. 18. *Even boys* (𐤒𐤕; so 21<sup>11</sup>) *despise me*;

*Would I rise, they speak against me* (Ps 50<sup>20</sup>).

(Or *Let me but rise* (stir, move), and they pass remarks on me.)

𐤒𐤕: *if I rise up*, i.e. set about something; cf. Ps 139<sup>2</sup>. Others think he refers to his struggles to rise from his seat on the ash-heap. Cf. also 2 K 2<sup>23</sup> for the mockery of the young lads. (Du, who explains: 'if he goes out, or goes about'.) 𐤔 οἱ δὲ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα = 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 pro 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕! The same queer blunder appears again, 21<sup>11</sup>. The translator did not know the rare word 𐤒𐤕 *boy*. He renders st. ii 𐤒𐤕 𐤒𐤕 *κατ' ἐμοῦ λαλοῦσιν*—an excellent translation.

v. 19. *All the men of my circle (my intimates) abhor me (cf. Ps 88<sup>9</sup>),  
And they whom I loved have turned against me.*

For סוֹדֵי כָל־מַחְתִּי all the men of my counsel or converse, 𐤓 has οἱ ἰδόντες με, they who saw me (𐤓<sup>A</sup> ἰδοτες = εἰδότες, knew me) = (י) כל-מתורעי (Gn 45<sup>1</sup>).

v. 20. 𐤓 st. i is too long for the metre. Either בְּעוֹרִי or בְּבָשָׁרִי belongs to st. ii (cf. 7<sup>5</sup> 18<sup>13</sup>); we must therefore omit one of them here. For the language, cf. Ps 102<sup>6</sup> בָּשָׁרִי לְבָשָׁרִי רֶקֶבָה עֲצָמִי (ל for ב, as in 29<sup>10</sup>). An emaciated person is said to be 'nothing but skin and bone'. The key to st. ii might perhaps be 13<sup>14</sup> אֲשֶׁר בָּשָׁרִי בְּשָׁנִי I carry my flesh in my teeth; said of running a great risk and escaping with difficulty (cf. the parallel stichus: And I put my life in my hand = 1 Sa 28<sup>21</sup>). We might then read ואֲחַטְלִי בְּעוֹרִי רֶקֶבָה בָּשָׁרִי And I have escaped with my flesh in my teeth: i.e. like some animal impeded in its flight by carrying off its young in that way. St. i 𐤓: ἐν δέρματί μου ἐσάπησαν αἱ σάρκες μου = בְּעוֹרִי רֶקֶבָה בָּשָׁרִי In my skin rotted my flesh, which Du says is 'clearly the correct text' (could one say בְּעוֹרִי בָּשָׁרִי רֶקֶבָה, as Du writes?). For st. ii 𐤓 gives τὰ δὲ ὀστέα μου ἐν ὀδόντων ἔχεται = וְעֲצָמֵי (ת) הָאֲחוּזָה בְּשָׁנִי: (For ἔχ = אחז, vid. 17<sup>9</sup> 18<sup>21</sup> 21<sup>6</sup> 30<sup>16</sup>.) 𐤓 thus om. עוֹר<sup>2</sup>. Bickell, Du, accordingly read וְחַטְלִי שָׁנִי And my teeth have slipped away (or out: cf. 41<sup>11</sup>); which is metrically too short, while שָׁנִים is strictly feminine. Possibly we should restore שָׁנִי וְחַטְלִי מִבְּשָׁרִי And my teeth have slipped forth from my flesh; but obviously the term required is gums, not flesh (see OL s.v. מַלְטָה). (𐤓<sup>A</sup> for ὀδόντων gives ὀδοναῖς = בעני (30<sup>16</sup> 𐤓) for בְּשָׁנִי; an interesting variant, exhibiting the common confusion of ע with ש.)

v. 21. *Pity me, you my friends, (om. חֲנִנִי<sup>2</sup> metr. gr.)*

*For the Hand of Eloah hath stricken me! (1<sup>11</sup> Is 53<sup>4</sup>)*

𐤓 ἡ ἀπαμένη μου ἐστιν = נִנְעָה (points only). κυρίου = יהוה pro אֱלֹהִים, ut alibi ap. 𐤓.

v. 22. Lit. *Why like El will ye pursue me,  
And are not sated of my flesh?*

(𐤓 again pl. ἀπὸ σαρκῶν μου. So also 31<sup>31</sup>.) The suggestion כַּאֲלִי like a hart instead of כַּאֲלִי like El is plausible, but more obvious and commonplace. Besides, צוּר would be more natural of hunting a hart (10<sup>16</sup>). According to 𐤓, Eyob accuses his friends of siding with his Divine Persecutor. 𐤓 διὰ τί με διώκετε ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Κύριος. Cf. 13<sup>26</sup>. 'For him (leg. אֹתוֹ) whom Thou hast smitten they pursue' (Ps 69<sup>26</sup>; a psalm which contains other echoes of this ch.). St. ii of my flesh; i.e. with portions of it. Cf. 31<sup>31</sup>. To eat pieces of a man is an ancient and common Semitic metaphor for slander and calumny. The Assyrian word-lists prove that it was originally Sumerian. Thus we find EME-KU.KU (lit. Tongue-eat-eat = 'One who devours with the tongue'), explained by the Assyrian ākil qarçī, lit. 'eater of pieces', i.e. slanderer

(Br. 840); and the phrase *akālu qarṣī*, 'to eat the pieces' of any one, 'to slander', is common in all periods of Assyrian. It is also found in Aramaic, both old (Inscr.) and new (Dan 3<sup>8</sup> 6<sup>25</sup>); while in Arabic they say '*akala lahmaḥu*, 'he eat his flesh', in the same sense. (Cf. also Ps 27<sup>2</sup>; where the phrase *לֹאכַל אֶת בִּשְׂרִי* *to eat my flesh* is used in much the same sense of false accusation.)

vv. 23-24. Since his persistent affirmation of a clear conscience and his arraignment of what he cannot but regard as unjust dealing on the part of God (if the traditional doctrine that all human suffering is penal be true), fall upon deaf ears and unsympathetic hearts, Eyob is fain to appeal to posterity :

*O that my sayings might be written,—  
That my words might be inscribed in a roll,—  
That with stylus of iron and (with) lead  
They might be graven in rock for ever!*

In st. *a* I have substituted *אָמַרְי* *my words* for *אָמַר* plur. 22<sup>22</sup> 32<sup>14</sup> 6<sup>10, 25, 26</sup> 8<sup>2</sup> 23<sup>12</sup> 33<sup>3</sup> *אָמַרְי* 32<sup>12</sup> *אָמַרְי* 34<sup>37</sup>). *אָ* is too long for the metre. The second *מִי יִתֵּן* seems superfluous; I have therefore read *בַּסֵּפֶר* *וּמִלִּי* in st. *b*. If Duhm's *בַּסֵּפֶר* in *his roll* be right, why not also *בְּצוּר* in *his rock* in st. *d*? (For the construction *מִי יִתֵּן* c Imperf. without Waw, see 6<sup>8</sup> 14<sup>13</sup>.) In st. *c* leg. *וּבַעֲפֶרֶת* and with *lead* (i.e. with leaded lettering, for greater permanence), which gives a better-balanced rhythm. Duhm thinks it strange that Eyob should express so emphatic a wish that his words should be written in a book, and asks, Why should not Eyob write them down himself? Therefore, he concludes, that Eyob's wish is for a record in God's book of remembrance. The answer to Duhm's question, however, would seem to be that, although writing was freely practised in the patriarchal age to which the figure of Eyob belongs, it was confined, so far as we know, to an official class of scribes whose art and mystery it was, as is amply attested by the remains of Babylonian and Assyrian antiquity. Eyob was no more likely to write down his own compositions than a Bédāwī poet of his own or any later age. And even if that were otherwise, Eyob's physical condition of extreme helplessness is conceived as precluding all possibility of such a thing.

Θ τίς γὰρ ἂν δόξη γραφῆναι τὰ ῥήματά μου (= 𐤓𐤕)  
τεθῆναι δὲ αὐτὰ ἐν βιβλίῳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (= 𐤓𐤕 𐤁𐤁𐤓𐤕 𐤅𐤀𐤔).

Cf. 29<sup>2</sup>, τίς ἂν με θείη = 𐤓𐤕. The verb *נָתַן* is here taken by Θ in the sense of *put* or *place*; a meaning which it bears in many other passages from Gn 1<sup>17</sup> onwards. *וַיַּחֲקֵן* is then omitted, perhaps as superfluous, if not also unintelligible; and the stichus is finished off with *לְעַד* = *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, transferred hither from st. *d* (v. 24 *δ*). Thus it cannot be said with certainty that Θ omits the second *מִי יִתֵּן* (so Duhm

and Kittel), but only that it understands and renders the verb נתן as it does in above eighty other passages of OT. Then, for v. 24, 6<sup>B</sup> presents merely ἐν γραφίῃ σιδηρῇ καὶ μολύβῳ = st. *a*; but B<sup>ab</sup> A supply the other clause ἣ ἐν πέτραις ἐνγλυφῆναι = : בְּצוּרִי יִתְצַבֵּן. (6 seems to give πέτραι plur. for צוּר, Is 2<sup>10</sup>, where, however, it perhaps read 'בְּצוּרִי, cf. vv. 19, 21. So probably here.)

Theodotion's לְעַד for a witness, instead of לְעַד for ever, is very attractive and may be right. At any rate, it correctly specifies the object of the desired record. Duhm calls it 'a not incorrect, but self-evident addition'. The same, surely, might be said of לְעַד. Eyob had said before, 16<sup>19</sup>, that his Witness was in heaven; but here he is longing for an eternal witness on earth.

vv. 25-27. It is generally recognized that this famous passage has suffered considerable corruption in the course of transmission. The ancient Versions diverge from the Hebrew text and from each other; and that text itself presents unmistakable evidence of those detrimental changes, many examples of which have already perplexed us in this and previous chapters of the book. Upon close scrutiny, however, one fact stands out clearly and conspicuously, which may prove to be a clue to the essential meaning of the passage, even if it should fail to enable us to restore the original text with anything more than a relative degree of satisfaction or certitude. Eyob affirms, with all the emphasis of solemn repetition, that he will eventually 'see God' (וַעֲיִי רֵאָו). The obvious implication is that this Vision of God will be the all-satisfying close of his prolonged and inexplicable sufferings. And Eyob does not hesitate to give his unfeeling friends, who have so long insulted his misery with groundless assumptions of his secret guilt, the stern and even savage warning, '*Fear ye the sword for yourselves!*' (v. 29); as though his own vindication was to involve Divine vengeance on their heartless and obstinate cruelty. *I shall see God! . . . My (own) eyes will behold Him! It is what I am waiting for with soul-consuming desire* (v. 27 c). The question at once suggests itself, did Eyob, *in fact* (i.e. in the development of his poetical history), ever 'see God'? In other words, is the *Deus ex machina* the culminating point and conclusion of the whole spirit-stirring drama? We know, of course, that it is. *Jahvah answered Eyob out of the storm-wind*—an immediate physical manifestation (38<sup>1</sup> 40<sup>6</sup>; cf. Ez 1<sup>1</sup>). We are left in no doubt about it by Eyob's own words (42<sup>5</sup>), which surely were not written without intentional reference to the present passage: *I had heard of Thee by hearsay; But now my own eye hath seen Thee!* (וַתֵּחַד עֵינִי רֵאָו; cf. וַעֲיִי רֵאָו, v. 27 d). Eyob's prophecy, then, finds its fulfilment within the limits of the poem itself. He is not represented as looking forward to the establishment of his innocence after he had passed out of the body into the dim world of the dead

(‘after death, apart from the flesh’: OL s.v. חוה); much less is he anticipating his own resurrection from the dead at the Last Day (so B). He simply declares his unalterable conviction that Iahvah, the God of righteous Retribution (אל נקמות Ps 94<sup>1</sup>) will appear to right his lamentable wrongs in the present life (cf. v. 29), before his disease has run its fatal course (16<sup>22</sup>).

Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit,  
Et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum;  
Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea,  
Et in carne mea videbo Deum meum.  
Quem visurus sum ego ipse,  
Et oculi mei conspecturi sunt, et non alius:  
Reposita est haec spes mea in sinu meo.

Thus does St. Jerome find in this passage a clear and precise statement of the faith of Christendom concerning the Resurrection of the Dead (cf. Joh 11<sup>24</sup>). But what was his authority for the striking divergence of the second line from the Masoretic text? Did he possess a Hebrew codex written by some Pharisee (cf. Acts 23<sup>8</sup>) which actually gave it in the form וְבַיּוֹם הָאַחֲרָיִם מֵעַל עֹפֶר אֶקוּם? Or did the Rabbi whom he consulted assure him that the line might be so emended? Or was the *First Pers.* of the verb here merely a guess of his own, based on the fact that the verbs of the following stichi are all in the *First Person* except the last? What is certain is that, with whatever written or oral assistance, the learned Father was working upon a Hebrew text not very different from מֵעַל, and that he was by no means dependent upon G or other antecedent versions. That he exercised a critical judgement upon the difficulties of his text is apparent from his rendering of the next distich (v. 26), which as it stands in מֵעַל cannot possibly be regarded as authentic: *Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea*,<sup>1</sup> ‘And again shall I be encompassed with my skin’ = וְעוֹרִי נִפְתָּחִי (ב). Here instead of the baffling נִקְפּוּ זֶאֶת he reads or corrects נִפְתָּחִי, understanding the verb as Niphal Perfect (Prophetic) of נִקַּף *to go round* (Is 29<sup>1</sup>; Hiph. ch. 1<sup>5</sup>; 19<sup>6</sup>), although the Niphal of this verb has not been recognized elsewhere. It may be that St. Jerome’s *rursum* is merely a loose rendering of אַחֲרֵי *afterwards*; but since עוֹר and עוֹר are often indistinguishable in MSS, his rendering of the stichus may really preserve a conflate reading עוֹרִי עוֹרִי. In the remaining stichi his version agrees with מֵעַל, except that in v. 26<sup>b</sup> he reads וּבְבָשָׁרִי *et in carne mea*, instead of וּמִבְּשָׁרִי *et ex carne mea* (an important variation which supports our view of the general meaning of the passage), and in v. 27<sup>b</sup> he escapes the absurdity of locating the kidneys in the bosom by reading, as it would seem, כָּסֵלִי *my hope* instead of כִּלְיֵי *my kidneys*, and perhaps taking כָּלִי *are consumed* as a defectively written כָּלִוא *is confined, shut up*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cic. *Univ.* ‘Animum (Deus) circumdedit corpore et vestivit extrinsecus’.



The Greek translator starts well, with an elegant paraphrase which reads almost like a reminiscence of the tragic tale of Prometheus:

οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀέναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων

*For I know that he that is to release me is eternal*

(ἀέναοι, Aesch. *Suppl.* 554; τὸν ἐκλύουσιν' ἐμέ, Prom. *Vinct.* 800) = חי נאלי (כי) בי ידעתי גאל. גאל is not so rendered elsewhere (ἀγχιστεύων, Le 25<sup>26</sup> f. Dt 19<sup>6</sup> al.). ט פרק here: cf. ופרקת = ἐκλύσης, Gn 27<sup>40</sup>. חי is understood as *ever-living*, naturally enough. (Yet it is curious to observe that in Is 48<sup>12</sup> אחרון *the last* is rendered εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα = ἀέναος; for אחרון is the next word in the Hebrew here, and ט apparently omits it.) The second stichus in ט runs 25 b and 26 a together thus: ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστήσαι τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα, *Upon earth may he raise up my skin which exhausteth or goeth through* (cf. Prom. *Vinct.* 375 ἀντλήσεις) *all this!* = על עפר יקים עורי נוקף זאת (cf. Is 29<sup>1</sup>). (י נוקף might be supposed to mean 'going the round of this' = completing this suffering. But possibly ט intended rather נופק זאת, an Aramaism = יצא זאת *coming out of this*, reading נופק for נקפו.) This is no improvement on מ, the text of which it really confirms, except in the apparent omission of אחרון (perhaps supposed to be covered by ὁ μέλλων) and ואחר. The next stichus is strangely represented by παρὰ γὰρ Κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη, *For from the Lord all this was accomplished to me* = ושמרי כלו לי אלה instead of מ's אחזה אלה; which, again, is far from being an improvement. (Κύριος = שרי in eight other passages in Job.) לי כלו = μοι συνετελέσθη appears to come from the next versc. There can be little doubt that מ אחזה is right here. In the first two stichi of v. 27, ט had evidently a Hebrew text identical with מ, although it has altogether missed its purport: ἃ ἐγὼ ἐμαντῶ συνεπίσταμαι, ἃ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἑώρακεν (ט<sup>a</sup> οἱ ὀφθ. μου ἑώρακασιν) καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος. For the third stichus ט gives: πάντα δέ μοι συνετελέσται ἐν κόλπῳ = וכל כלו לי בחקי, instead of כלו כליתי בחקי; which does not help us at all, though it gets rid of the 'kidneys' in the bosom.

We may now submit a tentative reconstruction of the Hebrew:

כי אני ידעתי גאלי  
ואחר על-עפר יקים:  
אחר בעודי נקמות אל  
ובכשרי אחזה אלה:  
(Is 42<sup>8</sup>) אשכננו ולא אחר  
(Is 43<sup>12</sup>) ועיני יראהו ולא יר  
כלו כליתי בחקותי  
(3<sup>21</sup>)  
[עדי-פי יבא פסלי:]

*For I, I know my Avenger;  
And at last He will rise up on earth;*

*I shall see, while I yet live, El's revenges, (Ps 58<sup>12</sup>)  
 And in my flesh I shall gaze on Eloah!  
 I shall behold Him and not Another,  
 And mine eyes will look on Him, and not a strange god!  
 My kidneys are wasted with my waiting  
 (Until my hope shall come).*

v. 25. ואני ידעתי נאלי חי *But I—I know my living Avenger* (Ho 2<sup>1</sup> al.). If the meaning were *I know that my go'el is alive*, we should expect פִּי after ידעתי, as in 9<sup>2,28</sup> 10<sup>13</sup> 13<sup>18</sup> al. Besides, the question of the *existence* of God is not raised in the book (as it might very well have been in connexion with the main problem). Both Eyob and his friends take it for granted throughout. חי, חיים, חיה are never predicated of God in Job (except in the common formula of the oath, 27<sup>2</sup>). Cf. 16<sup>10</sup>. The st. is also metr. too long (four stresses). The חי may be due to the חר of the following word. Otherwise, apart from the above considerations, we might read st. ii as follows: *He liveth and on earth will appear.* (For יקום cf. also 16<sup>8</sup> Dt 19<sup>15</sup>, of a witness coming forward.) ואחר *and afterwards* or *by and by*, Ps 73<sup>24</sup>. But ואחרון (18<sup>20</sup>; joined with נאלי in Is 44<sup>6</sup>) may mean *And last of all, He will stand up* as a witness. *on earth*, על עפר, lit. *on (the) dust* = *on the ground*, as in 39<sup>14</sup> (of the ostrich leaving her eggs on the bare ground), and 41<sup>25</sup> (*there is not on earth his like*, of the crocodile); Is 47<sup>1</sup> (*sit on the ground*). At present He is in high Heaven, 16<sup>10</sup>. The distich might also be read thus:

חיהוא ועלעפר יקום | ואני ידעתי נאלי

*But I, I know mine Avenger; | He liveth and will rise up on earth!*

v. 26. *And I shall see; pointing ואחר ואחר And after.* The ✓חור to see is attested by the Assyrian *hāru*, sehen, ansehen, anblicken, ersehen (HWB), a synonym of *amāru*, *atā* (2 R 35. 20, 21 ef; MA), as well as by the Aramaic (Syriac) ܫܪܝ to see. *in my lifetime*, lit. *in my continuance*; עוֹרִי (בְּ)עוֹרִי, Ps 104<sup>33</sup>. Perhaps simply עוֹרִי. *revenges*: 'The whirligig of Time brings his revenges' (Shakespeare). נקמות Ps 18<sup>48</sup> 94<sup>1</sup>. Iahvah is אל נקמות *God of Requitals* or *Revenge*s. For the sense, cf. also Ps 58<sup>12</sup>: הִזָּה נָקָם *he hath seen vengeance*: Je 11<sup>20</sup> 51<sup>11</sup>. ואחר עוֹרִי נִקְפוּ זאת *is usually rendered: And after my skin, which they have struck off* (alluding to the ravages of his disease)—*this!* (so OL); that is, *this will happen!* But *after my skin* is an extraordinary expression to denote a point of time; and the pregnant use of זאת is both unparalleled and intrinsically improbable, although the Targum assumes it here: ואחר עוֹרִי נִקְפוּ זאת *And after my skin has been breathed into* (a reference to Ez 37<sup>9</sup>), *this will happen; And out of my flesh I shall again see God!* ע has the curious version ועל משכי הו

'*אחברך הלן ועל בסרי אן תחוא לאלהא עיני חוי נוהרא, כוליתי וג'* *And against my skin these things have set themselves round about, and against my flesh. If mine eyes see God, they see light! For my reins are quite perished, &c.*; apparently reading 'נקפ' *נקפ' ואת ובבשרי וג'* and taking נקף (like 𐤒) for נקף *to go round*. (A trace of the same thing may perhaps be recognized in 𐤒's *παρὰ γὰρ Κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη*, since עורי might have been misread שרי, while *συνετελέσθησαν* = *הקיפו* in 𐤒 15.) The proposed *ואחר עדי נקף אתי* *And Another as my Witness* (16<sup>19</sup>) *will raise himself with me* is dubious Heb. (Ps 145<sup>14</sup> 146<sup>8</sup> only, of Iahvah lifting up the bowed or prostrate). A similar remark applies to *וימשהדי*: *And as my Testifier I shall see Eloah*.

v. 27. 𐤓 gives three stichi instead of four and, moreover, continues the context in ordinary prose style: *לי אשר אני אחזה* *Whom I shall gaze on for myself*... Remembering Nu 24<sup>17</sup>, I long since conjectured *אשרנו* (20<sup>9</sup>) *I shall behold Him* for *אשר אני* *Whom I*; and *אחזה לי*, which looks like dittography from the preceding stichus, supplies material for *ולא אחר* *and not another* (cf. Is 42<sup>6</sup>), which provides a parallel to *ולא זר* (Is 43<sup>12</sup>), in the next stichus (where the Prophetic Perfect *ראו* may be right; cf. *דרך* in Nu l.c.). Thus the form of the distich, v. 27 a b, exactly reproduces that of Nu 24<sup>17a, b</sup>. The third stichus probably ended with *בחכותי* *through my waiting* (3<sup>21</sup>) corrupted in 𐤓 into *בחקי*, by loss of ת and confusion of כו with ק. Its fellow has disappeared altogether. Our *כסלי* (or *כסלתי*, 4<sup>6</sup>) may find some slight support in the *spes mea* of 𐤒 in the previous line.

v. 28 f. *If ye are saying, 'How shall we run him down,  
And find the cause of the thing in him?'  
Be afraid for yourselves because of the sword!  
(Or, Fear ye a Sword for yourselves!)*  
*For Wrath will consume the unjust!*

*If ye are saying*; among yourselves; laying your heads together to entrap me into an admission of guilt, in which you could recognize the 'root of the matter', the real cause of my calamities. Or else, *if ye are saying in your heart*, i. e. *thinking* (as Duhm takes it).

*How?* Heb. *מה*, which is so used Gn 44<sup>16</sup>. (Cf. 26<sup>2</sup> *How!*)

*in him*, Heb. *בו*. So about a hundred codd. and 𐤒 𐤔 𐤕, instead of the meaningless *בי* *in me* of the *Textus Receptus*.

*How shall we run him down or to earth*; lit. *pursue him?* 𐤒 has the instructive variant *נרבר* for *נררף*: *τί ἐροῦμεν ἐναντί αὐτοῦ*; = *מה נרבר לו* (13<sup>7</sup>: where *לו* = *for him*). Perhaps this is right, as it gives a good sense, and *מה נררף לו* is rather strange: *If ye muse, What shall we say to him, That we may find in him the cause of the thing?*

v. 29. *Fear ye a Sword*; or *the Sword*. The Sword of Divine Justice is, of course, intended, which would avenge Eyob's wrongs upon his

persecutors. Dt 32<sup>41, 42</sup> Ju 7<sup>18</sup> Is 34<sup>8</sup> 66<sup>16</sup>. (ὁ ἀπὸ ἐπικαλύμματος = מפני חפה, cf. Je 14<sup>3, 4</sup> ἐπεκάλυψαν = חפו. A curious error, due to illegibility of Heb. MS. Confusion of ב with פ, and *vice versa*, is very common; cf. v. 28.) *For wrath will consume the unjust* = כי חמה עולים תבער: see Is 42<sup>25</sup>, where חמה *heat, hot anger*, and בער *to burn up* are similarly connected. וְלִי חֵמָה עוֹנוֹת חֶרֶב וְלִי is ungrammatical and untranslatable, unless any one can find satisfaction in *For heat (is) sins of (the) sword*. ὁ θυμὸς γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνόμους ἐπελεύσεται, *For Wrath will come upon lawless ones* = תעבר על עולי חמה כי (ἐπέρχομαι = עבר 15<sup>19</sup> Na 3<sup>19</sup> al. More usually it represents בוא; e. g. 20<sup>22</sup>). This תעבר may have been a misreading of תבער. For ἀνόμους, cf. ἀνομα = עולה 27<sup>4</sup>; τῶν παρανόμων = עול 27<sup>7</sup>. The verse ends with a third stichus, which is probably an interpolation: *In order that ye may know—what?* שְׁדִין KΘΞΘΞΘΞ that (there is) a judgement: Q שְׁדִין, apparently the same. But שְׁדִין could hardly stand for שִׁישׁ דִּין (cf. Ps 58<sup>12</sup>); and if it could, ש = אִשׁר is otherwise unknown to our book. שְׁדִי is a probable correction (so Ew Di); and the original line may have been: *למען ידעו שדי*: That they (Θ) may know Shaddai (a marg. note). Θ<sup>B</sup>: καὶ τότε γινώσκονται πού ἐστιν αὐτῶν ἡ ὕλη = (!) וְיָדְעוּ אֵין עֵצִים; but Θ<sup>A</sup>: καὶ τότε γιν. ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχὺς ἐστιν = (לָמוֹ) וְיָדְעוּ אֵין עֵצִים (19<sup>7</sup> 30<sup>21</sup>)—a difference of pointing. [In 29<sup>6</sup> Θ gives ὑλώδης, *woody, wooded*, where M has שְׁדִי Shaddai. But there M בעור שדי עמדי *While Shaddai was still with me* is obviously right, and Θ's ὅτε ἤμην ὑλώδης λίαν, *When I was exceedingly woody (substantial?)*, a mere curiosity of interpretation. The passage, however, lends some support to the conjecture that ὕλη = שדי here. Perhaps αὐτῶν ἡ ὕλη = יערם, which might be a misreading of שְׁדִין; ש being broken up into יע, and יי run together into מ.] It is natural to compare Ps 9<sup>21</sup> יִשְׁעֵי גוֹיִם יִכָּרְזוּ: *Let the nations know they are (but) mortal men!*

### Chapter 20.

v. 2. *Therefore*: לָכֵן: but Θ לֹא(א)־כֵן *Not so*; but cf. st. ii *because of this*. For שעפִים *anxious thoughts*, see note on 4<sup>19</sup>. *reply to me*: 13<sup>22</sup> 33<sup>5, 32</sup> al. St. ii. *because of this*; scil. which thou hast just said. וְאָתָּה (or אֵלֶּה) must be restored to the text after the Prep. *they speak to me*: רָג. יִשְׁחֹו לִי (cf. 12<sup>8</sup> note) instead of the evidently corrupt בִּי חוֹשִׁי *my hasting in me*. Perhaps rather בִּי יִשְׁחֹו *they muse (or complain) in me*. His indignant thoughts compel Zophar to speak again. Θ 'Not so did I suppose thou wouldst utter these contradictions; And you (!) have no better understanding than I.' (Illegible Heb. text.) But Θ et mens in diversa rapitur = יָחֹוֹשׁ לָבִי; and the occasional confusion of מ with ש (see 15<sup>23</sup>) suggests יָחֹוֹשׁ (יָחֹוֹשׁ) for יָחֹוֹשׁ, so that the st. might orig. have said *And with anger* (וּבְעֵבֶרָה) or *And within me* (וּבִקְרִבִי) *my heart waxeth hot* (יָחֹוֹשׁ לָבִי): Ps 39<sup>4</sup>. Others would read *And because of this my heart is stirred up* (רָחַשׁ לָבִי + Ps 45<sup>2</sup>); but the ᾤχσ expresses joyous, not angry,

emotion. On the whole, we may perhaps prefer the following version of the couplet :

*Not so (G) do my thoughts respond to me ;  
But within me my heart waxeth hot.*

v. 3. A lit. translation of מ would be *The correction or chastisement of my reproach or ignominy* (i.e. *My shameful correction*; cf. Is 53<sup>6</sup>) *I hear*; *And a spirit out of my understanding answereth me* (cf. v. 2). So G. St. i then refers to Eyob's scornful words and threats. But the Hebrew is strange. For כלמה (here only in Job) see Ps 44<sup>16</sup> 69<sup>20</sup>. Since st. ii continues the thought of v. 1, it seems probable that st. i. originally expressed something similar. We therefore suggest כליתי *my reins* instead of כלמתי (cf. Ps 16<sup>7</sup> כליותי יסרוני *my reins corrected or instructed me*); a frequent parallel to לב *heart*, Ps 7<sup>10</sup> al. Je 17<sup>10</sup>: *The monition of my reins* (my inmost thoughts and feelings) *I hear*: *And my intelligent spirit* (leg. רוחי מבינה pro רוח מבינתי *answereth me*. Cf. G εκ της συνείσεως = מבינה (a difference of points only). The ה מבינתי really belongs to the next word, which should be תענני (not יענני as M), since רוח *spirit* is fem. (6<sup>1</sup> 10<sup>12</sup> 17<sup>1</sup> 21<sup>4</sup>) in Job.—In the opening quatrain Zophar merely affirms that he speaks with all due deliberation, not offhand and without previous thought (cf. 11<sup>2</sup>).

v. 4. Reading הלא c 1 cod. (cf. G μη ταῦτα ἔγγως καταλ.) instead of מ הוא. St. ii. *from the placing of man on the earth*; viz. at his creation. To delete שים (Ki) would spoil both sense (see Gn 2<sup>8</sup> וישם) and metre. G gives the meaning correctly: ἀφ' οὗ ἐτέθη ἄθρωπος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

v. 5. joy: רינת: lit. *shouting*; cf. Assy. rininu, 'whining'. The ✓ רנ *cry aloud*, usu. from joy, but also from grief (La 2<sup>19</sup>), may be akin to לנ or לון *to murmur* (cf. Sum. LIL, *the wind*, from its wailing), and to Assy. ramiāmu, 'to thunder' (LIL = LIN = RIN, RIM). soon over: מקרוב: an idiomatic phrase found in Ez 7<sup>8</sup> Dt 32<sup>17</sup> Je 23<sup>23</sup> ('at hand', 'anear' as opp. to 'afar', of place; then of time, 'not far', 'near' in either direction, past or future; e.g. 'lately', Dt 32<sup>17</sup>, 'soon' or 'shortly', Ez 7<sup>8</sup>, and adjectivally, 'not farreaching', 'short', as here). G paraphr. πῶμα ἐξάισιον, 'The joy of the impious (plur.) is a signal fall': see 4<sup>1</sup> 9<sup>23</sup> 18<sup>12</sup>. (Did G read פתאם for מקרוב and אֶכֶר, Pr 11<sup>10</sup>, or אִיד = ἀπώλεια, for ערירנע, in a defaced text?)

v. 6. *his height, or growth, stature*. מ שיאו *his loftiness*; a ἄπ with which we may perhaps comp. שיאן, 'the Lofty' (?), as a name of Hermon. שאתו *his dignity or exaltation, majesty* (13<sup>11</sup>) has been proposed. Perhaps שגאו *his growth*: cf. 8<sup>7.11</sup> 12<sup>23</sup> al. G *his gifts* (שׁי Ps 68<sup>30</sup> al.) supports M. B superbia eius = גאותו. G רומה *his height (or pride)*. In st. ii, G ἡ δὲ θυσία αὐτοῦ pro וראשו (? ואשה = ואשו!).

v. 7. מ כנללו יאבר מ *Like his own dung he perisheth for ever*. 'The dung-heaps which are used as fuel and consequently disappear' (Dillon).

So RV: cf. Ez 4<sup>12</sup>. But surely the disappearance of these would be gradual, and certainly not rapid enough for the figure. We may read בְּגִדְלוֹ *In his greatness* (Ez 31<sup>27</sup>) or, better, instead of לִנְצַח בְּגִלְלוֹ לִפְנֵי-רוּחַ, *like a dustwhirl before the wind* (Ps 83<sup>14</sup>) or perhaps כְּגִלְלוֹ וּמִן *like a whirl of chaff and stubble* (cf. Is 17<sup>13</sup>). ט paraphrases with the unlikely guess ὅταν γὰρ δοκῇ ἡδὴ κατεστηρίχθαι, *For whenever he seemeth to be now firmly established, then* (&c. as מ) = בְּגִדְלוֹ *in his greatness or pride*. Instead of רְאוּ *they who saw him* ט εἰδότες = יָדְעוּ *they who knew him*.

v. 8. Cf. Ps 73<sup>20</sup>. *Like a dream that flieth*: so ט ὡς ὄνειρον ἐκπετασθὲν οὐ μὴ ἐύρεθῇ (לֹא יִפְצֵא): ℣ Velut somnium avolans non inveniatur. Or *Like a dream he flieth away* (cf. Ps 90<sup>10</sup>), and they ('who saw him') find him not (so מ). St. ii. *And he fleeth*: pointing וַיֵּרֶד. מ וַיֵּרֶד Hoph. *And he is made to fly, chased away* (cf. Hiph. 18<sup>18</sup>); which is hardly the way a dream departs. ט ἐπτη δέ = וַיֵּרֶד; ℣ transiet.

v. 9. *that once glanced at him; or descried him* 28<sup>1</sup>: but in Ct 1<sup>6</sup> שוּף = שָׂף *to scorch*. (Perhaps distinct Roots. With שוּף *look upon*, cf. צַפָּה *watch, look out*, and perhaps Sum. SHAB, *barú ša šîri*, 'inspect, of flesh' or 'Seer of the omen'; with שוּף *scorch*, cf. שָׂבַב *burn, flame*.)

*beholdeth*: leg. יִשְׁרֵנוּ pro מִשְׁ (due to preceding תוֹסִיף). Though starred by the Hexapla, the verse is necessary to the completion of the quatrain. (This, however, might be effected by connecting v. 11 immediately with v. 8, as some prefer to do, and rejecting vv. 9, 10, as an insertion.)

v. 10. The resemblances noted between st. i and v. 19<sup>a</sup> (יִרְצוּ דָלִים) = (רִצְצוּ דָלִים) and between st. ii and v. 18<sup>a</sup> (מִשֵּׁב = תִּשְׁבֵּנָה) have suggested that we have here a variant or a gloss upon those verses. The likeness, however, is not reflected in ט.

In מ, as it stands, the two stichi are not parallel. To remedy this, וְיָדְיוֹ *And his children* (cf. ט) or וְיָדֵיהֶם *And their hands* (i.e. his sons') has been proposed in place of וְיָדְיוֹ *And his hands*. But the idea that the wicked man's sons are brought so low as *to court the favour of poor folk* by restitution of the gains of oppression, is more than dubious; and the meaning assigned to יָרָצוּ (a scribal error for יִרְצֻ? cf. ℣ and v. 19) finds no support elsewhere (on √רצה see note 14<sup>e</sup>). We might get a parallel to יָדְיוֹ *his hands* (st. ii) by reading כַּפָּיו *his palms* (16<sup>17</sup> 31<sup>7</sup>; cf. Is 59<sup>3.6</sup>) instead of בְּנָיו *his sons* (st. i). St. i might then be restored to *His palms oppress* (יָרָצוּ or יִרְצֻ or, correcting the gend., הָרָצָה?) *the poor*; cf. ט *His sons may inferiours destroy* (Θ<sup>A</sup> θλασῖαν, ut v. 19); ℣ *His sons shall be broken by poverty* = ℣ Filii eius atterentur egestate (both pointing the vb. as Niph. יָרָצוּ). Hence some would render: *His sons are crushed* (as) *poor men*; a quite improb. construction. It will be noted that all the Verss. imply √רצה > רִצְצוּ. (RV marg. 'The poor shall oppress his children' = rg. of ט, but sense improb., and incongruous with st. ii ap.

RV.) In st. ii,  $\mathfrak{G}$  gives αἱ δὲ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ πυρσεύσαισαν ὀδύνας (-as, B<sup>a</sup>b N<sup>ca</sup> AC), *Let his hands signal to sorrows* (or *kindle sorrows*)! app. rg. תִּשְׁכְּנָה or תִּצְנָנָה for תִּשְׁכְּנָה. But  $\mathfrak{G}^A$  ψηλαφήσουσιν = תִּשְׁכְּנָה *feel*, Gn 27<sup>12</sup>, or חמששנה, 5<sup>14</sup> 12<sup>25</sup> (cf. Gn 31<sup>34.37</sup>), suggests the interesting sense *And his hands search through* ('finger'?) *their wealth* or *goods* (to claim them as his own, or otherwise annex them).  $\mathfrak{G}$  ὀδύνας = 'און (= אונם in this case, not אנו as  $\mathfrak{M}$ ). Perhaps, however, we should read some vb. meaning *to plunder*, e. g. תִּשְׁלָנָה or תִּשְׁלָנָה or even תִּבְצַענָה. (Both  $\mathfrak{G}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  et manus illius reddent ei dolorem suum confuse און *wealth* with און *trouble, sorrow*.)

v. 11.  $\mathfrak{M}$  lit. as RV *His bones are full of his youth*. So  $\mathfrak{G}$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}$ ; the latter explaining עלומו by vitiiis adolescentiae eius (cf. Ps 38<sup>8</sup> 25<sup>7</sup>). If ל' be right, the verse simply means that the wicked man's youthful vigour (33<sup>26</sup>) survives unimpaired to his dying day; a sense which is hardly suitable here. Besides, עלומי m. plur. does not agree with חשכב. Read, therefore, עולתו *his injustice*; which accords with v. 10.

v. 12. So  $\mathfrak{G}$   $\mathfrak{B}$ , with stop at the end of the verse. But it is better to extend the influence of the introductory particle אם ( $\mathfrak{G}$  ἐάν,  $\mathfrak{B}$  cum enim) to the three following stichi, as in our versions; thus connecting vv. 12, 13 with v. 14 as the apodosis. Injustice is sweet in the doing, but bitter in its results for the doer (cf. also v. 16).

v. 13. *Though he save or spare it*. He finds it so delicious, that he does not swallow it at once, but rolls it under his tongue, loth to let it go down. Cf. Pr 9<sup>17f.</sup> 20<sup>17</sup>. ( $\mathfrak{G}$  prefixes οὐ to st. i perperam.  $\mathfrak{B}$  rectè ut  $\mathfrak{M}$ .) (*holdeth it back*: ימנענה.  $\mathfrak{G}$  συνάξει, cf. ἀδίκως συναγόμενος v. 15 = בלע. But possibly al. συνέξει is right.)

v. 14. *Into poison*: leg. למרורת: cf. 30<sup>21</sup> 41<sup>20</sup> Ex 7<sup>17.20</sup>. For the noun, *bitterness, gall, poison*, see 13<sup>36</sup> and v. 25 infr.  $\mathfrak{G}$  here χολή,  $\mathfrak{B}$  fel.

For st. i  $\mathfrak{G}$  has καὶ οὐ μὴ δυνηθῇ βοηθῆσαι εαυτῷ, *And he will not be able to help himself* = ולא יוכל לעזור לנפשו. Cf. with this the text of  $\mathfrak{M}$  (c Apodot. v) ולחמו במעיו נהפך. ( $\mathfrak{G}$  prob. intended by this app. incongruous substitution '*But he is obliged to swallow it; he cannot help himself, keep it as long as he will in his mouth*'.) In the closing st.  $\mathfrak{G}$  χολή (not εἰς χολήν) ἀσπίδος shows that מרורת (not למרורת) stood in  $\mathfrak{G}$ 's Heb. text. The Prep. must therefore have occurred in the previous st. Read therefore לַחֲמָה *into venom* (6<sup>4</sup> Dt 32<sup>33</sup> Ps. 58<sup>5</sup>) instead of the jarring לַחֲמֵי *his bread* at the beginning of the verse, and so restore both symmetry and sense:

*Into venom in his bowels it turneth,—*

*(Into) poison of asps within him.*

v. 15.  $\mathfrak{G}$  paraphrases *Wealth unjustly gathered shall be vomited forth*.

St. ii;  $\mathfrak{G}$  Out of his house מִבֵּיתוֹ:  $\mathfrak{M}$  rectè מכִּתְּנו; see on 19<sup>21</sup>) an angel will draw it יִמְשְׁכֶנּוּ ut Gn 37<sup>28</sup>). Perhaps יעלנו *bringeth it up* or

יצאנו *bringeth it forth*. מַשְׁנֵי יִרְשְׁנוּ (see note on יִרְשְׁנוּ 13<sup>26</sup>. Not a Job word). *ἄγγελος* = אֵל (? אֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִים: cf. Gn 31<sup>24</sup> Ps 8<sup>6</sup>).

v. 16. *venom*: רָאשׁ: which B confuses with רָאשׁ caput. Θ *θυμός*, as in Dt 32<sup>33</sup>. (Perhaps Θ read חֲמָה 1. *wrath*, 2. *poison*: see v. 14.)

v. 17. Θ *Let him not see a milking of nomads, Nor pastures of honey and butter!* (perhaps reading במלגות, and connecting the strange word with Gk. ἀμέλω, *to milk*. Then νομάδων = רָעִי, i. e. רָעִים 1 C 27<sup>29</sup> and νομάς = נָיִי or נָאִי Je 23<sup>3.10</sup>.) That M cannot be original is certain; the first st. being short, and the second redundant in more senses than one. פלגות (Ju 5<sup>15.16</sup>) is suspicious and should prob. be פלני, which is followed in the parallel passage 29<sup>6</sup> by שֶׁמֶן *oil* (cf. Mi 6<sup>7</sup> נְחָלִי שֶׁמֶן *torrents of oil*). Others have suggested יֶצֶהֶר *fresh oil*, which, however, does not occur in מִ"מ, while, as we have seen, || locc. favour שֶׁמֶן נהרי. (נהרי looks like a var. of נחלי, or a gloss on פלגות. But cf. Ps 46<sup>8</sup> נָהָר פִּלְגֵי; the latter being the irrigating canals drawn from the main stream.)

v. 18. M corrupt. Lit. *Returning* (or *about to return*) *gain* (יָנַע ἄπ' one cod. יָנַע *toil, produce*; whence some read יָנִיעוּ *his produce*), and *he swalloweth not*; *According to the wealth of his exchange* (15<sup>31</sup> 28<sup>17</sup>) and *he rejoiceth not* (39<sup>13</sup> Niph.). RV supposes st. i to mean: 'That which he laboured for shall he restore, and shall not swallow it down': cf. v. 10 and 15. But the oppressor's wealth is not the product of his own labour (יָנִיעַ). It is extorted from the poor (v. 19). Θ *εἰς κενὰ καὶ μάταια ἐκοπίασεν, πλοῦτον ἐξ οὗ οὐ γέυσεται* (? יִטְעַם) *לא יבלע בְּחַיִל יָנַע לְשׁוֹן יָנַע*: cf. 9<sup>29</sup> 39<sup>16</sup> *εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασεν* = לְרִיק יָנַע: Is 49<sup>4</sup> Je 51<sup>58</sup>. בחיל: so fifty codd.: for יָנַע see Jos 24<sup>13</sup>. γευσ' = יִטְעַם: see 12<sup>11</sup> 34<sup>3</sup>: πλοῦτος = חַיִל 21<sup>7</sup> 31<sup>25</sup>. For st. ii Θ gives ὥσπερ στρίφνος ἀμάσητος ἀκατάποτος, *Like a tough morsel unchewed, not to be swallowed*. (See note on στρίφνος in Θ<sup>B</sup>\* ap. Swete). This = יָלַעַם . . . ולא ילעם. Θ appears to have read ילעם (an Aramaism; יָלַע, ܠܥܥ, *manducare, esse, 'chew', 'eat'*) instead of ילעם *he rejoices*; a better parallel to יבלע *he swallows* (7<sup>19</sup>). That Θ's version of the distich is more or less composite is evident: e. g. it bears traces of both בחיל and בחיל, while ἀμάσητος (fr. μασάομαι) = לא ילעם and ἀκατάποτος = לא יבלע. We may perhaps read, partly following Θ:

לְשׁוֹן יָנַע וְלֹא יַעֲיֵל  
יְחִיל לְתִבְוֹאָתוֹ וְלֹא יִלְעַם:

*He toils in vain without profit;  
He hopes for his crop and eats not.*

Cf. also Θ: *He will turn to labour and will not swallow; Acc. to the power of his exchange he will not profit* (לְשׁוֹן). B *Luet quae fecit omnia, nec tamen consumetur: iuxta multitudinem adinventionum suarum, sic et sustinebit* = יָשִׁיב יָנִיעוֹ וְלֹא יִבְלַע | בְּחַיִל מְזִמָּתוֹ? (תְּמִידוּתוֹ?) וְלֹא יִפְסֵל? Another attempted restoration is perhaps worthy of mention: יָנַע לְשׁוֹן



: *He labours in vain, and eats not; With his palate he tastes, and swallows not.* (יִבְלַע pro יִנְיֵר. Cf. 22<sup>20</sup> נִימֵר = אָכַל!)

v. 19. מ For he hath crushed, he hath forsaken (עָנִי), the poor is not in the poet's manner. ὁ πολλῶν γὰρ ἀδυνάτων (AC rectè; B δυν. error script. see 5<sup>16</sup> 31<sup>16</sup>) οἴκους ἔθλασεν: a better parallel to st. ii. Read perhaps מִשְׁכָּב the dwelling. For this word as syn. of בֵּית house see Ex 12<sup>10,20</sup>. (οἶκος is usu. בֵּית, but sometimes אֹהֶל 12<sup>6</sup> 15<sup>34</sup>.) Otherwise, we might read עֲרֵף neck, 16<sup>12</sup>, or זְרֹעַ arm, 22<sup>9</sup>. Ὡ Because he thought to abandon (= עָזַב = מָ) the poor. דָּבָר = עֵיפָא the matter of the poor. In st. ii read בְּנֵהוּ c אֵב instead of יִבְנֵהוּ; cf. Ὡ καὶ οὐκ ἔσθῃσεν ולא = אֵב apparently. The well-known metaphor of 'building a house' = establishing or perpetuating a family (1 Sa 2<sup>35</sup> Ru 4<sup>11</sup>) is not intended, the material house only being in question.

v. 20. מ cannot mean RV, for שָׁלוֹ is not quietness (שָׁלוֹה Pr 17<sup>1</sup>) but quiet, easeful (16<sup>12</sup> 21<sup>23</sup>), and בְּחִמּוֹ is not aught of that wherein he delighteth (מְחִמִּי) but in or with that, &c. (cf. Ps. 39<sup>12</sup> Is 44<sup>9</sup>); and the vb. מָלַט Pi. requires an Accus. Obj. (6<sup>23</sup> 22<sup>30</sup> 29<sup>12</sup>). The √חמד desire, delight in, does not recur in any of its forms in Job (though we might have expected the Niph. desirable, valuable, in ch. 28); which seems a suspicious circumstance, esp. when taken in connexion with the fact that the stichus in which it occurs is too short, while st. i is app. too long. Ὡ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ σωτηρία τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν (Ὡ<sup>A</sup> οὐκ ἔσθῃ αὐτῷ σωτηρία ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ + v. 21<sup>b</sup>). Ὡ therefore appears to have read לו כי לא ירע שלו For he hath no safety instead of שלו כי לא ירע (ישועה) לו in his belly either בביתו in his house (see on v. 15 and 19<sup>15</sup> for the same confusion. τὰ ὑπάρχοντα = בֵּית Gn 45<sup>18</sup>) or באונו in his wealth (see v. 10; and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ = אוֹנו 18<sup>7</sup> 21<sup>18</sup>). The context favours the latter here (ב was repeated after אנו was misread (טנו). Instead of the dubious בחמורו we propose (ו)ברכ חילו And by the greatness of his wealth (τὰ ὑπάρχ. αὐτοῦ = חילו 15<sup>29</sup>), which at least restores the balance of the stichus. The vb. must be pointed Niph. יִפְלֹט c אֵב אֵב. Thus we get for the distich:

*No safety for him in his wealth;  
Nor doth he escape by his great riches.*

For the general form of the verse cf. Ps 33<sup>16-18</sup>.

v. 21. 'There was nothing left that he devoured not' (RV) sounds plausible enough; but שְׂרִיר survivor (v. 26; 18<sup>19</sup> Is 1<sup>9</sup>) is only used of persons. Hence, though Ὡ supports מ, we should read באהלו in his tent (18<sup>19</sup>). Ὡ מן חולדתה of his generations or race: a paraphrase. 'Therefore his prosperity (lit. good) shall not endure' (RV = מ) is not a good parallel to st. i. Ὡ Therefore his good things will not flourish (ἀνθίσσει = יפרח: cf. 14<sup>9</sup>). For טובו his good read שְׁמוֹ his name. The vb. חיל

*shall be firm* or *enduring* is doubtful both here and in Ps 10<sup>5</sup>, although the sense would suit. *His name flourisheth* (lit. *buddeth* or *sprouteth*) *not* is a beautiful metaphor for childlessness (cf. Nu 17<sup>2.5</sup> Ps 72<sup>17</sup>). Perhaps יהלף (Ps 90<sup>5.6</sup>) or יהליף (14<sup>9</sup>); or even ינון in the like sense (Ps 72<sup>17</sup>; cf. Sum. NUN *rabû*, NUM, LUM, *uššubu*, NUMUN, NÛ, *zêru*, 'seed', 'offspring').

v. 22. Lit. *when his sufficiency is full, he is in straits* (or *want*). שָׁפֵק אִם־Aramaism? cf. vb. 1 K 20<sup>10</sup> Eccles 15<sup>18</sup> שָׁפֵק suffice, abound. But possibly שָׁפֵק = צָמָק = קָצַם *fist*, read backwards: cf. the phrase מְלֵא קִצּוֹ *fullness of his fist*, Le 2<sup>2</sup> 5<sup>12</sup>, and Gn 41<sup>47</sup> לִקְצִים *by handfuls*, i.e. abundantly.

In st. ii point עָמַל *suffering* instead of עָמַל *sufferer* (3<sup>20</sup>), c 6 B, both of which om. יָד *hand, power*. Perhaps יָד *sufficiency, abundance*: *All plenitude of trouble attacketh him*; or read בְּכָל־יָדָיו עָמַל חֲבָאוֹ In all his plenty trouble attacketh him. (יָד prop. *overflow*, from רוּחַ *to flow*; cf. שֶׁ *gift* from שׁוּחַ *to put* in the hand.)

v. 23. A tristich. St. i is obviously corrupt. It cannot mean *His belly shall be filled!* (Davidson, Driver); for בֶּטֶן is fem. (15<sup>35</sup> Pr 18<sup>20</sup>). The Hex. stars the line, but the mention of God is necessary to the context (cf. v. 15); and it is more prob. that either st. ii or st. iii is spurious. Read יִמְלֵא בֶטְנוֹ (?) יהוה (*Iahvah* or *Eloah* *filleteth his belly*; | *He looseth against him* (or *sendeth into him*: Am 1<sup>4</sup> Ps 104<sup>10</sup>) *the heat of his anger*; *And He raineth upon him His (?) Terrors* (leg. בְּלִהוֹתָיו or simply בְּלִהוֹת *terrors*, c 6 δδύνας = 'בלה' 18<sup>11</sup> 27<sup>20</sup>: מִבְּלִחֻמוֹ, which Dr doubtfully explains *into his flesh*; cf. X and Zp 1<sup>17</sup>: but the word evidently conceals the direct Obj. which should follow יִמְטֵר as in Ps 11<sup>6</sup> פָּתִיחַ.) S *And he will rain upon him* in his valour (בְּקִרְבַּנְתּוֹתָהּ), app. pointing מִבְּלִחֻמוֹ *qs. in his fighting*; cf. B Et pluatur super illum bellum suum, which suggests וִימְטֵר עָלָיו מִלְחָמוֹ (or 'וִימֵ' עָלָיו מִלְחָמָה) *And He rains down upon him His battle* (or *the weapons of His battle*): cf. the next two verses.

v. 24. C καὶ οὐ μὴ σωθῇ ἐκ χειρὸς σιδήρου. This may confirm the suspicion that וָאֵם has fallen out at the beginning of the stichus: *And if he flee from arms* (39<sup>21</sup>) *of iron*, | *The bow of bronze transfixeth him*: cf. also S *He who fleeth from the corselet of iron*, &c.

v. 25. App. a tristich; grammatically incoherent, and metrically defective. Instead of מֵעַ מִנוֹחַ וִיֵצֵא שֶׁלֵּחַ, which is really nonsense, C has the excellent sense διεξέλθει δὲ διὰ σώματος αὐτοῦ βέλος = וִיֵצֵא שֶׁלֵּחַ מִנוֹחוֹ *And the missile* (Jo 2<sup>8</sup> βέλος = שֶׁלֵּחַ) *cometh out of his body* (מִנוֹחַ might be retained if pointed מִגִּיחוֹ, i.e. מִגִּיחוֹ *out of his back*). The suggestion that שֶׁלֵּחַ should be read, on the ground of Syr. שֶׁלֵּפָא *a blade without handle or hilt*, is improb. An *arrow* is intended, as the context shows. Cf. Ps 18<sup>15</sup> 144<sup>6</sup>. שֶׁלֵּחַ recurs, 33<sup>18</sup> 36<sup>12</sup>. St. ii, *the flash*: i.e. the flashing steel of the barb. בָּרָק *lightning* is similarly used in the Psalms cited above; Hb 3<sup>11</sup>. C ἀστρα is a mere scribal error for ἀστραπή = בָּרָק, and ἐν

*diáltais* (-תת) *αὐτοῦ* = בָּאֵהָלוֹ in *his tent* is due to the translator's eye having wandered to the end of the next verse, where that word occurs. St. iii. *עָלָיו (יָפְלוּ) אִימִים* Upon him fall terrors (see Ps 55<sup>5</sup>) is prob. a gloss. (There seems no sufficient reason for regarding vv. 24-25 b ממֵרָחוֹ as an addition.)

v. 26. מִ lit. *All darkness is laid up for his things laid up* (כָּל חֹשֶׁךְ טָמָן); cf. ὁ ἄγέκρευται τοῖς ἐγκειμένοις αὐτοῦ a not very appropri. sense, since it is for the wicked man himself > for his treasures that 'all darkness' = every kind of misfortune is reserved: cf. st. ii. צָפֹן must be omitted (c ט) as a marg. variant of טָמָן, which should be followed by לוֹ or אֵלָיו (cf. 15<sup>22</sup>). For the √ טָמַן *hide* see 3<sup>15</sup> (3<sup>21</sup> מִטְמוֹנִים *hid treasures*) 18<sup>10</sup> 31<sup>33</sup> 40<sup>13</sup>. צָפֹן *hide, treasure up*, also occurs some seven times in Job.

St. ii. For the anomalous pointing תִּאֲכָלְהִי leg. the ordinary form תִּאֲכָל implied by the Versions and given by seven codd. The curious phrase אֵשׁ לֹא נִפְחָה a *fire unblown* seems to mean not fanned by breath or bellows (נִפְחָה Je 6<sup>29</sup>); i.e. not of human origin: prob. an allusion to 1<sup>16</sup>. We must read נִפְחָה (cf. 41<sup>12</sup> נִפְחָה Ecclus 43<sup>4</sup> כֹּר נֶפֶחַ) for נִפְחָה, as Pu. does not seem to be substantiated: cf. נִפְחָה רֵלָא נִפְחָה and ἡ τῆς πυρρῆς τοῦ ᾧ the *fire of hell which is not blown up*. ὁ ἀκαυστος but ὁ ἀσβεστος *unquenchable, not to be blown out* = לֹא־תִכְבֶּה (Pr 26<sup>20</sup>; but not al. in Job).

St. iii is prob. an add. Cf. v. 21. The text is unsatisfactory, however we choose to vary the pointing of יָרַע (וַיֵּרַע). If אֵשׁ *fire* is the Subj. (RV), the word should at least be תָּרַע (cf. תִּאֲכָל ad init.). ὁ κακῶσαι = יָרַע. ט misread יָרַע as יָנַשׁ. The old conjecture יָרַע shall be *grazed upon* or *fed upon* = *consumed* is improb. and, indeed, unparalleled. If we read יִתְבַּעַר, we get good sense and a good parallel to st. ii: *And consumeth the survivor in his tent*. (The reading suggested by Ki יִתְבַּעַר שְׂכִיבִי וגו' *The flame is quenched in his tent* is ingenious, but also incongruous with st. ii, though it might suit as a parallel to st. i, if we rejected st. ii as spurious.)

v. 27. The mode in which Heaven and Earth attest the guilt of the wicked man is made clear by v. 28. It is by the flood which sweeps his house away. (Instead of מִתְקִימָהּ לוֹ we might read לְעִדְבּוֹ And earth stands up as a witness against him. Cf. ὁ γῆ δὲ ἐνανταστὰν αὐτῷ, Ὡς et terra consurget adversus eum. מ seems metr. short.)

v. 28. מִ The produce (יָבֹל always elsewhere of *yield of the soil*) of his house shall depart (יָגֵל; cf. Is 24<sup>11</sup> Pr 27<sup>26</sup>); *Things flowing or running down* (נְגִירוֹת; cf. La 3<sup>40</sup>: corrupt) in the day of his anger. Supposing נַגְרוֹת = נֶאֱנָרוֹת = נֶאֱנָרוֹת his *ingatherings* or *stores* (cf. Pr 6<sup>10</sup> 10<sup>5</sup>), we get a passable parallel. But the loss of crops hardly suffices as a climax or finishing stroke in the picture of ruin. Moreover, יָגֵל ad init. may have been influenced by יָגֵל v. 27 ad init.; and there is no immediate reference for אֵפוֹ, as God has not been mentioned since v. 23. Prob. we must read אֵירוֹ his (the wicked man's) *ruin* (21<sup>30</sup>) instead of אֵפוֹ his (God's)

*anger*. For יִבּוֹל we suggest יִנֵּר מְבוֹל (Hb 1<sup>15</sup> Pr 21<sup>7</sup>) or perhaps יִנֵּר (Mi 1<sup>4.8</sup> 2 Sa 14<sup>14</sup>). There seems no reason why a late poet might not use מְבוֹל (Noah's *Flood*, Gn 6<sup>17</sup>+) of any great deluge or storm of destruction (cf. Ps 29<sup>10</sup>). (The word מְבוֹל = \*מִנְבוֹל?; cf. Assy. *nabbaltu* = *nanbaltu*?, the def. of Sum. IM-BAL, 'destructive wind', 'hurricane'. *Nabālu* means to *throw down* or *destroy* cities. Since IM denotes both wind, *šāru*, and rain, *zunnu*, it seems not impossible that the old Heb. *mabbāl* may be a transformation of Sum. IMBAL.) Others have proposed יִגּוֹל *The river rolleth away*; but neither גֹּל nor יִגּוֹל *watercourse* or *canal, conduit* (Is 30<sup>25</sup> 44<sup>4</sup>), for irrigation, seems to be so used. In st. ii for מִנְּרוֹת read וְנִרְפָּה *And sweepeth it away* (cf. Ju 5<sup>21</sup> of a river). Ki וְנִרְפָּה; but what does this mean? ὁ ἐλκύσαι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀπωλεία εἰς τέλος | ἡμέρα ὀργῆς ἐπέλθοι αὐτῷ. See IIb 1<sup>15</sup> ἐλκύσεν αὐτόν = וְנִרְפָּה; ἀπωλεία = אֲבוֹר Pr 11<sup>10</sup>, or אֵיד 21<sup>30</sup>. As בָּלָה *destruction* may be ἀπωλεία (cf. vb. ap. ὁ 7<sup>6</sup> 9<sup>22</sup>) and εἰς τέλος = לְבָלָה 2 C 12<sup>12</sup>, בָּלָה Ps 74<sup>12</sup>, ἀπωλ. εἰς τέλος may be a dupl. equivalent of יִבּוֹל. For st. ii ὁ app. read 'עָלִי יוֹא יוֹם אֶפֶס'. ὁ *The foundations of his house shall be exposed* (= יִבּוֹל), *And he shall be drawn away* (נִבְנֶה = יִנְנֶה pro נִנְרוֹת) *in the day of wrath*; cf. ὁ Apertum erit germen (= בָּלוּ or יִבּוֹלוּ?) domus illius | Detrahetur in die furoris Dei.

v. 29. Om. אָרָם *man*, which is implied in רָשָׁע (9<sup>22-24</sup> 15<sup>20</sup> 24<sup>8</sup> al.), metri gratia. Cf. 27<sup>13</sup> Is 17<sup>14b</sup>. *from Iahvah* = ὁ παρὰ Κυρίου, for which מִמֶּלֶךְ מֵאֱלֹהִים *from Elohim* may have been substituted.

St. ii. מִן אֶמְרוֹ מֵאֵל *and the portion of his word* (= sentence?) *from El*; but the second word is unknown in such a use, and the parallel locc. show that it is superfluous. See 27<sup>13</sup> 31<sup>2</sup> Is 17<sup>14</sup> 54<sup>17</sup> Je 13<sup>26</sup>. The objection to מוֹרָא = מוֹרָה *rebel* (Nu 20<sup>10</sup>) is that the מוֹרָה is of doubtful occurrence in Job (see notes on 17<sup>2</sup> 23<sup>2</sup>) except in the Elihu-section (36<sup>22</sup>). ὁ καὶ κατῆμα ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ (ὁ<sup>AC</sup> αὐτοῦ) παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου = (Es 2<sup>11</sup>) מִיָּדָע (18<sup>7</sup>) אֹנוֹ (27<sup>13</sup>) וְנִחַלַת מוֹרָשׁ (Dt 11<sup>12</sup>). Read backwards, either יָדָע or דָּרַשׁ indicates יָדָע > אֵל: see 27<sup>13</sup>. But מִן may be a perversion of מֵאֵל וְנִחַלַתוֹ *And his portion from with* (i. e. assigned by) *El*: cf. Is 54<sup>17</sup>.

Chapter 21. v. 2. *Comfort*. מִתְנַחֲמֹת abstr. intens. plur., as 15<sup>11</sup>. The m. form occurs thrice (see Je 16<sup>7</sup> תְּנַחֲמִים); the sing. never. Kittel's note '1 c ὁ ὁ<sup>AC</sup> ὁ<sup>AC</sup> מִתְנַחֲמִים—' is therefore erroneous. ὁ mistakenly reads שְׂמֵעַ for שְׂמֹעַ in st. i, and inserts a neg. in st. ii.

v. 3. *Ye may mock*: reading plur. חֲלִינוּ pro מִן sing., c ὁ ὁ<sup>AC</sup> ὁ<sup>AC</sup>, as the parallel vb. and the context require. ὁ again inserts a neg., rendering *Then ye will not laugh at me*. But Eyob hardly expected his friends to become mollified towards himself by what he was going to say. He only thought to silence them.)

v. 4. Lit. I—of (ל) *man is my complaining* (שִׁיחִי) or *musings*? But a

vb. fin. seems to be wanting; and  $\text{ע}$  *I will speak* ( $\text{אָמַר}$  pro  $\text{אָנְכִי}$ ) may possibly be right. Leg.  $\text{הָאִמֵּר}$ : *Do I make my plaint of a man? Or why should not my temper be short?* (For  $\text{שִׁחוּ} \text{ע}$   $\eta$   $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$   $\mu\omicron\nu$ : so 23<sup>2</sup>).

v. 5. *appalled or silenced* (16<sup>1</sup> 17<sup>8</sup> 18<sup>20</sup>): cf. the parallel stichus and 40<sup>1</sup>. The mystery of the wicked prospering in a world governed by God overwhelms Eyob with trembling fears and uncertainties (v. 6, 7); and he thinks that, if his friends will but consider his presentation of the facts, they will have nothing left to say. Cf. Ps 17<sup>14</sup> 37 73 Je 12<sup>1</sup>. Whether he has sinned or not, it is a fact of common observation that the wicked often prosper; a fact which contradicts their theory of the relation between sin and suffering.

v. 6. *confounded*: or *dismayed*,  $\text{נִבְהַלְתִּי}$ ; a vb. which  $\text{ע}$  curiously renders by  $\sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  *to make haste*, 4<sup>6</sup> 22<sup>10</sup> (cf. 23<sup>16</sup>) as well as here ( $\text{ע}$  rectè  $\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ , 22<sup>10</sup>  $\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ ). Cf. Aram. (Tg.)  $\text{בְּהִיל}$  *to hasten*, trans. *bewilder, terrify*. The root is perhaps akin to  $\text{בלל}$  *mingle, confuse, confound* (Gn 11<sup>1</sup>), or to Sum. BUL, *to quake, tremble* ( $n\acute{a}\acute{s}\acute{u}$ ) before a god; cf. also Aram.  $\text{בָּל}$  *heart* = Ar.  $\text{بَل}$ . *seizes*: leg.  $\text{אָחַז}$  fem. pro  $\text{אָחַז}$  masc.

v. 7. The moral problem which so greatly disturbs him. *mighty in power*: or *in riches* ( $\text{חֵיל}$  5<sup>5</sup> 15<sup>29</sup> al.)  $\text{עֹצֵם}$ . But  $\text{ע}$  makes the expression refer to physical strength: *And grow old as mighty men of valour* (=  $\text{נְבוֹרֵי חֵיל}$ ), app. reading  $\text{נִבְּרִי}$  pro  $\text{נִבְּרִי}$ . Cf. Ps 73<sup>4</sup>. This may be right in sense, even if we keep  $\text{נְבוֹרֵי}$ .

v. 8. St. i: cf. Ps 102<sup>29b</sup>. The stichus is too long metr. It is prob. that  $\text{עִמָּם}$  *with them* conceals the vb. of st. 2, viz.  $\text{וְעָמְדוּ}$  or  $\text{וְעָמְדוּ}$  Is 66<sup>2</sup> Ps 102<sup>27</sup>: *And their offspring* (5<sup>25</sup> 27<sup>14</sup> 31<sup>8</sup>) *endures in their sight*. ( $\text{ע}$   $\delta$   $\sigma\pi\omicron\phi\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\gamma$  (+  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$   $\text{ע}^A$ ) =  $\text{נִפְשָׁם}$  pro  $\text{לִפְנֵיהֶם}$ .)

v. 9. Lit. *Their houses are peace*; cf. 5<sup>25</sup>.  $\text{ע}$   $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  =  $\text{שָׁלוֹם}$  *are quiet*, La 1<sup>6</sup>, or  $\text{שָׁלוֹם}$  pro  $\text{שָׁלוֹם}$ ; cf.  $\text{ע}$  *securae sunt et pacatae*.

v. 10. *Their bull*:  $\text{שִׁנָּה}$  c  $\text{עֹצֵם}$  pro  $\text{שִׁנָּה}$  *his bull*. Similarly in st. ii  $\text{פָּרָתָם}$  *their cow* pro  $\text{פָּרָתוֹ}$  *his cow*, where  $\text{ע}$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$   $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$   $\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\iota$   $\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu\sigma\iota$  =  $\text{פָּרָתָם}$  *their fruitful one*, or  $\text{הָרָתָם}$  (cf. Ho 14<sup>1</sup>).  $\text{ע}^A$  rectè  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$ . As to the meaning,  $\text{עֹצֵם}$  interpret both stt. of the female; but  $\text{ע}^A$  rightly understand the t. t. of st. i as referring to the function of the male. The  $\text{נָאֵל}$  *to loathe, regard as foul*, may be compared with  $\text{נָאֵל}$  II, and with  $\text{נָאֵל}$  Syr. The primary *GAL, HAL*, is perhaps akin to Sum.  $\text{GUL}$ , *bad calves*:  $\text{חָפֵלֵם}$  Pi.; cf. Aram. use (Tg. Syr.) *spit forth, spue out*; here of easy delivery. ( $\text{ע}$   $\delta\iota\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}\theta\eta$ , pointing as Niph.) Cf.  $\text{מָלַם}$  Pi. ova parere, Is 34<sup>15</sup>.

v. 11. *play about*:  $\text{יִשְׁחָקוּ}$  ludunt, 40<sup>20.29</sup> Zc 8<sup>5</sup> (of children playing) pro  $\text{יִשְׁלְחוּ}$  *send forth*, which does not seem very suitable (cf. Is 7<sup>26</sup> 32<sup>20</sup>). Whither do they 'send forth their little ones' ( $\text{עוֹלָדֵי$  19<sup>18</sup>)? Cf. Gn 25<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, st. ii is metr. short; and  $\text{כְּמוֹ-עֵגֶל}$  *like a calf*, Ps 29<sup>6</sup>, or  $\text{עֵגֶלִים}$  *like calves*, may have fallen out before the verb.

ἡ μένουσιν δὲ ὡς πρόβατα αἰώνια = ישבו כצאן עולם (Ps 98).

v. 12. Lit. *They lift up* (scil. the voice) *with* (accompaniment of) *labor and lyre* (cf. Ps 49<sup>6b</sup>). The 'pipe' (אֲבוּבָה from Assyr. *imbābu*, a reed-pipe or flute; cf. Ar. 'unbāb, a reed) recurs 30<sup>31</sup>: see also Gn 4<sup>21</sup>.

v. 13. *They end*, or *complete*; reading יִבְלוּ c Qerî, ἡ συνετέλεσαν, ㊄ and 36<sup>11</sup> where the words are quoted. Cf. Is 65<sup>22</sup> (where also the text is יִבְלוּ *they wear out*). St. ii מִיָּדָאֵם וְיָבִינֵם *And in an instant*; i.e. they know no lingering pains; their death comes swiftly, is a matter of a moment: see 7<sup>18</sup> 20<sup>1</sup> 34<sup>20</sup>; 'a quick and easy death' (Driver). So ㊄ ㊄; but ἡ ἐν δὲ ἀναπαύσει ἄδον ἐκουμήθησαν connects רָנָה with רָנָה II *be at rest* (Niph. Hiph. only), pointing וְיָבִינֵם or וְיָבִינֵם, and ㊄ has וְיָבִינֵם (= מְרִינֵם Je 6<sup>10</sup>), app. meaning the same thing: *And into the rest of the Grave* (var. *She'ol*) *they go down*: cf. 1 K 2<sup>6.9</sup> 2 K 22<sup>20</sup> Je 34<sup>5</sup>. But why not בְּשָׁלוֹם, as in these and similar passages, if that were the poet's meaning? No form or derivative of רָנָה II occurs anywhere else in the book.

*go down*: יָחִי = יָחִי (cf. Pr 17<sup>10</sup> Je 21<sup>13</sup>): metaplastic form from יָחַת, an Aramaism used in poetry. ἡ ἐκοιμ. = ישכבו (3<sup>13</sup> 14<sup>12</sup> al.), or perhaps יָנחו *they repose*.

v. 14. ㊄ has vbb. in sing., λέγει δὲ (ἡ<sup>A</sup> + ὁ ἀσεβής), returning to the plur. in the next verse. Cf. note on v. 3<sup>b</sup>. κυρίῳ = לְאֵל.

v. 15. ἱκανός = שָׂרִי; so 31<sup>2</sup> 39<sup>32</sup>. But 6<sup>4</sup> κυρίου = שָׂרִי (alii *ikanoû*, ἡ<sup>2</sup> σαδδαί: see Ez 1<sup>24</sup> 10<sup>5</sup>). This equivalent rests on a false etymology, viz. שָׂרִי = שָׂרִי Pron. Rel. *He Who* + י (is) *Sufficient* (so Rabb.). In 5<sup>17</sup> 8<sup>5</sup> παντοκράτωρ, *Almighty* (so 15 times in the book). It is improb. that שָׂרִי as a title of God is akin to שָׂרִי *demon* (Dt 32<sup>17</sup>), Aram. שָׂרִיָּא, Assyr. *šēdu*, which is used of evil spirits as well as good (*šēdu limnu*). Rather is this ancient word *Shaddai*, Σαδδαί, Σαδαί, to be compared with the Sumerian SATI (from SAD; cf. ITI from ID), *bāmātu* (בָּמוֹת), *hills*, and SHAD, SAD, values of the mountain-symbol (𒂗), from which Assyr. *šaddû*, *šadû*, plur. *šaddê*, *šadê*, *mountain*, is doubtless derived. The great gods Asshur and Bel were styled *šadû rabû* (Sum. KUR-GAL), 'Mighty Mountain'; cf. the Personal Name *Šaddû-šû* (*his mountain*). There may be a trace here of primitive mountain-worship. In any case, it would seem that the old Heb. (originally Babylonian) Divine title *Shaddai* is nearer in meaning to עֶלְיִי ('the Most High') than to שָׂרִי *demon*. (*šadû* also denoted an earthly prince or potentate: Anp. I. 22 al.)

v. 16. ㊄ lit. *Lo, not in their (own) hand (is) their welfare*: *The counsel of the wicked is far from me* (מִנִּי 22<sup>18</sup> 30<sup>10</sup> Ps 18<sup>23</sup>). A parenthesis repudiating all sympathy with such impious sentiments. But this is improb. in the context which it interrupts. Nor can we suppose (with RV marg.) an interruption at this point by one of the friends. The verse looks like an interpolation by some scribe who felt bound to protest against such arrogant impiety. ἡ ἐν χερσὶν γὰρ ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ ἀγαθὰ, ἔργα

δὲ ἀσεβῶν οὐκ ἐφορᾷ, omitting the Neg. Part. in st. i and app. reading מַעֲשֵׂה טוֹב instead of טוֹבָם עֲצָתָם, with רָחֵק מִמֶּנִּי ad fin. This is at least in better harmony with the context: *Lo, their prosperity is at their own command; The doings of the wicked are remote from Him* (far from the Divine notice). We get virtually the same sense if we read הֲלֵא Interrog. pro לֹא הֵן st. i ad init. *Is not their pr. in their own hand?* Possibly the orig. text was יָדָם טוֹבָם אֵין-לָאֵל *Their weal is not subject to their own control*; &c. as in וַעֲ. It appears, however, to be even more probable that the verse is a corrupt form of 22<sup>18</sup>: cf. וַעֲ הֵן לֹא בִירָם טוֹבָם וַעֲ (st. ii is the same in both locc.). Further, it is possible that vv. 16–18 have been dislocated from one column to another and really belong to the speech of Eliphaz. They certainly fill up in a desirable manner the lacuna between 22<sup>18</sup> and 22<sup>19</sup>.

v. 17. *How often*: כִּמָּה which in 13<sup>23</sup> means *How many?* and here is understood to mean *How seldom!* but may very well be *How often!* as in Ps 78<sup>40</sup>. In that case we have an utterance in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the friends (cf. 18<sup>5,6</sup> 22<sup>19</sup>). Moreover, it seemed strained and unnatural to make v. 18, which is much more forcible as a direct statement, depend on כִּמָּה (as well as st. iii, which is prob. spurious). טֹט מְהֵרָה דֵּה אֶלְלָא אֶדְלָא. (כִּמָּה pro אֶדְלָא; cf. 32<sup>8</sup> 34<sup>38</sup>) *Nay, but the lamp of the wicked will be quenched*, also treats the verses as a categorical assertion. St. iii, lit. *Portions (or Pains) He distributes in His anger*. The Asyndeton is strange and the sense doubtful. It is more likely that the stichus is an interpolation than that a parallel line has fallen out of the text. If a distich stood here once, it may have run somewhat as follows:

חֲבָלִים יֵאָחֲזוּם בְּאַפּוֹ  
חַיִּל כִּיּוֹלְדָה:

*Sorrows seize them in His anger,—  
Pangs as of the woman in travail.*

Or, as this couplet is in the *Qinah*-measure, יַחֲלִי כִי בַחֲמֹתוֹ *They writhe, like a woman in travail, at His wrath*, might be substituted for the second stichus.—ט rectè: ὁδῶν δὲ ἐξουσιῶν αὐτοῦ (ἐχῶ = אָחוּ, the proper term with חֲבָלִים): see Is 13<sup>8</sup>, of which the vs. may be a reminiscence; cf. also 18<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>6</sup>. For אֶפְרָו ט ἀπὸ ὀργῆς = (ו)אֶפְרָו.

v. 18. *carries off*: נִגְבְּחֵי filches away = ט φείλατο, 27<sup>20</sup>. (With נִגְבְּחֵי, str. *put aside*, cf. Sum. GUN, *idu*, 'side', as well as Ar. جَنْب side. נִגְבְּ = side-at.) For מִן ט κοινοτός cf. Dan 2<sup>35</sup> עוֹר chaff; which ט perhaps read here (עוֹר = מוֹר misread backwards), if not עָפָר or אֶפְרָו, אֶפְרָו favilla, *ashes* = אֶפְרָו.

v. 19. St. i מֵאֵל Eloah stores up his trouble (מֵאֵל 15<sup>35</sup>) or wickedness (22<sup>18</sup>) for his sons. This agrees neither with st. ii, nor with vv. 20, 21; in fact, while consistent with the doctrine of the friends (cf. 5<sup>4</sup>), it is quite contrary

to Eyob's argument here, and the line is metr. redundant. We may regard אֱלֹהִים as a marg. gloss and read הַצִּפּוֹן: *Doth He store up his trouble for his sons?* Is that your contention? or else read אֵל instead of אֱלֹהִים (which is perhaps due to a scribe's mispointing the word אֵל God): *Let Him not lay up his trouble (= the trouble due to him) for his sons!* (Ⓢ<sup>B</sup> *vioús* is prob. a scribal error pro *vioús* Ⓢ<sup>A</sup>. τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ = אֲנוֹנו: see note on 20<sup>10</sup>.)

v. 20. *his ruin*: reading פִּירוֹ (12<sup>5</sup> 30<sup>24</sup>) or אִירוֹ (v. 30, 18<sup>12</sup> +) pro מִירוֹ, an otherwise unknown ἀπ.—Ⓢ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ σφαγὴν (cf. 10<sup>16</sup>), but Ⓢ πτωσιν.

In st. ii, Ⓢ om. הַמָּחַ (ἀπὸ Κυρίου (מִשְׁדֵּי) and seems to read אֵל (or לֵא) יִמְלֹךְ or יִבְלֹךְ (v. 10, 22<sup>30</sup>) pro מִיִּשְׁתָּה bibit. More probably, however, the translator merely intended a free rendering of a non-Hellenic metaphor like 'drinking the wrath of Shaddai' (Is 51<sup>17</sup> Ps 75<sup>9</sup> Je 25<sup>15</sup>).

v. 21. After his death the wicked man has no further interest (הִפִּיץ 1. *pleasure, delight*; 2. *business, affair*, Is 53<sup>10</sup> 58<sup>13</sup> Ec 3<sup>1</sup> al.—late usage) in the fortunes of his house. Cf. 14<sup>21</sup>. Ⓢ μετ' αὐτοῦ = אִתּוֹ pro מֵאַחֲרָיו *after him*. Ⓢ app. om. מָה *what?*)

*is cut short*: חֲצָצוּ plur., because מִסְפַּר חֲדָשֵׁי is equivalent to *all his months*; a *constructio ad sensum*. The vb. חֲצָצוּ Pi. = Assyr. *ḥuṣṣu*: e.g. *kîma qané abi uḥaṣṣu*, *like a reed of the sedge I cut off* (or *broke off*, Sum. ZUR), Anp. I. 27. The statement is not that 'the number of his months' is 'decreed' or predetermined by God ('חֲרוּצ' 14<sup>5</sup>), but that it is exhausted (cf. Is 38<sup>12</sup>). It is not therefore an improvement to read חֲרָצוּ here. Ⓢ διηρέθησαν (διαίρ = חָצָה 2 K 2<sup>9</sup> al.): so Ⓢ dimidiatur.

v. 22. מִי can only mean *Will he* (i.e. the wicked man) *teach knowledge to El* (emph.)? We might point יִלְמֵד pro יִלְמִד: *Shall knowledge be taught to El?* Would you make your limited ideas of justice a canon for the Omniscient? (Cf. Ⓢ *Do ye teach?*) But Ⓢ אֵל הָאֵל pro מִיִּלְמֵד seems preferable (πότερον οὐχὶ ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ὁ διδάσκων σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην;). Should we not rather observe what God actually does (vv. 23–33), in His dealings with man, than assert our own a priori notions of what He ought to do? *Shall not El teach knowledge* (Ps 94<sup>10</sup>)—teach us, e.g., that calamity is not an invariable consequence of sin?

*the Heights*: רָמִים: i.e. Heaven, Ps 78<sup>68</sup>. (Perhaps the more usual מְרִמִּים *id.* 16<sup>10</sup> should be read in both places.) Cf. 25<sup>2</sup> and 4<sup>18</sup>; 22<sup>12</sup>. So שְׁמַיִם מְרִמָּה *the highest heavens*; but Ⓢ excelsos, i.e. their inhabitants. Ⓢ φόνους = רָמִים simply confirms מְרִמִּים. The proposed רָמִיָּה *treachery*, making the stichus a threat to the friends (cf. 19<sup>29</sup>), is hardly prob. here.

v. 23. בְּעָצֶם חֲמוֹ is difficult. Ⓢ ἐν κράτει ἀποσύνης αὐτοῦ, pointing 'בְּעָצֶם' (30<sup>21</sup>). The phrase might then mean *in the might of his completeness* or *perfection* = 'in his full strength'; with all his faculties of mind and body unimpaired. Cf. Ⓢ robustus et sanus.



*entirely untroubled*: reading שְׁאֵן c 1 MS. (12<sup>5</sup>, cf. vb. 3<sup>18</sup>) pro שְׁאֵן at rest, in peace, cf. 3<sup>18</sup> (of the grave), is prob. cogn. c ישן *asleep*; cf. Syr. שָׁנָא pax and Assy. šitu (shin-tu), *sleep*. For the prim. root cf. Ch. ch'in, ts'im, Jap. shin, An. tēm, *to sleep, rest*, and perhaps Sum. SAN in U-SAN, *sleep* (U šitu + SAN). The prim. mg. is prob. *lie down*; cf. Assy. šalālu, id. (צנ = צל), and שָׁלָה שְׁלֹ be quiet, at ease, Assy. na'ālu, nālu, *lie down, sleep* (n = s).

v. 24. *his belly*: reading בִּטְנוֹ or כְּעֵי (= טὰ ἔγκαρα αὐτοῦ, viscera eius) for the עֲטִינִי. The word has been supposed to mean *milk-pails*; a bad parallel to st. ii. Cf. Pr 3<sup>8</sup>. The Versions agree in making some part of the human body to be intended (בְּיוֹרֵי *his breasts*; עֲבוּרֵי *his sides*). The suggested Aramaism עֲטִמִּי *his thighs or flanks* (cf. 15<sup>21</sup>) becomes plausible, if we point (c στéartos, adipē, תְּרָבָא *fat* pro חֶלֶב *milk*; but *milk* gives a better parallel to *moistened* (lit. *watered*; kept moist, not dried up) in st. ii. (Instead of עֲטִמִּי we might also read שָׂאֵר *his flesh* as parallel to *his bones*; or שְׂרִירֵי *his muscles*, a Job-word, 40<sup>16</sup>. *His flesh or his muscle is fraught with fat, &c.*)

v. 25. It would improve the metre to read c טַעַם in bitterness of soul, like 7<sup>11</sup> 10<sup>1</sup>, pro טַעַם בְּנֶפֶשׁ קָדָה with bitter soul (so טַעַם). *tasted happiness*: lit. *eaten of good* (9<sup>25</sup> Ex 12<sup>43</sup> f.). The stichus seems too short. Perhaps מִכָּל טוֹבָה of any good.

v. 26. *in the dust*: or *on the ground* (עַל-עֲפָר), 19<sup>26</sup> 39<sup>14</sup>. טַחֲבֵר worms: i.e. maggots: רָקָה coll. טַחֲבִיָּא, rottenness. רָמַם = Ar. رَمَمَ, ramma, *to decay*: cf. also Assy. ramū, *become loose, go to pieces, decay, of a foundation*.

v. 27. *plots or devices*: מִזְמוֹת: 42<sup>2</sup> Ps 10<sup>2-4</sup> 21<sup>12</sup>. *devise*: reading תַּחְפֹּשִׁי (written ? תַּחְפֹּסִי), Ps 64<sup>7</sup>, instead of תַּחְמֹסִי which takes an accus. obj. (15<sup>33</sup>) > על. Perhaps, however, מַעַל may mean: *And the devices against me wherewith ye deal violently* (contr. Accent.). ט's text here was probably defective, but it gives ἐπὶ κακῶσθε μοι for the verb (= 19<sup>2</sup>! q.v.). וְ et sententias contra me iniquas. יִשְׁלַח favours תַּחְרִישִׁי > תַּחְפֹּשִׁי (see Pr 6<sup>14-18</sup> יִשְׁלַח). The Aram. חָשַׁל, like חָרַשׁ, means *to forge, fabricate*, both lit. and met.

v. 28. *Ye say*: or *think* (say in your heart). The friends think that the ruin of Eyob's (the former 'Great Man's') house is ocular demonstration of the truth of their suspicions, and of the justice of their efforts to entrap him into an admission of guilt. Cf. 18<sup>16,21</sup>; also 8<sup>16,22</sup> 15<sup>34</sup>. (St. ii is overloaded metr. אָהַל may be due to dittogr. of אָהָה, or to the influence of the parallel locc. Om. c B et 1 cod.).

*The godless*: plur., indicating Eyob less directly, or rather perhaps including his dependents.

v. 29. An interesting reference to 'Travellers' tales', such as Orientals

delight in, especially when full of the marvellous. With *passers along the way* or *wayfarers* (merchants, handicraftsmen, and the like), cf. the similar phrase Ju 5<sup>10</sup>. Stories of successful villainy are intended.

*heed*: or *regard* or *recognize* (תִּנְכַּרְוּ); Pi. here and 34<sup>10</sup> only in Job; perhaps Hi. תִּנְכַּרְוּ which occurs six times). *their tokens*: or *signs, indications*, signal instances of the prosperous careers of men thoroughly wicked. (St. ii seems metr. short. Some word, e.g. זָרִים *strangers*, 15<sup>19</sup>, רוֹבְלִים *merchants*, Ez 17<sup>4</sup>, or אֱמֶת *of truth*, Jos 2<sup>12</sup>, may once have followed אַתָּה *tokens*, if that word itself be genuine.)

v. 30. מ, if correct, should mean: *That the bad man is held back* (*reserved*: cf. 38<sup>23</sup>) *for the day of ruin*; *To the day of outbursts* (of wrath, 40<sup>11</sup>) *they are led* (cf. Is 53<sup>7</sup>); which is contrary to the context. We must at least read בָּיּוֹם for לַיּוֹם in both stt. And since יוֹם אִיר (without an individual reference) is an unlikely phrase, whereas יוֹם עֲבָרָה *day of wrath* occurs, Zp 1<sup>16</sup>, cf. 18 Pr 11<sup>4</sup>, and the verb חָשַׁךְ is common in the sense of *holding a man back* or *keeping him from* evil fortune (33<sup>18</sup>), while the first בָּיּוֹם, which overweights the stichus, may easily be dittogr. of the second, it seems natural to restore the verse as follows:

כִּי מֵאִיר יִחְשַׁךְ רָע  
וּבְיוֹם עֲבָרָה יִפְלֹט:

(ὁ κουφιζεται = מ: cf. Ezr 9<sup>13</sup> ἐκούφισεν.)

For יוֹבֵל (which recurs v. 32) יִפְלֹט seems probable, and a better parallel to Ni. in st. i. The plur. as parallel to the sing., st. i, is obviously corrupt. The י- is either a relic of ט-, or belongs to the next verse (יִמִּי *And who...*). The plur. עֲבָרוֹת may be Intens. (cf. 3 diem furoris). The objection to עֲבָרוֹת *his* (God's) *Wrath*, is that God has not been mentioned since v. 22, which seems too far back for the reference of the suffix. (Might st. ii have been: בָּיּוֹם עֲבַר מִבּוֹל *In the day when the Flood overfloweth*?)

v. 31. None dares to rebuke the powerful wicked for his crimes; much less, to attempt his punishment.

Read perhaps יָזַה (15<sup>17</sup>) pro מָה: *And what he hath done, who can repay him?* cf. 33<sup>26</sup>: or וְהוּא עָ' *And what He (emph.) hath done, &c.* But והוא begins the next verse.

v. 32. *And He* (emph.)—in contrast with other and better men—is *borne* (10<sup>19</sup>) or *conducted* (Is 55<sup>12</sup>) *to a stately tomb* or *mausoleum* (lit. *graves*: plur. excellentiae). (Was עֲבָרוֹת יוֹבֵל, v. 30, influenced by עֲבָרוֹת *קְבוּרָה* here? The scribe's eye may have strayed downward. This would account for the plur. עֲבָרוֹת instead of עֲבָרָה.)

St. ii. מ lit. *And over a (the) mound he watcheth*: as though the dead man's spirit, or his sculptured image, stood on guard over his tumulus. But the stichus is metr. short; and on this ground, and because of the sense, we read עָלָיו *over him* instead of the simple prep. עַל: *And over*

him a mound keepeth guard (to prevent disturbance of the body). נִישׁ heap, which was a heap of corn 5<sup>26</sup>, is here a heap of earth or grave-mound (a barrow).  $\text{ע}^B \text{ἐπὶ σωρῶν}$ , but  $\text{ע}^A \text{σωρῶ}$  better. Σωρός = either a heap of corn or a mound of earth. ( $\text{ע}^A \text{ἐπὶ σωρῶ}$  = over a cinerary urn.)  $\text{ע}^A \text{גֶּדְשָׁא}$ , *gedšā*, *id.* The Aram. נִישׁ heap up may be akin to Hb. גָּדַל *grow up, become tall, great* (cf. מִגְדָּל *tower*), by interchange of *l* and *s*; the prim. root being perhaps נָד = Sum. GID, *long* (*ardku*).

v. 33. *clods* of the glen or wādy; scil. of which his tumulus is built. For  $\text{ע}^B \text{גֶּבֶב}$  *clod, gleba*, cf. 38<sup>38</sup>.  $\sqrt{\text{נב}}$  (= Sum. GAB, *breast*); a rounded protuberance or prominence; cf. Aram.  $\text{ע}^B \text{גֶּבְבָּא}$  *hill*, Hb.  $\text{ע}^B \text{גֶּב}$  *mound*, Ez 16<sup>24</sup>:  $\text{ע}^B \text{גֶּבֶב}$  =  $\text{ע}^B \text{גֶּבֶב}$  (cf.  $\text{ע}^B \text{שֹׁב}$  *be high*, 5<sup>11</sup>):  $\text{ע}^B \text{אֵרֶנֶב}$  *cairn*,  $\text{ע}^B \text{I Sa 20}^{10}$ .  $\text{ע}^B \text{χάλικες χεῖμαρρον}$ , *pebbles or rubble of the winter torrent*:  $\text{ע}^B \text{dulcis fuit glareis Cocyti}$ , 'He was dear to the gravels of Cocytus' (taking נַחַל for the river of Hades).  $\text{ע}^B \text{בלעץ לה נפִּיִּי נחלא}$  *The winding hollows (or caves) of the waddy swallow* (= *are greedy for*: see Payne-Smith, col. 538) *him*.

*Sweet to him are the clods of the glen* is a somewhat strange statement in this context. There is no reference to Hades (She'ol); for there is nothing 'sweet' in Eyob's conception of Hades (10<sup>21f.</sup>; cf. 3<sup>17-21f.</sup>). Perhaps a better reading would be  $\text{ע}^B \text{יִשְׁתַּק בְּמִדְרַבִּי נַחַל}$  *He is quiet (at rest Ps 107<sup>30</sup>) among the clods of the glen* ( $\text{ע}^B \text{שׁ מ} = \text{ע}^B \text{שׁ}$ ). Some reject vv. 28-33.

St. ii. *And after him all men march*: i.e. all go the same way, good and bad alike (cf. v. 26); all without distinction march to the same goal of the grave. The verb  $\text{ע}^B \text{מִשַׁךְ}$  seems to be used intrans., as in Ju 4<sup>6</sup>, where  $\text{ע}^B \text{ἀπελεύσῃ} = \text{ע}^B \text{ἀπελεύσεται}$  here. ( $\text{ע}^B$  adds a third stichus: *And before him* (they marched?) *without number*. This is clearly a marginal note.)

v. 34. Cf. 16<sup>2</sup>. *with mere breath*: or *vainly, to no purpose* ( $\text{ע}^B \text{הֶבֶל}$  9<sup>20</sup> 27<sup>12</sup> Is 30<sup>7</sup>). St. ii  $\text{ע}^B$  lit. *And your answers—treachery remains over*; an inadequate parallel, and an improb. form of sentence. Instead of נִשְׂאָר leg.  $\text{ע}^B \text{שֶׁקֶר}$  *falsehood* (13<sup>3</sup>), or  $\text{ע}^B \text{שׁוֹא}$  *emptiness, futility*, either of which would be a good parallel to  $\text{ע}^B \text{הֶבֶל}$ , and point  $\text{ע}^B \text{מַעַל}$  (a word not found elsewhere in Job)  $\text{ע}^B \text{מַעַל}$  (=  $\text{ע}^B \text{מַעִיל}$ ) *profiting, helpful* (15<sup>3</sup> 21<sup>15</sup> al.), supplying the neg.  $\text{ע}^B \text{אֵין}$  before it: cf. Je 16<sup>19</sup>. Further, since  $\text{ע}^B \text{תְּשׁוּבוֹת}$  *answers* only recurs in 34<sup>3</sup> (Elihu-section) and not elsewhere in OT, we may get rid of the cumbrous  $\text{ע}^B \text{וּתְשׁוּבוֹתַיִם שֶׁקֶר אֵין־מַעִיל}$  and improve the syntax by restoring: *And answer me* (13<sup>22</sup> 20<sup>2</sup>) *with profitless falsehood!*  $\text{ע}^B \text{τὸ δὲ ἐμὲ καταπαύσασθαι ἀφ' ὑμῶν οὐδέν} = \text{ע}^B \text{אֵין־יָשְׁבְּתִי מִכֶּם אֵין}$  (!).  $\text{ע}^B$  *And the answer of his words is left before me*.

Chapter 22.—Eliphaz opens the third round with a third attempt to compel Eyob to an admission of guilt.

v. 2. *benefit*: or *profit*: 15<sup>8</sup> 35<sup>8</sup> 34<sup>8</sup>. Driver renders st. ii: '(No,) for he that is wise is profitable unto himself.' If, however, we read  $\text{ע}^B \text{עָלֵי}$  for

עליו in st. ii, הלא can hardly be right in st. i. That the text is more or less corrupt is evident from the variations of the Versions. G simply repeats 21<sup>22</sup>, word for word; S *With God sayest thou, O man, That thou art equal with Him in wisdom?* cf. B. I *Can a man teach (אלה) God?* cf. G δ διδάσκων, 21<sup>22</sup>. *Can a man impart knowledge to El, That the sage should profit Him?* is at least good sense (for the constr. cf. 3<sup>12</sup> 6<sup>11</sup> 7<sup>12</sup> 21<sup>15</sup> et saep.). To make עליו refer to משיב > אל seems unnatural. Apart from the difficulty of the change of prep., לנפשו would have been more explicit than עליו in the sense of 'unto himself'. (If we might assume an Arabism עלים = عليم wise, doctus, ומשיביל would give for st. ii *That the wise and prudent should profit him?*)

v. 3. Shaddai's concern or interest (21<sup>21</sup> חפץ). *perfectest*: cf. Ps 18<sup>33</sup> 101<sup>2</sup>. (G ἀπώσης is a mere scribal error for ἀπλώσης G<sup>NC.2A</sup>.)

v. 4. godliness or piety; lit. fear, scil. of God = religion or religiousness (4<sup>6</sup> 15<sup>4</sup>, cf. 28<sup>28</sup>). G ἡ λόγον σου ποιούμενος = *or because He maketh account of thee*; taking מיראתך wrongly in the sense *from fear of thee*, which it might bear in a different context.

v. 5. The argument so far (vv. 2-4) seems to be this: Neither your wisdom or subtlety displayed in your special pleading, nor your boasted integrity, constitutes any claim upon God; and as you recognize with us that your affliction is from Him, and as He cannot, of course, be chastising you for godly living, it stands to reason that it can only be for unacknowledged sins. *Is not thy wickedness great?* We should say: *Must not thy wickedness be great?* What else necessarily follows from what I have said? Then vv. 6-9 suggest various sins of which a great man like Eyob might have been guilty (sins at all periods characteristic of the ruling classes in Israel according to the testimony of the Prophets), and of one or all of which the speaker assumes that he *must* have been guilty.

v. 6. Doubtless: כ' lit. *For*. *distrainest upon*: or *exactest pledges from* (cf. st. ii and 24<sup>33</sup> Ex 22<sup>26</sup> Dt 24<sup>6.17</sup>).- *thy kin*: lit. *thy brothers*; i. e. members of thy tribe or clan. (The verbs in vv. 6-8 are all impf., describing what Eyob habitually did. We must not therefore render *thou hast taken . . . stripped . . . hast not given*, as RV, which would require the pf.)

v. 7. bread: לחם; but G ψῶμον, *a morsel*; i. e. פה as 31<sup>17</sup>, where Eyob affirms the contrary of these charges; Pr 17<sup>1</sup>. (A variant in the orig. text?)

v. 8. M lit. *And the man of arm* (usu. taken to mean *the powerful*, but the phrase occurs nowhere else in this sense)—*his is the land*; *And the face-uplifted* (i. e. the person of honour, the accepted or favoured one, 13<sup>8</sup> Is 3<sup>3</sup>) *dwelleth in it*. This is explained as a covert reference to Eyob himself, 'insinuating that he was one of the class of powerful men who claimed all the land for themselves, and ejected their poorer neighbours

from it (Is 5<sup>a</sup>), by force or fraud': see Driver. So **W**: In fortitudine brachii tui possidebas terram, Et potentissimus obtinebas eam. But the Heb. can hardly mean this. (Did **W** read יִרְשָׁהּ ad fin.?) We propose תִּרְצָה *thou favourest* pro **M** הָאָרֶץ *the land*, and תִּיטִיב *thou treatest well* in place of יִשְׁכְּבָה *dwelleth in it*, or perhaps הִיטִיבְתָּה *thou hast well-treated* (pf. as v. 9<sup>a</sup>). Cf. 24<sup>21b</sup>; Ma 1<sup>a</sup>. The form of such a statement certainly harmonizes better with the context on both sides of it:

*The man that hath an arm (i. e. power) thou favourest,  
And the person of rank thou treatest well.*

Cf. **G**:

*And thou didst admire the person of some,  
And cause them to dwell upon the land.*

**G**: *There is a man who sorveth (וִירַע pro וִירָע) for himself the land,  
And a lord of violence (מֶלֶךְ קָטִירָא) taketh it from him.*

v. 9. *empty-handed*: see Gn 31<sup>42</sup> for the same phrase. Lk 1<sup>63</sup>.

*thou crushest*: תִּרְכָּא pro וִירְכָּא. **W** comminuisti, rectè; **G** ὀρφάνους δὲ ἐκάκωσας, *And didst illtreat orphans*; a free rendering. **G** ضَمَمَ *didst lay low*.

v. 10. *are about thee*: סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ. **G** ἐκύκλωσάν σε = fort. סְבִיבוֹךְ, cf. Ps 18<sup>9</sup>. For the paronomasia פָּחַד . . . פָּחַד see Is 24<sup>17</sup>, and for פָּחַד פָּחַד *a sudden alarm, panic, or scare*, Pr 3<sup>26</sup>. פָּחַד, פָּחַח, פָּחַח, 18<sup>9</sup>, is prop. *a bird-snare*, Ho 5<sup>1</sup> 9<sup>8</sup>: cf. perhaps Sum. PAG, *esirum* ša iṣṣuri, *auceps*, or *cavea avium* (?). The Chinese say *T'ien chi kiang wang*, 'Heaven is letting down its net', scil. of calamities on the country (Shi III. iii. X. 6, 1). *alarmeth thee*: וַיִּכְהֹלֶךְ. There is no need to point וַיִּכְּ, unless we read סְבִיבוֹךְ ante. **G** καὶ ἐσπούδασέν σε, as 4<sup>5</sup> 21<sup>6</sup>, where see note. For *sudden scare* **G** gives πόλεμος ἐξαίσιος, possibly reading תַּרְבִּי (5<sup>15</sup>) or תַּרְבִּי for פָּחַד. As to the translator's favourite adj. ἐξαίσιος, see 9<sup>23</sup> 18<sup>12</sup> 20<sup>6</sup> 4<sup>12</sup> 37<sup>16</sup>.

v. 11. **M** lit. *Or the darkness dost thou not see, And the multitude of waters which covereth thee?* This is taken to mean, Art thou altogether blind to the real significance of thy afflictions? But the Heb. is suspicious, there being nothing to justify the use of אֵין, and the two members of the distich lacking symmetry and metrical precision. Read perhaps אֵין חֹשֶׁךְ בְּאֹהֶלְךָ (after 18<sup>6</sup>): *The light is darkened in thy tent*; cf. **G** τὸ φῶς σοι σκότος ἀπέβη: or תִּרְצָה וְלֹא תִרְצָה *Thy light is darkened, and (so that) thou seest not*. But אֵין does not usually take a suff. except with ref. to God (cf., however, 38<sup>16</sup>?).

*multitude*: שְׂפָעַת. So 38<sup>34</sup>, where st. ii is repeated. The word seems to mean *overflow, abundantia*: see 2 K 9<sup>17</sup>. Cf. Syr. *pour forth, overflow, rise* (of a river in flood). פָּעַע; cf. נִבְכַּע, נִבְכַּע, בּוּק, שִׁפַּךְ, Assy. *iabāku*, &c., *pour*. (**G** κοιμηθέντα δὲ ὕδωρ σε ἐκάλυψεν; but מַיִם שִׁכְכָה *a layer of*

*waters*, cf. Ex 13<sup>14</sup>, is wholly improb. here, where the violent action of a flood is intended, not a gentle deposit of moisture like dew, Ex 1.c.)

v. 12. Reading הַנִּבְיָה pro מַגְבֵּה *height*. To make מַגְבֵּה tolerable, קִנְיָה (so  $\mathfrak{L}$  plur.) might be read: *Is not Eloah in the height of heaven?* (AV, RV). From such a height He necessarily sees everything on the earth (Ps 33<sup>13,14</sup>). But אֲרָם = הַנִּבְיָה is certainly preferable. It is possible that אֱלֹהִים, which  $\mathfrak{G}$  omits, grew out of הָלֵא (dittogr.) and that נִבְה was then added. The orig. v. may have been: וַיֹּרֶא כוֹכָבִים | וַיֹּרֶא שָׁמַיִם וְרָאָה | וַיֹּרֶא כוֹכָבִים *Look at the heavens and see; And behold the stars that they are lofty!* (cf. 35<sup>5</sup> which may be an echo of this verse). רָאָה, which is unique in its present connexion, may very well be a corruption of שָׁרָה (written backwards). This relieves st. ii of its metrical overweight. In any case, the thought of vv. 12–14 is similar to Is 40<sup>26,27</sup>, and may have been suggested by that passage.

$\mathfrak{G}$  μὴ οὐχὶ ὁ τὰ ὑψηλὰ ναίων ἐφορᾷ = יִרְאֶה מִנִּבְיָה שְׁבִתּוֹ יִרְאֶה (cf. Ps 113<sup>5</sup> ch. 5<sup>7</sup>; ἄπ' ναίων = κατοικῶν) or יִרְאֶה מִנִּבְיָה שְׁבִתּוֹ יִרְאֶה (cf. Is 33<sup>5</sup> מִרוֹם; also Is 57<sup>16</sup>). Note  $\mathfrak{G}$ 's omission of אֱלֹהִים. τοὺς δὲ ὑβρεὶ φερομένους ἐταπείνωσεν; = יִשְׁפִּיל (?) אֲבִירִים (עֲרִיצִים?) וְרָאָה (cf. 24<sup>22</sup> Is 13<sup>11</sup>), or something similar. ( $\mathfrak{G}$  hardly intended דָּאָשׁ = דָּאָשׁ *treads down* or *threshes* by ἐταπείνωσεν. That verb is never used of God, and never so rendered by  $\mathfrak{G}$ .)

v. 14. *a cover*: or *hiding-place, covert*, סִתָּר Ps 18<sup>12</sup>;  $\mathfrak{B}$  latibulum eius;  $\mathfrak{G}$  ἀποκρυφή (ἡ ἀποκρυφή recte), also pointing יִרְאֶה (and He is not seen). St. ii. In English we can say 'walk' or 'pace' the vault of heaven, but not, it would seem, in Heb. הַתְּהֵלֶךְ is usually followed by  $\mathfrak{Q}$  *in* (1<sup>7</sup> 2<sup>2</sup> Gn 3<sup>8</sup>) or  $\mathfrak{L}$  *on, upon* (18<sup>8</sup> 2 Sa 11<sup>2</sup>); one of which preps., probably the latter, may be assumed to have fallen out here. Cf. Is 40<sup>22</sup> Pr 8<sup>27</sup>. The רוֹגֵג,  $\mathfrak{G}$  γῶπον (Ecclus 24<sup>8</sup>), *ring, circle*, also *round hole*, is the semicircular vault or firmament of the visible heavens. Cf. perhaps Sum. AGA, AGU, *crown, diadem* (from GAG; Ch. Ṣ ngo, ak, *a ring, a bangle*, from ngak). Cf. the verb 26<sup>10</sup>, and עוֹג (round) *cake*.

v. 15. So  $\mathfrak{M}$  and  $\mathfrak{G}$  τριβὸν αἰώνιον φυλάξεις =  $\mathfrak{B}$  Numquid semitam saeculorum custodire cupis. But עוֹלָם *the unjust* would supply the missing parallel to מְחַיִּיִּם *men of wickedness* (cf. 11<sup>11</sup>); and אֶשֶׁר *step(s), track, path*, would do the same for אֶרֶץ *way* (cf. 23<sup>11</sup>), at the same time getting rid of the prosaic אֶשֶׁר (points) which, besides, follows properly in the next stichus:

*Will thou keep to the way of the unjust,—*

*The track which men of wickedness have trodden?*

( $\mathfrak{G}$  δίκαιοι ad fin. prob. scribal slip for ἄδικοι.) With this disappears the supposed reference to the Flood in אֶרֶץ עוֹלָם and the following verse.

v. 16. Reading בָּלָא (15<sup>82</sup>) c 20 codd. and  $\mathfrak{L}$ : cf.  $\mathfrak{G}$  οἱ συνελήμφθησαν

ἀσποῖ and 𐤁 Qui sublati sunt ante tempus suum. 𐤁 adds explan. *from the earth. were snatched away*: קִפְּטוּ lit. *were seized or grasped* (an Aramaism 𐤁 in OT, 16<sup>e</sup> being corrupt). The root is clearly akin to קָמַץ and קָמַץ (Ar. قَبَضَ) *grasp, seize, gather, &c.* (Cf. Sum. GAM, *to bend, bow, curve*, as the fingers do in grasping. Hence קָמַץ קִמְצָא *fist, handful*, Ar. قَبْضَةٌ *handful*. √/√ נָב, נָב, are variants of the same orig. sound.) St. ii נָהַר נָהַר יוֹצֵק יסודם. RV *Whose foundation was poured out as a stream*; but this would require נָהַר, for נָהַר as a secondary predicate is not in the poet's manner. Besides, the sense required, as at once more natural and direct, is *Whose foundation the river dissolves* (or washes away). Cf. 14<sup>19</sup> Na 27. We might read יוֹצֵק *pours out* (Impf. of יוֹצֵק 29<sup>e</sup>) or יוֹצֵק *id.* (Impf. of יוֹצֵק 1 K 18<sup>34</sup>; script. plen.) or point יוֹצֵק (cf. 6) Ptcp. *effundens* or *effusus est*, instead of יוֹצֵק Ho. Impf. *is poured out* (cf. 11<sup>15</sup> 37<sup>18</sup> 38<sup>38</sup> where Ho. Ptcp. = *poured out as metal, cast, made firm*, and 41<sup>15.16</sup> where יוֹצֵק Qal Ptcp. has the same mg.). Possible also is יוֹצֵק Hi. Impf. *pours out* (Jos 7<sup>23</sup>). In view of the general use of יוֹצֵק in Job, it is perhaps not altogether improbable that the text orig. ran: וְכָהַר יוֹצֵק יסודם *Though their foundation was firm set as a mountain* (Ps. 87<sup>1</sup> 125<sup>1</sup>): יוֹצֵק Qal Ptcp. Pass. 6 ποταμὸς ἐπιρρέων οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτῶν (ἐπιρρέων = יוֹצֵק intr.); which may be a false interpretation of the possibly correct reading (*vid. supr.*). The idea that the *foundations* of the wicked *are* (or *become*) *a stream flowing on and on*, is not probable.

v. 17. Cf. 21<sup>14.15</sup>. *Do for us*: reading לָנוּ c 𐤁 𐤁 pro לָנוּ to them. *for us > to us*, on account of 21<sup>15</sup>. 𐤁 gives the verse differently, but with much the same mg. *Who say, Iahvah—what will He do to us? Or what will the Almighty (= Shaddai) bring on us?* (= יבִיא עֲלֵינוּ cf. 34<sup>28</sup> 42<sup>11</sup> 6; or perhaps לָנוּ יבִייל cf. 21<sup>30</sup>). Verses 17–18 may belong to the marg. (a citation *memoriter* of 21<sup>14–16</sup>?).

v. 18. St. i has four stresses: leg. fort. וַיִּמְלֵא *though He filled*.

St. ii. *principles*: lit. *counsel or plan*: עֲצָה. See on 21<sup>16b</sup>.

*from Him*: מִמֶּנּוּ = 𐤁 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 𐤁 *from me*; making the sentence a (needless) repudiation by the speaker of the axioms or standpoint of the wicked; cf. 𐤁: Quorum sententia procul sit a me! (This stichus also is metr. unsatisfactory.) Verse 16 described the catastrophe of the godless; vv. 19–20 describe the joy of the righteous thereat (cf. Ps 58<sup>11</sup>). As the text stands, vv. 17–18 disturb the connexion; but 21<sup>16–18</sup>, rightly translated and regarded as a continuation of 22<sup>16</sup>, would not have this effect:

*How often (כמה) is the lamp of the wicked put out,  
And their ruin cometh upon them;  
They become like chaff before wind,  
And like stubble the storm carries off!*

Then would follow, quite naturally (22<sup>19</sup>)

*The righteous see and rejoice,  
And the innocent mock at them, &c.*

v. 19. *rejoice*; יִשְׂמְחוּ: so Ps 58<sup>11</sup> 107<sup>42</sup>. Ὡ ἐγέλασαν = יִשְׂחָקוּ. (The aorists of Ὡ do not imply וַיִּשְׂחָקוּ . . . יִשְׂחָקוּ, nor is that a preferable reading; cf. the following יִלְעָנ.)

v. 20. *our adversaries*: קִימָנֵי (Ex 15<sup>7</sup> al.) pro מִ קִימָנֵי ἄπ' (vox nihili). This involves the plur. of the verb (נִכְחַד מִ). Ὡ ἡ ὑπόστασις αὐτῶν, *their substance*; Ὡ erectio eorum; both perhaps implying קִימָנֵי *their rising up* or *standing* (or else יִקְמָנֵי *their existing things*: Gn 7<sup>4.23</sup> Ὡ substantiam Ὡ τὸ ἀνάστημα; Dt 11<sup>6</sup> Ὡ substantia eorum but Ὡ αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόστασιν). It is in the destruction of the wicked themselves rather than their possessions that the righteous rejoice elsewhere (see the Psalms cited above); קִימָנֵי is therefore to be preferred. With this is naturally involved the destruction of their belongings (? יִתְרָם *their abundance*, st. ii, cf. Ps 17<sup>14</sup> Is 15<sup>7</sup>. But יִתְרָם may mean *the rest of them*, i.e. the rank and file of their followers, who share the fate of the chiefs: cf. Dt 11<sup>6</sup> Nu 10<sup>32.35</sup>). (Ὡ *If they are not humbled from their obstinacy, The rest of them also shall the fire devour!* does not certainly prove that Ὡ read נִכְחַד pl. It may perhaps have read נִכְחַד as מִ with subj. קִימָנֵי *their upstanding, firmness, or opposition*. א also may have had the same text.)

v. 21. *be reconciled with Him*: or *use thyself to Him*; *become familiar and friendly with Him*: אֶפְסִיָּה אֵלָיו *become used to Him*; Ὡ acquiesce ei, yield or assent to Him; Ὡ *make an agreement, come to terms with Him*. Ὡ γενοῦ δὲ σκληρός, ἐὰν ὑπομείνης = הִקְשִׁיהָ אֶת־שִׁלְיָם; vid. 9<sup>4b</sup>.) Driver: 'Accustom thyself to Him, acquiesce in His dealings with thee.' For the Hi. of סָכַן (15<sup>3</sup>) see also Nu 22<sup>30</sup> Ps 139<sup>3b</sup>. [If סָכַן is a Saph. of בָּן Assy. *kānu*, the idea of use and wont, habituation, familiarity, may be traced back to the primary mg. *fixed*, firm, right, regular, proper = Sum. GIN, GEN, *kēnu*, *kēttu*, *kunnu*, &c. See note on 9<sup>4</sup>. מִסְכֵּן (Heb., Aram., Ar.), on the other hand, may, like its syn. Assy. *muškinu*, have sprung from Sum. GEN, *little, weak*.]

*be at peace*: scil. with Him. Cf. Ps 7<sup>5</sup> Ptcp. Or *be safe and sound, prosperous*: 9<sup>4</sup>. Perhaps we should read Hi. הַשָּׁלֵם *make peace* (with Him): Dt 20<sup>12</sup>.

St. ii. מִ is evidently more or less corrupt. Ὡ εἶτ' ὁ καρπὸς σου ἔσται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς = אִמְכֶם תְּבוּאָתְךָ בְּטוֹב. For εἶτα = אַמְנָם see 12<sup>2</sup>; for ἐν ἀγαθοῖς = בְּטוֹב see 21<sup>13</sup> 36<sup>11</sup>; cf. v. 18 supr. תְּבוּאָתְךָ *thy crop* or *gain* (31<sup>12</sup>) is supported by 18 codd. as well as ⑤⑥⑦⑧. Others would read תְּבוּאָתְךָ *shall come to thee*, which is perhaps less prob. (cf. 20<sup>22</sup> Ez 32<sup>11</sup> in both of which locc. as elsewhere בּוֹא c suff. is used of evil haps). בְּטוֹב may be entirely consisting in good, wholly good, excellent (*Beth Essentiae*), cf. Ὡ fructus optimos. Else we must keep מִ טוֹבָה *good, well-being*.



בָּהֶם *Thereby*, lit. *By those* (things?), is doubtful. Why not f. בָּהֶן or, as is much more usual, בָּהֶן? Moreover, the precise reference of the pronoun (why plur.?) is not clear. בּוֹאֵח would be more natural: cf. 6 εἰδῶ. Perhaps בָּבֶן *then* (Aramaism = אֵן), Ec 8<sup>10</sup>.

v. 22. Eliphaz appears to pose as a prophet, or at least to lay claim to prophetic inspiration (cf. 4<sup>12ff</sup>); תּוֹרָה *teaching, instruction*, being either the oracular response of a priest, or the authoritative utterance of a prophet of Iahvah (both regarded as indicating or pointing out the Divine will to man, and so *teaching* him truth for conduct and belief: cf. 6<sup>24</sup> 27<sup>11</sup>). Cf. Assy. *tértu*, omen, oracle, command, law; Sum. UR-UŠ = *tértum* ša ḡašē, 'omen from the inwards (liver?)'; UZU UR-UŠ = (DP. šir) *tértum* ša šīri, 'omen from inspection of the flesh'.

v. 23. 6 If thou wilt return and humble thyself before Iahvah; reading either וְחָבַנְתָּ or וְחָבַנְתָּ instead of וְתִבְנֶה *thou shalt be built up* (which is clearly wrong, as the Apod. is given in the next verse: the ו fell out after י, as often). The Ni. of neither of these verbs, however, occurs anywhere else in Job (עָנָה Pi. 30<sup>11</sup> 37<sup>23</sup>; כָּנַע Hi. 40<sup>12</sup> +). Read therefore וְתִפְקֶה *and turn* scil. to Him for help (5<sup>1</sup>: cf. Is 45<sup>22</sup>), or perhaps אֶחֱשׁוּב *אֶחֱשׁוּב חַפְנָה* 'ועל (אל-)ישׁ' *If thou repent and turn unto Shaddai*. Prefix י to חָרַחֵק: *and banish or put far*.

v. 24. 7 And set thou on the dust (or ground) precious ore (?), And in the rock of wādy's Ophir. This cannot possibly be right. Eyob, who had lost all, had no gold left to sacrifice (see 1<sup>21</sup>). We propose חָשִׁית *Thou shalt make gold as dust*, | And bullion of Ophir as the rock(s) of the ravine. Cf. 27<sup>16</sup> Zc 9<sup>1</sup> 1 K 10<sup>21</sup>. Instead of 7 חָשִׁית 10 codd.<sup>or</sup> give יִשִּׁית (cf. 23 dabit), but 6 חָשִׁית = חָשִׁית (GA θήσεις). The על-עֵפֶר of 7 may be due to a scribe's subconscious memory of the phrase which occurs 19<sup>25</sup> 20<sup>11</sup> 21<sup>28</sup>. There appears to be no real authority for the supposed בָּצֵר *precious ore, gold* (cf., however, 36<sup>19</sup>). The word may easily be a corruption of חָרִיץ *gold*; or it may be a disguise of צָרָה = Assy. *šarpu*, silver (here only). 6 ἐν πέτρᾳ = צָרָה (pts); cf. 23 silicem. In st. ii some 65 codd. וְיִבְצֹר *rectè* pro וְיִצְבֹּר; so 6 καὶ ὡς πέτρα χεῖμαρρον σωφελρ; cf. 23. (It will be seen that 6 *And thou shalt gather silver as dust, And as sand of the sea gold of Ophir* comes near to the prob. orig. text, and that AV is here preferable to RV. The verse is not an exhortation to the surrender of treasure which Eyob no longer possessed, but a promise of future wealth contingent on repentance: cf. 42<sup>11</sup>.)

For בָּהֶם אֹפִיר, see 28<sup>16,19</sup> 31<sup>24</sup> Is 13<sup>12</sup>. Cf. further v. 21 (promise of *gain* תְּבוּאָה) and Pr 3<sup>14</sup> (תְּבוּאָה, חָרוֹץ, כֶּסֶף associated). For st. i we may also suggest וְיִכְסֹף *And silver as dust thou shalt heap up*: cf. 27<sup>16</sup>. (ישׁ, וכסף miswritten successively וכסף, וכסף?)

v. 25. Unquestionably corrupt as it stands in 7. In fact, vv. 24-25

look like different attempts at restoring the same distorted text: cf. וְשִׁית and וְשָׂרִי and בָּצֵר and בָּצֹר, and (כַּחַם) אֹפִיר, בָּצֵרִיךְ and תּוֹעֵפּוֹת. ⑤ st. i gives  $\xi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$   $\nu\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma$   $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$  (⑤<sup>A</sup> δέ σοι) ὁ παντοκράτωρ βοηθὸς ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν = וְהִיָּה וְהָיָה (כִּי) צִרְךָ שְׂרִי צִרְךָ (cf. Ps 18<sup>3</sup> צוּרִי = μου βοηθός); a sort of conflate reading. ⑤ app. understood פָּצְרִיךְ as mg. *against thy foes* (which it might mean in another context); so ③ Eritque Omnipotens contra hostes tuos. But ⑤ appears to have read before this word (בֶּצֶר־צִרְךָ) (as) *thy rock* (Beth Ess.); which may have been an alternative view of the obscure בָּצֵרִיךְ and, in any case, reminds us of the בָּצֵר and בָּצֹר of v. 24. If we might read for בָּצֵרִיךְ (4 codd. and Qimhī (בָּצֵרִיךְ) the very similar צִרְפֶּךָ or מְצַרְפֶּךָ *thy refiner*, we should at least get a line in perfect harmony with ⑤ st. ii: καθαρὸν δὲ ἀποδῶσει σε ὥσπερ ἀργύριον πετυρωμένον (Ps 12<sup>7</sup>) = וְכִכְכָּף צִרְפֶּךָ יִתְהַרֵּךְ. The distich would then be:

*And Shaddai will become thy Refiner,  
And like silver refined will purify thee (37<sup>21</sup>).*

It is, however, possible that ⑤ has preserved the true reading: viz. (pro בָּצֵרִיךְ in (= as, in the character of) *thine help*: for its version is: *And God will become in thine help* (בְּחֵלְךָ). Indeed ⑤ may have intended the same expression by βοηθός σου: see Ex 18<sup>4</sup> Ps 70<sup>6</sup> and other locc. ap. Concord. For st. ii (metr. short?), where a verb may be missing, ⑤ gives: *And silver of countings* (i.e. in great quantity) *shall be thine*; but ③ et argentum coacervabitur tibi = וְכִכְכָּף יִצְבֵּר לְךָ (cf. Zc 9<sup>3</sup> coacervavit), or perhaps תִּצְבֵּר לָךְ (*thou shalt heap to thyself*). ③ obviously resembles the difficult and prob. corrupt תּוֹעֵפּוֹת and also ⑤'s צִרְפֶּךָ. ① st. i app. מְצַרְפֶּךָ (*thy stronghold(s)*) pro בָּצֵרִיךְ; in st. ii (וְיִמְן כִּכְכָּף תִּקְוָה רִמָּה דִּלְךָ) *And above silver shall lofty strength be thine* may imply: *וּמִכְכָּף תּוֹעֵפּוֹת לְךָ*. Cf. ③ Nu 23<sup>22</sup> 24<sup>8</sup>. It would make a good parallel to

*And Iahvah will be thy Refiner*

if we might read: וְכִכְכָּף צִרְפֶּךָ תּוֹפִיעַ

*And like silver refined thou shalt shine (3<sup>4</sup> 10<sup>3.22</sup>).*

The phrase כִּכְכָּף תּוֹעֵפּוֹת *silver of the summits or peaks* is improb. (cf. 28<sup>1</sup>). Silver-mines are not usu. situated on hill-tops. But that תּוֹעֵפּוֹת means something like cacumina, *peaks, tree-tops*, is prob. from the three other locc. where the word occurs. In Nu 23<sup>22</sup> 24<sup>8</sup> the 'n of the wild ox are mentioned; and it is natural to compare the similar figure of Dt 33<sup>17</sup> where the *horns* of the wild ox are spoken of. In Ps 95<sup>4</sup> (the only other occur.) we have תֵּי הָרִים *the tops of the mountains* (③ altitudines montium); their 'horns', as they are called in the Alps. In the Psalm ⑤ τὰ ὑψῆς τῶν ὀρέων rectè. The יִעָף may perhaps be compared with Assy. appu (from wa'pu?), 'top', e.g. appa u išdi, 'top and bottom'; appu ša iči,

'top of a tree' (cacumen). Cf. also the use of the Sum. SAG, *head, top* (*rēṣu*), in the sense of *horn* (*garnu*).

v. 26. St. i: see 27<sup>10</sup> Is 58<sup>14</sup>. Perhaps a quotation. *lift up thy face* (11<sup>18</sup>): in renewed confidence and trust. 𐤔 om. 𐤕 For, 9<sup>31</sup> 13<sup>20</sup>: παρρησιασθήσῃ ἐναντίον κυρίου (a paraphrase as in 27<sup>10</sup>), ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἰλαρῶς.

v. 27. St. ii: 𐤔 δώσει δέ σοι ἀποδοῦναι τὰς εὐχὰς = 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 (יְהוָה יִנְרֵךְ תִּשׁ): cf. 6<sup>8</sup>. The stichus is metr. short. Perhaps rather 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 to *El*, or 𐤓𐤓 to *Him*, the usual constr., has fallen out before 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 *thou shalt pay*.

v. 28. *purpose*; or *decree*. (𐤓𐤓 here only in Job; an Aramaism in this sense. In Heb. it means *to cut in two*: 1 K 3<sup>25</sup>.) For st. i 𐤔 repeats 8<sup>1</sup> ἀποκαταστήσει δέ σοι δίαίταν δικαιοσύνης = 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕: a better parallel. Was it orig. 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 And *He will raise thee up thy righteous tent* (Am 9<sup>11</sup>)? Then 𐤓𐤓 might have originally stood as a mistaken gloss on 𐤓𐤓𐤕, and 𐤓𐤓𐤕 have displaced 𐤓𐤓𐤕.

v. 29. St. i is corrupt. 𐤓 lit. *For they abased* (𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕) and *thou saidst pride* (33<sup>17</sup>; an Aramaism 𐤓𐤓𐤕 = 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕); which, however explained, is no parallel to st. ii *And the downcast of eyes he saveth*. See Dan 4<sup>34</sup> *And them that walk in pride* (𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕), *He is able to abase* (𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕), Is 2<sup>11.12</sup> 5<sup>15</sup> Pr 29<sup>23</sup>, and ch. 40<sup>11</sup>, which suggest a suitable parallel, e.g. 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 *For He abaseth the pride of man*. 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 the *speech of pride*(?) is doubtful Heb. Cf. also Is 13<sup>11</sup> 25<sup>11</sup>. Also 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 the *lofty and proud* is possible (cf. Is 2<sup>12</sup> but order reversed for the worse; and why 𐤓𐤓𐤕?). Perhaps 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 the *haughtiness of man* (= 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕): Is 2<sup>17</sup>. 𐤔 *Because thou didst humble thyself and didst say, I (𐤔𐤕) was haughty* app. = 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 (Aram. use of 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕?); but this cannot be right, and is prob. a guess. (In st. ii 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 = 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 should be 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕: scribal error? Cf. Is 2<sup>9</sup> 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 = ἑκψεν.) Cf. 𐤔: *Because he who humbleth himself hath said* (= thought) *that he will be exalted, &c.*

v. 30. St. i, besides being metr. short, contains the isolated expression 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 *non-innocent*, which really contradicts st. ii, instead of presenting a parallel thereto. The idea that, if Eyob makes his humble submission to God, He will then 'deliver even the guilty for the sake of Job's righteousness' (so 𐤔; cf. 42<sup>8</sup>), is entirely foreign to the thought of Eliphaz. 𐤔 𐤓 om. the anomalous Neg. 𐤓, which 𐤔 turns into a Positive Ptc. by pointing 𐤓, 𐤓 *where* and rendering it *wherever he is* (𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕): so 1 cod. and Ar.—The suggestion 𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤓𐤓𐤕 is improb., the 𐤓𐤓𐤕 being superfluous; and 𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕 the *innocent man* is contrary to the use of 𐤓𐤓𐤕, which is mostly substantival (exc. when joined with 𐤓𐤓 *blood*) like 𐤓𐤓𐤕 the *just man*. In fact, among all the forty-two occurrences of the word, neither of these expressions is ever found. 𐤓𐤓 *El* is therefore to be preferred. (For 𐤓𐤓 alone, see 4<sup>7</sup> 17<sup>8</sup> 22<sup>19</sup> 27<sup>17</sup>; plur. 9<sup>23</sup>.)—The verbs 𐤓𐤓𐤕 . . . 𐤓𐤓𐤕 do not seem very probable. It is not in the poet's manner to make one form of

a verb parallel to another. Perhaps יִפְדֶּה *he ransometh* is indicated by ὁ ῥύσεται (5<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>23</sup> 33<sup>28</sup>); and since verbs of saving and delivering are commonly followed by מִן, as in the locc. citt., אִי may very well be regarded as a remnant of מִצָּרִים *from trouble*, or מִצָּרָה *from calamity, ruin*. In st. ii מִלֵּט (ἡ καὶ διασώθητι ἡ Ἀ melius διασωθήσῃ) is prob. right; cf. 6<sup>23</sup> מִלֵּט = ὠσωσάι με 29<sup>12</sup>, אֶמְלֵט = διέσωσα. See also 15<sup>16, 17, 19</sup> מִלֵּט Ni. = σωθήναι and prob. 20<sup>20</sup> (מִן Pi.).—The similar פִּלֵּט occurs in 21<sup>10</sup> 23<sup>7</sup> only (see notes ad locc.).—For מִן בִּפְרִי ad fin. (ἡ Ἰ) leg. בִּפְרִי *his palms* (בִּפְרִי טִי). The phrase בֵּר בִּפְרִי *purity of hands* (cf. Ps 18<sup>21, 25</sup>) is found nowhere else in Job; but בֵּר is connected with בִּפְרִי, in a different sense, 9<sup>30</sup> q.v. The verse may be an addition in the vein of Elihu.

Chapter 23.—Eyob's seventh answer, chaps. 23–24.

7. 2. מִן lit.:

*Also (or even) to-day rebellion is my musing (or complaint);*

*My hand is heavy upon my sighing.*

St. i cannot possibly be regarded as good Heb. for 'My complaint is still accounted of you rebellious', viz. against God. The verse is certainly more or less corrupt. ἡ καὶ δὲ οἶδα ὅτι ἐκ χειρός μου ἡ ἔλεγχίς ἐστιν, καὶ (ἡ ὁμ.) ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ βαρεῖα γέγονεν ἐπ' ἐμῷ στεναγμῷ = בִּי־עֲתָה יִרְעָתִי בִּי־עֲתָה יִרְעָתִי | (בִּי־מִי־יָשָׁהּ | (יִרְעָתִי) בְּבָרָה עַל־אֲנָתִי: For καὶ δὲ = בִּי־עֲתָה, cf. 6<sup>3</sup>. יִרְעָתִי may have grown out of this; or it may be an accidental anticipation of v. 3<sup>a</sup>. Possibly καὶ δὲ = גַּם־הַיּוֹם מִן. It is self-evident from the following verses (3–15) that God must have been mentioned by name in this verse, as otherwise there is no visible reference for the 3rd Pers. Pron. throughout. Now מִן *rebellion* (chiefly Ez, e.g. 27<sup>8</sup>) is not a Job-word; and if it were, it would not be in harmony with the context here. It probably conceals the Divine name שְׁרִי (מִן or מִן = שִׁי or שִׁי, as in other instances; see 15<sup>29</sup> 21<sup>33</sup>; and 7 = 7). Thus the original stichus may have been גַּם־הַיּוֹם מִן לְשִׁי *Still of Shaddai is my complaint*; scil. and not of man; see 21<sup>4</sup>. Nothing thou hast said has altered my standpoint or modified my conviction, which is the same 'to-day' as it was yesterday. There is clearly a reference to Eyob's last (the sixth) reply, 21<sup>1b</sup> (where ἡ μου ἡ ἔλεγχίς = שִׁי as here). St. ii naturally enough adds: *And His Hand it is that is heavy on groaning me* (lit. *on my groaning*). Leg. יִרְעָתִי pro מִן יִרְעָתִי c ἡ Ἰ. (ἡ Ἰ read מִן *bitter* in st. i pro מִן *rebellion*. If we could dispense with all mention of God until v. 16, the stichus *To-day also is my complaint bitter* would suit well enough.)

7. 3. St. ii. Leg. וְאָבֹא *That I might come*. Exc. 1 post 1 praeced. The st. is metr. short, and תְּכִנֶּנָּה *preparation, things prepared* (Ne 2<sup>10</sup>) is more than doubtful in the required sense of *fixed abode, seat*. We therefore restore מְכוֹן (שֶׁבֶת) *His dwelling-place* (Ps 33<sup>14</sup> 1 K 8<sup>13, 39+</sup>), which satisfies both sense and metre. Cf. ὁ solium eius (מְכוֹן כִּסְאוֹ Ps 89<sup>15</sup>,

or שבת = sedes?). ὁ εἰς τέλος = ער-לכלה (1).—In st. i leg. יְדַעְתִּי Inf. cst. c suff., ut 11<sup>s</sup> Ex 16<sup>s</sup>, pro מִשְׁפָּטִי constr. anom. (Kittel dl. c 1 cod.—Ṣ incert.).

v. 4. *That I might . . .* So ὧς (making verbs of 4-5 depend on *O that . . .*, v. 3). *my case*: מִשְׁפָּטִי (י exc. p. 1?—cf. 13<sup>18</sup> ubi exc. p. י). So ὧς ἐμάντοῦ κρίμα.

v. 5. Eyob cannot conceive, and would like to learn, how God could refute his contentions. *the words*: ὧς ἰάματα, prob. scribal error for ῥήματα (Ṣ<sup>Ac. a</sup> AΣ).

v. 6. Note the paronomasia in the Heb. (*habdērob-kōah yarîb* 'immadî?). Leg. prob. הַבְּרִיבָחוּ *In the greatness of His strength* (Is 63<sup>1</sup> 30<sup>18</sup> note). The ו fell out before י, as often elsewhere.

*would He strive*: ὧς ἐπελεύσεταιί μοι = יבוא עלי; *pro עמרי*; but the paronomasia as well as the legal force of ריב favours מ.

St. ii is difficult, and the text uncertain if we may judge by the Versions. ὧς εἶτα (ἧ<sup>A</sup> καὶ εἰ) ἐν ἀπειλῇ μοι οὐ χρήσεται (ἧ<sup>A</sup> μοι in loc. ult.). Since ἀπειλή = אִימָה *terror*, Pr 20<sup>2</sup> (a word found in 9<sup>34</sup> 13<sup>21</sup>, where Eyob expresses the same desire as here that God would meet him on equal terms, and not overawe him with His Majesty); and since χηρῆσθαι c dat. pers. = עשה עם 13<sup>20</sup>, or ל עשה Gn 16<sup>6</sup>, ὧς may perhaps indicate some such text as *ואם לא באימה יעשה לי Or not in terror deal with me?* Cf. ὧς *In greatness of strength He striveth with me; And if not (ואן לא), fear He putteth upon me.* Ὡς Nolo multa fortitudine contendat mecum; *Nec magnitudinis suae mole me premat* (= ולא אכפו ישים בי *And not put His pressure on me*; cf. 33<sup>7</sup>). Since we desiderate a parallel question, we may assume that the sentence began with *ואם לא* (י exc. p. י; אם = אם) and render: *Or will (would) not He (emph.) listen to me?* (ישמע ut 15<sup>17</sup> al. pr. מ בי ישם; a doubtful constr. Cf. 1<sup>23</sup>).

v. 7. מ lit. *There an upright one (or the upright) would be arguing with Him.* There is something strange about this oblique reference to himself, apart from the question of a suitable parallel to st. ii. We incline to read יִשָּׁר וְנוֹכַח עִמִּי *There* (i. e. at His 'fixed abode', v. 4) *would He contend and argue with me.* Cf. Ho 12<sup>6</sup> (of which this verse may be a reminiscence: 'At Bethel he findeth him, And there he speaketh with him'); Gn 32<sup>29</sup> Eyob implies that (like Jacob) he would come off victorious in the strife of words; i. e. that he would convince God of the justice of his case. ὧς ἀλήθεια γὰρ καὶ ἔλεγχος παρ' αὐτοῦ (? αὐτῷ = עִמּוֹ); perhaps pointing יִשָּׁר וְנוֹכַח, or יִשָּׁר וְהוֹכַח, and in either case confirming וְנוֹכַח; cf. ἔ. *There the upright and perfect (will be?) with me* (but Levy עמו *with Him*, as מ). Ὡς Proponat aequitatem contra me; mispointing שם pro שם, taking כח(ו) as the prep. (adv.) *לפני in front, ante, and not confirming* 'ו. ὧς *There uprightly I should plead*

(or *strive*) along with Him, and should be found guiltless (implying text of M). See also Burney, *JTS*. Apr. 1910, pp. 436 f.

St. ii. *I should escape*: leg. וְאִפְלֹטָהּ pro מְאִפְלֹטָהּ: cf. 22<sup>30</sup>. The ✓פֹּלֵט is prob. not genuine anywhere in Job. M has it besides only in 21<sup>10</sup>, where it may be a t. t., but should probably be altered to הִפְלֵט. Moreover, פֹּלֵט Pi. is always trans. Hence some would provide an Obj. by pointing מִשְׁפָּטִי *my cause* or *case* (c ㉔㉕) instead of מִשְׁפָּטִי *from my judge*. But *I should secure, carry off, or deliver my cause*, is not a Heb. mode of saying *I should win my case*; and the most usual Subj. of פֹּלֵט Pi. is Iahvah. Perhaps אֲבִטְלָה might be read (an Aramaism; cf. Ec 12<sup>3</sup>) with מִשְׁפָּטִי: *And I should end my case for ever*; put a final end to my litigation. Cf. ㉔ ἐξαγάγοι δὲ εἰς τέλος τὸ κρίμα μου. B Et perveniat ad victoriam iudicium meum gives the general sense; but the particular meaning of the verse is that God will cease to persecute Eyob, when once the latter has succeeded in demonstrating his innocence.

v. 8. קִדְמָה וְאַחֲרָה may mean either *forward and backward, to the front and to the rear, before and behind* (cf. Ps 139<sup>6</sup>), or *eastward and westward* (cf. Gn 11<sup>2</sup> Is 9<sup>11</sup>). Similarly, in the next verse, שְׂמֹאל וְיָמִין may be either *left hand and right* or *north and south* (Ez 16<sup>46</sup>). As is well known, Orientals face the east, to determine the points of the compass.

*He is not there*: אֵינֶנִּי: ㉔ οὐκ ἔτι εἰμί = אֵינִי *I am no more*: so Or<sup>K</sup> but Or<sup>Q</sup> as M rectè. Cf. B Si ad Orientem iero, non apparet; si ad occidentem, non intelligam eum.

v. 9. *I seek Him*: בִּפְשָׁתִּי (= ㉔ ㉕) pro מְבַעֲשָׁתוּ *when He works*. Perhaps בִּשְׁעָתִי *when I look*—a Job-verb, 7<sup>19</sup> 10<sup>20</sup> 14<sup>6</sup>. see Him: אֶחְזֹק (Apoc. Impf. of חָזַק; cf. Mi 4<sup>11</sup>), which B apprehendam eum and ㉔ κατέσχεον (Gn 22<sup>13</sup>) confound with אָחַז *to seize*. *I turn*: אֶעֱטֹף (c ㉔㉕) (si me vertam ad dexteram) pro מְעִטְפָה *He turneth*; an Aramaism (the word in ㉔). Sole occurrence of a ✓עֲטָף in Job. At the end read אֶרְאֶנִּי *I behold or perceive Him* pro מְרְאֶה. (The fine quatrain, vv. 8–9, wanting in Hex., may be regarded as an apt marginal parallel to v. 3. Here it seems to interrupt the connexion of thought between v. 7 and v. 10.)

v. 10. מְרִדָּה עִמָּדִי *the way with me*; an unlikely, if not meaningless expression in Heb.—㉔ *For He knoweth already my way*; B Ipse vero scit viam meam. I also om. עִמָּדִי (without which the stichus is too short metr.). ㉔ *He Himself knoweth my way* and my uprising (or *standing, steadfastness*, קִימִי) = וְעִמָּדִי. This, which recalls the phrase ‘Thou knowest my downsitting and my uprising’, Ps 139<sup>2</sup>, may be right, either in the sense of *my going and standing* (stopping), or in that of *my steadfast or persistent way*, or simply *the way wherein I stand* (עִמָּדִי *the way of my standing*; cf. Ps 1<sup>1</sup>). *If He test or try me*: בָּחַן perhaps akin to בָּחַר *choose*. In Aram. (Syr.) both words are used of proving or testing metals by fire.

The original idea seem to be that of looking into, or examining with the eye (cf. *בחן* *look-out, watch-tower*, Is 32<sup>14</sup>, and *חור* *to look at*): cf. Ps 114. *I shall come forth*; scil. from the crucible; cf. Zc 13<sup>9</sup>. The ancients knew nothing of chemical assaying; fire was their only means of testing metals.

v. 11. *His steps*: 31<sup>7</sup> (not elsewhere in Job); Pr 14<sup>15</sup>. Perhaps plur. always as in Ps 17<sup>5</sup> al. (= *vestigia eius, His footprints or tracks*: so B). *ἡ ἐξελύσσομαι δὲ* (= *אצא* v. 10!) *ἐν ἐντάλμασιν αὐτοῦ* (= *ממצותיו* v. 12! —translator's eye wandered to next line, and overlooked *אחזה רגלי*).

v. 12. *from the commands*: *מִצְוֹת* = *ἡ ἀπὸ ἐνταλμάτων*, B *A mandatis* (om. ante *מ*; per contra *מ* ולא male add. *ו* post *ו*).

*in my breast* or *bosom*: *בְּחִי* = *ἡ ἐν κόλπῳ μου*, B *in sinu meo* pro *מ* *מחִי* which cannot mean *מלחם חקי* (Pr 30<sup>9</sup>); nor indeed can anything sensible be made of it. Cf. 22<sup>22</sup>. St. ii: four stresses. Leg. *אִמְרֵי* *His words*?

v. 13. *וְהוּא בָּאֶחָד* *But He is One* (Beth Essent.), i.e. 'one and the same, who will not change His purpose', can hardly be right (= B *Ipse enim solus est*; et nemo avertere potest cogitationem eius). *בָּחַר* *He hath chosen* is not used in the sense required by the context. *ἡ εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔκρινεν* = *וְהוּא מִרִּיב* (cf. 10<sup>2</sup>). Perhaps *מִאֵיךְ* or *הֵאֵיל* *He pleaseth, willeth, or resolveth* (cf. 6<sup>3,25</sup>): *But He pleaseth, and who can turn Him back?* (9<sup>12</sup> 11<sup>10</sup>). Cf. also Nu 23<sup>19,20</sup>, which suggests *יִשְׁכַּנְהוּ . . . וְהוּא אָמַר* *But He hath spoken, and who can reverse it?* Another possibility is *הִפְיִן* or *תִּפְיִן* (9<sup>3</sup> al. Ps 115<sup>3</sup> 135<sup>6</sup>), *voluit, vult, or יחרין* *decidit* (14<sup>5</sup>).

v. 14. St. i is metr. short. *יֵדַעְתִּי* *I know*, fort. exc. p. *וַיַּעַשׂ* *I know that He will fulfil* (Is 44<sup>26,28</sup>) *my fate* (*חֲקִי* *מ*; cf. 14<sup>5</sup>; fort. *חֲקִי* *His decree* concerning me; cf. B).—St. ii. *וְכַהֲנָה רַבּוֹת עִמּוֹ* *And like those things* (there are) *many with Him*; very improb. (prosaic and a bad parallel to st. i). Fort. leg. *וַיִּכְלֶה רַבּוֹת עִמִּי* *And He will finish the strife with me*: *רִבִּי* 13<sup>6</sup>. God will not be diverted from His purpose, but will pursue His quarrel to the bitter end, regardless of Eyob's sufferings. (The verse may be an interpolation. It is apparently omitted by B, which gives instead of it a duplicate version of v. 15.)

v. 15. *אֲבָהָל* *ἡ κατασπουδασθῶ* (hic tant. ap. Job; vid. B<sup>A</sup> Ps 2<sup>5</sup> 6<sup>11</sup>) = *ἐσπουδάκα* v. 14<sup>a</sup>: cf. v. 16 4<sup>5</sup> 21<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>10</sup>. Eyob is 'dismayed' or confounded at the thought of the Omnipotent Will as dealing out weal or woe to man without regard to moral desert. See what follows, ch. 24, and cf. 21<sup>6ff</sup>.

v. 16. *softened my heart*; i.e. robbed me of all courage and confidence, and filled me with despair: cf. Is 7<sup>4</sup>. St. ii is metr. short. As parallel to *לִבִּי* *my heart* insert *נַפְשִׁי* *my soul*; *הַבְהִילֵנִי* pro *הַבְהִיל* (פִּשְׁי); cf. Ps 6<sup>4</sup>: or add *מְאֹד* *greatly, sore*: Ps 64<sup>11</sup>.

v. 17. The first stichus is overweighted, and the verse evidently

corrupt. 'Who could be satisfied with such a rendering as '*For I am not undone because of the darkness* (i.e. his calamity), *Or because of my own face* (!), *which thick darkness hath covered*' (Driver)? Such a roundabout and prosaic statement is altogether unlike the usual style of the poet. Omitting the Neg. לא c cod. K<sup>48</sup> and reading נצמתי pro מנצמתי (cf. 17<sup>8</sup> 18<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>5,6</sup>), and in st. ii ועל-פני (21<sup>26</sup>) pro ומפני (which may be due to the previous מפני), we get the more natural and more poetic statement:

*For I am appalled before the darkness;  
And my face the gloom (30<sup>26</sup>) hath covered.*

The 'darkness' is the mystery of the Divine dealings, which baffles and bewilders his mind. § st. i: *For I knew not that darkness would come upon me* (= עַל־חֹשֶׁךְ יָבֵא יָרֵעָתִי יְבֵא עָלַי חֹשֶׁךְ); πρὸ προσώπου δέ μου ἐκάλυψεν (ἘΑ καλύψει) γνόφος (= וְלִפְנֵי יִכְסֶה אֲפֶל). § gives the verse thus: *For I was not stilled from before the darkness, And from before the veil of the gloom.* It read נצמתי, as did also B (Non enim perii propter imminentes tenebras, Nec faciem meam operuit caligo).

Chapter 24. Eyob continues his reply. He cannot understand God's toleration of the daily spectacle of oppression and crime.

v. 1. M lit. *Why of Shaddai are not times laid up* (or *reserved*: 15<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>10</sup>).<sup>2</sup> or, more naturally, *Why from Shaddai are times not (?) hidden* (10<sup>18</sup> 17<sup>4</sup>).<sup>2</sup> *And why have His knower(s) not seen His days?* The 'times' and 'days' are usually supposed to be those of Divine retribution and Judgement. Eyob, however, makes no reference to the prophetic doctrine of 'the Day' (never 'Days') 'of the Lord' (Am 5<sup>18</sup> Is 2<sup>12</sup>). Moreover, acc. to the prophets, the Day of Iahvah is 'laid up' or in store for the wicked, and its coming is generally imminent. What Eyob demands is, why do so many wrongdoers prosper all their lives, if his friends are right in maintaining that God always dispenses prosperity and adversity according to human deservings? Instead, therefore, of the really irrelevant questions of this verse, we would restore

מדוע לא־נצמתי ערי(צ)ים  
ור(ש)עים לא־חוו אידם (פידם 21<sup>20</sup>):  
*Why are not oppressors annihilated,  
And bad men see not their own ruin?*

§ διὰ τί δὲ Κύριον ἔλαθον ὧραι = מדוע משדי נצפנו עתים = M sine לא. § continues the question with ἀσεβείς δὲ ὄριον ὑπερέβησαν κτλ. (v. 2) = 'ורשעים גבולות וגו'', omitting v. 1<sup>b</sup> (st. ii). In Job ἀσεβής, which occurs some 23 times, always = רשע (as usu. elsewhere in OT). It does not, therefore, indicate רעים here, but רשעים (רעים *bad men* occurs but once in Job, and that in the Elihu-section, 35<sup>12</sup>; the sing. רע is found in 21<sup>30</sup> only, where perhaps we should read רשע.)



v. 2. St. i is metr. short. It is natural to supply רָעִים or רָעָם of *neighbours* or *of their neighbour* (2<sup>11</sup> 16<sup>21</sup> al.); cf. Dt 19<sup>14</sup> Pr 22<sup>28</sup>. The vb. יָשִׁינוּ is a mode of writing יָסִינוּ: see the locc. citt. (ש = ס ut 5<sup>26</sup>). St. ii ט ποίμνιον σὺν ποιμένι ἀρπάσαντες, reading וְרָעוּ and its shepherd pro וְיָרְעוּ et pascunt (scil. gregem), which is prob. right. They lift or snatch their weaker neighbour's flock; and then openly graze it as their own. But ט also gives a good sense: They appropriate flock and shepherd together (the shepherd being a slave).

v. 3. Cf. Dt 28<sup>31</sup>. *distrain*: or *take in pledge*: cf. v. 9 22<sup>6</sup> Dt 24<sup>6,17</sup>.

v. 4. *from justice*; leg. מָרִין as Is 10<sup>2</sup>, where we have the same vb. Cf. also Am 5<sup>12</sup>. וְלֵ מָרִין *out of the way* (to which ט adds δικαίως). *the humble folk*: Qeri אֲנִי prob. rectè; vid. Is 10<sup>2</sup>. So טסססס. Kellb אֲנִי = ט πραεὶς γῆς, B mansuetos terrae; so Occ Or<sup>k</sup>. The poor of the land hide, and dare not appear 'in the gate' to claim their rights at law.

v. 5. M lit. *Lo, wild asses into the steppe they go forth in their work, seeking eagerly for the prey* (or *food* Pr 31<sup>15</sup>); *the Arabah (is) to him bread for the boys*. Textual corruption has obliterated metre, and turned the orig. distich into bald prose. A little adjustment makes the verse tell us that the despoiled poor seek a refuge in the waste land:

בְּמוֹ-פְּרָאִים בְּמִדְבָּר יֵצְאוּ  
כ(מו) עֲנִיִּים מִשְׁחָרֵי לְמִדְבָּר

*Like (טטטט) wild asses into the waste they go forth,*

*Like (wild) ass-colls in quest of forage.* (Cf. 7<sup>21</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> 11<sup>12</sup>.)

ט st. ii ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ = עָלוּ = *ascendunt*; prob. a marg. var. of יֵצְאוּ (ἐξεληθόντες); τάξιν prob. scribal error for πρᾶξιν (ט; ט<sup>A</sup> πρᾶξει = *לפעל*).

St. iii, as it stands in M, is really meaningless. Metrically, of course, it is superfluous; unless we suppose that it constituted the first member of a distich of which the second stichus has been lost. Possibly the line has grown out of marginal glosses or variants to the preceding distich: thus עֲרֵבָה (ב) might be a var. of בְּמִדְבָּר; לוֹ לֶחֶם (ללחם) might be an explanatory gloss on לְמִדְבָּר; and לְנַעֲרִים may have originated in a correction or corruption of כְּנַעֲרִים (כְּמִדְבָּרִים), or whatever erroneous form had already displaced it. (ט ἡδύνθη αὐτῶ = לוֹ עֲרֵבָה pts. B praeparant panem = *ערבו לחם* cf. Pr 9<sup>2</sup>.)

v. 6. M: *In the field they reap his fodder* (בליל: 6<sup>6</sup> Is 30<sup>24</sup>); they cut the fodder for the cattle of the wicked man who is mentioned in st. ii. But this inversion is not natural. Hence RV: *They cut their provender in the field*; the term 'fodder' being here used 'to denote the coarse food of these unfortunates' (Driver). This, of course, would require בָּלִיל.

Ⲫ gives a double equivalent of בלילו, viz.  $\pi\rho\acute{o}$  ὥρας = *before the time* (cf. 5<sup>26</sup> καθ' ὥραν) + οὐκ αὐτῶν ὄντα = בְּלִילֹ (a field) *that is not theirs* (בְּלִי לָמוֹ?). Prob.  $\pi\rho\acute{o}$  ὥρας indicates another reading (not בְּלִיל in the night), viz. בְּלִילֵי-עַתָּה (בְּ) *at the wrong time* (see 5<sup>26</sup> 38<sup>23</sup> for ὥρα = עַתָּה) for בְּלִילו; and as a parallel term to רָשָׁע for which some would substitute עָשִׁיר *the rich*, 27<sup>19</sup> (ant. et dub.; vid. note ad loc.) seems desirable, we suggest בליעל *the villain or the wicked, worthless, or even the man who ruined them* (cf. 34<sup>18</sup> Na 2<sup>1</sup>): *In the field (בְּשָׂדֵה) of the wicked they reap* (Qerī יִקְצֹרוּ; Ketīb Hi.; prob. a vox nihili; hic tant.); *And the vineyard of the godless they glean* (יִלְקְטוּ c 2 codd. pro אֵן. יִלְקְטוּ *despoil?*: vid. Le 19<sup>9,10</sup>), as the poor had a customary right to do. The poor outcasts gather up what they can, to eke out a scanty subsistence—perhaps in the very lands of which the oppressor has robbed them. The reading בְּלִיל would imply that they do this surreptitiously ‘in the night’, as though it were not allowed by the churlish owner. ⲩ Agrum non suum demetunt: et vineam eius, quem vi oppresserint, vindemiant. This refers the verse to the conduct of the local oppressors instead of the oppressed. (Some would transpose vv. 10–11 to follow v. 6.) Ⲫ paraphrases st. ii: ἀδύνατοι (= אֲבִינִים v. 4) ἀμπελῶνας ἀσεβῶν ἀμισθὶ καὶ ἀσιτὶ ἡργάσαντο, *The poor tilled impious men's vineyards without wages and without rations* (a guess at the meaning of the אֵן. יִלְקְטוּ, which is generally explained *they gather the לֶקֶט or late-ripe fruit from the vineyard*).

v. 7. Cf. 31<sup>19</sup> (also 26<sup>6</sup>); 22<sup>6</sup>; Is 20<sup>2,3,4</sup>. If אֵין-כְּסוֹת might be read with but one accent, we might insert לְעוֹרָם *for their skin* (cf. Ex 22<sup>26</sup>) or לָמוֹ *to them* after כְּסוֹת, which generally has some defining term attached to it. St. i looks like a variant of v. 10<sup>a</sup>. One or the other may be an interpolation. Ⲫ γυμνοὺς πολλοὺς (רב add. gloss) ἐκοίμισαν (יִלְינו as Hi., 2 Sa 17<sup>8</sup>; but cf. 39<sup>9</sup>) ἀνευ ἱματίων, | ἀμφίαισιν δὲ ψυχῆς αὐτῶν ἀφείλαντο (a different text? cf. 22<sup>6</sup>; ψυχῆς scribal error = ψύχους = קָרָה 37<sup>9</sup>).

v. 8. *storm*: of rain, יָרַם: cf. Is 25<sup>4</sup> מְרֹם מְחֹסֶה *a shelter or refuge from the rainstorm*. Ⲫ ἀπὸ ψεκᾶδων *from raindrops*.

v. 9. App. a variant of vv. 2–3, and obviously out of place in a description of the sufferings of the homeless poor. *from the breast*: pointing מִשֶּׁר = Ⲫ ἀπὸ μαστοῦ pro מִן מִשֶּׁר *from violence* (cf. ⲩ).

*babe*: עֹל suckling Is 49<sup>15</sup> 65<sup>20</sup> only: pro עֹל (which makes the line metr. short). Ⲫ ἐκπεπτωκότα δὲ ἐταπεινώσαν = ויענו נופל a misreading of מ. ⲩ vulgum pauperem = עֲלֵעֲנִי pro מִן עֲלֵעֲנִי.

v. 10. The verse cannot reasonably be connected with the last. RV *So that* could only be supplied, if the rendering of v. 9 (*There are that pluck the fatherless from the breast*) were possible. But neither *There are* nor *So that* is either expressed or implied by the Heb.

*go about*: Pi. of הלך as 30<sup>26</sup> Is 59<sup>9</sup> Ec 4<sup>15</sup>: of the daily ‘walk’ or way

of life. ילכו may have been substituted here for ילינו (v. 7), for the sake of varying the stichus, as ὁ γυμνὸς δὲ ἐκοίμισαν (= ילינו Hi.) ἀδίκως suggests. (ἀδίκως = שקר *wrongfully* Ps 35<sup>19</sup> 38<sup>20</sup>; לבוש misread backwards?)

St. ii. In the midst of plenty the poor labourers are famished, unpitied by their cruel employer (cf. vv. 6, 11). ὁ And from (the) hungry they took away the morsel (τὸν ψωμόν = פת 31<sup>17</sup> or לחם *bread* 22<sup>7</sup> pro עמר *sheaf* Dt 24<sup>10</sup>); which would require ימָרְעֵבִים. Thus ὁ makes the whole verse refer to the conduct of the oppressor of the poor. Cf. B.

v. 11. *Between the twin rows*; prob. of olive-trees: Aram. שִׁירָתָא *a row, rank* (cf. Je 5<sup>10</sup> of rows of vines?). Others: *Within their walls* (cf. RV); but the plur. of שִׁיר wall (Gn 49<sup>22</sup>), not found in Heb., is שִׁירִין in Aram. (= שורים). The word is masc., like the cogn. Assy. *dūru*, plur. *dūrāni*. The var. of two or three codd. שורות suggests that שִׁירָתָא may be a contracted form of the dual > plur. c suff. (like עינים = עינים &c.). Etyml. this שור may be akin to ישר *straight, upright*. ὁ ἐν στενοῖς ἀδίκως ἐνήδρευσαν = שקר ? ישורו ? (בצרות ?) cf. 1 Sa 23<sup>14,19</sup> ἐν τοῖς στενοῖς; Je 5<sup>26</sup> ἐνεδρ. (fort. ארנו > ישורו; 38<sup>40</sup> La 3<sup>10</sup> al.). B Inter acervos eorum meridiati sunt (*they took a siesta*; deriving the ἀπ. צהרים from צהרים *meridies* > וצהר *oil*).

*winepresses*: יקבים prop. *vats*; used in sense of נחות *torcularia* (B); Is 16<sup>10</sup>. (St. ii ap. ὁ: δδὸν δὲ δικαίων οὐκ ᾔδεισαν; cf. vv. 4, 13. B qui calcatis torcularibus sitiunt = M rectè.) It is needless to read the dubious ויגמאו (cf. 39<sup>24</sup>) pro ויצמאו. The poor vintagers dare not quench their burning thirst with the wine they are making for a merciless master.

The following verses (12-16) are all triplets instead of couplets. Indeed the tristich seems to be the dominant measure to the end of the section (v. 24), which may have been substituted for a rejected or lost portion of the original text. Some question the authenticity of vv. 5-24; others consider v. 25 the only relic of the original chapter. Without adopting an extreme view, which our scrutiny of the text so far hardly appears to justify, we cannot but recognize that the chapter shows many signs of corruption and interpolation.

v. 12. *the dying*; i. e. prob. murdered, or wrongfully slain by violence: pointing מְתִים c 1 cod. and ὁ pro מֵתִים *men*. 'City of men' is not a likely phrase. The city rings with the vain cries of victims of lawless violence or judicial murder. For וינאקו and חָלַל *fatally wounded*, see Je 51<sup>62</sup> Ez 30<sup>24</sup> La 2<sup>12</sup>. Perhaps בעיר *In the city* > מעיר *Out of the city*. ὁ οἱ (ᾠ<sup>A</sup> om.) ἐκ πόλεως καὶ οἴκων ἰδίῳν ἐξεβάλλοντο (ᾠ<sup>A</sup> ἐξεβαλον αὐτούς) =

מעיר ומבתים יקיאו (?)

pro M:

מעיר מתים ינאקו

For the vb. cf. 20<sup>16</sup> (= ἐξεμεσθήσεται lit.) Jon 2<sup>11</sup> ἐξέβαλεν. (נקיא ? has

been suggested; but Ni. of קיא is not used.) In st. ii ט νηπίων = עללים (3<sup>18</sup>) *children* pro חללים wounded or slain. ἐστέναξεν μέγα (6<sup>A</sup> μεγάλως) = fort. חשוע אל־אל crieth for help unto El (38<sup>11</sup>), which improves the sense: cf. st. iii, αὐτὸς δὲ διὰ τί τοῦτων ἐπισκοπήν οὐ πεποιήται = והוא ; למחרה לא־ישים לבו. חפלה tastelessness, in the moral sense (1<sup>22</sup>); but ישים cannot mean *imputeth it for folly*, or treat it (the despairing cry or the outrages) as a thing morally anomalous. We must point חפלה prayer c 2 codd. and ט, restoring ישמע heareth for ישים settleth (see note 23<sup>6</sup> ad fin.; Ps 65<sup>2</sup>).

v. 13. מ lit. *They* (emph.) *were* (or *have been* = *are*) *in* (? Beth Essent. Predic. or ? *among*, cf. RV) *rebellers of* (? *against*) *light*. But מדר requires ך *against* (Nu 14<sup>2</sup>), or על, עלי id. (late constr.). Moreover, the implied figure, if it relate to moral light, is foreign to Job. Perhaps מדר־י באל *They are rebels* (cf. 3 Ipsi fuerunt rebelles) *against El*. This seems to suit the ensuing distich (*in His ways . . . in His paths*). ט ἐπὶ γῆς ὄντων αὐτῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπέγχευσαν (6<sup>A</sup> ἐπὶ ὄντων αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀτλ.) = המה היו ודרך משפט (אמת?) *they know not*; ולא־הלכו בנתיבותיו(יה) *And walk not in its paths*. For st. ii, metr. short in מ, read: לא־הלכו בדרך יהוה *They walk not in Yahvah's way* (cf. the || st. iii). In st. iii three codd. and ט 3 point ישובו *return* pro מ ישובו *abide*. Perhaps אָשׁוּ go on (Pr 4<sup>14</sup> 9<sup>6</sup>).—After all, it is perhaps better to understand the phrase מדר (ב) lit., in the sense of hating daylight (cf. v. 17); as criminals whose misdeeds are perpetrated under cover of darkness naturally do (cf. Job 3<sup>20</sup>). מ may then be left pretty much as it stands:

*These* (the following: Pr 30<sup>24</sup>) *are rebels against daylight;*  
*They acknowledge not its ways,*  
*And abide not in its paths.*

v. 14. *Ere the dawn*: leg. בלא־אור or לא־אור. Cf. 15<sup>22</sup>. מ לאור *At the dawn* (Ps 30<sup>6</sup>); but vv. 13–17 describe the doings of nocturnal malefactors. לערב *At sunset* (Pr 7<sup>9</sup>) is less prob. לפני־אור would also be possible. ט γνοὺς δὲ αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς σκότος has no apparent relation to the Heb. text. It resembles a Midrashic comment (cf. v. 12<sup>c</sup>). It may, however, be merely an unhappy misreading of an injured text (fort. = כיִּר מעבריהם ויסגורם לאַפֵּל? cf. 34<sup>22</sup> 16<sup>11</sup>). Per contra, from st. iii to v. 18<sup>b</sup> ט reproduces מ practically verbatim. (Olim deerant ap. ט.)

*He slayeth the poor and needy.* The lawless oppressor murders whom he will with impunity, esp. the weak and helpless: cf. Ps 94<sup>6</sup> (also Ps 91<sup>13</sup> 108<sup>14</sup>). To read אִיְּבוּ וְצָרוּ *his enemy and adversary* is to miss the point, and is quite arbitrary. St. iii. Reading יחלך נגב *walks the thief* (Merx) pro מ יהי כנגב *let him become like the thief*.

v. 15. Fort. leg. סָחַר עַל-פָּנָיו *a covering upon his face* (cf. 21<sup>5</sup> 29<sup>9</sup> Jer 13<sup>1,2</sup>) or insert לוֹ or עָלָיו: (And) *a face-cover (he putteth) on himself* (cf. 22<sup>14</sup>).

v. 16. *they break* (lit. *dig*) *into*: plur. as required by context, though מ and Versions have sing. (influence of last verse). Cf. Ez 12<sup>5,7</sup> Am 9<sup>2</sup>. Burglary is, of course, intended, as in Ex 22<sup>2</sup> (noun), Mt 6<sup>19</sup>. פָּלַשׁ = Assyr. *palāšu*, 'bore or dig through' walls (also ears).

St. ii. מִיּוֹם חֲתָמוּ לָמוֹ by day they seal up (Pi. hic tant.) for (?) themselves or seal themselves up; keep within closed doors. Perhaps ἄπ. Hithp. הִתְחַתְּמוּ *they seal them up close* (?). ὅτε ἡμέρας ἐσφράγισαν ἑαυτοὺς, *By day they sealed themselves* (gen. temp. at ὅτε ἑαυτοῖς, for themselves). It has been proposed to read יָמִים (*The days they seal up to themselves; make no use of them*); but this is hardly prob. (cf. 9<sup>7</sup>). יוֹקֵם is a better parallel to בַּחֹשֶׁךְ. Perhaps, as the metr. halts, and חָתַם seems to require an accus. obj., we may read יוֹמָם חֲתָמוּ (יָמִים) (*By day they seal their doors; keep them fast closed*). (Or דַּלְתֵּיהֶם or פֶּתָחָם *their gate*? The *waw* may belong to the next word.) They shut themselves in (and shut out the light? cf. st. iii). St. iii is defective metr. לִיָּאוֹת may have fallen out before the similar אֹר: *And they know not to see the light*. (If these triplets were originally distichs, the stichus might be a gloss on st. ii.)

v. 17. St. i is overweighted metr., and lacks a verb. Moreover, the occurrence of צַלְמוֹת as the final word in both stichi is unparalleled in the book and improb. We might read יָחַת scarcely (יָחַ 31<sup>14</sup>) pro מִיָּחָד (which is said to strengthen לָמוֹ and to mean, in conjunction therewith, *to them all at once*; a quite superfluous insistence upon the unity of feeling among the burglars); and, replacing לָמוֹ by בָּלָמוֹ or בָּלָם, omit יַצְלִמוֹת as an accidental anticipation of יַצְלִמוֹת<sup>2</sup>, render *For the morning scareth them all*. (ὅτε δεισκαέδασεν pro σκιά θανάτου = יָחַת; Is 9<sup>3</sup>.) St. ii would then follow quite naturally: *And they are familiar with the terrors of night* (וַיִּכְדּוּ pro מִיָּכִיד כי יכיד)—and therefore are not afraid of them. Note the return to the regular metrical form (the distich). Si subito apparuerit aurora, arbitrantur umbram mortis; et sic in tenebris quasi in luce ambulant may almost be called a fair paraphrase of this. The words in tenebris . . . *ambulant* may lend some support to הַלִּיכוֹת the goings (= doings Pr 31<sup>27</sup>) pro בְּלָחוֹת the terrors; but בִּקְרוֹ (בִּקְרוֹ?) *seek for* pro בִּקְרִי morning in st. i (בעו) is wholly improb. Night comes without 'seeking'.

vv. 18-21 are supposed by Driver and others to 'express, in opposition to what Job has been saying, the view taken by his friends'. Hence RV marg. *Ye say, 'He is swift', &c.* But there is no 'ye say' in the Heb., nor any hint of such a reference to the speaker's opponents. It is, in fact, only an expedient due to the vain endeavour to defend a desperately corrupted text.

v. 18. St. i, lit. *Swift is he upon the face of the waters*, is surely an

extraordinary way of saying 'The sinner is rapidly borne away upon the stream'; and obviously there is no trace of parallelism between the three stichi of the verse. Leg. קללו לפני שמים *They are accursed before Heaven* (cf. 1 Sa 26<sup>19</sup>; or keep על-פני = *in sight of*; cf. 1<sup>11</sup> 6<sup>28</sup> 21<sup>31</sup>); a good parallel to st. ii (rendering it needless to read חלקתו): *Accursed is their portion* (allotted ground, allotment) *in the earth*. St. iii, מ lit. *He turneth not the way of the vineyards*. Driver paraphrases stt. ii, iii: 'The passers-by, as they see his desolated homestead, utter a curse over it (5<sup>3</sup>); he no more revisits his well-planted vineyards', which would be good sense, if it did not read so much into the text which is not there (*the passers-by* . . . יפנה *revisits* . . . his *vineyards*). Instead of לא־יפנה דרך פרמים some would read לא־יפ' דרך פרמים *the treader of their vineyard turns not* (cf. v. 11<sup>b</sup> 9<sup>8</sup> for דרך). See Is 31<sup>4</sup> 5<sup>5</sup> Je 12<sup>10</sup> (but could דרך in connexion with כרם have such a meaning?). Perhaps לא־יפנה פרמם בארמה *Their sprout fruiteth not in the ground*; which is at least parallel to the preceding distich (and perhaps a gloss upon st. ii). If, however, we suppose the crimes of the wicked to be still the subject, we may read either לא־יפנה דרך פרמים *Their way turneth not away from bloodshed*, or לא־יפני מדרך דמים *They turn not from the way of bloodshed*. Cf. Is 1<sup>15</sup> Je 2<sup>34</sup> Ps 14<sup>4</sup>, &c. But ὁ ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ἡγῆς ξηρά seems to favour the former suggestion.

v. 19. מ lit. *Dryness* (?) *also heat snatch* (vv. 2<sup>b</sup> 9<sup>a</sup>) *waters of snow*; or (since the vb. is masc. plur.) *Snow waters snatch away drought* (and) *also heat*; *She'ol* (those who?) *have sinned*. St. i is metrically redundant; st. ii defective both metr. and gramm. ὁ (ἐπὶ ἡγῆς ξηρά added to v. 18) ἀγκαλίδα γὰρ ὀρφανῶν (-οῦ) ἤρπασαν = יתום יגולו: (a guess or substitution for an illegible text). Even in its present corrupt state, the verse has the look of a proverb. Assuming ציה to represent a verb, viz. a אפ. Aramaism ציה *to dry up* (= Syr. צִי arefecit) and regarding גם as a double of חם, we get for st. i חם מימי-שלג ציה *Heat drieth up snow waters*. Cf. 6<sup>17</sup>. This leaves יגולו to supplement st. ii, which might be restored thus: ושאול יגול חוטא *And She'ol snatcheth away the sinner*. Or we might treat חם as a marg. gloss on ציה *drought* (usu. *desert*), and suppose that the similar word ישא has fallen out after ושאול: *Drought snatcheth away* (leg. תגול) *snow waters*; and *She'ol carrieth off the sinner*. Or, finally, we might read תחריב דריeth up pro גם-חם, and restore st. ii in the way first suggested.

v. 20. The opening distich is marred by being broken into three detached statements, the second of which, moreover, is not quite grammatical; and metre is, as usual, disregarded. Lit. *The womb* (whose?) *forgets him*; *the worm has sucked him* (ס them); *he is no more remembered*. Reading רחם backwards we get מחר *to-morrow* (Pr 3<sup>28</sup> 27<sup>1</sup>); implying that the sinner is soon forgotten. The one word necessary to complete

both sense and metre in st. i lurks under the disguise of the supposed Aramaism מתקו *exsuxit eum* (מתקחו would be necessary with Subj. רמה), viz. מקמו *his place*; i. e. his abiding-place or home (not his *city* in Job, but either his fixed abode or station, or his locality: cf. 2<sup>11</sup> 6<sup>17</sup> 7<sup>10</sup> 8<sup>18</sup> 14<sup>18</sup> 18<sup>4,21</sup> 20<sup>9</sup> 27<sup>21,23</sup> 28<sup>1,6 al.</sup> 34<sup>26</sup> 37<sup>1</sup> 38<sup>12,19</sup>: hence רחב pro רחם is less prob.; since the 'square' or *plaza* of a מקום is nowhere else mentioned in OT, nor is מקום thus subordinated to a limiting term anywhere in Job). After *His place forgetteth him to-morrow*, st. ii *His name is no more remembered* would naturally follow (שמה pro רמה): cf. 18<sup>17</sup> and Je 11<sup>19</sup> where the same words occur; and for the gen. sense of the distich 7<sup>10</sup> 20<sup>9</sup>. That רפה *worm* (7<sup>5</sup> 17<sup>14</sup> 21<sup>26</sup> 25<sup>6</sup>) has displaced (שמו) שמה *his name* in מ is perhaps due to the need of finding a suitable Subj. for the supposed verb מתקו *exsuxit eum*.—In st. iii ט ט read עול the *unjust* pro עולה *injustice*; prob. rightly (cf. 16<sup>11</sup> 18<sup>21</sup> 27<sup>7 al.</sup>). But the language is rather strange. *Why like a tree?* Trees are not specially brittle or liable to breakage (Ps 29<sup>6</sup> Ex 9<sup>25</sup> are different). *sed conteratur quasi lignum infructuosum* = (?) וישבר קעין ערירי. Read וישלך (cf. Ez 19<sup>12</sup>) or rather וישחת (Je 11<sup>19</sup> Dt 20<sup>19,20</sup> Ju 20<sup>21</sup>) *is felled* (שחת = Assyr. *šahātu*, *to fall*).

ט gives a quatrain for the tristich:

*Then was remembered his sin* (עוד לא? עונו זכר? v. 19 pts. ? חטאין)

*And as a mist of dew he vanished:*

וכמו־שֶׁלֶג לא יִשָּׁכַח. (cf. Pr 26<sup>1</sup> Ps 147<sup>16</sup>.)

*And let there be repaid to him what he did,* (וישלם לו כפעלו cf. 34<sup>11</sup>.)

*And every unjust man be shivered, like a tree incurable!*

(אין־מרפא a gloss, Ps 6<sup>10</sup>.)

The third line here is apparently a variant text of the fourth.

v. 21. RV marg. connects with last verse: *as a tree; even he that devoureth, &c.* As the dubious action of 'devouring' cannot be attributed to a tree, this must imply the reading עול in v. 20 c. In such a sense, moreover, we should have expected אכל (Ps 14<sup>6</sup> Pr 30<sup>14</sup>) > רעה *graze* or *feed on*. It is obvious, and prob. right, to read הִרַע *he hurteth* or *ill-treateth*; a good parallel to לא ייטיב *doeth not good to*, st. ii. (The pointing ייטיב—app. by false analogy from יהיטיב—is prob. erroneous, and should be ייטיב as elsewhere.) For the phrase *the barren that beareth not*, cf. Ju 13<sup>2</sup> Is 54<sup>1</sup>.

v. 22. מ st. i lit. *And he draws or drags (off, away) mighty ones (אבריים) by his strength*: cf. Ps 10<sup>9</sup> 28<sup>3</sup>. The word 'אביר is suspicious, since neither it nor its root occurs elsewhere in Job, except once in the Elihu-section (34<sup>20</sup>). ט ἀδυνάτους = אבנים (see 5<sup>15</sup> 29<sup>16</sup> 31<sup>20</sup>), not אבדים, as has been supposed without reference to the usage of the translator. The vb. ומשך (Consec. to the preceding Impf.) must describe yet another enormity of the wicked man; viz. *he drags off the poor as his prey*. (סטר)

alone cannot mean *to prolong the life of*; the Obj. would have to be expressed: cf. Ps 36<sup>11</sup> Ne 9<sup>30</sup>. Nor is it reasonable to supply *God* as the Subj. of the stichus, when the wicked is that of the immediately preceding lines.) As מִשָּׁךְ is followed by ב Instrum. (40<sup>25</sup> בַּחֲכָה *with a fishhook*; Ps 10<sup>9</sup> *with his net*), it is prob. that the forcible-feeble בָּכָחוּ conceals a similar phrase here (perhaps בַּחֲכָה itself; cf. ὁ θυμὸς = בַּחֲמָה—an easy misreading of that word—or even of בָּחֲרָמוּ *with his net*: Ha 1<sup>15</sup>).

St. ii belongs to the next tristich: *He standeth* (8<sup>15</sup>) *and trusts not*, has no confidence, *in his life* = While he subsists, he is always uncertain of life (quotation of Dt 28<sup>66</sup>; on the ground of which we read בַּחַיִּי instead of בַּחַיִּין *in life*). The stichus cannot possibly mean *He riseth up, and no man is sure of life* (RV).

v. 23. מ lit. *He giveth him securely and he leaneth*; which is much too elliptical to be intelligible, to say the least. ὁ has an entirely different verse: *Having sickened, let him not expect to be healed; But he shall fall by disease*. St. i is perhaps a variant or duplicate of v. 22<sup>b</sup>; but the whole may possibly be merely a conjectural reading of מ somewhat as follows: בְּמִדְּוֵהוּ (14<sup>10</sup>) יִנּוּעַ | אֶל־יִבְטַח לַחַיִּית | נַחֲלָה(י)חֲלָה. Dedit ei (= מ) *Deus locum paenitentiae, et ille abuitur eo in superbiam* (prob. = ולבטח ישען = מ); oculi autem eius sunt in viis illius (= מ c — pro —). We propose לֹא־אֵיתָן מִבְּטָחוֹ יִשְׁעֵן־עָלָיו וְעֵינָי אֱלֹהֵי עַל־דְּרָכָיו *Not enduring is his trust whereon he leaneth* (cf. 8<sup>14,15</sup> where מִבְּטָחוֹ is immediately followed by יִשְׁעֵן as here; 18<sup>14</sup> 31<sup>24b</sup> 2 K 18<sup>21</sup>); *And the eyes of Eloah are upon his ways*; i.e. marking them for retribution (cf. 11<sup>1</sup> 34<sup>21</sup>).

v. 24. Read רָם־הוּא כְּמַעַט *High grown (or exalted) is he for a little while* (Is 26<sup>20</sup>), pro מֵרֹמֶם כְּמַעַט *They are exalted a little while*. Perhaps יָרוֹם (cf. prec. impff.). רָמוֹ or רֹמוֹ is a doubtful form; and the plur. does not agree with the following וְאֵינָנוּ *and he is no more* (וְאֵינָם *and they are, &c.*). ὁ πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐκάκωσεν τὸ ὑψωμα αὐτοῦ = רָמוֹ *he is brought low*: leg. והמך sing. (Ho. ᾠπ.). This implies יָרוֹם ad init. Perhaps וְיָמָּה Qal (Ps 106<sup>43</sup>). מֵוְהִמָּכּוֹ; but the final ו belongs to the next word, וְכַמֶּלַח *and like the mallow* (sic leg. c ὁ pro מ כָּפָל *like all*). *he is plucked*: יִקָּטַף (8<sup>12</sup> 30<sup>4</sup> of the mallow), pro מ יִקְבְּצוּן *they are gathered together*. Cf. ὁ ἐμαράνθη δὲ ὥσπερ μολόχη ἐν καύματι = והמך? כַּמֶּלַח בקיץ. *cut off*: יִמָּל sing. pro מ יָמָּלוּ plur. (1 seq. v. 25). ὁ perhaps read יָבֵל (αὐτόματος ἀποπεσών? cf. Is 34<sup>4</sup>). See note on 14<sup>2</sup>; 18<sup>10</sup>. Ps 37<sup>2</sup> (both vbb.).

Driver assumed that vv. 22–25 express Eyob's own view, as opposed to that of the friends, viz. that 'God by His power preserves the powerful oppressor, and even when he is sick and in despair of his life, restores him to health again' (note on v. 22). Accordingly, v. 24 is supposed to



describe 'how the sinner, though of course he must die like all other men, enjoys a long life' [But *a little while*?], 'and has at the end of it a quick and painless death (cf. 21<sup>19</sup>)'. In harmony with this, *cut off as the head of a corn ear* is explained to mean 'not prematurely, but only when fully ripe (cf. 5<sup>26</sup>)'. But the text does not justify the statement that the sinner 'enjoys a long life', nor that his end is 'painless', but only that it is sudden and complete. The words **מָעַט וַיֵּאֲנֶנּוּ** are, in fact, fatal to this interpretation (cf. Ps 37<sup>10,35,36</sup>), although it must be admitted that it finds some support in the ancient Versions. There is, however, nothing in the text of **מ** to warrant the opinion that vv. 18-21 represent the view of the friends and vv. 22-25 the contrary view of Eyob himself (see the notes); and the fact that throughout the entire section, vv. 13-24, the tristich supplants the normal distich, may be taken as a clear indication that we have to do here with material foreign to the original poem. The views expressed are those of the friends, not Eyob's: cf. chap. 20. (Might these verses, in their original form, have belonged to Bildad's third speech, now unsatisfactorily represented by chap. 25?)

v. 25. Lit. *And if not, then . . .* 9<sup>24</sup> 17<sup>14</sup> 19<sup>6,23</sup>. (**אִפְּוֹ** enclit., and as such metr. attached to prec. word. Leg. **מִי אִפְּוֹ**. Cf. Gn 27<sup>33</sup>?) *prove me liar*: Hi. cf. 6<sup>28</sup> Pi. 41<sup>1</sup> (41<sup>9</sup> AV) Ni. *make my word naught*. For **לְעַלְוָה** cf. Mi 1<sup>8</sup>. **לֹא** nihil, *ἀπ.* Fort. **לֹאִין**: cf. Is 40<sup>23</sup>. **אֱ** ante Deum = **לֹאֱלֹהִים** pro **לֹאֱ**; at **אֱ** eis *οὐδέν* = **לֹאִין** Is 40<sup>23</sup>.

#### Chapter 25. Bildad's (?) Third Reply to Eyob.

It is difficult to believe that this lofty utterance was the original response of *Bildad* to the indictment of God's rule in chaps. 23 sq. Not only is it a response which is no answer to Eyob's allegations, but it is quite unlike Bildad's previous speeches. Indeed, as Driver has observed, vv. 4-6 repeat, partly in the same words, the argument of Eliphaz in 4<sup>17</sup> (cf. 9<sup>2</sup>) and 15<sup>14-16</sup>; while vv. 1-2 remind us of Eyob's own words 9<sup>6-9,19</sup> 26<sup>6-13</sup>. Has this virtual cento of previous thoughts, the brevity of which contrasts so strongly with the much longer and more characteristic replies of Bildad in chaps. 8 and 18, taken the place of an illegible or lost or rejected original? In itself, at all events, it is a fine and stately utterance and, as such, worthy of preservation, however much we may regret the missing portion of the original text.

v. 2. *Dominion and dread or awe, awfulness = A dread sovereignty.* Hi. Infin. Abs. **הַמִּשָּׁל** = *exercising rule or dominion*, here only. **אֱ** mis-pointed **הַמִּשָּׁל** (cf. 27<sup>1</sup> 29<sup>1</sup> **מִשָּׁל** = *προσείμω*). *He maketh, or made*: **עָשָׂה** (so **אֱ**) pro **עָשָׂה** = **אֱ** *ὁ ποιοῦν*, **אֱ** qui facit. The allusion may be to the old myth of the War in Heaven between the Powers of Light and Darkness; esp. perhaps to the Babylonian legends of Creation (cf. 9<sup>13</sup> 26<sup>13</sup>); or more generally, to the power of the Deity in raising and quelling storms. For **מְרוֹמִים** = **שָׁמַיִם** (usu. **מְרוֹם**) cf. 16<sup>19</sup> 21<sup>22</sup>. Instead of **שָׁמַיִם**

(שלם) *peace* 6 app. read חבל *the world* (τὴν σύμπασαν) Na 1<sup>5</sup> or ארץ *the earth*, 2<sup>2</sup>.

v. 3. Lit. *Is there a number to His troops* (invading or assailing forces)? They are innumerable. He is the Lord of the Hosts of Heaven, and therefore irresistible and omnipotent. For נדור see 19<sup>12</sup>.

6 curiously: *For would any one suppose that there is παρέλκυσις πειραταῖς delay to assailants?* For πειρ. cf. 19<sup>12</sup>. Pro παρελκ. 6<sup>2</sup> ἀριθμός. *his ambush*: אֹרְבוֹ (cf. 31<sup>9</sup>) c 6 ἐνεδρα παρ' αὐτοῦ. Either by open assault or by surprise-attack He vanquishes His foes. An app. better parallel; but if נדוריו = צבאותיו and denotes the stars, we may keep אורהו and render: *And upon whom ariseth not his light?* The meaning will then be that God is the Creator of both stars and sun. Cf. Ps 147<sup>4</sup> Is 40<sup>26</sup>.

v. 4. St. i repeats 9<sup>2b</sup> verbatim. The meaning must be, How can a mere mortal be *justified*, i.e. held and treated as blameless (11<sup>2</sup> 40<sup>6</sup>) or perfectly innocent, in relation to God and judged by His standard, when things so far exalted above man in the scale of being as the moon and stars are not free from fault in His eyes (vv. 5, 6, with which cf. Ps 84<sup>6</sup>)?

v. 5. *Lo, even the moon*: so 3 Ecce luna etiam non splendet. But can הן ערירח mean this? 3 ער as far as to prob. conceals some other word. In Ps 89<sup>38</sup> ער is app. an epithet or syn. of ירח *the moon* (cf. Sum. ID, ITU, ITI, *the moon*); and ירח here might conceivably be a gloss on the rare word ער. A verb, however, seems desirable: cf. 6 ἡ σελήνη συντάσσει (= צוה pro ער: 38<sup>12</sup>: not יַעַר, which does not bear the required sense), καὶ οὐκ ἐπιφάσκει. Perhaps: (נ) exc. post. (נ) נער(ר) *Lo, the moon faileth, and shineth not*: cf. Is 40<sup>26</sup>. ע(מ)ר halteeth or stoppeth, is also possible: cf. Jos 10<sup>13</sup> Hab 3<sup>11</sup>. The 3π. יהל pro יהל (see 31<sup>26</sup> 41<sup>10</sup> also 29<sup>3</sup>) may be a scribe's error due to reminiscence of יאמין 4<sup>18</sup> 15<sup>15</sup>. The moon 'stops' in its walk across the sky (31<sup>26</sup> הלך; ירח = 'the Traveller', cf. ארח).

St. ii is identical with 15<sup>16b</sup>, only substituting the stars for the heavens. For the ideas involved in the verse, cf. notes on 4<sup>18</sup> 5<sup>1</sup> 5<sup>16</sup>, and the common formulas of the old Bab. exorcisms prescribed for the healing of the sick: *Like Heaven let him shine, Like Earth let him be bright!* (Kîma šamē lelil, kîma iršitîm libbîb); *Let the man the son of his god shine, be bright, glisten!* (amēlu mār ilîšu lîlî libbî limmir).

v. 6. *a maggot* (רמה), associated with bodily decay and death (7<sup>5</sup> 17<sup>14</sup> 21<sup>26</sup>) and the corruption of the grave (Is 14<sup>11</sup>). Fort. of the same origin as רמש *to crawl*. *a worm* (תולעה), as small and weak Ps 22<sup>7</sup> Is 41<sup>14</sup> (but also associated with the corruption of death, Is 66<sup>24</sup>). The Sum. UĜ TURA *tultu*, UĜ DURRA (= TURA) *ākilu*, 'devourer' (אֲכִל cf. 13<sup>28</sup> Dt 28<sup>39</sup>). 6 renders the two words σαπρία, *rotteness*, and σκόληξ, *worm*. The idea of 'uncleanness' or impurity was naturally associated with such creatures.

Chapter 26.—Eyob's answer to Bildad (vv. 2-4 only?).

v. 2. A bitter sarcasm. (Ⓜ seem to have read מי pro מה in vv. 2, 3. Ⓜ's *Whom art thou joining*—πρόσκεισαι = גלויית, cf. Is 56<sup>8,6</sup>—or *whom art thou going to help*? Is it not him that hath much strength and a mighty arm? app. involves confusion of לא with לו, as elsewhere, and is no improvement. Cf. also v. 3<sup>a</sup>. לא is treated as equivalent to לו הלא in both instances.)

v. 3. *How hast thou counselled him that hath no wisdom, And made him know sanity abundantly!* לִבֶּךָ to the tender, i.e. young and inexperienced, has been suggested in place of לָרֹב in abundance; but this hardly suits the case of Eyob, and the רכך occurs only 23<sup>16</sup> 40<sup>27</sup> with quite different implications. לִפְתִּי to the simple might serve; but there is no need to diverge from Ⓜ, which is perhaps more pointedly ironical with its suggestion of abounding sagacity.

v. 4. *Whom (את־מי): not With whom:* cf. 31<sup>37</sup> 2 K 7<sup>9-11</sup>. The meaning seems to be *Whom hast thou thought to instruct? And at whose inspiration hast thou spoken?* (Driver). Cf. Is 28<sup>9</sup>. Perhaps, however, the sense is rather *With whom have you been talking* (setting forth arguments)? I can scarcely credit your unaided powers with such extraordinary wisdom. אֶל־מי would be possible (= the usual לְמי): Ex 19<sup>9</sup>: cf. Ⓜ τίμι ἀγγέλλας ῥήματα; The remainder of the chapter, vv. 5-14, is obviously out of connexion with what precedes, and has probably been dislocated from its original context. It may well have followed 25<sup>3</sup>, as the continuation of Bildad's monologue on the universal sovereignty of God, which then concludes naturally with 25<sup>4-6</sup>, after having run to about the average length. It is hardly necessary to point out the general harmony of the thoughts with 25<sup>2</sup> sq.

v. 5. From the realms of Heaven and the Upper Regions or 'Heights' (25<sup>2,3</sup>) the speaker passes to the Underworld of She'ol and the Deep: cf. Ps 139<sup>9-10</sup>. Verses 5-11, started in Ⓜ<sup>H</sup>, as wanting in the old text of Ⓜ, cannot be brought into any reasonable connexion with vv. 2-4; not even on the highly artificial hypothesis that Eyob wishes to demonstrate that he 'knows God's greatness as fully as Bildad does' (Driver), as to which it may be observed that the poet's method is not exactly that of the rival singers in a Virgilian Eclogue.

St. i is metr. short and otherwise defective; e.g. יחוללו must mean either *are travailed with, brought forth*, as 15<sup>7</sup> (cf. 39<sup>1</sup> Act.), or *are made to writhe, tormented* (cf. 15<sup>20</sup> Hithpol.), neither of which is suitable here. Perhaps מפני has fallen out before מתחת, and we should read יחולו מפניו *shiver* (with fear) *before Him* (Je 5<sup>22</sup>), or מלפניו id. (Ps 114<sup>1</sup>); and since רפאים (ἄπ. in Job) in the sense of the Shades or denizens of She'ol is always anarthrous (seven times in OT, e.g. Is 14<sup>9</sup> 26<sup>14,19</sup> Pr 9<sup>18</sup> al.),

we may perhaps restore וְנֹר' הָלֹא רָפָה *Do not the Shades tremble before Him?* Cf. ὁ γίγαντες μαωθήσονται κτλ. (taking ה as the Interrog. Part.).

St. ii. Reading מִשְׁכְּנֵיהֶם (מִשְׁכְּנֵיהֶם is dub.) pro וְשִׁכְנֵיהֶם. The world of the dead lay under the earth and the surrounding ocean. מ Beneath the waters and their inhabitants; but parallelism apart, a reference to the denizens of the water does not seem very relevant, though perhaps picturesque. As a parallel phrase to מִרְפָּאִים one might think of וְשִׁכְנֵי מִתַּחַת לַמַּיִם *And the dwellers below the Waters?* But the proposed מִרְפָּאִים *The Shades tremble at Him (i), And the Waters and their dwellers are dismayed*, although ingenious is not satisfactory; (1) because of הָר' (vid. supr.), (2) because of the dub. constr. לוֹ יִחְלוּ which, moreover, leaves the stichus metr. short, and (3) because st. ii is no real parallel to st. i, if it refer to the seas and their fishy inhabitants. The Shades do not live in the waters, but in a region far below them, viz. She'ol, which is immediately mentioned (v. 6).

v. 6. *Abaddon*: Destruction or Ruin (אֲבַדּוֹן *perish, be destroyed, ruined* of houses, Am 3<sup>15</sup> = Assy. *abātu, fall into ruin*); as Syn. of She'ol, virtually a Nom. Prop. (28<sup>22</sup> 31<sup>12</sup>). Only in Wisdom-Lit. (six times): see besides, Pr 15<sup>11</sup> 27<sup>10</sup> Ps 88<sup>12</sup>. Perhaps an old Canaanite word. Even the Land of Darkness (9<sup>21</sup>) lies open to the All-seeing (cf. Ps 139<sup>12</sup>).

v. 7. *the North* must be the northern sky: cf. Is 40<sup>12</sup> Ps 104<sup>2</sup> (נֹתָר as here, of stretching or spreading out the heavens). *The Void* or *Waste* (תְּהוֹ 6<sup>18</sup> 12<sup>24</sup> *desert*; Is 40<sup>17</sup> *nothingness, vacancy*) is the app. empty air or vacant space between the northern vault of heaven and the earth. From this quarter of the heavens issued Theophanies (37<sup>22</sup> Ez 1<sup>4</sup>); and there (above the celestial Ocean) rose the divine 'Mountain of Assembly' in the farthest North, where the Most High was enthroned (Is 14<sup>13,14</sup>). The far North was vaguely known to be a land of mountains; and the same was assumed to be true of its heavenly counterpart.

St. ii may mean that the earth is suspended in space, with no solid support underneath (cf. 2 Sa 4<sup>12</sup> 'over the pool'). Hindu myth makes it rest upon a huge elephant, the elephant in turn standing upon a tortoise. As not being solid, the waters upon which the earth was supposed to rest (Ps 24<sup>2</sup>) might perhaps be regarded as 'nothing' (בְּלִימָה *ἀπ.* usually derived from בְּלִי *not* + מָה *anything, aught*; thus = *naught* || תְּהוֹ st. i): cf. ὃ *He set up the earth upon the waters, with nothing supporting it*. Since, however, תָּלָה is to hang a thing on (i.e. *from*) another, to let it depend from it, as a harp from a willow (Ps 137<sup>2</sup>) or a 'vessel' from a peg (Ez 15<sup>3</sup>), the earth, as standing under the hollow sky, might perhaps be said to be suspended on nothing. But, in that case, what of 'the pillars of heaven'? Cf. also 9<sup>6</sup> 38<sup>6</sup> 1 Sa 2<sup>9</sup>. Of course, we are dealing with poetry, founded more or less upon ancient mythical conceptions, not upon scientific astronomy. (Is בְּלִימָה really בְּלִי + מָה, and so a Syn. of תְּהוֹ in the sense

of *vacancy*, *vacuity*, the *Void*, as the parallelism would suggest, possibly coined by the author? Then the meaning will be: *Who suspendeth Earth from Vacancy or the Air*. Or is it an old mythic name for the ocean Deep, *The Curbed* or *Bound One*, from בָּלַם Aram. Heb., related to אָלַם *to bind*, Ps 32<sup>9</sup>? cf. Ps 24<sup>2</sup>.)

v. 8. 'Another marvel of God's power: the waters upheld [צָרַר *bind* or *tie up*: Pr 30<sup>4</sup>: cf. Sum. SAR, *bind*] in the clouds, which yet do not burst under their weight. The Hebrews were unaware that clouds consist of the vapour of water, and do not contain actual water' (Driver). They were ignorant that matter might become solid, liquid, or aeriform under variable conditions. Cf. the questions in 38<sup>19, 22, 28, 37</sup> and other wonders of nature, which were insoluble mysteries until the dawn of modern science.

v. 9. מִצָּחוּ Pi. אָּפּ. appears to mean *shutting in* (cf. Qal Ne 7<sup>9</sup>) or *enclosing*. The corresponding form in Assy. (*uḥḥiz, uahḥiz*) means to *enclose* or *set* gems in gold, and also to *overlay* doors with gold or silver. Cf. also *iḥzu, setting*, and *fence* (of a field). אָּחַר *he shut, closed*, e.g. a door; Pa. *shut closely, fastened up*. The prim. idea of the √ח = חו is that of *grasping, holding, holding fast* (cf. Sum. GAD, *hand*); hence ט κραῶν, ὅ qui tenet. Read perhaps מִצָּחִיָּא or מִצָּחִיָּא *hiding*. כִּסֵּא = כִּסֵּא *throne* in 1 K 10<sup>19</sup>, and many codd. read the latter word here. So ὁ θρόνου. But we should expect כִּסֵּא *His throne* (so אָּפּ), since the throne of God is never mentioned simply as 'The Throne'. Nor is there any other instance of כִּסֵּא = כִּסֵּא = כִּסֵּא. We must either read כִּסֵּא or point כִּסֵּא (Ps 81<sup>4</sup>) = כִּסֵּא *the full moon*, a glorious object in Eastern skies. The † of the anomalous form פִּרְשׁוּ, variously explained as Pil. of פִּרְשׁ (= פִּרְשׁ) and as 'forma mixta ex פִּרְזוּ et פִּרְשׁ' (an improb. origin), may be an accident due to unconscious reminiscence of the preceding מִצָּחוּ, and should prob. be פִּרְשׁוּ *And spreadeth* (ἄ et expandit super illud nebulam suam: cf. Ps 105<sup>39</sup>): cf. 11<sup>13</sup> 36<sup>30</sup>.

v. 10. Pr 8<sup>27</sup> has בָּחַק חוּג עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם *when He drew a circle over the Deep*. Hence it is proposed to point חָק חָק *He drew a circle* here; but חָק does not happen to occur elsewhere (cf. Ez 4<sup>1</sup>), and חָק is the *boundary* marked out for the sea, 38<sup>10</sup>, cf. Pr 8<sup>29</sup> Je 5<sup>22</sup> Ps 148<sup>6</sup> חָק נָתַן. The verb חוּג may very well mean *to mark out with a compass* (מְחוּגָה Is 44<sup>13</sup>). The noun חוּג is the *arch, dome, or vault* of heaven in 22<sup>14</sup>. ὁ προστάγμα ἐξῆρασαν ἐπὶ πρόσσωπον ὕδατος, ὅ Terminus circumdedit aquis.

St. ii may mean that the arch of heaven reaches on both sides to the point where light is merged in darkness, i.e. to the horizon-line of east and west. For חֲכָלִית *end*, see 11<sup>7</sup> 28<sup>3</sup>.—According to the poet's Physics (which are mythico-phenomenal), Darkness is not merely the negation of Light, but both are substantive beings, having their separate though unknown abodes, 38<sup>10, 20</sup>.—Perhaps עֵר > עֵר should be read, and the

stichus rendered: *He hath determined the limit of Light along with Darkness*: cf. the possibly cogn. Assy. (*w*)*add*, to fix or determine, appoint. Pa. *uaddi* (*Uaddišumma šuknat mūši ana uddū ūmé*, 'He appointed him (i.e. the Moon), a creature of Night, to determine days' (Creation Tab. V). But, in view of 11<sup>7</sup> 28<sup>3</sup> 38<sup>19f.</sup>, יָדַע *He knoweth (the limits of Light and Darkness; knows them in their entirety)* seems also possible. In either case we have a stichus of four stresses (cf. also st. i). The verse is perhaps an intrusion from the margin.

v. 11. *the pillars of Heaven* are only mentioned here. As Driver explains, they are prob. 'distant mountains, on which the vault of heaven was supposed to rest', like e.g. the classical Atlas. The mountains *rock* or sway to and fro (ירופפו *āp.*) at Iahvah's *rebuke* (Ps 18<sup>16</sup>), Whose voice is the thunder. Cf. 9<sup>5</sup> 36<sup>29</sup> 37<sup>2</sup> Ps 29<sup>3ff. 6</sup>. ὁ ἐπεράσθη = יעופפו; cf. 5<sup>7</sup> Is 6<sup>2</sup> Ps 18<sup>12a</sup>. But רָפַף = *make tremble* (of a pillar), J Gn 44<sup>18</sup>, מַחֲרַפֵּינִי = יַחֲפִלְצוּן 9<sup>6</sup> (of the pillars of the earth), Talm. רַפַּף is to flap the wings (of a bird) = Ar. فرف, to flutter, flap the wings, and رَفَف (= רַפַּף) is to glisten, flash, quiver: see Lane.

St. ii is metr. short (cf. 9<sup>8</sup>). הָרִים *mountains* may have fallen out; or the verse may be a marginal intrusion. (תָּמָה Aram. תָּמָה is cogn. c שָׁמַם, דָּמָה, דָּמָה; cf. Sum. DIM, to bind fast.)

v. 12. *stilleth*: or *stilled*, viz. at the Creation, when he fought and conquered Tiāmat (= Rahab), the great Dragon of the primeval Deep (חָהוּם), as related in the Babylonian Epic of Creation, Tab. IV. See on 7<sup>12</sup> 9<sup>13</sup>. The rendering *he stirreth up* spoils the parallelism. ὁ κατέπαυσεν, *he quieted*. Cf. Ps 65<sup>7</sup> 89<sup>9</sup>. 93<sup>4</sup>. There are many allusions elsewhere to Iahvah's quelling or quieting the sea, but few or none to His disturbing it (cf. Jon 1<sup>4</sup>): see note on רָנַע at 7<sup>5</sup>. Perhaps בקַע, Ps 78<sup>13</sup>. [ᾠ transposes the letters, reading נָעַר בָּיָם *who rebuketh the sea* (= Na 1<sup>4</sup>); ᾠ repente maria congregata sunt (remembering Gn 1<sup>9</sup>) appears to have made אָנַר רָנַע (cf. Pr 6<sup>8</sup> 10<sup>5</sup> ᾠ).] Moreover, the language of vv. 12<sup>b</sup> 13<sup>b</sup> recalls that of Is 51<sup>9</sup>, and is obviously not independent of it (מִזֵּן רָהַב, cf. 51<sup>16</sup> Ju 5<sup>28</sup> for the verb; Is חֲלַל: המַחֲצֵבֶת רָהַב; Is מחולל); but both that passage and Is 27<sup>1</sup> נחש ברח *the Fleeting Serpent* tell not of stirring up or exciting but of quelling the Water-dragon. See also notes on 3<sup>8</sup> 9<sup>13</sup>. ὁ ἔστωται (ᾠ ἔστωσε) τὸ κῆτος = חָלַל חֲנִין: cf. Gn 1<sup>21</sup> Is 51<sup>9</sup> Ez 28<sup>7</sup>. (But κῆτος = לִיתֵן 3<sup>8</sup>: ἡ δὲ τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανόν = עֲזָרִי רָהַב 9<sup>13</sup>.) For the general sense, cf. also Ps 74<sup>13</sup>.

v. 13. מִי lit. *By His breath or breeze the Heavens are beauty* (אָפַר שְׁפָרָה = שְׁפָר Gn 49<sup>21</sup>; Aram. שְׁפָרָה). Perhaps rather הִשְׁפָּר (Aramaism: cf. J Gn 9<sup>27</sup>): *By His breath the Heavens He made fair* (cf. Ps 33<sup>6</sup>); a better parallel to st. ii. Otherwise leg. שְׁפָרָה (שְׁפָרָה) *become fair* Ps 16<sup>6</sup>. Cf. Spiritus eius ornavit caelos. (ᾠ takes חָלַל as in 15<sup>7</sup> 39<sup>1</sup>; ᾠ rectè ἐθανάτωσεν.) ὁ κλείθρα δὲ οὐρανοῦ δεδοίκασιν αὐτόν. προστάγματι δὲ ἐθ.

δράκοντα ἀποστατην misreads ברוחו as בריחי *bars* and שפרה or שפרו as שפרו *shudder* (שערה?; cf. Dt 32<sup>17</sup>); while the second line may be חלל נחש מרר (also due to misreading, as Is 51<sup>9</sup> proves). This last, like חלל ירו נחש ברח, is a line of four stresses, and thus metr. abnormal. The simplest way out of this difficulty, which is a serious one, inasmuch as we have found the rule of the three-stress stichus rigorously observed hitherto, is to suppose that נחש ברח has been substituted for תנין the *Dragon* (= δράκων γ<sup>12</sup> Is 51<sup>9</sup> and about 16 other locc.), having been orig. perhaps a marg. gloss by some one who remembered Is 27<sup>1</sup>. (His *hand* is supported by the 'arm of Iahvah', Is 51<sup>9</sup>; which makes וחלל נחש ברח inadmissible.) The verse is gen. explained of the wind (God's 'breath', Is 40<sup>7</sup>) clearing the sky by blowing away the cloudrack after a storm, and of the slaying or driving away of the great Serpent which was believed to coil round the sun and obscure his light. (Winds were Merodach's chief instruments in subduing Tīāmat: Creation Tab. IV. Cf. Gn 1<sup>2</sup>.) See notes on 3<sup>8</sup>. ☞ *By His Spirit He governeth the Heavens* (ברוחה שמיא מְרַבֵּר); *And His hand killed the Serpent that fled*. The archetypal passage Is 51<sup>9</sup>, however, with its reiterated notes of time (*As in the Days of the Prime, the Ages of Eld*), seems to leave little room for doubt that the allusions are to the exploits of God in subduing the primeval monsters of the chaotic Deep at (and after?) the Creation of the World, as told in the sacred literature of the Babylonian priesthood.

v. 14. *fringes of His Way*: pointing יְרֵכֵי c Ketib ט; cf. Pr 8<sup>a</sup>. God's 'way' is His course of action, or mode of creative procedure, of which only the *ends* or outer edges and outskirts (קְצוֹת Ps 19<sup>7</sup>), the mere extremities, are perceptible to man. Then בּוֹ will refer to יְרֵכֵי: *And what a whisper of a word* (= what a mere whisper) *is heard in it!* (cf. 4<sup>12</sup> 15<sup>8</sup> Ps 92<sup>12</sup>) > *do we hear of Him!* [Since *m*, *n*, are interchangeable, e.g. שָׁטָן, שָׁטָן, the rare שָׁמֵן may be cogn. c Assy. šanāṣu, to revile, slander (שָׁנַן; Abp.), and so c נֶאֱמַן, irrisit, sprexit, as a Shaph. form of the same Prim. Root.] ☞ καὶ ἐπὶ ἱκμάδα λόγου, curiously taking שָׁמֵן as compounded of the Relative ש and יִמְצָא (Le 5<sup>9</sup>) = *what is drained out, moisture* (cf. ומה רי אתמצי מן קצת מלתיא St. iii is prob. an addition: lit. *And the thunder of His prowess* (sing. so Ketib ט ט ט; plur. *feats of pr.* Qerī) *who discerneth* (or *considereth*, or *understandeth*)? 11<sup>11</sup> 23<sup>15</sup> 30<sup>20</sup> 31<sup>1</sup> 32<sup>12</sup> 37<sup>14</sup> 38<sup>18</sup>. ☞ θένος δὲ βροντῆς αὐτοῦ (= וגבורת רעמו) τίς οἶδεν ὅποτε ποιήσει (a mistaken gloss). For רעם see 39<sup>26</sup>; but read perhaps רֵא and גְבוּרָתוֹ (Qerī): *And the sum* (Ps 119<sup>100</sup> 139<sup>17</sup>) *of His exploits who can perceive?*

Chapter 27. Hitherto the heading of Eyob's replies has been simply *And Eyob answered and said*; and a like formula has introduced the

speeches of the friends. Now, for no obvious reason, a new formula arrests our attention: *And Eyob again took up his mashal, and he said*: cf. Nu 23<sup>7-18</sup> 24<sup>3,15,20</sup>. The same variation recurs, 29<sup>1</sup>. There is, however, nothing in the form or diction of the contents of either chapter to distinguish them from previous discourses as specifically 'mashalic'. They are not characterized by terse maxims and proverbial similitudes like those which constitute the main contents of the book named after them (משלי 'Proverbs'); nor are they lyrical effusions like those of Nu 11. cc. (cf. also Is 14<sup>1</sup> Mi 2<sup>4</sup> Ha 2<sup>6</sup>), from which the new heading may indeed have been taken by an editorial hand.

No attentive reader can fail to perceive that Eyob's solemn reiteration of his innocence, vv. 2-6, forms a natural sequel to his ironical address to Bildad, 26<sup>2-4</sup>. It is also in perfect harmony with what he has often said before. But the transition from 26<sup>14</sup> to 27<sup>2ff.</sup> is too abrupt to be original, and the gap is not adequately filled by the introductory formula.

That Eyob should have the last word in the argument with his friends, summing up his own case at great length, as he does in chaps. 29-31, is reasonable enough. What is not reasonable is that he should contradict himself, as he certainly does if 27<sup>7-23</sup> are correctly assigned to him. The wish *Let mine enemy be as the godless!* (v. 7) stands in strange contrast with the supposed speaker's idyllic picture of the lifelong felicity and peaceful end of the godless (21<sup>7ff. 23</sup>). The questions of vv. 8-10 are equally incongruous in the mouth of Eyob (cf. 21<sup>29-33</sup>). Does he include himself with the 'godless' whose cry God will not hear (v. 9)? But he has always steadfastly asserted his own righteousness, and has just declared it on oath ('As God liveth!'), although often complaining that God pays no heed to his appeals and protestations (cf. 16<sup>17f.</sup> 19<sup>7</sup> 23<sup>3,8f. 30<sup>20</sup></sup>). Not only so. The description of God's judgements on the 'godless' (vv. 13-23) is in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the friends and in perfect contradiction to his own view as expressed in chap. 21 (cf. 24<sup>1</sup>). Evidently these sections are erroneously attributed to Eyob, owing prob. to accidental dislocations and lacunae in the Heb. manuscripts and perhaps also to the unskilful patchwork or wilful alterations of editors. However that may be, the solution which recognizes in these verses a third speech of Zophar is, in all probability, correct. They agree in style and sentiment with his previous utterances (chaps. 11, 20); while symmetry of plan is restored to the book by assigning three speeches to each of the three friends (thus nine in all, corresponding to the nine discourses of Eyob) and concluding with Eyob's final restatement and summing up of his case.

v. 1. *his mashal*. A mashal is strictly a *likeness*, *equivalence*, and then a *comparison* or *similitude*; hence a *proverb* or brief popular saying, expressing a *likeness of relations*, a correspondence or analogy, real or



supposed, between two different persons, objects, or sets of circumstances. (מִשְׁלַּח Ni. to be or become *like*, Hi. to *liken*, Assy. *mašālu*, to be *like*, *equal*, *mīšlu*, *half*, *equal part*, *tamšīlu*, *likeness*, *image*, may be referred to the Sum. MASH, *twin*, BAR. *half* = MASH, trilateralized by the addition of the Postposition LI, ל *in* or *into*.)

Θ τῷ προοιμίῳ in (his) *proem* or *exordium* (so also 29<sup>1</sup>; cf. 25<sup>2</sup>). Did the translator confuse this word with προοιμία = מִשְׁלַּח *proverb*?

v. 2. *As El liveth*: or *By the Life of El*!; formula of the sacred oath: lit. *El (is) living* (cf. Ps 18<sup>47</sup>). When the oath is by the life of a human being מֵ is always careful to point יֵ instead of הֵ (see 1 Sa 20<sup>8</sup> for both uses); a theological rather than a logical or grammatical distinction. *who hath set aside my right*: Θ softens this into *who hath so judged me*.

v. 3. St. i is apparently a quotation or reminiscence of 2 Sa 1<sup>3</sup>, with נִשְׁמַתִּי *my breath* pro נַפְשִׁי *my soul* or *life*: cf. Is 42<sup>5</sup>. (The distich looks like an intruder. Perhaps some one thought it necessary to account for the prolonged eloquence of a sufferer so grievously afflicted. He still retains 'life and energy' enough for the lengthy discourse that follows. The verse interrupts the oath, the substance of which is suspended till v. 4.)

v. 4. Eyob swears that all that he has said is true and sincere. In v. 4 Θ ἡ ψυχὴ μου = נַפְשִׁי pro לִשְׁוִי wrongly substituted, because the verb was understood in the sense of *musings* or *meditating* (Pr 24<sup>2</sup>) > that of *uttering* (חֲהַנָּה Is 59<sup>3</sup>: so read here also pro יֵה' מֵ).

v. 5. *Be it far from me*! Ξ Absit a me ut iustos vos esse iudicem! Θ μὴ μοι εἶη δίκαιους ὑμᾶς ἀποσφῆναι! It is gen. assumed that חֲלִילָה = *Ad profanum*! but חֲלִיל *profanus* does not otherwise exist, and the analogy of classical phrases like ἐς βάραθρον, *Peream*! &c., would rather suggest a somewhat similar meaning. Conceivably, חֲלִילָה might be a noun fem. (מַלְעִיל ante (לֵךְ, לֵי) denoting 'the Pit', 'Perdition' (cf. Syr. חֲלִיל, חֲלִילָה a hole, cavity): cf. 1 Sa 24<sup>1</sup> *Perdition to me from Iahvah if I do this thing*, &c.).

Perhaps, however, חֲלִילָה has nothing to do with חֲלִיל, but is a Neg. form of אֲחִיל (2 K 5<sup>3</sup> Ps 119<sup>6</sup>), qs \*אֲחִילָה or אֲחִילָה *O that not*! (an elliptical phrase = *May I not have my wish from Iahvah if, &c.*). St. ii is too long: om. מִמֶּנִּי *from me* c Θ Ξ. *disown*: or *retract*, Is 31<sup>2</sup>, or *cease affirming*.

v. 6. *let it go*: מֵ points אֲרָפָה c Suff. as in 7<sup>10</sup>; some codd. Θ Ξ Ξ carent Suff. ut Pr 4<sup>13</sup> (same parallel).

In st. ii, keeping מִימִי *from my* (earliest) *days* (cf. 38<sup>12</sup> 1 K 1<sup>6</sup>), we might perhaps read חֲרַפְנִי pro יַחְרַף מֵ: *My heart* (i.e. conscience) *hath never reproached me all my life*: cf. Ξ neque enim reprehendit me cor meum in omni vita mea. Θ οὐ γὰρ σύννοδα ἐμαυτῷ ἄτοπα πράξας may represent לֹא־יִחְרַפְנִי לִבִּי מֵאִמּוֹהָ *My heart* (1 Sa 24<sup>6</sup>) *reproacheth me with nothing* (cf. Ju 8<sup>15</sup> Ps 55<sup>13</sup>). Neither יַחְרַף Pi. nor יִחְפֹּר (62<sup>6</sup> Ps 34<sup>6</sup>) is acc. to Heb. use. Perhaps מִימִי לֹא־יִחְרַף־לִי לִבִּי *My heart reproacheth me not with a fault* (11<sup>15</sup> 31<sup>7</sup>). The — ad fin. may be dittogr. of foll. י. Cf. Θ.

v. 7. St. ii seems too short.  $\Theta$  ὥσπερ ἡ ἀπώλεια τῶν παρανόμων ( $\parallel$  ὥσπερ ἡ καταστροφή τῶν ἀσεβῶν) suggests that אִיר (= both καταστρ. and ἀπώλεια. cf. 21<sup>17,30</sup> 31<sup>3</sup>) may have fallen out (כְּאִיר עוֹל as *the ruin of the wrongdoer*). Possibly also it would be an improvement to point אִיבִי and וּמִתְקוֹמְמִי plur. c  $\Theta$  (cf. Ps 59<sup>2</sup>), reading יְהִי יְהִי pro יְהִי.

v. 8. St. i is metr. over weight, as it would seem. We must in any case point יִבְצַע (6<sup>3</sup> cf. Is 38<sup>12</sup>). The phrase כִּי יִבְצַע is usu. rejected as a gloss on the obscure כִּי יִשָּׁל which follows. Of the emendations proposed we prefer בִּי יִשָּׂא אֶל- When he lifeth up his soul (in prayer) to Eloah. This, which is a known phrase (Ps 25<sup>1</sup> La 3<sup>41</sup>), appears to be supported by  $\Theta$  ὅτι ἐπέχει (= *animum advertit*) and  $\Sigma$  At the time when God is taking from him his soul (שָׁקַל לֵה לְנַפְשׁוֹ = יִשָּׂא לִי נַפְשׁוֹ), and agrees better with the context, vv. 9, 10. When God draweth out (יִשָּׁל Apoc. Impf. of שָׁלָה = Syr. שלֵא *extraxit*; or יִשָּׁל or יִשָּׁל from שָׁלַל id., Ru 2<sup>16</sup>) his soul, i.e. his life, apart from the strangeness of the phrase, does not suit the connexion. There is no question of *hope* in the actual hour of death for Eyob and his friends. The three verses (8-10) simply emphasize the idea that the prayer of the godless is vain. Nor is the more attractive יִשָּׂא *asketh* really at all probable; for שָׂא is never used of God's *demanding a man's life*, nor does the verb occur in Job in any other sense than that of asking questions (8<sup>8,24</sup> 12<sup>7</sup> 21<sup>20</sup> 38<sup>3</sup> 40<sup>7</sup> 42<sup>4</sup>), except in 31<sup>30</sup> (of imprecating death on an enemy). Perhaps  $\Theta$  ὅτι ἐπέχει = יִעֲצֹר כִּי (1 K 14<sup>10</sup>) = כִּי יִבְצַע (al. ὅτι πλεονεκτεῖ). For st. ii  $\Theta$  gives πεποιθὼς ἐπὶ κύριον ἄρα σωθήσεται; = כִּי יִצִּיל אֱלֹהִים נַפְשׁוֹ? But cf. also 11<sup>18</sup> 12<sup>6</sup>. (5<sup>A</sup> μὴ πεπ. ἐπὶ κ. εἰ ἄρα σωθ. יִצִּיל (וְאֵם) הֲכִי Is it that (Or will) Eloah deliver his life? This may poss. be orig. Cf. 3 Quae est enim spes hypocritae si avarē rapiat (= 3), Et non liberet Deus animam eius?

v. 10. With st. i cf. Ps 37<sup>4</sup> Is 57<sup>4</sup> (*alio sensu*). For  $\Theta$  ἐχ. παρησ. cf. 22<sup>26</sup>. And call: וְקָרָא pro וְיָקְרָא—an intolerable Asyndeton. Cf.  $\Theta$  3  $\Sigma$ . After this verb we should expect לְאֱלֹהִים (12<sup>4</sup> 19<sup>16</sup>), or אֶל-אֱלֹהִים (so some codd.); cf.  $\Sigma$ . Perhaps וְקָרָא אֵלָיו And call unto Him ( $\Theta$  om. אֵלָיו). Yet cf. also Is 43<sup>22</sup> קָרָא c Accus. Pers.  $\Theta$  st. ii might represent וְאֵם קָרָא אֵם יִבְקָרָא יַעֲחֹר לוֹ or וְקָרָא וְיַעֲחֹר לוֹ or even יַעֲחֹר לוֹ. Cf. Gn 25<sup>21</sup> for the second verb. But בְּכָל-עֵת (Ps 34<sup>2</sup>), 3 *omni tempore*, is supported also by  $\Theta$  1. ( $\Sigma$  ineptly turns the verse into a promise of mercy to the penitent: But if he trust in the Almighty and call unto God continually, God will answer him and hear him. Coloured by  $\Theta$ ?)

vv. 11, 12. If these two distichs really belonged to Eyob originally, we must suppose that they once introduced a very different account of 'the portion of the wicked' from that which follows them in the present text; an account like that which Eyob has already given in chap. 21, but perhaps going so far beyond it as to provoke editorial excision, although, of course, the loss of the original sequel may have been due to an *hiatus*

*valde defendus* in the Heb. manuscripts. Verse 11 would be fairly suitable in the mouth of either Eyob or Zophar (cf. Eliphaz, 15<sup>17</sup>); but v. 12 is certainly more pointed and forcible in the mouth of Eyob, as a challenge to the friends not to uphold arbitrary theories in the face of undeniable experience.

v. 11. *instruct you in*: Ps 25<sup>8</sup> Pr 4<sup>11</sup> (ברוך *in the way*; which would be not inappropriate here). *the Hand*: i.e. the Power, and its exercise, or His doings, mode of action. But ט *τί ἐστίν ἐν χειρὶ* K., *what is in Iahvah's Hand*; as if מַה had fallen out after אַתְּכֶם (ט *יְמִינֵךְ*). This perhaps agrees better with the parallel *what is with Shaddai*; i.e. in His mind or purpose (cf. 10<sup>19</sup>). (אתה *thee* pro אַתְּכֶם *you* is improb. since Eyob has always addressed the friends collectively, except in 12<sup>7,8</sup> and 26<sup>2-4</sup>.)

v. 12. אַתְּמָם הֵן should prob. be אַתְּמָם הֵן with a single stress, metri gratia. St. ii: *And why do ye vapour in vain?* or *And why will ye babble so idly?* by contradicting the evidence of your own eyes (or perhaps your own admission that God's ways are unfathomable and inscrutable to man, e.g. 11<sup>7-9</sup>). Cf. B *Ecce vos omnes nostis; et quid sine causa vana loquimini?* ט<sup>B</sup> *Behold, ye all know | That ye are adding vain things to vain*; a loose paraphrase, which ט<sup>A</sup> corrects *Behold, ye all have seen*; | But why do ye add, &c.

v. 13. St. i is repeated from close of Zophar's second speech, 20<sup>29</sup>; a fact which lends some degree of support to our attribution of the section. Like 20<sup>29a</sup> the stichus is metrically redundant, and the superfluous אֲדָם must be rejected here as there (cf. 9<sup>22,24</sup> 15<sup>20</sup> 24<sup>6</sup> al. for רָשָׁע). *from El*: reading מֵאֵל (cf. מֵאֵלָה 20<sup>29</sup>) pro מֵעַם-אֵל *with El*, which echoes עַם-יִשְׂרָאֵל (v. 11), or may be mere dittogr. of the preceding עַ. So ט *παρὰ Κυρίου*; but B *apud Deum* = מ. Perhaps rather מֵעַם-אֵל *from with El*; God has it in store and it comes from Him: cf. ט<sup>ז</sup>.

St. ii also appears overweighted (cf. 20<sup>29b</sup>), and יָחַו add. mars the parallelism. עֲרִיץ *the violent man, the tyrant*, sing. as || to רָשָׁע (15<sup>20</sup>), seems preferable to the plur. (6<sup>23</sup>: see note there), and agrees better with 'his sons', &c., in what follows. (ט *δυναστών*, B *violentorum* = מ. In accordance with this plur. ט<sup>B</sup> continues with οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν . . . χήρας δὲ αὐτῶν, vv. 14, 15; but returns to the sing. in v. 16 ff. So also ט.)

v. 14. *His sons grow up or are multiplied*: ὁμ. אם *If* (from v. 16?). מ must mean *If his sons multiply* (or *grow up*, 39<sup>1</sup>), (*it is*) *for the sword* = לָמוּ חֶרֶב יִהְיוּ; cf. ט *εἰς σφαγὴν ἔσονται*, B *in* (?) *בְּמוֹ* gladio erunt. Cf. Je 15<sup>2</sup> *לחֶרֶב אֲשֶׁר לָמוּ* *They who are for the sword . . . ואֲשֶׁר לָרָעַב* *and they who are for famine*, &c. לָמוּ = לָּ recurs 29<sup>21</sup> 38<sup>40</sup>. A more logical parallel to st. ii would be לָמוּ-רָעַב *it is for hunger* (5<sup>20</sup>). But see Je 15<sup>2</sup> (*plague, sword, famine* = *sword, famine, plague* here, vv. 14 f.). *his offspring*: נֶאֱמָאִים (5<sup>26</sup> 21<sup>8</sup> = τέκνα; Is 48<sup>19</sup> 61<sup>9</sup> 65<sup>23</sup> = ἔκγονα) *issue*; a word peculiar to II Is and Job. ט suggests וְאִם יָצְאוּ *And if they come* (or *grow*) *up*

(8<sup>16</sup> 14<sup>2</sup>), with its *ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀνδρωθῶσιν, προσαιτήσουσιν*, *And if they have even grown up, they shall beg*. But this version perhaps merely indicates that the translator felt the difficulty discussed above. The slain could not hunger any more.

v. 15. *perish*: יאבדו pro יקברו *are buried*. by the Plague: בַּמָּוֶת: lit. *by the Death*: cf. the old English designation of the Plague as the Black Death. ὁ τελευτήσουσιν = ימותו (1<sup>10</sup> 3<sup>11</sup> 12<sup>2</sup> 14<sup>8</sup> al.). To insert לֹא not before יקברו spoils the formal correspondence of the distich with v. 14 and yields a doubtful sense. (קבר is joined with בַּ of the *place* of burial; and בַּמָּוֶת can hardly mean *when they die* or *when dead*.) St. ii occurs in Ps 78<sup>64</sup> in a similar context. There is little reason to read '*their widows*' instead of '*his widows*' (טט), as all the widows of the ישׁע's tribe or clan are regarded as belonging to the great man himself; and still less to point תִּבְכֶּינָה Ni. (which is not used, though טטט wrongly suggest it in Ps 78<sup>64</sup>) as the widows would naturally weep over their loss on ordinary occasions, but not in times of general and overwhelming calamity (cf. Ez 24<sup>16ff.</sup>).

v. 16. St. i = Zc 9<sup>3b</sup> where חרוץ *gold* in ||, as ט here χρυσίον instead of מלבוש *clothing*, which, however, suits יבין better, and is required by the immediate context, v. 17<sup>a</sup>. For clothes as an important element of wealth, side by side with silver and gold, see Gn 24<sup>53</sup> 45<sup>22</sup> Ex 3<sup>22</sup> 2 K 5<sup>5</sup> 2 C 9<sup>24</sup>.

v. 17. Lit. *He provides, and the righteous (emph.) puts on*. It is what always happens, according to the speaker. ט paraphrases: *All this just (men) will acquire* (περιποιήσονται; app. reading ירכש pro ילבש: Gn 36<sup>6</sup>). ט ἀληθινοί = נקי (hic tant.) perhaps indicates a variant יִשָּׁר in ט's Heb. text (cf. 2<sup>3</sup> 4<sup>7</sup> 8<sup>6</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>).

v. 18. ט *And his house turns out* (ἀπέβη 22<sup>11</sup>) *as moths and as a spider*, incorporating the two readings כעש *like the moth* (טט *sicut tineae*, זכרוביתא) and כעכביש *like the spider* (טז). The latter is prob. right; cf. 8<sup>14</sup>. טא completes the distich by add. δ πολυτος αὐτοῦ (עשרו, a relic of עשה נצר? st. ii). St. ii was partially effaced in ט's manuscript. The *booth* is the temporary screen against the sun, put up by the keeper of a vineyard (Is 1<sup>8</sup>), and soon blown down by the storms of winter.

v. 19. ט lit. *The rich man lies down (in death?), and is not gathered* (for burial, Je 8<sup>2</sup> 25<sup>33</sup>, cf. also Ju 2<sup>10</sup> 2 K 22<sup>20</sup>). There is, however, something strange in this sudden transition from the ישׁע of the introduction (v. 13) to the עשיר. Prob. the latter is due to a misreading of the former word, written in the margin as a gloss. There is no more need to repeat the Subj. here than in vv. 16–18. But this leaves st. i metr. short; and as ולא יוסף לקום is hardly a good || to ואיננו, we restore ולא יוסף לקום *and riseth not again*. After making this emendation, it was satisfactory to find that it was actually the reading of ט (ולא נוסף למקם); cf. also ט καὶ οὐ προσθήσει.

*He openeth his eyes*: i.e. app. in She'ol or Hades, the world of the dead (cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$  which thinks of Ps 49<sup>18</sup>; Lk 16<sup>23</sup> 'in Hades he lifted up his eyes'; also Lk 12<sup>20</sup>).

v. 20. *by day*: יוֹמָם (5<sup>14</sup> 24<sup>16</sup> tant.) pro מַיִם כְּמַיִם like the waters, i.e. a sudden inundation or flood, sweeping everything away. So the Versions; but the other agrees better with the parallel stichus. It may, however, very well be that vv. 20, 21 are explanatory of the general statement of v. 19: *He lieth down (to sleep), and riseth not again*; He wakes and finds himself whirled to destruction by flood and storm. Cf. 22<sup>11,16</sup>.

We must point תַּשְׁבִּיחוֹ plur. pro תַּשְׁבִּיחוֹת with Subj. בְּלִהוֹת (cf. 18<sup>11</sup>), unless that noun be regarded as an Intensive Plur. = extreme terror: cf. Ez 26<sup>21</sup> 27<sup>36</sup> 28<sup>19</sup> where it is connected with אֵין as here (v. 19). See also 18<sup>14</sup> 24<sup>17</sup> 30<sup>15</sup> Ps 73<sup>18</sup> and esp. Is 17<sup>14</sup> בְּלִהוֹת Sing.  $\alpha\pi\tau.$ ). In some, if not all, of these locc., a late Sing. בְּלִהוֹת would suit. With st. ii cf. 21<sup>18</sup> (סוּפָה 37<sup>9</sup>).  $\sigma\upsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$  סוּפָה as for שַׁעֲרָה 17<sup>9</sup>.

v. 21. *Sirocco*: the burning wind from the E. and S.E. deserts (15<sup>3</sup>).  $\sigma\kappa\alpha\upsilon\sigma\omega\nu$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}$  *ventus urens*. St. ii is metr. short. Fort. exc. בְּרִיָּע in a moment (cf. 20<sup>5</sup> 7<sup>18</sup> 21<sup>13</sup> 34<sup>20</sup> Ps 73<sup>19</sup>). *whirleth him away*: cf. Ps 50<sup>8</sup> 58<sup>10</sup>.  $\sigma\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , *winnow (him) away* (usu. = יָרָה: cf. Is 41<sup>16</sup>).

v. 22. Lit. *And he casteth at him* (cf. Nu 35<sup>20</sup>) *and spareth not* (16<sup>19</sup>). Read וַיִּשְׁלֶךְ. *God* may be Subj. subaud., though we have to go back to v. 13 to discover this. Either אֵל has fallen out before עָלָיו, or the reference may perhaps be to the violent action of the wind hurling things upon its victim; but the former view is preferable. וַיִּשְׁלֶךְ sine Obj. is somewhat remarkable (cf. Nu l. c.). It seems to include all the calamities already specified, and to suggest others to the imagination, if any be omitted. The root occurs four times in Job (15<sup>33</sup> 18<sup>7</sup> 27<sup>22</sup> 29<sup>17</sup>) ac. to מַ; but two of these are dubious (see notes on 18<sup>7</sup> 29<sup>17</sup>).

v. 23. מַ (evidently more or less corrupt) lit. *He claps at them their palms, And hisses at him from his place*. The forms כַּפֵּימוֹ, עָלֵימוֹ are foreign to the style of Job (cf. st. ii עָלָיו, the normal form). The ו of the second word may be dittogr. of the foll. ו; read therefore כַּפֵּימֵי, after La 2<sup>15</sup> (although כַּפֵּי would also be possible, Nu 24<sup>10</sup>). But even so the Subj. of the verb יִשְׁפֹּק (= יִסַּפֵּק; see locc. citt.) is not clear. It may be El (see note on v. 22). Iahvah jeers at His enemies, Pss 2<sup>4</sup> 59<sup>3</sup>, and He 'hisses' to summon nations, &c., Is 5<sup>26</sup> 7<sup>18</sup> Zc 10<sup>8</sup>. But שָׂרַק is more usual as an expression of human hatred and derision (La 2<sup>16,16</sup> Je 19<sup>8</sup> al.), and does not appear to be said of God in such a sense elsewhere. Moreover, the reference to God makes מִמֶּקְמוֹ from his place difficult, as in that case it would have to mean from Heaven (cf. Rabb. use of מִקוֹם), since יִשְׂרָאֵל עָלָיו מִמֶּי cannot mean hiss him out of his place, but only hiss at him from his place. Cf. Ez 3<sup>12</sup> Mi 1<sup>8</sup>. מִמְּרוֹם from the Height has been proposed; but the usage of Job would require the plur. (16<sup>19</sup> 25<sup>2</sup> 31<sup>2</sup>).

To read the verbs as plur. indef. (*they*, i. e. men, *clap*, *hiss*) is a doubtful expedient in the context; and the repetition of עליו, though not ungrammatical, is suspicious. The parallel passages cited above (add 1 K 9<sup>8</sup> Zp 2<sup>15</sup> Is 55<sup>12</sup> Je 50<sup>13</sup>) suggest

יספק עובר כפים

וישרק עלי כל מכות(י):ו

*The passer-by clappeth hands,*

*And hisseth at all his plagues.*

Cf. 18<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>29</sup>. (St. ii possibly וישרק על-יוֹם פירו (אידו) *And hisseth at the day of his ruin.*)

Chapter 28. THE PRAISE OF WISDOM. *Other things accounted precious have sources whence man obtains them; but the source of Wisdom, the thing of supreme value, is beyond the search of man, and known to God alone.* Although this unique discourse begins with the word *For* (כי), it gives no justification for the statements which, in the present text, immediately precede it (27<sup>13-23</sup>). It is equally out of all visible relation to the immediate sequel (chaps. 29-31), in which Eyob reviews at length his past life and affirms his blamelessness as stoutly as ever (cf. 27<sup>2-6</sup>). To secure a place for the chapter in Eyob's discourse, Bickell and others make it the continuation of 27<sup>11,12</sup>, while freely revising and rejecting more than half of its contents. Even this expedient, however, cannot hide from us the fact that the connexion so effected is only external. Instead of furthering, the chapter really interrupts the course and progress of the argument; and the conclusion of the whole (v. 28), however true in itself, is not the point of Eyob's previous or subsequent pleadings. (See the note ad loc., and cf. Pr 1<sup>7</sup> 9<sup>10</sup> Ec 1<sup>2</sup>). This conclusion, indeed, might have been more appropriately put into the mouth of one of Eyob's three antagonists, all of whom have maintained that Eyob's calamities are direct and irrefragable evidence that he has *not* 'feared God and departed from evil'; while he himself (in complete harmony with what may be called a postulate of the book, 1<sup>1</sup>) has steadily and consistently affirmed the contrary. In the following chapters he reaffirms his consciousness of innocence and his confident readiness to confront his Divine Adversary if He will but vouchsafe him a hearing (31<sup>35-37</sup>); after which, no doubt, the original poem proceeded at once to the *dénouement* of Iahvah's answer out of the whirlwind (38<sup>1</sup>).

As regards the substance of chap. 28, it must be admitted that the long description of the wonders of mining (vv. 1-11), and the elaborate enumeration of gems and precious metals which are worthless for the purchase of Wisdom (vv. 15-19), provide neither a natural sequel to Eyob's passionate protest, 27<sup>2-6</sup>, nor any clear fulfilment of the promise, 27<sup>11</sup>. The latter passage (vv. 15-19), which might almost be an extract from the Book of Proverbs (cf. Pr 3<sup>14,15</sup> 8<sup>11,19</sup> 16<sup>16</sup>; cf. also the lists of gems,

Ex 28<sup>17-20</sup> Ez 28<sup>18</sup>), is remote from the usual thought and diction of Job (cf. 21<sup>8ff.</sup> 22<sup>24f.</sup> and the Prologue and Epilogue, where we find no mention of gems among the tokens of wealth). Lastly, if vv. 23-27 originally belonged here, we can only call them an inartistic anticipation of the Divine utterances, 38<sup>25. 35ff.</sup> (cf. also Pr 3<sup>19f.</sup> 8<sup>22-30</sup>).

Throughout the chapter, with the exception of the last verse (see the note), 'Wisdom' appears to denote insight into the Creator's methods of working in the physical world (see the innumerable questions with which Iahvah confounds Eyob in chaps. 38 sqq.); a topic hardly discussed at all in Eyob's preceding speeches and in the long soliloquy with which he concludes his case against God and man. The poetical merits of the piece ought not to blind us to the perception of its irrelevance in its present context, nor to the probability that, if Eyob had raised the question, he would not have handled it in this fashion.

v. 1. The gap in style and sentiment, in thought and expression, between this and the last chapter, is too obvious to escape the notice even of a cursory reader. We should at least have expected the bridge of an introductory heading like that of 27<sup>1</sup>. Assuming that the chapter was originally an independent piece drawn from another source, Duhm accounts for the opening Ptc. *For* by the ingenious supposition that the 'Refrain'

*Wisdom, whence is it found?*

*And where is the Place of Insight?*

(see vv. 12, 20) once preceded it. This expedient is at least preferable to rendering יָדָא by *Surely*, which is against ordinary usage.

*they refine*: Rel. clause. For the verb, see Ps 12<sup>1</sup>. It occurs in another sense, 36<sup>21</sup> (Elihu).

v. 2. *earth*: or *the soil or ground* (עפר *dust*: 4<sup>19</sup> 5<sup>6</sup> al.). *it is taken* (Gn 3<sup>19. 23</sup>). There is no need to point יָקָח. St. ii lit. *And (the) stone, it poureth copper* (i.e. when smelted). The 'stone' is, of course, the 'Vein Rock' which is the matrix of the metal. Cf. Dt 8<sup>9</sup> *A land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayst hew copper*. The verb יָצַק, which recurs 29<sup>6</sup> (q.v.), should perhaps be pointed יָצַק, *scr. plen.* = יָצַק, Impf. of יָצַק *effudit* > of the dub. יָצַק: see 11<sup>16</sup> 22<sup>16</sup> 37<sup>18</sup> 38<sup>38</sup> 41<sup>18. 16</sup> Gn 28<sup>18</sup>. Moreover, the gender of אֶבֶן (1 Sa 17<sup>40</sup> et pass.) requires תָּצַק ('י' due to influence of || 'ק'). The Ho. תִּיצֶק (22<sup>16</sup>): *And the stone is poured out as copper or cast, smelted into copper* (cf. 1 K 7<sup>16. 23</sup>) seems also possible. ☉ *And copper is quarried like stone* (?) תַּחֲצֵב: 19<sup>24</sup> Is 51<sup>1</sup>).

v. 3. In מ a tristich. But תַּכְלִית is usually followed by a defining Genit. (11<sup>7</sup> 26<sup>10</sup>), which in this case would naturally be some syn. of חֶשֶׁן, perhaps the אֶבֶן preserved in st. iii. The כָּל before תַּכְלִי may well be dittogr., and instead of the Prep. ל usage suggests עַר (although, as חֶשֶׁן takes a simple Accus., 5<sup>27</sup> 13<sup>0</sup> 29<sup>16</sup> 32<sup>11</sup>, a Prep. is hardly needed). Further,

the phrase חשך וצלמות (3<sup>5</sup> 10<sup>21</sup>, cf. 34<sup>22</sup> Ps 107<sup>10,14</sup>) justifies restoration of וצלמות, the last word of st. iii, to st. i. Thus we get the distich

קץ-שם לחשך וצלמות

ועד תכלית אפל הוא חוקר :

*An end he puts to darkness and deathshade,  
And the limits of gloom he explores.*

The miner does this by opening to the light the mountain sides within which the metallic ores lie hidden. If the meaning be that the miner carries a lantern, why is not the lantern expressly mentioned?

v. 4. מ lit. *He breaks through (or into or open) the wady from with the sojourner | Which are forgotten (masc. plur.) by the foot | They hang (?) (far?) from men they waver (swing? wander?)*. Another tristich, evidently very corrupt. It is generally taken for granted that the verse describes how the miner is let down deep into the earth by a rope. So Driver; who suggests אר light for גר sojourner. But even so, st. ii remains out of all grammatical connexion with st. i; and if we connect it with st. iii (*They who are forgotten by the foot swing, &c.*), we violate the metrical structure and substitute prose for poetry. It is possible that the third line (דלו מאנוש נעו) has grown out of marginal variants or corrections of the second (הנשכחים מני רגל): see Duhm, who restores the verse as follows:

פרין נחל מני רגל  
דלו במושכה נעו

*Man broke away a shaft under the foot;  
So man hangs down swaying on the rope.*

But here, as always, נחל means *wady, torrent-bed, ravine*, and *shaft* is only a guess from the context (*Thes.* 'Prob. *puteus metallicus*'). The phrase מני רגל can hardly stand for מתחת רגל; and if it could, the whole sentence would still be very strange. Besides, ancient mines were worked by lateral adits rather than by deep vertical shafts (e.g. those of the old Egyptian sovereigns in the *Wady Maghāra*, or 'Valley of Caverns', in the Sinaitic peninsula).

Duhm regards מעם גר, st. i, as an inferior variant of מני רגל, st. ii; and similarly, he takes הנשכחים as a variant of אנש נעו; both the latter being assumed to be perversions of the true reading במשכה נעו (38<sup>1</sup>; במושכה). This is certainly very ingenious, if nothing more. In any other context st. iii would naturally be rendered *They are brought low* (cf. Ps 79<sup>8</sup> Is 19<sup>6</sup>); *away from man they wander* (cf. Gn 4<sup>12</sup> נעו). Perhaps גלו should be read דלו (cf. 2 Sa 15<sup>19</sup>), so that the stichus would mean *They are exiled (and) wanderers from men*—a possible gloss on ער (vid. *infr.*).



A better sense emerges for st. i if we make the very slight change of pointing עם *people* pro מִעִם *with*, and connect the מ with the preceding נחל (thus gaining a Subj. for the vb. and an antecedent for the following הנשכחים, which otherwise, like the supposed miner, hangs in the air):

*The foreign folk breaketh up the ravines,  
Forgotten of the foot (i. e. long untrodden).*

The mines and quarries of Sinai were worked by foreigners, Phoenicians and others. Cf. B Dividit torrens a populo peregrinante eos quos oblitus est pes egentis hominis, et invios (dividing נָעוּ וּמֵאוּשׁ נָעוּ (רל) ומאוּשׁ נָעוּ). C διακομή χεῖμαρρον ἀπὸ κοινίας = פָּרַץ נָחַל מִ(עִם) נָר (points; cf. Is 27<sup>9</sup> 2 Sa 6<sup>9</sup>) only confirms מ. οἱ δὲ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι ὁδὸν δικαίαν ἡσθένησαν ἐκ βροτῶν = וְנָשְׁכָהּ הַשְׂכָּחִים מִעֵנַל יִשָּׁר דָּלּוּ מֵאֲנוּשׁ (app. om. נָעוּ).

An unfrequented glen might poetically be said to be 'forgotten of the foot' (of travellers); but to say of a man hanging by a rope in a shaft, or working underground, that he was 'forgotten of the foot' (instead e.g. of 'forgotten of the passer-by', עֹבֵר, or of the people above) would be an illogical obscurity of expression. The foot is not the organ of remembrance.

v. 5. 'The earth provides man with food; but, not content with that, in his search for metals he overturns her ruinously underneath' (Driver): cf. RV which, however, would require נִהְפָּכָה f. instead of מִנִּהְפָּךְ m. St. ii is probably corrupt. X thinks of the fire of Gehenna; but the reference may well be to precious stones (cf. v. 6). We might perhaps read אֲשֶׁר אֲבִי אֲשׁוּ (נִצְפָּנוּ?) וְתַחְתִּיהָ נִחְבּוּ And under her are hidden stones of fire (Ez 28<sup>14,16</sup>); or as the סָפִיר follows in v. 6, וְיִשְׁפָּה נִפְךְ carbuncle and jasper might be substituted for מִנִּהְפָּךְ כִּמוּ אֵי: see Ez 28<sup>13</sup> (Ex 28<sup>10</sup>) יִשְׁפָּה סָפִיר נִפְךְ. (It may be more than a mere coincidence that in the previous verse of Ez l. c. חֲכָמָה Wisdom is mentioned, as also before in vv. 3, 5, 7.) In st. i also (which has four stresses) we may suppose a ref. to gems > bread, reading מִנִּי-אֶרֶץ יֵצֵא לֶשֶׂם Out of Earth cometh the jacinth (Ex 28<sup>13</sup>); or perhaps יְהִלִּם the onyx (?).

v. 6. Her stones are the place of the sapphire (C σαφείρον; so CXX); others lapis lazuli, in view of st. ii, which is then supposed to mean Which hath specks of gold. But עֲפָרִית plur. of עָפָר dust, earth (Pr 8<sup>26</sup> tant.) is improbable in this sense; and Ex 24<sup>10</sup> Ez 1<sup>26</sup> 10<sup>4</sup> suggest a transparent > an opaque blue. מִ And dusts of gold it (the place of the sappir) hath. Either way we get an indifferent parallel. To correspond to her stones we should expect her dust (עֲפָרִיתָהּ her earths or clods?); and we might perhaps read לָמוּ ad fin. pro לֹא: And her clods have gold: or keeping מִנִּי וְהָבָה, we might render And they (her stones) have nuggets (?) of gold. (C seems to have read וְעֲרַפְתָּ And a dripping (of gold), &c., instead of וְעֲפָרְתָּ, as it gives וְעֲרַפְתָּ וְיִשְׁפָּה.) Ex 28<sup>13</sup>, where

נֶפֶס כַּפִּיר וַיְהִי־לָהֶם are mentioned together, suggests the possibility of the line *And her dusts are gold and onyx (?)*.  $\Theta$  καὶ χῶμα χρυσίου αὐτῶν,  $\mathfrak{B}$  et glebae illius aurum. Perhaps יִהְיֶה לָמוֹ or יִבְרָקֶת לָמוֹ or יִהְיֶה בִּרְקֶת לָמוֹ *And they have the sheen of the emerald*.

v. 7. There is no visible connexion between this verse and the last.

RV's 'That path no bird of prey knoweth' (i.e., as Driver explains, the path found by the miner) is not a permissible translation.  $\mathfrak{M}$  may be rendered: *A (The) path, no eagle knows it, And the hawk's eye hath not descried it*, or *A (The) path which no eagle knows, &c.* Why should birds of prey and wild beasts be supposed unfamiliar with the mountainous scenes of mining operations? It is not the path to the mines, but the path to the 'place' of Wisdom that is hidden from the 'birds of the air' (v. 21). The mountains and deserts are the natural haunt of the birds and beasts of prey, and nothing, however remote, escapes their marvellous powers of sight. But Wisdom is beyond the range even of *their* almost miraculous vision. It is highly probable, therefore, that some reference to Wisdom preceded this verse; in fact, the refrain of vv. 12, 20:

*But Wisdom, whence cometh it?*

*And where is the place of Insight?*

We may then read נָחִיבוּ לֹא יָרַע עֵינָיו *The path thereto no eagle knows* (i.e. the path to the 'place' of Wisdom; cf. 38<sup>19,20</sup>).

v. 8. *Sons of Pride*: 41<sup>26</sup>. (שַׁחֲצָא = lion,  $\mathfrak{X}$  Ps 17<sup>12</sup>; but var. שַׁחֲלָא.) No doubt, majestic wild beasts are intended; cf. st. ii.  $\mathfrak{X}$  בְּנֵי אַרְיוֹן *sons of lions*;  $\Theta$  υἱοὶ ἀλαζόνων;  $\mathfrak{B}$  filii institorum, *sons of pedlars*!

v. 9. *flint*: חִלְמִישׁ. There can be little doubt that this word is etym. identical with the Assyr. *elmešu*, *ilmēšu*, *elmūšu*, *elmīšu*, a brilliant precious stone, the Sum. equivalent of which (SUD-AM) means *light* (*nūru*) or *glittering*. The Semitic word may be compared with the Sum. ĠAD, ĠUD, *bright*, GIR, *lightning*, GIRIM, *bright*, a kind of gem (*samtu*), GAR, AR, *light*, ĠUL, *joy* (brightness), MUL, UL (from GUL), *star*, *glitter* (cf. UL, *joy*), EL, *bright*, and MAŠ, *bright, shining*. The Greek ΑΔΑΜΑC, *diamond, steel*, may perhaps be of the same origin.  $\Theta$  ἐν ἀποτόμῳ, *on (the) abrupt rock or precipice* (see also Dt 8<sup>15</sup>).  $\mathfrak{B}$  ad silicem, *towards the flint*.

St. ii seems hyperbolic, as a description of ancient mining. Cf. 9<sup>6</sup>. (It is possible that vv. 9-11 originally followed v. 4.)

v. 10.  $\mathfrak{M}$  בְּצִוְרוֹת  $\mathfrak{A}^{\pi}$  = בצורים (8 occ.): *In the rocks (cliffs) he cleaveth* (opens) *watercourses* (or *channels*); i.e. either the damp, dripping tunnels or 'workings' themselves, or else gutters to carry off their moisture, which seems more likely. For יַאֲרִים, str. *Nile-arms*, see Is 33<sup>21</sup>. Cf. also Ps 78<sup>15</sup>. An leg. מִבְּקַע לְאוֹר *Things inaccessible* (cf. Je 33<sup>3</sup>) *he breaks open to the light (?)*.  $\Theta$  δίνας δὲ ποταμῶν ἔρρηξεν, fort. מְצִוִּלוֹת (41<sup>23</sup>); cf. note τὰ κοιλάματα τῶν ὑδάτων τὰς ἱλίσσας, *the cavities of the*

waters, the whirlpools ( $\text{B}^{\text{A}}$  mg. inf.);  $\text{C}^{\text{C}}$  θίνας ποτ. = dunes.  $\text{C}$  connects waters with בצורות with  $\checkmark$  בצר (vid. supr.). But  $\text{B}$  In petris rivos excidit =  $\text{M}$ .

v. 11. This looks like a variant of v. 10.

St. i.  $\text{M}$  lit. *From weeping the rivers (or canals) he bound up*; which is supposed to mean that the miner prevents water from percolating into the workings (Driver). Obviously this is no parallel to st. ii. Moreover, חבש Pi. does not recur in OT in the sense of *restraining*, nor is this Root found in Job except in 5<sup>18</sup>, where it has its ordinary meaning (34<sup>17</sup> 40<sup>13</sup> are corrupt: see notes). If with  $\text{C}^{\text{C}}$  (ἐξηρεύνησεν;  $\text{B}$  scrutatus est) we read חפש he searched, and for the dub. מבכי substitute the very similar נבכי springs (38<sup>16</sup> Pr 8<sup>24</sup>  $\text{C}$ ), or מעמקי depths, we get a better || to st. ii.

$\text{C}$  βάθῃ δὲ ποταμῶν ἀνεκάλυψεν = נָלָה וְנִמְכִּי נְהָרוֹת נָלָה; cf. 12<sup>22</sup> Pr 9<sup>18</sup>. In st. ii leg. וְחַלְמוֹת יָצָא לְאוֹר (or וְחַלְמוֹת הוֹצִיא לְאוֹר) And hidden things he brings into the light: cf. 11<sup>6</sup> 12<sup>22</sup>. ( $\text{C}$  δύναιμι = 'חלמ' as in 11<sup>6</sup>.)

Do vv. 10, 11 refer to mining at all? Such words as יארים (plur. of יאר, יאור, the Nile), which commonly, if not always, means the arms and canals of the Nile in the Delta (Ex 8<sup>1</sup> Is 19<sup>6</sup> 33<sup>21</sup> Am 8<sup>8</sup> Ez 29<sup>3ff.</sup> 10 Zc 10<sup>11</sup>), and נהרות rivers, plur. of נהר (14<sup>11</sup> 20<sup>17</sup> 22<sup>16</sup> 40<sup>23</sup>), appear altogether extravagant in their assumed application. The term נהר always implies a considerable volume of running water, denoting either an independent stream or a river-canal (Egypt, Babylonia), and is never app. used of an artificial channel or gutter for carrying off water, for which other terms were available, e.g. תעלה, Ez 31<sup>4</sup>. The word, in fact, is mostly used of the great rivers of the world, esp. the Euphrates, 'The River', 'The Great River', and the Nile (Gn 2<sup>13.14</sup> 15<sup>18</sup> 31<sup>21</sup> Is 19<sup>6</sup>), and poet. of the ocean floods ('the running seas'), Jon 2<sup>4</sup> Ps 24<sup>2</sup> 93<sup>3</sup>. We have not to think of the vast underground workings of modern mines and their methods of preventing and overcoming floods. The two verses almost appear to describe works of Divine rather than human activity (cf. v. 24; Ps 78<sup>16.20</sup> 105<sup>41</sup> Hab 3<sup>9</sup>). Possibly, however (supposing the two verses still stand in their orig. context), the reference is to collecting gold and other precious things (e.g. pearls and other gems) from the beds of rivers. In that case, read מצולות יאר (cf. Is 44<sup>27</sup> Zc 10<sup>11</sup>) as parallel to 'נבכי נהר', and translate

*The depths of Niles he cleaves . . .*

*The sources of rivers he searches . . .*

v. 12. cometh it: reading תבוא (v. 20) pro תמצא  $\text{M}$  (ditlogr. of v. 13<sup>b</sup>).

v. 13. the way to her: leg. ררכה  $\text{C}$   $\text{C}$  ὁδὸν αὐτῆς (cf. v. 23) pro ערכה her price (anticipation of v. 15).

v. 14. There seems no need to alter אמר: cf. Hab 3<sup>10</sup>.

v. 15. The  $\alpha\pi$ . קנור should prob. be pointed קנור, which occurs 1 K 6<sup>20f.</sup> 10<sup>21</sup> in the phrase וְהָיָה קנור solid or massive gold (as distinct from gilding or gold leaf?). סנור is lit. closed, i.e. app. close or close-grained.

Whatever the exact implication, the Heb. phrase certainly corresponds to Sargon's Assyr. *hurāṣu sakru* (= חרוץ סכר), *sekēru* (סכר) being the Assyr. equivalent of סגר *to shut, close up* (3<sup>10</sup> 12<sup>14</sup> 41<sup>7</sup>). Perhaps זהב *gold* should be inserted here; the phrase being regarded metr. as a single word. ט συνακλισμόν (so also Ho 13<sup>8</sup> where סגור is prob. corrupt). B aurum obrizum (so 2 C 3<sup>5</sup> = זהב טוב *fine gold*); cf. obrussa, *assaying or testing gold by fire*; χρυσίον ὀβριζόν, *refined gold* (Ducange). Since the names of the metals are mostly colour-terms, e.g. זהב = צהב *bright, yellow*, חרוץ *hurāṣu*, id., it seems possible that סכר *sakru* may have sprung from Sum. SIG, *yellow* (cf. also SIG <|—|> *bright, purified, refined* of silver, KUBABAR SIG DIM = kima ṣarpi ṣurrupī, 'like refined silver'; SHAG, *bright, purify*), trilateralized by addition of the Pp. R (RA, RU, IR); so that B would be practically right.

v. 16. *poised or weighed*: תסלה = תסלה (La 4<sup>2</sup>). So again v. 19<sup>b</sup>, where we have the same stichus repeated with the var. טהור *pure* pro אופיר *of Ophīr*. B Non conferetur (cf. ט *tinctis Indiae coloribus*; perhaps connecting the late poet. כהם *gold* with כהם Aram. *stain, defile*. The Rt. may be identical with that of רם *blood*, אדם *red*, Assyr. *adamu*, a syn. of *sāmu*, trilateralized by the Pref. כ *like*, or it may be compared with Sum. GUSH in GUSH-KIN, *gold*, ĠUSHA, an epithet of gold, *bright* or perhaps *red*, akin to ĠASH, ĠAD, ĠUD, *shining* + Afform. M; so that כהם would be 'red gold', as our own poets say.

*onyx*: so ט ἐν ὄνυχι τιμύμ; cf. B lapidi sardonicho pretiosissimo. ט שם (Gn 2<sup>12</sup>) should perhaps be pointed שֵׁהם, related to Assyr. *sāmtu*, *sāndu*, as תהים to Assyr. *tāmtu*, *tāmdu*. The *sāmtu* was called in Sum. the 'sparkling' (GUG) or 'clear', 'pure' (GIRIM) stone; the latter perhaps indicating transparency. The Assyr. adj. *sāmu*, f. *sāmtu*, is somewhat vague in application, like other colour-terms. It covers various shades of brown (e.g. *imēru sāmu*, 'a dun ass'; *hurāṣu sāmu*, 'yellow gold'). The Heb. שֵׁהם was perhaps the beryl (so ט) or chrysoberyl; but the data are insufficient for any certain identification of ancient with modern precious stones: see the Bible Dictionaries.

v. 17. Read זהב מוקק (1 C 28<sup>18</sup>) pro זהב וחוכית = ט χρυσίον καὶ ὕαλος, B aurum vel vitrum. The sing. verb is against מ (cf. also v. 19<sup>a</sup>); and however costly glass may have been in the author's time, it can hardly have ranked with gold as equally or more precious. If וחוכית be right, it must denote some kind of gem or precious stone (cf. v. 19). It is found nowhere else in OT; and ק is easily and often confused with כו or כי and מ with ת. (Is וחוכית due to recollection or imitation of Syr. and Talm. וְנִינְיָא *glass*?)

יערכנה = יערך לה (cf. Is 40<sup>18</sup>) *is comparable or equal to it*.

St. ii. Leg. fort. פו לחמ' לא יכל Nor can beaten gold enable its exchange (cf. 42<sup>2</sup> Ho 8<sup>5</sup>) or *avail as its exchange*. כלי (or כלי plur. 11 codd.

ⓈⓈⓈ) פו is not found elsewhere, and the Neg. Ptc. (1 cod. Kenn.) and a verb seem desirable. Cf. Ⓢ Nec commutabuntur pro ea vasa auri = ולא יומרו בה כלי פו. The word פו is possibly from a פון = Assyr. pazāzu, 'to beat', 'crush'; cf. Ar. فضة (wrought) silver, from فץ to break in pieces. (On מופו see Burney ad 1 K 10<sup>18</sup>).

v. 18. The gems are again uncertain, as is shown by the Verss. Ⓢ μετέωρα καὶ γαβεῖς (=translit. of נביש); Ⓢ excelsa et eminentia; as if ראמות (Ez 27<sup>10</sup>) were רמות (Aram. ראמה a height), and נביש connected with Aram. גיבשא a heap, hill or with נביש (5<sup>26</sup> 21<sup>32</sup>). Ⓢ סנדרין וברילין sardonyxes (?) and beryls (the former is compared with the Greek σανδαράκη, orange colour, σάνδυξ, &c. Corals is Qimhi's interpr. of ראמות. Perhaps אדם וברקת, associated with פטרה Ex 28<sup>17</sup>. As to נביש Ⓢ ὑπερημένα cf. Ⓢ), the mg. rock-crystal is only an inference from comparison of אל-נביש hail, Ar. جبس gibs, gypsum, the uses of the Gk. κρύσταλλος (ice, crystal), and the Eth. ebna barad, hailstone, crystal; which can hardly be regarded as certain. Possibly this ἀπ. λεγόμεν. covers ושב (Ex 28<sup>10</sup>).

St. ii. Ⓢ משיך (Ⓢ points משיך ἑλκυσον, though Infin. would yield a better sense) is supposed to mean that the drawing (i.e. fishing, cf. 40<sup>26</sup>) up of Wisdom is better than (the drawing up of) corals (see OL). This use of משיך being dub. (cf. Gn 15<sup>2</sup>), we suggest מנכש (= מכש) or מנשית (= מנחת Le 27<sup>23</sup>) valuation, value, worth. Otherwise, leg. מנכר price (Pr 31<sup>10</sup>) or מחיר id. Rashi explains פנינים as pearls, but La 4<sup>7</sup> implies something of a red colour, perhaps red coral, which is more valuable than the white kind (? ראמות): cf. Pr 31<sup>8</sup> 31<sup>10</sup>. Ⓢ τὰ ἐσώτατα = פנימים, Ⓢ de occultis.

v. 19. See on vv. 16<sup>a</sup>, 17<sup>a</sup>. The verse sounds more like an echo than a fresh note here; marring, as it seems to do, the climactic effect of the last. [It is difficult to believe that פטרה topaz Ⓢ τοπάζιον, Ⓢ topazius) is masc. יערכ' is prob. due to v. 17. Ⓢ the pearls of Cush and stones of the Ephod app. gives two equivalents for פטרת כוש; the latter identifying פטרת with פרתא = אפור)]

v. 20. For מל תבוא cometh, Ⓢ venit, which seems preferable also in v. 12, Ⓢ ἐρέθη = תמצא as there.

v. 21. It is hid: omitting מ's initial ! c ⓈⓈⓈ.

all living: כל חי, including both man and beast, or either alone. See 12<sup>10</sup> Gn 3<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>19</sup> 8<sup>21</sup>. Here כל חיה all (the) wild beasts would perhaps give a better || to st. ii: cf. vv. 7, 8, 5<sup>22,23</sup> 40<sup>20</sup>. But חיה without a defining genit. is not so used elsewhere in Job, except in the Elihu-section (37<sup>8</sup>).

v. 22. Abaddon: 26<sup>6</sup> 31<sup>12</sup>. Death seems here to be a syn. of Abaddon or She'ol (Pr 5<sup>5</sup>, cf. chap. 38<sup>17</sup>), the place of the dead, Hades, > a personification of our last enemy in the modern fashion.

We have heard mere hearsay: lit. with our ears, as in 2 Sa 7<sup>22</sup> Ps 44<sup>2</sup>.

Cf. also 42<sup>b</sup>. The dead know no more of Wisdom than they heard about her on earth.

v. 23. *God*: אלהים. This word, rare in Proverbs, occurs elsewhere in Job only in the Prologue and in the Elihu-section (32<sup>2</sup> 34<sup>9</sup>) and once in the phrase בני אלהים 'The Sons of God' in the poem itself (38<sup>7</sup>). In 5<sup>8</sup> 20<sup>29</sup> it is almost certainly corrupt (see the notes ad locc.). (With Suff. it is not found in Job, and only once or twice in Proverbs.) If original here, it adds force *pro tanto* to the argument against the authenticity of the chapter. ὁ θεός, but perhaps α<sup>a.c.</sup> AC κς = יהוה is right (cf. v. 28).

*discerneth*: הבין: as in 38<sup>20</sup>. In 13<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>9</sup> al. *understand*, 62<sup>4</sup> *teach*; 9<sup>11</sup> 23<sup>8</sup> *perceive*. (ἔβη συνέστυθεν = הבין; so some codd.: but cf. the parallel ידע and 38<sup>20</sup>.)

v. 24. *ends of the Earth*: Is 40<sup>26</sup> 41<sup>5.9</sup>. Here only in Job. Cf. 26<sup>14</sup> (קצות). *looketh to*: הִבִּיט = *look at*, Ps 104<sup>32</sup>. The verb is abs. 6<sup>19</sup> and prob. 39<sup>29</sup>; takes an Accus. Obj. in Elihu-sect. 35<sup>5</sup> 36<sup>25</sup>. Not elsewhere in Job as here. *under the whole of Heaven*: Gn 7<sup>19</sup> Dn 9<sup>12</sup>. The phrase recurs in Job only 37<sup>3</sup> (Elihu), 41<sup>5</sup> (AV 11). It seems to suit the context (and metre) better if we transpose כל תחת and point בל, as an accented word: *All things under the Heavens He seeth*, and therefore also the 'place' of Wisdom and the 'way' to it. Cf. ἔβη εἰδὼς τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ πάντα, Ὡς et omnia quae sub caelo sunt respicit.

v. 25. מַעֲשֵׂה לַעֲשׂוֹת *to make*, connecting the verse with the last; as though stating the purpose of God's all-comprehensive survey (cf. Dr *in making*). But ἔποίησεν, עָשָׂה *He made*; Ὡς Qui fecit ventis pondus: i.e. at the Creation, which seems to be what is meant: cf. Is 40<sup>12.13</sup> (מִי . . . מִדֶּר . . . תִּכְנֶן . . . רֹחַ) 26<sup>8</sup> Pr 30<sup>4</sup>. Read בַּעֲשׂוֹתוֹ *When He made*, as v. 26, and connect with what follows. (הַעֲשָׂה = רַעְבַּד.) Cf. also Pr 8<sup>27 ff.</sup>

v. 26. *law*: or *limit*: 26<sup>10</sup> 38<sup>10</sup>. ἔκαὶ ἐποίησεν οὐτως ἰδὼν ἡρίθμηνσεν = אִזְּרָה רֹאֶה וְיִסְפֵּר (= v. 27<sup>a</sup>) *בעשותו*. The translator's eye wandered to the line below. Ὡς Quando ponebat pluviis legem.

St. ii is repeated in 38<sup>25 b</sup>. In both places we should prob. read plur. חֲיוּיִי after Zc 10<sup>1</sup> עֲשֵׂה חֲיוּיִים, where מָטָר *rain* is connected with thunder. The meaning is not altogether certain. *Thunderbolts* or *levinbolts* or *lightning-shafts* would suit. For the latter, cf. Je 10<sup>13</sup> *lightnings for the rain He made*. The Jewish explanation *bright clouds*, i.e. clouds illuminated by lightning, seems to connect חֲיוּיִי with the root חוה *to see* (cf. ἔ here: *And a way רָקֵלָה לַחֲוֹנָה for the shows of voices*): but this is a mere fancy. The Root חוה is a double (more primitive) form of חָצַץ, whence חֲצִץ *arrow* (used of lightning, Ps 18<sup>15</sup> Hab 3<sup>11</sup> חֲצִצִּיךָ Ps 77<sup>18</sup>); and חֲיוּיִי (?) may thus be an old Syn. of חָצַץ or חֲצִץ *arrow, bolt*, used esp. of lightning. (Cf. Sum. ĠAZ, ĠAŠ, GAZ, ḥaṣābu, ḥaṣācu, ḥipā, &c.)

v. 27. *examined her*: reading וַיִּשְׁכְּרָה (= וַיִּשְׁכְּרָה); fr. שָׁכַר *inspect*,

Ne 2<sup>13.15</sup>) instead of מִן וַיִּסְפֶּרָהּ *and counted her exactly*, 'reckoned her up' (i.e. estimated her nature completely). Others would point מִן as Qal (cf. 14<sup>16</sup> 31<sup>4</sup> 38<sup>37</sup>) and render *took account of her*. Wisdom is regarded throughout as a substantive entity, not merely as a faculty or attribute of mind.

*discerned* (or *perceived*) *her*: reading הִבִּינָהּ as parallel to רָאָה > מִן הִכִּינָהּ *prepared her* or *established her* (see note on v. 23). Cf. Pr 8<sup>22-30</sup>.

*proved*: lit. *searched her thoroughly* or *through and through*: cf. v. 3, 5<sup>27</sup> 13<sup>9</sup> al. The verse does not assert that God *created* Wisdom. She is a primeval, nay eternal, Being, whose 'place' He knows; whom He 'saw' before the world was, and having realized her excellence, made use of her in Creation. See Pr 8 l. c.

v. 28. *And He said to the Man* (or *to Man*). This is obviously pure prose; an extra-metrical introduction of the following distich. Cf. Gn 3<sup>9.17</sup>. The whole verse may be regarded as a later addition, based upon such passages as Pr 3<sup>7</sup> 9<sup>10</sup> 15<sup>33</sup> 16<sup>6</sup>. The 'Wisdom' of the preceding poem (vv. 1-27) is not so much the practical wisdom which should govern conduct as knowledge of the methods and principles of the Divine working in the world of Nature (cf. vv. 26, 27).

#### Chapter 29.

v. 1. See the note on this introductory formula, 27<sup>1</sup>. In the original text the ordinary heading וַיַּעַן אֵיבֹב וַיֹּאמֶר *And Eyob answered and said* may have introduced the unquestionably authentic discourse which follows (29-30).

v. 3. *let . . . shine*: pointing בְּהִלּוֹ = בְּהִלְהִלּוֹ Hi. Inf. Cst. c Suff. pro מִן בְּהִלּוֹ Qal Inf. (not found elsewhere). Cf. 31<sup>26</sup> 41<sup>10</sup> (Hi. in both = *shine, yield light*) and Is 13<sup>10</sup> (Hi. Trans. as here). The √ is common in Assy. though not in Heb. (*elēlu*, 'to shine', 'be pure'; *kīma šamē lēlil*, 'like Heaven may he shine!'). *above* > *upon*: cf. 18<sup>6</sup> 21<sup>17</sup>. ὁ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς μου. *By* (לְ as regards, because of) *His light*. Perhaps וּלְאוֹרִי *And by, &c.* (exc. ו post י), and ad fin. בְּחֹשֶׁךְ: Ps 23<sup>4</sup> (exc. ב post כ). Cf. ὁ ἐπορεύόμενος ἐν σκοτεινῇ = ὁ ambulabam in tenebris.

v. 4. St. i seems overweighted metr., and מִן בְּיָמֵי חַרְפִּי *in the days of my autumn* (Am 3<sup>15</sup>) is somewhat strange. Possibly we should read חֲלִי מִן בְּיָמֵי *my health* (an Aramaism; cf. the vb. 39<sup>4</sup> Is 38<sup>16</sup>) אֲנִי. Cf. ὁ ἀδολεσcentiae meae = עֲלָמִי (20<sup>11</sup> 33<sup>25</sup>). But חֲסֵדִי (חֲסֵדִי) *my kindness* (Hebr.?), i.e. God's kindness or favour to me, would yield a closer parallel. A reference to Eyob's 'maturity' (RV 'in the ripeness of my days') does not seem relevant. ὁ ὅτε ἤμην ἐπιβρίθων ὁδούς (ὁ ἄρ' ὁδοῦς) may be corrupt (? ὁδοῦς = ὁδοῦς, ὁδοῦς, ὁδοῦς? cf. 37<sup>11</sup> ὁ ἐπιβρίθων = יִטְרוֹ which suggests טְרוּחִי for חַרְפִּי and lends some support to the conjecture פְּרוּחִי *my budding*, i.e. flourishing; cf. Ps 92<sup>8.15</sup>).

*protected*: בְּסִוְיָהּ (ὁ περιέφρασσαυ) instead of בְּסִוְיָהּ (15<sup>9</sup> 19<sup>10</sup>): cf. 1<sup>10</sup>

(ש = ס) 3<sup>23</sup>: or rather (on account of the Prep. עלִי בִסֶּךָ (1 K 8<sup>7</sup>; cf. 40<sup>22</sup>): cf. שׁ (שֶׁן). *When Eloah overscreened my tent.*

v. 5. St. ii is metr. short, and barely complete from the point of view of sense. נָעָרִי would most naturally mean *attendants* or *retainers* (Gn 14<sup>24</sup> 22<sup>3</sup>); and if we keep the pointing, we may suppose עֲרַח *company* (15<sup>34</sup> 16<sup>7</sup>) to have fallen out before it. Cf. הַנְּעָרִים (15<sup>17</sup>) 'the young men'; an expression used in the general sense of Eyob's sons, 1<sup>19</sup>: cf. v. 8. (24<sup>5</sup> is corrupt.) We might point נָעָרִי *my youth* (13<sup>28</sup> 31<sup>18</sup>) and insert בְּנִי before it (Ps 127<sup>4</sup>); also prefixing וּ to סְבִי (so 9B), that letter having fallen out after י. This would give a reference to Eyob's sons: *And the sons of my youth were around me.* But a verb seems desirable, and perhaps עָמְדוּ *stood* has been accidentally omitted owing to its resemblance to עָמְרִי *with me* in the previous clause. Then, keeping נָעָרִי, we might render: *And my young men stood around me.*

v. 6. *were bathed*: רָחַץ Intrans. as in Ct 5<sup>12</sup>. Cf. Assy. *raḥāṣu*, 'to flood', 'to wash', 'bathe' (= Sum. RAĜ, RA, whence the Semitic Rt.).

*my steps*: הָלִיכִי ἄπ. *curd* or *curdled milk*, the Arab *leben* of to-day (Ju 5<sup>26</sup>), Heb. חֶמְצָא (20<sup>17</sup>), which must be read here with one cod. and 9B (βουτύρω, butyro, בָּלוּאִי) pro חֶמְצָא. Perhaps rather *liquid butter*, mod. Arabic *samn* (cf. Sum. LI = *šamnu*, 'oil', 'fat', LI-NUN, 'thick fat' = Assy. *ḫimētu* = חֶמְצָא; and cf. Sum. LI with Aram. לָוִיא).

St. ii has more than the normal three stresses, and is otherwise suspicious. Lit. מֵ says: *And the rock—it poured out with me canals of oil.* עָמְרִי *with me* is prob. dittogr. (v. 5<sup>a</sup>); and צֹר *rock* may be a corruption of צַעְרִי *my paces* (31<sup>4</sup>) or footsteps (|| הָלִיכִי). If this be right, we must restore יְצֻקִּי ? יְצֻקִּי ? plur. for יְצֻק sing. Cf. 6 τὰ δὲ ὅρη μου ἐχέοντο γάλακτι = חָלָב וְצֹרֵי יְצֻקִּי חָלָב. Possibly the phrase *streams of oil* is an intruder here from 20<sup>17</sup> (see the note there); and the original text may have been וְצַעְרִי יְצֻקִּי חָלָב *And my footsteps ran with milk* (cf. in part 6)—a better rhythm and sense than we find in מֵ, which is perhaps coloured by reminiscence of Ex 17<sup>8</sup> Nu 20<sup>8ff</sup>.

v. 7. Instead of שַׁעַר the gate 6 gives ὄρθρος = שַׁחַר (in the) *morning* or *early, at dawn* (cf. Ps 57<sup>9</sup>), while rendering עָלִי קֶרֶת ἐν πῶλει. 6 simply *ad portam civitatis* (cf. 6 When I went forth to the gate and called; rg. קֶרֶת instead of עָלִי קֶרֶת!). The Heb. might mean *went forth of* (i. e. through) *the gate* (cf. 31<sup>34</sup> Gn 34<sup>24</sup> for the constr.); but as Eyob's place was outside the town, the meaning must be *to the gate*, and קֶרֶת 'ע' will be either *by* (i. e. beside) *the city* or *upon* (i. e. rising over) *the city*; the town-gate being a considerable structure, with a chamber over it. The open space within the gate was the רְחוּב or forum (st. ii), where justice was dispensed and public meetings were held. There Eyob was wont to sit as an honoured and righteous *qaddī* or judge (vv. 11–17), whom all men feared and revered (vv. 8–10).



v. 8. The moment the younger men saw his approach, they fell back behind the elders (ונחבאו; Pf. of action simultaneous with the first-named). In st. ii 6 perhaps read כלם *all of them* pro כמ arose: πάντες ἔστησαν.

v. 9. Lit. *Princes—they restrained (or stopped) words* (4<sup>2</sup>, cf. 12<sup>15</sup>); they left off talking: 3 Principes cessabant loqui; 6 ἄδροι (= ἄδριαι) *Great men*, Je 5<sup>5</sup>) δὲ ἐπαύσαντο λαλοῦντες. In st. ii leg. על־פהם *upon their mouth* (21<sup>5</sup> Ju 18<sup>19</sup>) pro מִלִּפְתָּהֶם. 6 δάκτυλον ἐπιθέντες ἐπὶ στόματι (as we put the forefinger on the lips to recommend silence).

v. 10. מ: *The voice of leaders* (31<sup>37</sup>; not elsewhere in Job) *they retired* (נחבאו). The verb is obviously dittogr. from v. 8. We should have expected *The voice of leaders was hushed* or *became dumb*. This might be either נאלם (which, however, does not occur elsewhere in Job) or ידם (v. 21, 30<sup>27</sup> 31<sup>31</sup>) or יחדיו (6<sup>24</sup> 13<sup>5,19</sup>); but Ez 3<sup>26</sup>, with its parallel to st. ii, certainly favours נאלם. (ידם, however, might easily have fallen out after ננידים) 6 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐμακάρισάν με—a curious anticipation of v. 11<sup>a</sup>, due no doubt to eye-wandering.

The subject of vv. 7–10 is resumed somewhat awkwardly in vv. 21–25; a section which seems rather out of place as the sequel to vv. 18–20, but might very well follow as the continuation of v. 10, and should perhaps be restored to this place.

v. 11. Omit 7 (from v. 12<sup>a</sup>). So 3. Lit. *The ear, it heard and called, &c. And the eye, it saw, &c. bare me witness*: La 2<sup>13</sup> Qeri (cf. Lk 4<sup>22</sup>). The meaning appears to be, approved of his manifest integrity and benevolence. Neither this verb (העיד) nor the parallel (אשר) occurs again in Job. 6 με ἐξέκλινεν (23<sup>11</sup> 24<sup>4</sup> 31<sup>7</sup> 36<sup>18</sup>) = וחטני pro ותעידני (exc. 7 and ע = ט). 6 3 3 rectè ut 3.

v. 12. The verse resembles Ps 72<sup>12</sup>. Both there and here the pointing מִשֹּׁעַ *from the noble* or *magnate* (6 ἐκ χειρὸς δυνάστου) may be preferred (for שוע see 34<sup>19</sup> Is 32<sup>5</sup>). 6 מן אֹלְצָנָא = מִצָּר *out of distress* (or *from the adversary*, 6<sup>23</sup>); but the other seems better. מִרְשָׁע *from the wicked* (6 9<sup>22</sup>) or מִיַּד עֲרִיץ (6<sup>23</sup> 15<sup>20</sup> 23<sup>17</sup>) is also plausible. מן מִשֹּׁעַ = 3 vociferantem. But would the oppressed 'cry for help' in the court of justice? In st. ii read לא pro ולא c 11 codd., 6 3 6 (so 6 3 6 Ps 72<sup>12</sup>).

v. 13. *on me*. The pronoun is emphatic by position.

For the verb in st. ii cf. Ps 65<sup>9</sup>. (Intr. Ps 32<sup>11</sup>, 81<sup>2</sup>.) 6 στόμα δὲ χάρις με εὐλόγησεν app. preserves a different recension.

v. 14. Lit. *Right I put on, and it put me on*; as though Justice invested itself with the person of Eyob, or, as we might say, became incarnate, took visible form, in him. Cf. Ju 6<sup>34</sup> *The Spirit of Iahvah put on Gideon*. As the body may be regarded as the flesh-garment of the spirit, so the Divine Spirit may enter into any man, clothing itself as it were with the vesture of mortality, and for the time actuating both body

and soul for its own purposes. St ii מ lit. *Like robe and turban* (to me) (*was*) *my justice*; i.e. the justice he dealt out to suitors. ט (not understanding וילבשני) *And righteousness I had put on, And robed me with judgement like a double cloak* (διπλοῖς = מְעִיל 1 Sa 2<sup>19</sup> al.); app. reading וכמעיל אצנו מלשכתי *And like a robe I wrapped my justice* (about me). Perhaps, however, מ includes st. ii also under the government of לבשתי: *Like robe and turban* (I put on) *justice* (om. suff. י). Then ט will merely have supplied ἡμφιασάμην δὲ acc. to the sense (omitting צני). ט *Truth I put on and it clothed me, Like the pall and the diadem of judgement.*

v. 16. Notice the alliteration and the assonance in st. i. אב אבני לאב. *A father*: i.e. a protector and an adviser (Gn 45<sup>8</sup>). ט renders st. ii *And a cause which I knew not, I investigated*; implying that Eyob took all possible pains to ascertain the merits of any cause which came before him for decision, esp. in the case of the poor, instead of favouring the rich and powerful, as Oriental judges are only too apt to do. So ט ט; but ו *And I did the best for him whom I knew not.* The Heb. might certainly mean *And the cause of one I knew not, I searched out.* This provides a closer parallel to st. i; but the other rendering seems to yield a preferable sense. Eyob would probably know who the suitors were who came before him; but not always who was in the right in any dispute that might arise.

v. 17. *shattered* eagerly or with zest, as the form of the Heb. verb (Cohort. Impf. c Waw Conv.) implies. *grinders*: = ט μύλας, *dentes molares* (Galen). מחלעות = instruments of gnawing; √ חלע, prob. cogn. c לח, or לעע to swallow (cf. בלע), Syr. לחע the jaw, ח-חך lick up, لَيْقَ lick the fingers, לחא לחא the jaw, לחם to eat, ללך to lap or lick up. Cf. חילעה worm, grub, weevil, maggot, as an eater or gnawer of vegetation and grain, or decaying bodies (Is 14<sup>11</sup>); Dt 28<sup>30</sup>. Assyr. tultu, ákilu (*eater*), weevil, mealworm, and the like. Prim. Root LAG (Sum.), eat (?).

*drew*: rg. אשלוף, which usu. means *draw* a sword out of the sheath, instead of מ אשלף *cast*. Cf. Ju 3<sup>22</sup>, and Assyr. šalápu, 'draw sword', but also ašallapa lišánki, 'I will tear out thy tongue!' ט ἐξήρπασα: a happy equivalent.

v. 18. מ lit. *And I said* (to myself), *Along with my nest I shall expire, And like the sand* (Gn 32<sup>13</sup>) *I shall multiply days.* This can hardly be right, since Eyob would not find any satisfaction, but rather the contrary, in the thought of his 'nest' (i.e. his house or family; Nu 24<sup>21</sup> Hab 2<sup>9</sup>) and himself coming to an end together. Nor is it any real help to take עמ in the sense of *beside, close by* (Gn 25<sup>11</sup>; 2 Sa 6<sup>7</sup>?); for if the meaning were *I shall die surrounded by my family* (Dr), we should have expected at least בקני in my nest or בחון קני in the midst of my nest. Moreover, the parallelism of the two stichi has obviously been obscured. Prob. עמ קני is a corruption of ען old, an old man (Secondary Predicate): *And*

*methought, I shall die an old man*—a good parallel to st. ii. Or we might read: *עַם-יִשְׁכָּנִי* *with the aged* (= *עַם-יִשְׁכָּנִים*); i.e. in their company, as one of them. Comparison, however, of 14<sup>6,9</sup> with vv. 18, 19, suggests that corruption has gone further, and that we should read *וְיִשְׁכָּנִי וְיִכְנַחַל* *And methought, My stock will grow old, And like the palm* (or read *כַּאֲלִי* *like the terebinth*; a tree which attains to a great age) *I shall multiply days*. The context certainly favours the mention of a tree of some kind (cf. 'my root', 'my boughs', v. 19, and the same words, 14<sup>8,9</sup>), and 6 renders *כְּחֹל* (כְּנַחַל; cf. Nu 24<sup>6</sup>) ὡς περ στέλεχος φοίνικος = 2 sicut palma: cf. Ecclus 50<sup>12e</sup> 6 ὡς στελέχη φοινίκων = Heb. כְּעֵרְבֵי נַחַל (40<sup>22</sup>). The Arab. نَاحِل nahl (נַחַל), *palm-trees*, first cited by Perles, confirms this emendation; although φοῖνιξ in 6 gen. = תְּמָר (cf. στελέχη φοινίκων = תְּמָרִים Ex 15<sup>27</sup> Nu 33<sup>9</sup>).

For *עַם קִנִּי* (st. i) 6 has the enigmatical equivalent ἡ ἡλικία μου γηράσει (cf. *יִשְׁכָּנִי* = *γηράσῃ* 14<sup>8</sup>). What does ἡ ἡλικία μου (*age*, also *stature, height*) represent? Possibly קִמְתִּי *my stature* (קִנִּי misread קִמְ; cf. Ez 13<sup>18</sup> πάσης ἡλικίας = *בְּלָ קוֹמָה*), or perhaps קִנִּי *my stalk* (= *my trunk or stature?*); cf. 6 which gives a double reading of *עַם קִנִּי* (viz. *עַם יְעָ the poor folk* and *עַם-קִנְיָ with my property*—perhaps a scribal error for *עַם-קִנְיָ like a reed*). 6 (קִנִּי יִשְׁכָּנִי? קוֹמָתִי תוֹקֵן?) seems to omit *עַם*. For *יִשְׁכָּנִי my trunk or stock*, cf. 14<sup>8</sup> נֹעַר (= 6 τὸ στέλεχος αὐτοῦ) and Is 11<sup>1</sup>. In both locc. נֹעַר is associated with שָׂרֵף as here (v. 19). The Rabbinical exposition of v. 18 (Yalqut) which finds in it a reference to the fabled phoenix, 'the rare Arabian bird', which lives a thousand years, and is then consumed by a flame issuing from its nest, appears to depend on the ambiguity of the Greek word φοῖνιξ which may mean either a *palm* or a *phoenix* (Hdt. 2. 73: cf. the proverbial φοίνικος ἐτη βιοῦν, 'to live as long as a phoenix'), and on the prob. corrupt phrase *עַם קִנִּי together with my nest*. Beyond this fanciful interpretation of the passage, there is no evidence that חֹל ever meant a 'phoenix' (see Buxtorf, s.v. חֹל); nor does this view harmonize with the language of vv. 19, 20, which apparently describes the flourishing of a (palm) tree.

v. 19. מ: *My root (is) open unto the water*. 6 ἐπὶ ἐלִי upon, by, beside (= 2 secus) pro אֶלִי unto or towards the water. Leg. fort. *יִפְרֹחַ will sprout or shoot* (14<sup>9</sup>). Cf. Je 17<sup>8</sup>.

*my boughs*: 14<sup>9</sup> 18<sup>16</sup>: קִצִּיר: confounded by 6 with קִצִּיר *harvest*.

v. 20. מ lit. *My new glory (is) with me* (or *My glory is new with me*: but cf. ||); *And my bow—in my hand it sprouts afresh* (חֲחִלָּה: 14<sup>7</sup> of a tree). An extremely improb. utterance in the context, though supported by the Versions. If קִשְׁתִּי *my bow* were right in st. ii, כְּרוֹנִי (i.e. כְּרוֹנִי *my javelin* (39<sup>23</sup> 41<sup>21</sup>)) might be read for כְּבוֹדִי *my glory* (6 עַמִּי *my people* = עַמְרִי; om. כְּבוֹ) in st. i. But Gn 49<sup>24</sup> is no real parallel; nor was Eyob's 'glory' new or fresh, but rather long-established. Instead of

חדש a verb-form is required (cf. 10<sup>17</sup> Ps 103<sup>5</sup> 104<sup>30</sup>); and תחליף suggests a continuation of the tree-metaphor, which is otherwise prob. We would therefore read כפתי (15<sup>32</sup>) *my branch* (cf. Is 9<sup>19</sup>) instead of כבורי, and תחדש *it renews* pro חדש; and since a tree 'renews' its leaves, either ענפים *leaves* (Ps 104<sup>12</sup>) or עלה *its leaves*, or perhaps ענפיה *its twigs*, pro עפרי. Then, in place of the strange וקשתי בירי, we adopt עוד ונקתי (14<sup>7</sup>; cf. also 8<sup>16</sup> 15<sup>30</sup> Ps 80<sup>11,12</sup>). We thus get a distich in perfect harmony with the context:

*My branch, it will renew its leafage,  
And my shoot it will sprout again.*

v. 21. Continues the subject of v. 10 (vid. not. supr.).

Transpose וידמו ויחלו (Bateson-Wright), pointing ויחלו. But 5<sup>AC</sup> adds πρεσβύτεροι = זקנים; and as st. ii is metr. short, we may perhaps prefer

זקנים לי שמעו  
ויחלו וידמו למורעצתי:

*Elders to me did listen;  
They would wait and keep silence for my counsel.*

למועצתי ('ca 35 manuscripts') cannot be right, for 'מוע' is only used in the plur., and occurs nowhere else in Job, whereas עצה is fairly common in the book (eight or nine times). For למו = לו vid. 27<sup>14</sup> 38<sup>40</sup> 40<sup>4</sup>.

v. 22. Lit. *after my speaking* (pointing דברתי 21<sup>3</sup> pro אמר דברתי *my word*). would say (Impf.) no more: cf. 40<sup>5</sup> and note. would drop: אמר. As נתר (akin to שתר) is Trans. (Pr 5<sup>3</sup> Ju 5<sup>4</sup>), we should perhaps read אמר *I would drop*, or אמר Hi. (cf. Am 9<sup>13</sup>). The root does not recur in Job. 5 st. ii περιχαρείς δὲ ἐγίνοντο (= 3<sup>22</sup>), ὅπότεν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλουν: app. a loose paraphrase. They found Eyob's discourse as refreshing as rain. (5 perhaps read עליו they exulted for עלימו upon them.)

v. 23. As the text stands, ויחלו *And they would wait* (in hope) is the natural sequel to נתר. (I here is no need to point ויחלו Hi. as 32<sup>11,16</sup> Elihu-section:—see 6<sup>11</sup> 13<sup>16</sup> 14<sup>14</sup> 30<sup>26</sup>.) Omitting 1 c 5 5 5, and regarding v. 22 as an interpolation, we may see in this verse a natural expansion of the ויחלו of v. 21: *They waited for me as for the rain, | And their mouth they opened wide* (16<sup>10</sup> Is 5<sup>14</sup>) *as for the spring-rain* (leg. כְּמִלְקֵיט = 5 אֵין דְּלִרְבִּיעָא; 2 quasi ad imbrem serotinum). The verse may, however, have been suggested to an editor by תתר (v. 22), though it looks original. The conjecture כְּפִי הַמְּגִרְפוֹת *like the clods* (?) pro אמר פְּעִיָּהֶם *and their mouth they opened wide* cannot be called happy, since its only basis is a disputed passage in Joel (1<sup>17</sup>). 5 paraphrases *As a thirsty land expecting the rain, | So they my speech* (5<sup>A</sup> + were expecting). Cf. אֵין צִיָּה Is 53<sup>2</sup>. Have we here a trace of another recension of the Heb. text?

v. 24. *M* lit. *I laugh unto them, they believe not*; | *And the light of my countenance they cause not to fall*. Driver thought this might mean that 'Job's clear-sighted counsel encouraged them, if they were despondent [taking st. i as RV marg. *I smiled on them when they had no confidence*]; on the other hand (line 2), their despondency never clouded his cheerfulness' (*made his face fall*: cf. Gn 4<sup>5,6</sup>). This, however, reads too much into the text. It treats st. i as equivalent to *לֵאמֹנִי אֲשַׁח* (cf. 26<sup>2</sup>); but even so, a reassuring smile is not the same thing as 'clear-sighted counsel', and the phrase 'the light of my countenance' (parallel to *שֶׁחַק*) denotes the favouring look or smile of a superior (Ps 4<sup>7</sup> Pr 16<sup>16</sup>) rather than his personal cheerfulness or buoyancy of spirit. Cf. the proposed emendation of st. ii *יָנַחַם פְּנֵי אֲבָלִים* *And the light of my c. did comfort mourners* (from v. 25<sup>c</sup>); which, however, is metr. redundant, and associated with an ungrammatical alteration of st. i (*וַיֵּאמִינוּ*); as if this could mean *I smiled at them, and they grew confident*). We can say in Heb. 'My c. fell' (Gn 4<sup>5,6</sup>), but hardly 'the light of my c. fell'. *יִפְּלוּן* must be corrupt; and we may perhaps read *לֹא יִפְּלוּן* *The light of my c. they were not expecting*. The sense of the verse will then be that people stood in such awe of Eyob that, when he smiled graciously upon them, it came as a pleasant surprise, and they could scarcely credit their good fortune. For *לֵאמֹנִי* see 9<sup>16</sup> 15<sup>22</sup> 24<sup>22</sup>. *ⲙⲓ* support our view of st. i; but in st. ii they seem to have read *יִפְּלוּן* pro *יִפְּלוּן* (*ⲓ* app. *יִפְּלוּן*). *ⲛⲓ* *וַאֲלֵאמֹר פְּנֵי לֹא אִסְתַּכְלוּן* suggests a possible *לֹא יִפְּלוּן* *And at the light of my face they would (durst) not look*; i.e. they were so overawed by his presence. This agrees very well with st. i as we understand it. The stichus was wanting in the original text of *ⲓ*, as was also v. 25.

v. 25. A tristich, of which st. i has four stresses, while st. iii is incongruous with both the others. *אֲבָחַר רַכְּמִי* is prob. *I used to test* (Aramaic usc of *בָּחַר*: cf. Is 48<sup>10</sup> Je 6<sup>27</sup>) *their way*; i.e. their conduct or course of action (>choose, prescribe it for them). In harmony with this we propose *וַאֲשַׁבְּרֵם* and *examine them* (cf. Ne 2<sup>13,16</sup>), instead of *וַאֲשַׁבְּרֵם* and *sil chief*. Eyob is still thought of as *qādī*, or judge and referee.

St. ii. *And I used to dwell like a king in the host*. His authority was supreme among his people. *ⲓ* *ἐν μονοζώνοις* = *בְּנוֹדָר* (cf. 2 K 5<sup>2</sup> al.); *ⲓ* *ἐν στρατοπέδῳ*. It may be recalled that the Babylonian prototype of Eyob was, in fact, a king (see Introd.). St. iii, *As one who comforteth mourners*, has been regarded as a variant of v. 24<sup>b</sup>. If, however, instead of *כַּשֶּׁר אֲלָפִים בַּמַּחֲנֶה* we read the very similar *כַּאֲשֶׁר אֲבָלִים* *Like a captain of thousands in the camp* (or army) we get a good parallel to st. ii (*יָנַחַם* = *מַחֲנֶה* read backwards!). St. i may well be rejected as an intrusion.

Chapter 30. Eyob contrasts his present humiliations and sufferings with his happy past. (There is no real break between the chapters.)



appears to be related to מלח *salt* as ὁ ἄλιμα, *saltwort*, to ἄλς. Our own word 'mallow' appears to be identical with the Lat. *malva*, Gk. *μαλάχη*. 'Me pascunt olivae, Me cichorea levesque malvae' (Hor.); 'et gravi Malvae salubres corpori' (id.).

*beside the bush*: עֲלֵי שִׁי (v. 7, Gn 2<sup>6</sup>). Perhaps rather 'שִׁי עֲלֵי' and *the leaves of the bush* (Ne 8<sup>16</sup>). ὁ ἐπὶ ἡχοῦντι = עֲלֵי שִׁי (cf. Is 17<sup>12</sup>). Cf. 39 Et mandebant herbas *et arborum cortices* (= what is *upon* the bush). (39 om. vv. 3, 4.) 39 adds ἀτιμοὶ δὲ καὶ πεφασπισμένοι, ἐνδεεῖς παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ (39 ANB ab mg. inf. + οἱ καὶ ῥίζας ξύλων ἐμασῶντο ὑπὸ λιμοῦ μεγάλου). This looks like an explanatory paraphrase of vv. 3, 4; perhaps preserving some variants, e.g. לֶחֶם מִן הַבֹּשֶׂת, v. 3.

v. 5. St. i is metr. short, and מִן הָאֶרֶץ *from the middle* (Aramaic word), if correct, obviously requires a complement, e.g. הָאָדָם *of men*, or הָעִיר *of the city*. The latter word might have fallen out owing to its likeness to the following יִרְעוּ. Perhaps מִן הָעִיר יִגְרֹשׁוּ *From sojourning in the city they are driven out* (cf. Ju 9<sup>11</sup> for the Constr.). Others read מִן הָעַם *from the nation or community*; leaving the stichus still too short. 39 om. 39 מִן הָעַם (de convallibus).

St. ii. *shout against them*: cf. 2 C 13<sup>12</sup>. If they see the outcasts coming, people raise a hue and cry against them as they would against a thief (24<sup>14</sup>). 39 ad ea cum clamore currebant (? יִרְעוּ pro יִרְצוּ). (39 understands the verse as describing the joy of the outcasts at finding their wretched fare.) 39 ἐπανεστησάν μοι κλέπτει = עֲלֵי יִרְעוּ (יִרְעוּ). (cf. 14<sup>12</sup> 17<sup>8</sup>).

v. 6. מִן הַבְּרָדִים in the dreaded (Sing.) of the wādys, which is supposed to mean *in the most gloomy valleys*, but is prob. corrupt. Read מְעָרוֹת *caves*, 1 Sa 13<sup>6</sup>, or מְצֻדוֹת *fastnesses*, Is 33<sup>16</sup> (for שָׁבָן c accus. cf. Je 17<sup>6</sup>). *holes*: 39 τρωγλαι, as also 1 Sa 14<sup>11</sup>. They were Troglodytes; but these הָרִים were holes in the 'dust', i.e. the ground. *rocks*: בָּשִׂים Je 4<sup>29</sup> only. An Aramaism: cf. Syr. ܒܝܬܐ and Cephass. (Assyr. ka-a-pi ša šadē, 'the rocks of the mountains', and ka-bi alone 'the rocks'. Perhaps akin to Sum. GAB, 'breast', GABIRI, 'mountain'; cf. GABA-TINU, 'hill of life', i.e. the *mons Veneris*.) 39 paraphrases the whole verse *Whose houses were caves of rocks*.

v. 7. *bushes*: שִׁיחִים; 39 εὐήχων (cf. Ps 150<sup>5</sup> = שִׁמְעוּ). Not a different reading; see note on v. 4<sup>a</sup>. *bray*: 6<sup>5</sup>. Cry out for want of food, like wild asses. *they huddle together*: lit. *are joined together*: יִסְפְּחוּ: which perhaps should rather be pointed Ni. (cf. Is 14<sup>1</sup>), if the verb be genuine; but it seems very doubtful. 39 διητῶντο, *they lived*, 39 delicias computabant = יִסְפְּחוּ; but a parallel to יִנְהֲקוּ would be more satisfactory, e.g. יִרְעוּ *they roar* (Is 42<sup>13</sup>) or *howl or yell*, or יִסְפְּחוּ *they wail* (Mi 1<sup>8</sup>). *scrub*: קֶרֶן (Zp 2<sup>9</sup>, plur. Pr 24<sup>31</sup>), a plant or shrub of unknown species, growing

in neglected fields and wastes. 𐤔 𐤍𐤓𐤁𐤁𐤁 𐤀𐤒𐤓𐤁, *wild brushwood*; 𐤔 sentes, *briers, brambles*. (The Syr. ܚܪܝܬܐ denotes a kind of *vetch* used as fodder.)

v. 8. Metrically dubious and otherwise suspect. St. i virtually repeats v. 1<sup>a</sup>, and st. ii = v. 5<sup>a</sup>, so that the whole seems superfluous. For 𐤒𐤒, in wits and behaviour, see on 2<sup>10</sup>. The phrase 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓 cannot be exactly paralleled. 𐤁𐤓 should mean *without name* (fame, repute; cf. Gn 6<sup>a</sup> 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓 the men famous in story); but if the sense be *sons of men of no name*, we miss 𐤁𐤓. Cf. 8<sup>11</sup> 24<sup>10</sup> 31<sup>39</sup> 38<sup>2</sup> for the use of 𐤁𐤓. Moreover, the tone of aristocratic contempt does not harmonize with the spirit of 31<sup>39</sup>. (cf. esp. 31<sup>15</sup>); while, as regards form, the verse is rather prosaic than poetical. Perhaps 𐤁𐤓 has displaced 𐤁𐤓 (cf. 1 Sa 25<sup>25</sup>). 𐤔 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓𐤓 | 𐤁𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓 𐤁𐤓𐤓. This suggests for st. ii 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 *All report of whom is extinct from the land*; making the two stichi parallel in sense, and restoring the metre. (𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓 = 𐤓𐤓𐤓 28<sup>22</sup>; 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 = 𐤓𐤓𐤓 18<sup>5.6</sup> 21<sup>17</sup>.) It also gets rid of the isolated 𐤓𐤓𐤓 *they are scourged or smitten* (supposed Aramaism). It would give much the same sense if we read 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 (cf. 18<sup>17</sup> Ps 9<sup>7</sup>) *And their memory is perished from the land*; which is perhaps preferable in view of 18<sup>17</sup>.

v. 9. *But now*: 𐤓𐤓𐤓, as in v. 1. It looks as if the curious section vv. 1–8, which is introduced by the same Particle of Contrast, might be an interpolation. Certainly v. 9 might immediately follow upon 29<sup>25</sup>, at least as naturally as v. 1. Nothing necessary to the continuation of the sense would be missed, while what may seem to us an exaggerated and irrelevant insistence upon the wretched condition of Eyob's revilers would be avoided. It must, however, be recognized, in spite of manifold corruptions and obscurities of the text, that the section is picturesque, vivid, and poetical; and even if it did not originally belong here, we may be glad that it has been preserved.

*And now I am become their song*: La 3<sup>14</sup> (cf. 3<sup>63</sup>) Ps 69<sup>13</sup>: the subject of satirical allusions in popular minstrelsy and topical improvisations. (𐤓𐤓𐤓 *music*, playing on stringed instruments, La 5<sup>14</sup>, and the verb 𐤓𐤓 appear to be derived from the √NAG, *to strike*; cf. Sum. BA-LAG, *harp, lyre, music*, SIR BALAGA, *zamār balaggi*, 'harp-music', 'harp-playing', BA-LAG ZURA-TA, *ina balaggi u ikribī*, 'with music and prayer'; and the Ch. 樂 lok, ngok, Annam. lak, ñiak, 'joy', 'music'.)

St. ii lit. *And I am become to them a word*; i. e. a *byword*, or perhaps *common talk*. (𐤓𐤓 is not so used elsewhere.) 𐤔 proverbium; 𐤔 𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓 (= 𐤓𐤓𐤓, 17<sup>6</sup>, which may be right here also).

v. 10. St. ii lit. *And from my face they have not withheld spittle*: cf. Is 50<sup>6</sup>. So 𐤔𐤔. See also the note on 17<sup>5b</sup>.



v. 11. Very corrupt. For יתרו (Ketib) or יתרי (Qerî; 𐤀𐤓; 𐤅 φαρῆ. ταν αὐτοῦ = חליו; so 𐤁) leg. יתרום *their cord*, and point the two following verbs as plur., to agree with שלחו ad fin. (a syn. of פתחו 12<sup>15.18</sup> 39<sup>5</sup>). For מפני (dittogr. from v. 10<sup>b</sup>) leg. פִּימו (of) *their mouth* (Ps 17<sup>10</sup> al.). The two stichi thus become parallel in meaning:

*For their cord they have relaxed and abused me;  
And the haller (Ps 32<sup>9</sup>) of their mouth they have loosed.*

The meaning of יתר is determined by the parallel רסן (= 𐤅 χαλινόν; 𐤁 frenum). It cannot therefore be *bowstring*, as elsewhere, e.g. Ps 11<sup>2</sup>, but a restraining cord or bond, as in Ju 16<sup>6-9</sup>. The verse means that Eyob's assailants have cast off all the restraint once inspired by respect or fear, and given free rein to their tongues (cf. Ps 39<sup>2</sup>). Duhm, adopting Q. יתרי and שלח Sing. (𐤅) or rather שלך, and regarding שלחו v. 12, as a variant of רסן שלחו here, accepts Bickell's רגלי *my banner* pro רגלי *my feet*, and renders the verse thus violently emended:

*For He hath loosed my bowstring and humbled me,  
My standard He hath cast down before my face.*

It is, however, a curious fact that throughout the entire OT we nowhere else find mention of the רִגְלָל, *banner* or *standard*, of a single chief or king, but only of the standards of the tribes of Israel in the Book of Numbers. (For Ct 2<sup>4</sup>, vid. infr.) To us, no doubt, the supposed reference to Eyob's 'standard' is highly suggestive and poetical; but, as already indicated, neither in the heroic tales of the Conquest and the early Monarchy, nor in any of the old martial songs and patriotic psalms of Israel, do we find such reference to a standard. The fact makes it difficult to believe in the mention of one here. (Familiar as we are with the romantic associations called up by the words of Ct 2<sup>4</sup>, it is more than doubtful whether the text of that passage is sound. Read perhaps רגלו ויגר pro רגלו: *And he poured upon me Love.*)

v. 12. A tristich; text corrupt. The 𐤁π. פִּרְחָח for which 25 codd. have פרחח and 𐤅 פרח (βλαστοῦ, cf. Nu 17<sup>8</sup>) is prob. a *vox nihili*. If the rare word עלמין *Youths* orig. stood where עלימין *On the right* now stands, we might suppose that פִּרְחָח *soboles eorum*, a marg. gloss on that word, had crept into the text. But עלימיני is in itself unobjectionable (cf. Ps 109<sup>6.31</sup>), although the word ימין is not common in Job (23<sup>9</sup> 40<sup>14</sup> all). Perhaps פרחח is a disguise of פִּרְחָח *with the sword*; so that st. i would be: *On my right they rise up with the sword* (cf. Am 7<sup>9</sup>). In st. ii שלחו prob. originated in dittography (v. 11<sup>b</sup>), and רגלי may have been added (cf. ברנליו . . . שלח, 18<sup>8</sup>). In that case we might read יסלו עלי ארחותיהם *They cast up against me their highways* as the second member of the distich: cf. 19<sup>12b</sup> ויסלו עלי דרכם (𐤅) *the ways of their ruin*

overloads the stichus metr., and cannot be right.) Another possible restoration of the distich might be :

עלמין יקומו לרגלי  
יסלו עלי חרפותיהם

*The youths start up in my track* (cf. 18<sup>11</sup>); *They lift high* (Ps 68<sup>5</sup>? or *heap up* Je 50<sup>28</sup>?) *their taunts against me.*

v. 13. Another tristich, corrupt and entirely unmetrical. נתצו = נתצו (so five codd.) hîc tant. (perhaps an error of dictation). If we connect להיתי, which should be להותי (so Q., six codd., see notes on 6<sup>2,30</sup>), with st. i we get a passable line: *They have broken up my path for my destruction* (? להיתי to make me fall; an Arabism? cf. 37<sup>9</sup> הניא). Then, reading יבלעו for the meaningless יעילו, and connecting the word with what follows, the second stichus will be *They engulf* (2<sup>9</sup> 10<sup>8</sup> 8<sup>18</sup> 20<sup>15</sup> 37<sup>20</sup>) *them who have no helper*; or reading עצר pro עור: *They engulf—there is none to restrain them* (12<sup>5</sup> 29<sup>3</sup>: ? קמו). Cf. Is 3<sup>12</sup>. (St. ii ἐξέδυσαν γάρ μου τὴν στολήν = ויפשיטו מעילי; cf. 19<sup>9</sup> Nu 20<sup>26,28</sup>. St. iii βέλεισιν αὐτοῦ κατηκόντισέν με, with *His arrows He shot me down*: cf. St. ἀνέλας γὰρ φάρετραν αὐτοῦ, v. 11<sup>14</sup>, and 7<sup>20</sup> 16<sup>12,13</sup>. This prob. represents a different text.)

v. 14. *outburst*: i.e. of waters: cf. 2 Sa 5<sup>20</sup> כפרץ מים. *As (through) a wide breach*, scil. in my walls (Ne 6<sup>1</sup>), is also possible; cf. Quasi rupto muro, et aperta ianua, irruerunt super me.

St. app. from another text κέχρηται (δέ) μοι ὡς βούλεται (ἐβούλετο), (And) *He uses me as He will(ed)*. Perhaps it read כְּחֶפְצוֹ According to His will pro כפרץ ad init.

St. ii can hardly mean 'In the midst of the ruin they roll themselves upon me' (RV). תחת שׂאה is *Under* (or *Instead of*) *the ruin* (v. 3; Is 47<sup>11</sup>; or *the storm*; עלעלא; cf. Pr 1<sup>27</sup>); but we seem to require another comparison. Leg. fort. תחת pro תחת; i.e. either קָתַח (41<sup>25</sup>; or ? בְּקָתַח 6<sup>21</sup>), *Like a terrible storm*, or even קָתַח (= בְּקָתַח; cf. 31<sup>34</sup>), *Like the shattering* (Is 9<sup>3</sup>; or *terrifying*) *of the storm* (שׂאה akin to Assyr. šû, šûtu) *they rolled onward* (התגלגלו) or *whirled along*, storm-like: cf. נגלגל whirlwind, Ps 77<sup>19</sup>. The translation *roll themselves upon me* is usu. justified by reference to the Hithpoel עלינו להתגלגל Gn 43<sup>18</sup> (? להתגלגל; cf. 19<sup>9</sup> and Is 10<sup>16</sup>); but Hithpapel should have a different meaning. St. ἐν ὀδύνας (= v. 15<sup>a</sup>) πέφυγμαi, in *griefs I wallow* (cf. πεφυγμένος = מתלל 2 Sa 20<sup>12</sup>).

v. 15. Another tristich. St. i may be an intrusion. The Hophal הפך (here only in OT) should perhaps be Niph. נהפכו (v. 21; 19<sup>19</sup> 20<sup>14</sup>), as St. (cf. Redactus sum in nihilum = נהפכתי לבלמה 26<sup>7</sup> or simply נה; or Qal הפך *He hath turned* (9<sup>5</sup> al. ה'ה dittogr.). The stichus is not parallel to either of the others; while they are mutually parallel, and make a good distich. In st. ii תרדף would naturally mean *Thou*

*pursues*; cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$  *abstulisti*.  $\mathfrak{G}$   $\psi\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron$  = תִּחַלֶּה (Mine honour *departeth*) gives a better parallel; but תִּחַלֶּה (4<sup>15</sup> 9<sup>11</sup> where it is joined with the syn. עָבַר as here; Is 21<sup>1</sup> of whirlwinds) seems better still. Others point Ni. תִּרְדֶּה and render: *Mine honour is chased as by the wind*. נִיבְתִי *my honour*; i.e. his princely dignity and reputation (Driver): cf. נִיב *noble*, 12<sup>21</sup> 21<sup>28</sup>. But  $\mathfrak{G}$  ἡ ἐλπίς μου = תְּקוּתִי (11 times) or תַּחֲלִיתִי;  $\mathfrak{B}$  *desiderium meum* =  $\mathfrak{G}^s$  τὰ καταθύμιά μου (= תְּחִמָּתִי, cf. Is 44<sup>9</sup>).

v. 16. St. i is metr. over weight with its four stresses. Om. וְעָהָה *And now* (v. 9; dittogr.). Lit. *Upon me* (or *Over me*) *my soul is poured out*; my feelings overwhelm me. Cf. Ps 42<sup>5,6,7,12</sup>. For the vb. (Hithpael), La 2<sup>12</sup> 4<sup>1</sup>. Pro מַי עֲנִי *Days of affliction* we might perhaps read, in view of the vb. יִאָּחֲזֵנִי *grip me* or *hold me fast*, עֲנִי חֲבָלֵי *cords of affliction* (36<sup>6</sup> cf. Is 13<sup>8</sup>) or יָדֵי עֲנִי *hands of affliction*; but hardly אֲמִי *the terrors of a*. (אֲמִי constr. plur. does not occur). But the following לַיְלָה *By night* certainly favours מַי: cf. 7<sup>3-5</sup>, 13<sup>f</sup>.

v. 17. St. i has become too long, owing to dittogr. of עָלִי from v. 16. Instead of מִן נִגְרָה מִי (עָלִי) *He bored from off me*, read נִקְרָה מִי (= מִן ut saep.); cf. יִשְׁכַּבֵּן ad fin., which also confirms לַיְלָה: *By night my bones are pierced*;  $\mathfrak{G}$  om. מַעֲלִי. For the vb. see Ju 16<sup>21</sup> Is 51<sup>1</sup>. 'Corroded' is not a possible rendering (RV marg.); nor is it likely that לַיְלָה is the Subj. ('The night gnaws away my bones'). It seems needless to suggest נִקְרָה *decay*, or יִרְקָבֵי *rot* (cf. Pr 12<sup>4</sup>), since he means that his bones are racked and wrenched with pain. נִבְהָלֵי *are troubled* (Ps 6<sup>3</sup>) would be better (cf.  $\mathfrak{G}$  συγκαίχεται = בָּלַל Gn 11<sup>7</sup>). *my gnawers*: cf. v. 3: i.e. my gnawing pains. Cf. Mk 9<sup>44</sup>.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Et qui me comedunt non dormiunt. ( $\mathfrak{G}$  τὰ δὲ νεῦρά μου διαλέλνται, *And my sinews* (10<sup>11</sup> 40<sup>12</sup>) *are relaxed* treats עֲרִנִי as an Aramaism; cf. Aram. עֲרִנָא *a leathern strap* or *thong*. So Nachmanid. App. also it omits לֹא and reads יִשְׁכַּבֵּן pro יִשְׁכָּבֵן.) Add perhaps עוֹרִי *my skin* (or בָּשָׂרִי *my flesh*) in st. ii metr. grat. (pt. עֲרִנִי): *And the gnawers of my skin rest not*.

v. 18. Very uncertain. A reference to God (RV marg. 'By his great force', &c.) seems improb., though the phrase בְּרִבְכָּה is used in that relation 23<sup>6</sup> (cf. Is 63<sup>1</sup>); unless indeed the verse be an interpolation. If it were 'intended to describe how Job's garments are thrown out of shape, as they cling closely to his emaciated form' (Dr), it is surely obvious that 'clinging closely' would be the result of the limbs swelling rather than of emaciation, which would cause the clothes to hang loosely about the figure. The second member, *Like the neck* or *collar* (lit. *mouth*; Ex 28<sup>32</sup>) *of my tunic he* (if? they? יִאָּחֲזֵנִי? so  $\mathfrak{B}$ ) *engirds* (engird?) *me*, may suggest a parallel such as כִּנְפֵי לְבוּשִׁי יִחְבְּשֵׁנִי *Like the skirts of my raiment they enwrap me* (cf. Jon 2<sup>6</sup>): 'they', i.e. his gnawing pains, due to the eruptions or ulcers which covered him from head to foot (2<sup>7</sup>).  $\mathfrak{G}$  supports מְ, except that it has ἐπελάβετο = יִתְחַפֵּשׂ (1 K 11<sup>30</sup>) pro יִתְחַפֵּשׂ: *With much*

strength He laid hold of my robe ; | Like the orifice (= מ) of my tunic He encircled me. יאחזי . . . בפי (By the neck of my t. He seizeth me) would improve this; but, as pointed out above, the reference to God is improb. in the context. מ יתחפש לבושי my clothing or 'coat' (supposed by some to mean my skin) is disguised (= disfigured), is altogether improb. (cf. 1 Sa 28<sup>8</sup> 1 K 22<sup>30</sup>); and the emendation (כחשי) (my leanness: 18<sup>6</sup> see note) pro כח is little better (Through my great leanness is my garment disfigured). The supposed ref. to the ill fit of Eyob's clothes seems almost grotesque. The reading בשרי my flesh instead of לבושי my garment does not harmonize with st. ii. (ס I clothed me with my clothing and girt me with my tunic: They threw me into the mire, &c., v. 19. Cf. 9<sup>21</sup>.)

v. 19. St. i is too short metr. and otherwise suspicious. He hath cast me into the mire would rather be הֵרַנִי בַחֲמֵר (cf. Ex 15<sup>14</sup>) than הֵרַנִי לַח' (Hi. c ל = shot at me). We might read הֵרַנִי הֵרַנִי He hath brought me down (cf. La 2<sup>10</sup> Ps 55<sup>24</sup>) into the mire (Is 10<sup>6</sup>), and insert אֱל God as the Subject, thus restoring both sense and metre. Since, however, the following verses appeal directly to God in the 2nd Pers., we should perhaps consider this verse as the beginning of the appeal (ה = vestige of אתה Thou, emph.; רני = רם), and read in closer parallelism with st. ii להֲמַר לְחִמִּי Thou, thou hast likened me to the clay: cf. ὁμοιωσάμενος δὲ με ἡσά περὶ πηλῶ and Ὡ Comparatus sum luto. He complains that God thinks of him as mere clay (cf. 10<sup>9</sup>), and treats him as of no more account than dust and ashes (42<sup>6</sup> Gn 18<sup>27</sup>).

v. 20. The rendering of st. ii in RV, I stand up, and thou lookest at me, is forcible (cf. Ps 22<sup>18</sup> בִּי יִבְטְחוּ וִירְאוּ), but unsatisfactory. The vb. הִתְבּוֹנֵן (23<sup>15</sup>) does not mean to look at physically but mentally; i. e. to pay attention to, give heed to, consider: cf. 11<sup>11</sup> 23<sup>15</sup> 26<sup>14</sup> (see note). And metrical balance and parallelism are improved by repeating the Neg. Ptc. לֹא c 1 cod and Ὡ (Sto et non respicis me). Further, עֲמַדְתִּי I stood seems dubious (ἑστησαν δὲ καὶ κατενόησάν με, They stood, &c.; cf. Ps 22<sup>16</sup>). Does it mean I stood praying, or I stopped (32<sup>16</sup> 2 K 13<sup>18</sup>)? עֲמַדְתָּ Thou stoodest is not more prob. of God: cf. 9<sup>11</sup> 23<sup>3,8,9</sup>. The parallelism requires the 1st Pers. Reading עֲתִרְתִּי (33<sup>26</sup>) or rather אֶעֱתֵר I supplicate or entreat (22<sup>27</sup>), we get the good || I entreated, and Thou wouldst not regard me.

v. 21. Thou turnest (or art turned or wouldst turn) into a cruel (41<sup>2</sup>) one to me. For the verb cf. 1 Sa 10<sup>6</sup> and 41<sup>20</sup>. So Ὡ Mutatus es mihi in crudelem. Ὡ<sup>A</sup> ἀπέβησαν δέ μοι ἀνελήμονες, They (my foes) turned out ruthless to me (Ὡ<sup>B</sup> ἐπέβησαν prob. does not indicate a different reading, but a scribal error). Instead of חֲשַׁטְמִי assailst me = Ὡ adversaris mihi (see 16<sup>9</sup> Gn 27<sup>41</sup> 49<sup>23</sup> 50<sup>15</sup> bear malice against one) Ὡ ἱμαστίγῳσάς με, didst scourge me; app. a (hypoth.) Denom. from שׁוּט scourge (5<sup>21</sup>) חֲשַׁטְמִי.

v. 22. עַל upon pro אֶל unto. So Ὡ<sup>AB</sup>. This must be right, whether we connect עַל-דָּרֹךְ with the preceding or the following vb. c Ὡ (cf. Gn 31<sup>17</sup>

Ex 4<sup>20</sup> Dt 32<sup>13</sup>) as seems better in view of st. ii. Ἐταξας δέ με ἐν ὀδύνας = בְּבִלְהוֹת וַחֲשִׁמְנִי (v. 14) or בְּשֹׁאָה (v. 15; cf. st. ii ad fin.).

St. ii is metr. short. The vb. תִּמְנְנִי can only mean *thou meltest or dissolvest, breakest up, shatterest* (cf. Ps 65<sup>11</sup> the hard earth with rain) *me with . . .*, if strict parallelism be observed. The remaining word חֲשֵׁה (Ketib) Qerf חֲשִׁיה (i.e. חֲשִׁיה see note at 5<sup>12</sup>) is clearly corrupt. If 'my substance' were meant, the Pron. Suff. would be indispensable. בְּשֹׁאָה in (*with?*) the storm (RV), v. 14, or בְּתִשְׁאָה in the din or uproar, 36<sup>29</sup> 39<sup>1</sup>, would make sense but not metre; to complete which we might perhaps read וַתִּנְחֲנֵנִי כַמֶּץ בְּשֹׁאָה *And thou snatchest me away like chaff in the storm* (or leg. שׁוּפָה = סוּפָה?); cf. 21<sup>18</sup> 27<sup>20</sup>. Ἐ καὶ ἀπέρριψάς με ἀπὸ σωτηρίας = וַתְּשַׁלְּבֵנִי מִמְּחֻשָּׁה; Ὡς elisisti me valide = וְיָ?; Ὡς *And Thou hast humbled me and brought me low.*

v. 23. the Grave: lit. Death, i.e. the place of the dead, used as a syn. of Abaddon, 28<sup>22</sup>, and She'ol, Ps 6<sup>5</sup>: cf. also 38<sup>17</sup>. The Prep. אֶל may have fallen out: cf. 10<sup>9</sup>. House of Assembly (בֵּית מוֹעֵד): cf. the Mountain of Assembly, scil. of the gods, Is 14<sup>13</sup>. (An leg. לְבִית . . . לְמוֹת . . . לְמִיתָה?) Ἐ οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι θάνατός με ἐκτρίψει = יִשְׁפֹּנִי *will bruise or wear me down* (9<sup>11</sup>) pro וַתְּשַׁלְּבֵנִי. Seq. οἰκία γὰρ παντὶ θνητῷ γῆ = וְכִתְּבֵנִי לְכָל-חַיִּי *pro עֵפֶר = γῆ* ut 2<sup>12</sup> et saep.—pro מוֹעֵד).

v. 24. Neither RV nor RV marg. is satisfactory. The dub. עֵי a heap of ruins (Mi 1<sup>6</sup> cf. 3<sup>12</sup> Is 17<sup>1</sup>) is improb. in the context and, in any case, cannot mean *in his fall*. The phrase שָׁלַח יָדָא = 'stretch out hand against one', Gn 37<sup>22</sup> al., and אֶכְיִין, v. 25, suggest the || term עָנִי here (cf. 24<sup>14</sup> 31<sup>19</sup>). Read therefore בעֵי pro וַעֲנֵי. (The suggested טָנַע *sinking*, qs 'a drowning man', is improb. without some explanatory addition: cf. Ex 15<sup>4</sup> Ps 69<sup>3</sup>). For אַךְ ad init. אִם should prob. be read (cf. Ἐ εἰ); and for the ungrammatical words ad fin. (לְחַן שׁוֹעַ), parallelism demands a verb. If now we read לֹא אֲשִׁיעַ (him I would help; cf. וְעֵ) there, and אֲשַׁלַּח pro 'יש' in st. i, we obtain:

*If not against the poor I stretched hand,—  
If in his ruin him I did help:—*

a distich which essentially agrees with the immediate sequel (v. 25)

*If I wept for him whose day was hard,—  
If my soul was grieved for the needy:—*

and obviates the necessity of alteration in v. 25, except omission of לֹא ad init. (dittogr. fr. v. 24?).

Ἐ εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον δυνάμειν ἐμαυτὸν χειρώσασθαι = אֲשַׁלַּח יָדָא (!) אֲחִי בְּעַצְמִי (or אֲחִי בְּנַפְשִׁי cf. 9<sup>33</sup> Ps 81<sup>9</sup> 119<sup>5</sup>) *Would that I might lay hands upon (= kill) myself!* (Perhaps אִם לֹא עָלַי *O that against myself . . .* Cf. Ἐ

*But not against me—*וְלֹא־עָלַי—*will he extend his hand | And when I cry*  
*unto him he will save me.)* ו therefore prob. read יִרְאֶשְׁלַח . . . אֶמְלֵא.  
When ו continues ἡ δεηθείς γε (A δεηθῆναι) ἑτέρου, καὶ ποιήσει μοι τοῦτο,  
it perhaps preserves traces of two guesses at the riddle of לֵהָן שׁוּעַ, viz.  
לֵי יַעֲשֶׂה and לֵי אֲשׁוּעַ.

v. 25. For the phrase קשה־יוֹם *one who has a hard day or time*, cf. ו  
1 Sa 1<sup>15</sup> γυνὴ ἡ σκληρὰ ἡμέρα (= קשת יום pro קשת רוח). Note the  
Aramaism עָנַם *to be grieved*. The word is of the same origin as אָנַם  
*troubled* (Is 19<sup>10</sup>), אֲנַם *a troubled or muddy pool or marsh* (Is 14<sup>23</sup>), both  
found in Assy. (*aganu*, 'trouble'; *aganumu*, 'swamp').

v. 24, 25 do not seem to belong here. They agree in form with 31<sup>899</sup>.  
and may have belonged to that chapter, either as a marg. variant or a part  
of the original text (cf. 31<sup>10-20</sup>). Vv. 27-31 might naturally follow v. 23.

v. 26. Perhaps a quotation from another source. The distich has  
four stresses in each member (Tetrameter) instead of the normal three  
(Trimeter). ו paraphrases (as in v. 25). *for good*: read לְטוֹב pro לְרָע  
טוב: cf. 3<sup>9</sup> 6<sup>19</sup> (also st. ii). For the sense cf. 3<sup>26f</sup>. Je 8<sup>15</sup>. וּמִן om. קִי.

v. 27. *boiled*: רָחַחוּ (41<sup>28</sup> Hi. Causative); an Aramaism. Pointed Pu.;  
perhaps should be Qal (cf. Syr. use); but Ez 24<sup>5</sup> has Pi. וּלְעִזְזָם.

*were not quiet*: רָמוּ Pf. וּשְׁמָהּ = יָרָמוּ Impf. (*would not be*  
*quiet*): prob. correct. Fig. of 'the tumult of his emotions' (Dr). Cf.  
La 1<sup>20</sup>. The parallelism is weak. For *met* or *confronted me*, cf. 3<sup>12</sup> Ps 18<sup>10</sup>.

v. 28. *A mourner*: str. dressed as such: in dark and squalid attire  
(Dr). Cf. 5<sup>11</sup>. The phrase קָרַר הַלְבָּשִׁי occurs Ps 38<sup>7</sup>, where it is completed  
by the addition בְּלֵילֵינוּ *all the day*, which would suit here also instead of  
the strange בְּלֵיל חֶמָה *without the sun* (Ct 6<sup>10</sup>). For the form of the sentence  
cf. 24<sup>10</sup>. חֶמָה *sun* (Is 30<sup>26</sup> Ct l.c.) does not recur in Job. Leg. מְנַחֵם  
*a comforter*, La 1<sup>2</sup>, or נְחָמָה *comfort*, 6<sup>10</sup>. בְּלֵיל חֶמְדָּה *without desire* (2 C 21<sup>20</sup>  
*without regret*?) is improb.; and 'I go darkened (in skin), but not by the  
sun' (cf. Ct 1<sup>6</sup>; but קָרַר is not a syn. of שָׁחַר) is simply a curiosity of  
interpretation. ו ἀνευ φυμῶ (alii θυμῶ = ו sine furore, ו חמתא,  
pointing חֶמָה; so three codd.), *without a muzzle* (scribal error in ו?).  
*in the Assembly* is strange if the verse is genuine. Did he visit the Gate  
in the intervals of sitting on his heap? בְּקוֹלִי *with my voice*, i.e. *aloud*,  
seems plausible; but קָמָה suits I rose. The next verse, however,  
favours בְּקוֹלִי, since his mournful cries constitute his resemblance to jackals  
and ostriches: cf. Mi 1<sup>8</sup>.

v. 29. For תַּנִּין *jackals* (ו draconum, confusing the word with תַּנִּין  
*a serpent*), וּמִן = יְרֹדִין, ו gives σειρήνων, *sirens* (so Is 34<sup>13</sup> 43<sup>20</sup>;  
= *ostriches* Is 13<sup>21</sup>!). For the two Sirens see Odyss. xii. 39 ff. (Since  
the Sirens were singers, and the word has no known etymon in Greek,  
we may compare the Sumerian SIR, *to sing*, (also SUR, *zamāru*), and  
Heb. שִׁיר *id.* The debt of Greek mythology and religion to primitive

Babylonia is greater than is commonly suspected; e. g. Σίβυλλα, *Sibyl*, *propheteess*, may ultimately be akin to ŠIB, *divination*.)

v. 30. 'My skin is black, and falleth from me' (RV). The supplement is inadmissible. 'Black' or even blackened skins do not necessarily 'fall' off. Read perhaps מַחֲלִי *from disease* pro מֵעָלַי *from off me*. וְדֵנִיגְרָא עָלַי *super me*; וְ (ἰσκόσται) μεγάλως = עֲרֵמָאֵר (Ps 38<sup>19</sup>), but מַחֲלִי is a closer parallel. The verb שָׁחַר *be black*, אִפ. (Hi. Eccus 25<sup>17</sup> = σκοτοῖ) is Aramaic. It is prob. a Factitive (ש) formation from חָר (cf. חָרָה st. ii), which means *be hot* (cf. fig. חֲרִיָּה, חֲרָא of *heat* of anger), *scorched*, *burned*, *charred*, and may ultimately be identical with GAD (KAD), GAR (KAR), *shine*, *burn*; cf. Sum. KAR-KAR, *shine*, ĠAD, ĠUD, *id.*, Mongol k'ara, *black*, Jap. kuroi, *id.* Things *burnt* become *black*. (חָר has no visible connexion with Sum. SHU-RIN, *tinúru*, clay 'firepot', חָנִיר; cf. SHU, *hand*, RIN, *bright*, *glowing*, qs the portable fire.) *my bones* or *limbs* (v. 17): pointing c וְעַצְמִי as plur. וְעַצְמִי > וְעַצְמִי sing. and reading plur. חָרָה pro וְחָרָה (Is 24<sup>6</sup>). Yet cf. 2<sup>5</sup> 19<sup>20</sup> (Sing. Coll.?).

### Chapter 31.

v. 1. A covenant or binding agreement (בְּרִית; cf. Assy. *birītu*, 'bond', 'fetter', fr. *barú*, 'to bind', fr. Sum. BAR, *id.*) I made for (= imposed on, cf. 40<sup>28</sup>) my eyes. The gist of the covenant immediately follows: I will never take notice of a virgin. וְמָה (dittoqr. of v. 2 ?) can scarcely be right. וְ ut ne cogitarem quidem de virgine; וְ καὶ οὐ συνήσσω ἐν παρθένῳ (the verse was wanting in G<sup>H</sup>); וְ רָלָא, &c. That I would not, &c. Leg. אֲנִי אֵם־emph. Pron. + the strong Neg. in oaths (cf. 1<sup>11</sup> 6<sup>28</sup>). The Ptc. might also be understood as Interrog. = Num ? (6<sup>12</sup> Ju 5<sup>9</sup>): אֵם(!) And would I take notice, &c. ? The suggestion מִיִּתְחַבֵּן From taking notice (= That I would not take, &c.; מִן of a Neg. Consequence) is grammatically but not metr. suitable. (Mt 5<sup>28</sup> has been compared. There, however, the subject is *adultery*, i.e. illicit intercourse with a married woman, cf. 2 Sa 11<sup>2</sup>, which is not the case here.)

v. 2. Lit. And what is the portion of Eloah from above, &c., as RV; but the meaning demanded by the context, according to some, must be as RV marg. For this sense we should have expected וְמַה־חֲלִקִי מֵאֱלֹהִים And what (would be) my share from E. above, And my portion from Shaddai on high ? cf. 20<sup>29</sup> 27<sup>13</sup>. As, however, נַחֲלָה may possibly mean *portion* assigned by *Iahvah* (cf. Ps 127<sup>3</sup>), the synonymous חֵלֶק אֱלֹהִים and נַחֲלָה שְׁדֵי may perhaps bear the same unusual meaning here. But an entirely different sense for the whole verse may be obtained by rendering And what is (or was) Eloah's award from above, And Shaddai's allotment from on high ? I jealously guarded my eyes, says Eyob (v. 1), and with what result? It is before you. God has rewarded me evil for good. [He has all along maintained this (to us)

daring position, which, however, is quite in accordance with the pre-suppositions of the story (see the Prologue).]

Then v. 3 might ask in the same strain *Should not ruin (befall) the unrighteous, And misfortune doers of evil?* Why then has it befallen me, the righteous? Is it possible (v. 4) that God, like you, is blind to realities, and cannot see the blamelessness of my life?

(Θ καὶ ἔτι ἐμέρισεν κτλ. ἔτι is prob. a scribal error for τί, the reading of Θ<sup>ac</sup>; ἐμέρισεν = קָלַל 21<sup>17</sup> or קָלַל 39<sup>17</sup>. B Quam enim partem haberet in me Deus desuper, Et hereditatem Omnipotens de excelsis?)

v. 3. St. i is metr. short. נָכַן *prepared* may have fallen out after אִיד (18<sup>12</sup>); or perhaps rather יָבוֹא (3<sup>25</sup> 21<sup>17</sup> + אִיד Pr 6<sup>15</sup>): *Should not ruin come to the unrighteous* (leg. plur. c Θ; cf. || ad fin.), *And calamity* (נָכַן Ob 12?) or *hostility(?) to the evildoers* (34<sup>22</sup>, cf. 22<sup>16</sup>)? נָכַן is perhaps *estrangement, alienation*, as Θ B C. (Pro קָלַל ad init. vs. Θ οὐαί = הוֹי.)

v. 4. Cannot *HE* (or *Doth not HE*) *see my ways, And take account of all my steps* (14<sup>16</sup> same phrase)? It is an impossible supposition; and therefore He must know my innocence.

Considerable difficulty has been felt about vv. 1-4, which appear to have been wanting in Θ<sup>H</sup>, upon which and other internal grounds some would omit them. The latter, however, are at least weakened by the interpretation suggested above. It is no doubt true that Eyob has declared that the wicked often prosper all their lives and enjoy a peaceful end (21<sup>15</sup>), and that vv. 2, 3 appear to contradict this. Driver, therefore, held that vv. 2-4 'state not what Job argues now, but the considerations which deterred him from sin in the past'; and, unless we suppose him exempt from temptation, it must be admitted that the instinctive fear of consequences (which we call conscience) was one element in Eyob's piety (cf. 1<sup>15</sup>), until the catastrophe overwhelmed him with an agony of doubt, not of God's existence and power, but of His justice. Dr. E. J. Dillon, rejecting vv. 1-4 as having been 'substituted for the original verses', supposes that the lost pair of quatrains made Eyob declare 'that this great change of fortune is not the result of his conduct'. But, as we have seen, the Massoretic verses may imply this, although they do not directly state it.

v. 5. St. i is metr. short; and as we cannot speak of *walking with* אֲשֶׁר (7<sup>8</sup>), but only with *men of* 'ש, we insert (c 2 codd.) מִתִּי before it (11<sup>11</sup> Ps 26<sup>4</sup>; אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי does not occur). Θ μετὰ γελοιαστῶν, *with jesters* (ἄπ.). St. ii. *hath hastened* or *hastened*: M points שָׁחַח which looks more like Hi. than Qal (שָׁחַח). No other instance of the Impf. Qal of שָׁחַח occurs. (Assyr. ḥāṣu = Sum. ĠAL = BU-LUG; ĠAL, *run, flow, gardru*; GIR-PAB-ĠAL, *take the road quickly*. ĠAL = ĠASH? GAR? ḥāṣu is one of the synn. of alāku, 'to go'.) *toward*: לָךְ pro מִלְּךָ; cf. Θ εἰς δόλον. שָׁחַח usually takes לָ (e. g. Ps 22<sup>20</sup>).



v. 6. App. parenthetic. *a true balance*: so אֲבִנִי צֶדֶק *true* (correct) *weights*, Le 19<sup>36</sup>, opp. מֵאֲנֵי מְרֻמָּה *a false balance*, Pr 11<sup>1</sup>. *perfectness or integrity*: 28.9 27<sup>6</sup>. The verse reminds us of the old Egyptian doctrine of the Weighing of the Soul after death in the Hall of Judgement (see the *Book of the Dead*); where the heart of the deceased is placed in the one scale and the symbol of Truth in the other.

v. 7. St. i is overweighted. Leg. מִנִּי הָרָרָה pro מִנִּי הָרָרָה מֵ. The Art. is superfluous. With the idea of st. ii, cf. v. 1.

St. iii is prob. an intruder in the text. Et si manibus meis adhaesit macula (מִמָּוֶה = מִמָּוֶה; so some codd. & Qerf): see note at 11<sup>15</sup>. Or מִמָּוֶה מִמָּוֶה *ought*. U sees an allusion to taking bribes.

v. 8. *another cat*: U plur. It is needless to add any Obj. (e.g. בָּל): cf. Is 65<sup>22</sup> Mi 6<sup>15</sup>. Brevity may be the soul of force as well as of wit. St. ii has only two stresses. U *And may I become rootless* on earth (עֲרִי גִיטָה) suggests that מִמָּוֶה *from Earth* (cf. Ps 52<sup>7</sup>) may have fallen out after צִמְצִמָּה *my offspring* (so also 5<sup>25</sup> + וְרַעַךְ 21<sup>6</sup> 21<sup>14</sup>; the only other occurrences of the word in Job). Et progenies mea eradicetur = מֵ. Perhaps we should read: לֹא-יִשְׁרָשׁוּ בְּאֶרֶץ וְצֵא *And my offspring not take root* (Po. Is 40<sup>24</sup>, cf. Je 12<sup>2</sup> ch 5<sup>3</sup> Hi.) *in the land!* Cf. 18<sup>16,17</sup>. (Even in Is 34<sup>1</sup> 42<sup>8</sup> צִמְצִמָּה means *issue, progeny > produce*. The Earth is the Mother of All: cf. 1<sup>21</sup>.)

v. 9. *enticed*: or *deceived*: cf. v. 27, 5<sup>2</sup>, Je 20<sup>7</sup>. The פֶּתַח *to be open*, i.e. not shut, met. *unguarded, unsuspicious, easily deceived, simple*, is doubtless an offshoot of the Sum. BAD, *pīth*, 'to open'.

v. 10. *grind*: scil. with the handmill; usually the work of female slaves: Ex 11<sup>6</sup> Is 47<sup>2</sup> (cf. Ju 16<sup>21</sup>). Scortum alterius sit uxor mea, assuming a sexual metaphor, in agreement with st. ii (U ἀπέσαι is prob. a scribe's error for ἀλέσαι = מֵ); and so &. But there is no trace of this met. use elsewhere. If a free woman were degraded to a שִׁפְחָה, she would become liable to both services at the will of her master. טחן Ar. طحن = Assyr. *tēnu*, 'to grind', e.g. *tēnu ša qēmi*, 'grind, of meal', קָטַח: cf. Is 47<sup>2</sup>). Leg. אַחֲרֵי c 11 codd. ad fin. pro אַחֲרֵי (Aramaism): U om. U τὰ δὲ νηπιά μου = וְעֵלְיָהּ pro וְעֵלְיָהּ (Or וְעֵלְיָהּ La 1<sup>6</sup> 4<sup>4</sup>). In st. i leg. fort. לֵאדֹן *for a master > לאחַר for another*.

v. 11. St. i is metr. short. Lit. *For that is* (or *were, would be*) an evil device or wickedness (וְפִתָּה). We might insert עֲשֵׂוֹת *to do*, Pr 10<sup>23</sup>, or add וְנִבְלָה *and folly*, Ju 20<sup>6</sup> ch. 42<sup>8</sup> (see 2<sup>10</sup> note; 30<sup>8</sup>). For וְפִתָּה see Le 18<sup>17</sup>; here only in Job (17<sup>11</sup> is corrupt): cf. מְוִמָּה 21<sup>27</sup> 42<sup>2</sup>. The vb. וְפִתָּה (not in Job) springs from a Bilit. Root ZAM, *make a sound, noise* (Syr.), *speak* (Arab.), *speak to oneself or inwardly*, i.e. *think, plan, devise* (Heb., Aram.), cogn. c NAM in Heb. נָאֵם, NH. נִים *to speak*, and Sum. NIM in I-NIM, E-NEM, *word* (NIM = ZIM, by a well-known phonetic change).

Grammat. Concord justifies the Qerf הִיא in st. i and הִיא in st. ii.

In the latter פְּלִילִים עוֹן is an ungrammatical combination or mixture of עוֹן פְּלִילִים (v. 28, and about 20 codd. here) and עוֹן פְּלִילִי (so codd. multt.).

a criminal offence: an offence of which the law takes cognizance, or which renders one liable to its penalties. If the pointing עוֹן be correct, we must read פְּלִילִי iudicialis (v. 28), an Adj. not found elsewhere, though the f. פְּלִילִיָּה occurs as a Subst. in the sense of judging (Is 28<sup>7</sup> = κρίσις 62). It seems better to read עוֹן פְּלִילִים in both verses. For פְּלִילִים judges (plur. tant.) we have only Ex 22<sup>21</sup> (?) Dt 32<sup>31</sup> beside the present loc. According to the law of Le 20<sup>10</sup>, the penalty of adultery was death; but the phrase a crime of (for) judges hardly seems to express so much, or indeed anything specially distinctive of adultery. B renders iniquitas maxima (cf. 6 v. 28 ἀνομία ἢ μεγίστη); and it is evident that the original phrase, whatever it may have been, was intended to emphasize the moral gravity of the offence rather than its legal consequences. Did the translator think of פְּלִיאִי wonderful, extraordinary; or was his maxima merely determined by his just sense of the general import of the verse? 6, with its רצנעתא עינא הי רצנעתא est oculus fraudium and וידית כלהין צנעתא uidit omnes fraudes meas confuses עוֹן with עֵין, and appears to read נפתלים or נפתלים for פְּלִילִים and פְּלִילִי: cf. 15<sup>18</sup>, where it renders נפתלים the tortuous by צנועתא versuti, fraudulent.

We perceive that 6 and B had a phrase more or less resembling (עוֹן פְּלִילִים) in their Hebrew copies; but what are we to say of 6's θυμὸς γὰρ ὀργῆς ἀκατάσχετος, | τὸ μᾶναι ἀνδρὸς γυναικα (for a passion of anger not to be checked, | is the defiling a man's wife)? Duhm, who translates the Hebrew text For that is a deed of shame and rebellion, And that is an offence for the Criminal Court (Denn das ist Schandthat und Abfall Und das eine Schuld fürs Halsgericht), speaks of 'the doubtful addition which LXX has instead of v. 11<sup>b</sup>'; and then, after remarking that 'Unfortunately not much can be made of the LXX' (Leider lässt sich mit der LXX nicht viel machen), he says 'I get a וְסָרָה out of their ἀκατάσχετος (סָרָה)'. But סָרָה is an adj. fem. of סָר stubborn, sullen, refractory, and is not used for the subst. (abfällig, nicht Abfall); and it is improbable that ἀκατάσχετος represents a single positive term like סָרָה stubborn. The verb κατέχειν, poet. κατασχεθεῖν, means to hold back, check, restrain, bridle, e.g. ἵππους (Aesch. Pers. 190) and metaph. ὀργῇ, θυμόν, &c. (Soph. El. 1011); and the verbal adj. with privative prefix here used in connexion with θυμὸς ὀργῆς obviously means uncontrolled, unbridled rage or passion. In 3<sup>17</sup> θυμός ὀργῆς renders the single word רָגַז; and it may stand either for חָמָה (= θυμός, 6<sup>1</sup> 19<sup>29</sup> 36<sup>17</sup>, et al. saep.), or for זַעַם (= ὀργή 15 times in 6) here. It might also represent such a phrase as זעם ועברה, which might possibly be a distortion of זמה ונבלה (vid. supr.). Cf. also Is 30<sup>30</sup> 6. But the Adj. ἀκατάσχετος also belongs to st. i; and this may represent Heb. לֹא-לָבֵלָם (cf. Ps 32<sup>2</sup>; Pesh. ad 1 Cor 9<sup>9</sup>) or לֹא-זָמוּם

*uncurbed, unbitted*, by an Aramaism (cf. Aram. זממא *a muzzle or bit*, זמם *to bit or muzzle* an animal). We may therefore suppose that ט's first stichus implies a Heb. line כִּי־הוּא וְעַם לֹא־זִמּוּם *For that is (a cause of) indignation unbridled* (or כִּי־הוּא וְעַם לֹא־לִבָּלֵם); while its second stichus, τὸ μῦναυ ἀνδρὸς γυναικα, instead of being a superfluous gloss on st. i, as Duhm supposed, may stand for לטמא אדם לחלל (or אִשֶּׁת אָדָם), which may have grown out of וְהוּא עֵין פְּלִילִי by more or less obvious and usual corruptions of letters (e.g. ע = ש, ב = פ, לי = ע). [In the other two passages also (Ex Dt) ט failed to understand פְּלִילִים (cf. also Is 16<sup>3</sup> 28<sup>1</sup>, and the vb. פָּלַל Gn 48<sup>11</sup> 1 Sa 2<sup>20</sup> Ez 16<sup>32</sup> Ps 106<sup>30</sup>) in the sense of *judges* or *umpires*. If the פָּלַל really had the meaning of *intervening, mediating, interposing as arbitrator*, as well as *interceding, praying for*, in Heb., the primary idea will be that of *splitting, separating, coming between*; cf. Ar. فَجَّر *break or notch* the edge of a sword or anything else, e.g. *a tooth; break (through?) or defeat* an army; Sum. BAL, *break through, into*, BAL, *an axe*, BAL, *to dig, break up or open* the ground, and BAL, *to speak, break out* into speech or, perhaps, *open* the lips. Cf. the same Prim. Root in פָּלַח, פָּלַח, פָּלַח, פָּלַח, פָּלַח, פָּלַח, &c.)]

Both here and in v. 28 the reference to 'judges' is surprising; cf. vv. 8, 10, 22, 40, where we have imprecations, but no prosaic allusion to legal penalties. The word פְּלִילִים may be corrupt in both places; and vv. 11, 12 are possibly an interpolation. (An leg. נפ(י)לים? Gn 6<sup>4</sup>.)

v. 12. St. i is overweighted metr., even after omitting בִּי (dittogr. of v. 11?). App. based on Dt 32<sup>22</sup> (*unto Abaddon = unto She'ol*). Cf. 26<sup>6</sup> Pr 7<sup>27</sup>. ט ἐπὶ (ἘΑ ἐκ) πάντων τῶν μερῶν = מְכַל עֲבָרָיו 1 K 5<sup>4</sup>. The vs. has been influenced by v. 8 (תֹּאכַל—יֹאכַל; יִבְנֶה תְּבוּאָתִי תִשְׂרֹשׁ; יִצְרֶה תְּבוּאָתִי). *And would root out all mine increase* (תְּבוּאָה *produce, crops*) looks like a variant or gloss on v. 8<sup>b</sup>, and seems improb. here as parallel to st. i. ט οὐ δ' αὖν ἐπέλθῃ, ἐκ ριζῶν ἀπώλεσεν = וּבְכַל תְּבוּאָה תִשְׂרֹשׁ. We must read תִּשְׂרֹף *it burneth up* pro מִשְׂרֹשׁ (Fire does not 'root up').

v. 13. מִי violates the metre by wrong division of the stichi. Point עֲבָרִי > וְאִמְתִּי. *in their quarrel; or when they contended (at law) with me.*

v. 14. rose up: יָקֻם. ט ἔτασίν μου ποιῆται (ἘΑ ποιήσῃται ἘΑ ποιήσῃ) = יִחְקֹר. It is needless to point יָקֻם *avengeth*. But it is a plausible conjecture that this verse is out of place here and orig. preceded v. 18.

v. 15. Lit. *Did not—in the belly—my Maker make him* (not emph.)? i.e. *Is he not human like me? of the same flesh and blood as I am?*

One: emph. One and the Same Being, viz. God. *prepare us*: מִי יִבְנֶנּוּ; leg. Hi. יִבְנֶנּוּ or Pol. יִבְנֶנּוּ. ט ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κοιλίᾳ (האחד); perhaps meaning the womb of Earth, the Mother of All. (Ἐ γεγόναμεν = יִבְנֶנּוּ or יִבְנֶנּוּ; cf. Dt 17<sup>4</sup>.) מִי (יִבְנֶנּוּ?) may be intended as a contraction of יִבְנֶנּוּ *and constituted him. And formed him in the one womb* (בְּאֶחָד) is conceivably right.

v. 16. *from (their) desire*: cf. 21<sup>21</sup> 22<sup>2</sup>: perhaps חפצם (Ps 107<sup>30</sup> 1 K 5<sup>21</sup>). חפץ may mean *a thing desired* (cf. Pr 3<sup>15</sup>) as well as *delight, pleasure*. B Si negavi quod volebant pauperibus, Et oculis viduae *expectare feci*: see note 11<sup>20</sup>; 17<sup>5</sup>. For the Construction, st. i, cf. Nu 24<sup>11</sup>. C paraphr. *And the poor* (ἀδύνατοι), *what want they ever had, failed not to get*.

v. 17. *my morsel*: פתי (Gn 18<sup>6</sup>). *ate*: אכל. C καὶ οὐκ ὀφθανῶ μετέδωκα implies the pointing אכל (אוביל), a dubious Hi. form (cf. Ho 11<sup>4</sup>). C as מ.

v. 18. מ lit. *For from my youth* he grew up to me (יָרַלְנִי?) *as* (to?) *a father*, | *And from my mother's belly I would guide her* (i.e. the widow). This cannot be right. יָרַל Qal occurs nowhere else with any Suffix (cf. 2 Sa 12<sup>9</sup>); and the hyperbole of st. ii is extravagant and improb. If the verse be in its original place, the reference will naturally be to the adoption and rearing of orphans in childhood or infancy. (To get back to the widow, we must overleap v. 17.) *Nay, but from his youth* (יָ— pro י—) *I brought him up, as a father* (יָרַלְתִּי pro יָרַלְנִי; or simply יָרַלְתִּי), *And from his mother's womb I would guide him* (אָמַן pro אָמִי and אָנַחְנִי pro אָנַחְנָה)! The changes proposed are slight and easy; and the passage thus becomes similar to 29<sup>15</sup> (*A father was I to the needy*; cf. also 29<sup>12</sup>). The view of my late acquaintance Dr. Merx, however, is very attractive. Pointing יָרַלְנִי *He* (i.e. God) *brought me up* (cf. C *pains reared me*) pro מָרַלְנִי, and reading נָחַנִּי *He guided me* [38<sup>32</sup> יָנַחְנִי] pro מָנַחְנָה, Merx made this verse the immediate sequel of v. 14 (transposed to this place):

*What should I do, if El arose?  
And if He visited, what should I answer Him?  
For from my youth He fostered me as a Father,  
And from my mother's womb He guided me.*

C lends some support to the former view (ἐξέτρεφον ὡς πατήρ . . . ὠδῆγησα). B Quia ab infantia mea crevit mecum (= מ) *miseratio* (בָּאֵה pro בָּאֵה): cf. C.

v. 19. St. ii, lit. *And there was no covering to the needy*; which does not seem quite coherent with st. i. C καὶ οὐκ ἤμφιασα αὐτόν, *And I clothed him not*. Should we read לֹא בָסִיתִי לְאֵבִיִּן *And if I covered not the needy* (Is 11<sup>9</sup> לֹא בָסִיתִי)? אֵם may have been misread אֵין, and then לֹא omitted.

v. 20. *his loins*: 38<sup>3</sup> 40<sup>7</sup>. C ἀδύνατον perhaps חֲלָצִי pro מָרַלְנִי (cf. Jo 4<sup>20</sup>); or אֲבִיִּי from v. 19 fin. (The metaphor may have seemed improbable to the translator.) In st. ii לֹא may have fallen out before the verb. C supplies οἱ ὕμους αὐτῶν, *their shoulders* (vv. 22, 36) as the Subj. of the verb; making the stichus too long.

v. 21. *shook my fist at*: or *waved* or *lifted up my hand over* or *against*.

The phrase denotes a menacing gesture (cf. Is 11<sup>15</sup> 19<sup>18</sup>), or perhaps a contemptuous one (cf. Ecclus 12<sup>18</sup>). The  $\sqrt{\text{נר}}$  is cogn. c נוע and ווע, and also prob. c עור and עפעפּים. (For the permutations of initial sound, vid. Proc. Brit. Acad. VII, *Shumer and Shem*, pp. 9 ff. 31.)

at the orphan: cf. 5<sup>4</sup>.  $\text{עַל־יְתֵם}$  against an unoffending or honest man (11<sup>18</sup> al.) has been suggested pro  $\text{עַל־יְתֵם}$ . Cf. 8<sup>20</sup> Ps 64<sup>5</sup> for  $\text{יְתֵם}$  alone. But the change is not imperative. St. ii. When (or Because) I saw my help (= Concr. helpers, supporters or partisans) in the Gateway: cf 127<sup>5</sup>.  $\text{וְכַפֵּי־יְדַיִךְ}$  confident that I have a great surplus of help ( $\text{בְּשֶׁעַר}$  pro  $\text{בְּשֶׁעַר־יְדַיִךְ}$ ).

v. 22. Cf. the imprecation of Hammurabi: 'May Nergal . . . smash his limbs like an image of clay!' (*binādišū kīma ṣalam ṣitīm lihpūš!* Cod. Ham. XLIV. 37-39).  $\text{שֵׁכָם}$  shoulder, (upper) back, is prob. a Facitive formation ( $\text{ש} + \text{כָּם}$ ) from the Prim. and widespread Root GAM, KAM, to bend, bow (cf. Gn 49<sup>15</sup>) = Sum. GAM; cf. the Chinese, kung, kwafig, 'the upper arm', kīn, kien, kieng, 'top of shoulder'.  $\text{ἄπὸ τῆς κλειδός}$ , from the collar-bone;  $\text{ἢ}$  a junctura sua =  $\text{כִּשְׁבָּמָה}$  (so point! instead of  $\text{מִן הַר־רָפָח}$  et post  $\text{מִקְנֵה}$ ).  $\text{ἄπὸ τοῦ ἀγκῶνος}$ , from the elbow, which may be right ( $\text{קָנָה}$  reed, stalk; hīc tant. hoc sensu).

v. 23.  $\text{מִן הַיָּד}$  lit. For a dread unto me (was) ruin of El; but, since  $\text{אֵל}$  cannot mean 'calamity from God' (RV), but only calamity endured by God (30<sup>12</sup>, the supposed parallel instance, is corrupt: vid. not. ad loc.), it is evident that the stichus is in need of revision, as indeed the collocation of similar letters  $\text{אֵל אֵל אֵל}$  suggests at first sight. Read  $\text{כִּי פָחַד אֵל}$   $\text{יִאֲחֲזֵנִי}$  (3<sup>25</sup>, cf. 16<sup>22</sup>), or perhaps  $\text{יִאֲחֲזֵנִי}$  (cf. 37<sup>22</sup>).  $\text{ὁ φόβος γὰρ συνέσχευέ με}$  =  $\text{כִּי פָחַד יִאֲחֲזֵנִי}$ ; and the verb may be right: cf. 18<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>6</sup>  $\text{ἔσχευεν}$  1 K 6<sup>10</sup>  $\text{συνέσχευεν}$ .  $\text{ἢ}$  curiously: Semper enim quasi tumentes super me fluctus ( $\text{אֵל אֵל אֵל}$ !) timui Deum;  $\text{Ἔ}$  Because the fear of God shook me ( $\text{אֵל אֵל אֵל}$ ), And His breaking (ruin,  $\text{תְּבִירָה}$ ) came upon me ( $\text{עָלַי}$ ). St. i might perhaps have been  $\text{כִּי פָחַד אֵל יְבוֹא (אֵל)}$  For dread of El used to come to me. St. ii  $\text{מִן הַיָּד}$  lit. And from (= because of) His loftiness ( $\text{כִּשְׁוֹאֲתוֹ}$ ) I was unable (i. e. could do nothing). For  $\text{שִׁוְּאָת}$  exaltation, majesty, see 13<sup>11</sup> 41<sup>17</sup> and cf. Le 13<sup>2,10,28</sup> a 'rising' = a swelling or eruption of the skin.  $\text{καὶ ἄπὸ τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ (ῥήμα)}$  =  $\text{שִׁוְּאָת}$  Hab 1<sup>7</sup> Usu. =  $\text{מִשָּׁא}$  prophetic 'burden'  $\text{οὐχ ὑποίσω}$  (4<sup>2</sup> =  $\text{יִכָּל}$ ; but Am 7<sup>10</sup> =  $\text{לִהְבִּיל}$  bear, endure): cf.  $\text{Ἔ}$  Et pondus eius ferre non potui. Possibly  $\text{וְשִׁוְּאָתוֹ וְגו'}$  And His storming (?) I could not endure: cf. 30<sup>8,14,22</sup> Pr 1<sup>26</sup> 3<sup>25</sup>.

In any case, the distich is an unsuitable sequel to the imprecation of v. 22. Hence some have transposed it to precede v. 15. More probably it is an interpolation.

v. 24. (yellow) gold:  $\text{זָהָב}$ , the ordinary term for gold, prob. cogn. c  $\text{זָהָב}$  shine, of bronze, yellow, of hair (in Arab. reddish, of hair of men, camels, the lion). Cf. perhaps Sum. ZA-BAR (ZAB-BAR ?), gleaming, copper,

ZEB, *bright, beautiful*. *my confidence: my stay*: 8<sup>14</sup>. (red) gold: כָּהָן 28<sup>16</sup> note. (ὁ εἰς χοῦν μου, *my heap of earth, my rampart*? cf. 39<sup>14</sup> χοῦς = עָפָר. For λίθω πολυτελεί = כָּהָן cf. Is 13<sup>12</sup> 28<sup>16</sup> Pr 25<sup>12</sup>.)

v. 25. *much*: מְבִיר so Is 16<sup>14</sup>. For this poet. syn. of בִּיר see 8<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>10</sup> al.

v. 26. For the worship of the heavenly bodies, universal in the ancient East (and in the West among the Maya and Nahua-Aztec peoples of America), cf. Dt 4<sup>19</sup> Je 44<sup>17ff</sup>. Ez 8<sup>18</sup>.

*the sun*: אֹר (str. *light*) so here only. Cf. Is 18<sup>4</sup> (עַל אֹר 'in the sun'). *as it shone*: = ὁ τὸν ἐπιφάσκοντα: so 25<sup>5</sup> 41<sup>10</sup>. ὁ strangely adds ἐκλείποντα, *in eclipse*: 'Or see we not Helios that shineth *while being eclipsed* | And Selene *declining*? (φθίνουσιν ἄπ.) *For it is not in their power*'. ὁ perhaps read יָרַק *pale* pro יָרַר *splendid*; or else קָרַר *dark* (Jo 2<sup>10</sup>), which it may have transposed and rendered ἐκλείποντα, taking הִלָּךְ as *departing*. Possibly τὸ ἐπιφάσκοντα ἐκλείποντα combines two readings, viz. כִּירִיאל *when he shone* and יָכַה *was dim* (Is 42<sup>4</sup>). But there can be little doubt that B has understood the verse rightly: Si vidi solem cum fulget | Et lunam incedentem clare.

v. 27. *was seduced*, Niph. (וַיִּפְח) as v. 9 Je 20<sup>7</sup>, pro מ Qal. The meaning seems to be (*cor meum*) *sibi persuaderi passum est*. ὁ ἡπατήθη.

*my hand hath kissed*; as in throwing a kiss to a person at a distance. Kissing the images of gods is a well-known Oriental mode of worship. Cf. Ho 13<sup>2</sup> 1 K 19<sup>18</sup>.

v. 28. If genuine, the verse is parenthetic, rather than apodotic. There is no apodosis to vv. 16–20, 24–25, 29–34; the fact being that all these formally hypothetical propositions are virtually emphatic denials of the sins enumerated. See notes on v. 11. Certainly trust in riches (vv. 24, 25) was not 'an iniquity to be punished by the judges' (RV). The verse looks like an interpolation.

*I had been false (or lied) to . . .*, cf. 1 K 13<sup>18</sup>. Perhaps we should read בָּאֵל pro לֵאֵל: *I should have denied (or disowned) El above* (cf. 8<sup>18</sup> Is 59<sup>13</sup>).

v. 29. *If I rejoiced*. The Impf., as in the other instances (vv. 7, 13, 16, 19, 25 f.), expresses habitual conduct: *If I was wont to . . .* or *If I would . . .* ruin: פִּיר: 12<sup>5</sup> 21<sup>20</sup> al. *was elated: or exulted*: והתעוררתי *roused myself, was excited*: see 17<sup>9</sup>. B exultavi. Cf. Pr 24<sup>17</sup> where this Schadenfreude (we have no word for it in English) is the subject of a warning. ὁ gives an apparent variant: καὶ εἶπεν ἡ καρδία μου Εὖγε = וְאָמַר לִבִּי הָאֵם *And my heart would cry, 'Aha!'* 39<sup>25</sup> Ps 35<sup>21,25</sup> Ez 36<sup>2</sup>.

v. 30. Lit. *And (But) I have not given my palate to sinning, | To asking his life with a curse*. The Pf. here and elsewhere expresses habit, with a picturesque difference from the Impf.; as though one said 'I have never once done it!' ὁ has a different verse: *Let, then, my ear hear my curse | And let me, then, (A om.) be the common talk by my (the A) people abused*! =

תִּשְׁמַע אָזְנִי אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי (Cf. מ st. ii.)

יִלְמְלָה לְעַמִּי אֲדֹהָהּ (Cf. 30<sup>3</sup> θρῦλλημα = מלח.)

which has at least the merit of not involving another parenthesis, and of being a possible conclusion. As to *asking the life of enemies*, i.e. praying for their deaths, see 1 K 3<sup>11</sup> (with a curse, Nu 22<sup>6,11</sup> 23<sup>14</sup>).

v. 31. RV is not a possible equivalent of מ; and RV marg., which divides the stichus between a wish and a categorical assertion, sins against poetical construction. As in other passages of our book, however, e.g. v. 35 infr., מ יתן must introduce a wish. Accordingly, st. ii, as it stands in מ, can only mean *Oh that with his flesh we were not surfeited!* which might conceivably be the expression of a regret that repletion prevented them from eating more of such good fare. This would agree with v. 32; but the two verses need not be closely connected, and *flesh* (בשר), a frequent word in Job, does not occur in this sense elsewhere in the book (2<sup>8</sup> 4<sup>15</sup> 6<sup>12</sup> 7<sup>5</sup> 13<sup>14</sup> 14<sup>22</sup> 19<sup>20</sup> 21<sup>6</sup>). Even if בשרו could mean *his meat* (שׂאֵר) Ps 78<sup>20,27</sup>, מִחֵי אֶהְיֶה the *men of my tent* can hardly be *my guests*, but rather *my household or dependents* (cf. 19<sup>19</sup> Gn 34<sup>30</sup>). 6 αἱ θεραπαινίδες μου = אִמָּהוֹתַי (19<sup>15</sup>, v. 13 sing.). But the occurrence of the phrase וַתִּבְשְׂרֵי לֹא תִשְׂבְּעוּ And (why) are ye not sated with my flesh? i.e. *Why do ye not weary of slandering me?* would seem to be almost decisive; and then the stichus must mean *O that we could speak enough ill of him!* in this case, perhaps, as a churlish, mean, and niggardly master, and inhospitable to strangers (cf. 1 Sa 25). The second Neg. must be omitted c 6 7 (due to dittogr. or 19<sup>22</sup>). Others omit יתן and take נִשְׂבַּע as Niph. [אַπ-]. Pf. 3 Sing.: *Who with his flesh hath not been satisfied?* i.e. *Who has not enjoyed his lavish hospitality?*

(6 And if often my handmaids said, | *O that we might be filled with his flesh!* plur. τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ so 2<sup>5</sup> 4<sup>15</sup> 19<sup>20</sup> al. ten times. 6 adds the exegetical gloss λίαν μου χρηστοῦ ὄντος, *when I was all too kind.*)

v. 32. Cf. Ju 19<sup>20</sup>. We must, of course, point אֶרֶץ traveller, wayfarer (Ju 19<sup>17</sup>) pro מִן אֶרֶץ the way, c Versions.

v. 33. *If I covered my transgressions*; i.e. concealed them: Pr 28<sup>13</sup> (the same phrase). כְּאָדָם like men; as men usually do. Cf. 7 quasi homo. But מִן אָדָם from men would be better, in view of v. 34; cf. Gn 18<sup>17</sup> מֵאֲבָרָהם . . . הִמָּכְסֶה. 'בְּאָדָם' unter den Menschen will not do; כִּפֹּה = cover with, Gn 38<sup>14</sup> Ps 147<sup>8</sup>. כִּמְדִי Ps 109<sup>18</sup>, or כְּאֶרְצָה as with a mantle, cf. Ps 104<sup>6</sup>, might also be suggested, but מִן אָדָם is perhaps preferable.)

in my bosom: an Aramaism; חֹב = חֹבֶה. So 7 8; 6 בְּטִשְׁתִּיא in secret. 6 paraphrases εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀμαρτῶν ἀκουσίως | ἔκρυψα τὴν ἀμαρτίαν μου; app. supposing that st. i was another way of saying בִּשְׁתִּי בְּחֹבֶה, and omitting בְּחֹבֶה as a gloss on עֹלִי (owing to confusion with Aram. חֹבֶה)

*debt, sin*). Perhaps we should read בְּחִי (י) in my bosom (cf. 23<sup>12</sup>) and וְאֶמְנוֹן (18<sup>10</sup> 40<sup>13</sup>) c ב Et celavi in sinu meo, &c. (Cf. 6.)

v. 34. A tristich. *I dreaded*: אַעֲרוֹץ. Not so elsewhere c Accus. Obj. In 13<sup>25</sup> Trans. (*to scare*). Cf. Jos 1<sup>9</sup>. 6 For I turned not away from a mob of multitude | In order not to confess (Le 5<sup>6</sup> Ps 32<sup>5</sup> הוֹדָה) before them (a loose paraphr. which app. omits st. ii); | And if also I suffered a poor man to go forth of my door with empty bosom = וְאֶמְנוֹן לֹא אֶצֵּא פֶתַח, which might be due to misreading of וְאֶמְנוֹן לֹא אֶצֵּא פֶתַח (So that I kept quiet, nor went forth of the doorway; prob. a marg. gloss).

v. 35. מִי יִתֵּן לִי שֹׁמֵעַ לִי Who will give to me one listening to me? is barely metrical; and if we suppress the first לִי (after six codd. 6 6 6) it becomes less so. The restoration of a single letter will yield a satisfactory line, viz. מִי־יִתֵּן אֶל יִשְׁמַעֲלִי O that El would listen to me! St. ii, though metr., is even more dub. מַה הֵן תְּוִי שְׂרִי יַעֲנֵנִי Lo my mark! let Shaddai answer me! (הֵן mark, Ez 9<sup>4.6+</sup>). 'Job speaks, as he has often done elsewhere, in legal phraseology. Here, he says, is my solemn signature to these protestations of innocence; let the Almighty refute them, and "answer me", if He can!' (Driver). In Ez l.c., the only other place where it occurs, הֵן is a mark made with ink on the forehead, prob. a cross (cf. +, x, the oldest shapes of the letter Tau). No instance can be adduced of its use in the sense of a man's 'mark' appended to a written document by way of signature, as in the case of the illiterate to-day (cf. the thumbnail impressions on Babylonian Contract Tablets). But even if it were so used, it does not appear that Eyob had actually signed a written statement of his case; in fact, the next stichus makes him utter a wish for a document recounting the charges against him, which he would joyfully receive, as affording him something definite to answer and disprove. How could he exclaim 'Here is my signature!' before he had actually set it on any document? Are we to suppose that he held up a sort of stamp or seal engraved with a Tau? Moreover, as מַה gives it, the verse is a tristich; and the parenthetic st. ii robs st. iii of all possible grammatical connexion (e.g. with st. i, as RV). There is no trace of הֵן my mark in the Versions. 6 χεῖρα δὲ κύριον (= שְׂרִי 6<sup>1.11</sup> al.) εἰ (= הֵן) ἥμ ἐδεδοῦκαυ (!); 2 Lo, my desire (= תַּוִּי pro תַּוִּי) is that Shaddai answer me! So 3 Ut desiderium meum audiat Omnipotens. 6 If it be (הֵן הֵן תְּוִי pro תַּוִּי), let God answer me, | And write, &c. (st. iii). St. ii might be restored thus: וְיֵאָחַז שְׂרִי יַעֲנֵנִי And that Shaddai would come and answer me! But, since God does as He desires (אָחַז 23<sup>13</sup>), וְיֵאָחַז or וְיִתְאַחַז may have been the missing verb (cf. 6 6 6), which would account better for the תְּוִי of מַה: And that Shaddai would will it and answer me! A line may have fallen out either before or after st. iii, which still hangs in the air. To fill up the gap Duhm suggested מִי יִתֵּן לִי מְנִלָּה O that I had the roll (מְנִלָּה)



Ps 40<sup>8</sup> Ez 32<sup>3</sup> Je 36<sup>14ff.</sup>); making a good connexion with st. iii (iv): *And the writing which mine opponent hath written!* But the repetition of *מי יתן* within the bounds of the same quatrain seems strange; and *מגלה* roll does not occur elsewhere in Job. Perhaps Eyob does not so much assume the existence of a Divine catalogue of his offences as express the wish that God would prepare one and submit it to his scrutiny. He would have the Almighty state His case in writing (in a סִפּוּר); as he wished his own case might be stated, 19<sup>23</sup>. Hence טִבִּי may be right with יִתְּבֵב instead of בָּתֵּב: *An indictment let mine Adversary write . . .* Then might follow וְיִזְכְּרֵנִי עַל־מַעַלְמִי: *And show me why He contends with me!* (cf. 10<sup>2</sup>) as the missing st. iv; or something similar (e.g. וְעָרַךְ לִפְנֵי מִשְׁפָּטִי *And set out His case before me!* cf. 13<sup>18</sup> 23<sup>4</sup>; or simply וְיִשֶׁת נִנְדִי אֶת־עֲוֹנִי *And set before me my sin!*).

Is 30<sup>8</sup> might also suggest וְעַל־לוח יִחַק עוֹנִי *And on a tablet inscribe* (19<sup>23</sup>) *my sin!* and Is 50<sup>8</sup> מִשְׁפָּטִי בַעַל וּמִכְתָּב *And a written account my prosecutor!* ט וספר כָּתֵב? אִישׁ רִיבִי = ὁ συγγραφεὺς δὲ ἦν εἰς λόγον κατὰ τινος.

v. 36. I would wear it as a badge of honour; I would glory in it as evidence of my innocence. *I would bind it:* Pr 6<sup>21</sup> only. (The עִנָּה may be cogn. c אָנַר *bind*, Talm., cf. אָנְדָה, עָנַר *bind*, Arab. *tie fast*, Syr. *bend*, and קָר in קָרַר *bend, bow*, \*GAD = \*NGAD = \*NAD? Cf. Sum. GAR, GUR, *to bend, bow*; KUR, KEŠ, *to bind*.) Cf. also Pr 7<sup>3</sup> Dt 6<sup>8f.</sup> *a crown*: Sing. c 2 codd. and טִבִּי pro מִי plur. Cf. 19<sup>3</sup>. *upon my brows*: lit. *upon me* (עָלַי pro לִי: as Pr 6<sup>21</sup>). ט (in continuation of v. 35, st. iii) ἐπ' ὤμοις ἀν περιθέμενος στέφανον ἀνεγίνωσκον, (And the writing which I had against any one) *on shoulders putting round (as) a crown I used to read*. This app. omits אֶשְׂאוּ *I would bear it*, adding וְאֶקְרָאוּ *and I would read it* at the end (a gloss? cf. Dt 17<sup>18.19</sup>; or misreading of אֶקְרָבוּ, v. 37 ad fin.?).

v. 37. Driver explained the verse: 'I would also declare to my Judge every action of my life, and present (marg. RV) the indictment fearlessly before Him.' All his actions, however, are supposed to be already recorded in the 'indictment'; and it is difficult to believe that the repeated Suffix נִי can refer first to the Judge and then to the document. Its use in both stichi of v. 36 to indicate the document makes the same reference here most natural in both stichi. *The tale* (i.e. sum; or account, Ju 7<sup>16</sup>; cf. the verb chap. 15<sup>17</sup>) *of my doings (steps = proceedings) I would declare* (or *avow, proclaim*) *it*,—*Like a prince* (29<sup>10</sup>) or *As to a prince* (cf. B) *would I present it!* Since st. ii halts metr., we may perhaps see in כִּמוּ the vestige of כְּמֹלִי (26<sup>4</sup>) *Like the words of a prince or noble* (and therefore a true statement and above suspicion) *I would bring it on or forward!* (cf. Is 41<sup>21</sup>). We may even suggest אֶקְרָאוּ *I would*

read it aloud (Je 36<sup>8,15,21</sup>)  $\text{pro } \text{אָקֶבְנוּ}$ ; or, retaining the latter, *As the gift of a prince* ( $\text{כִּמוֹ מֶתֶן נָרִיב}$  12<sup>21</sup> 21<sup>28</sup> Pr 19<sup>6</sup>) *would I receive* ( $\text{אָקֶבְלֵנוּ}$ ) *it!*

He is sure that a Divine account of his actions could contain nothing against him. If only God would give him a written statement of what He well knows, Eyob would exhibit it to all the world as irrefragable proof of his innocence. Cf.  $\text{Per singulos gradus meos pronuntiabo illum, Et quasi principi (= כַּנְנִיד) offeram eum. } \Theta \text{ και ει μη ρήξας αὐτὴν ἀπέδωκα, Οὐθὲν λαβὼν παρὰ χρεωφιλέτου = נָשָׂה וְיָמֵי וְאִשְׁבְּנוּ וְיָמֵי וְאִשְׁבְּנוּ : לֹא-אֶקְבְּלֵנוּ} \text{ And I would have rent and given it back, Accepting naught from a debtor!}$

Verses 38–40 are evidently out of place. They belong somewhere in the previous series of hypothetical paragraphs (vv. 5–34). They may have originally followed v. 8 or v. 34. ‘Most of the paragraphs in this chapter begin with *If*; so that a scribe might easily have omitted one accidentally, and afterwards, discovering his mistake, have added it at the end of the chapter’ (Driver), to which vv. 35–37 form a natural conclusion.

v. 38. *cry out*: as wrongfully appropriated by fraud or violence: cf. 24<sup>2</sup> Dt 19<sup>14</sup> 1 K 21 Is 5<sup>8</sup>.

v. 39. *its produce without payment*: lit. *its strength* ( $\text{כֹּחַ}$  Gn 4<sup>12</sup>) or *virtue, goodness, without silver* (Is 55<sup>1</sup>); i.e. without payment for the rent of the land, or as wages to the labourers: cf. Je 22<sup>13</sup> Ma 3<sup>5</sup>.

$\Theta + \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma = \text{יָחִיד}$  (v. 17); a gloss which violates the metre.

*sniffed at*: i.e. despised, made of no account: cf. Ma 1<sup>13</sup>: *cared nothing whether he lived or starved*: cf. Pr 12<sup>10</sup>. Others: (the life of its owner) *I caused (him) to breathe out*, which would require  $\text{הִפְחִיתִי}$  (c Suff.). Cf. Je 15<sup>9</sup>.  $\Theta \text{ ἐκλαβὼν ἐλύπησα}$  (cf. 3<sup>5</sup> ἐκλάβοι); but  $\text{G}^A \text{ ἐκβαλὼν} = \text{הִפְחִיתִי}$  (Je 29<sup>18</sup>) seems the better reading.

*its owner > its owners* (Ex 21<sup>29</sup> 22<sup>10</sup> Is 1<sup>3</sup>); Plur. of Dignity. Cf.  $\Theta \text{ κυρίου τῆς γῆς}$ .

v. 40. *the brier*: 2 K 14<sup>9</sup>.  $\Theta \text{ κνίδη, a nettle; } \Theta^{\circ} \text{ ἄκανθα, thorn, thorn-bush; } \Theta^2 \text{ ἄκανος, kind of thistle. } \text{B tribulus: cf. Vergil's Lappaeque tribulique. } \text{L noisome weeds: } \text{הַשִּׁבְכָּה stinking thing, Coll. Cf. באֲשֵׁים labruscae, wild grapes, Is 5<sup>2,4</sup>. } \Theta \text{ βάτος, bramble-bush or wild raspberry; } \text{B spina.}$

*The words of Eyob are ended.* Prob. not part of the original text, but a colophon added by a scribe or editor, as is commonly the case in manuscripts.  $\Theta \text{ και ἐπαύσατο Ἰὼβ ῥήμασιν, as an integral part of the text, 32<sup>1</sup> (cf. } \Theta \text{ 31<sup>40</sup>). Cf. Ps 7<sup>20</sup>. Possibly } \Theta \text{ is right in connecting the words with the introduction to the Elihu-section: חֲמוּ . . . וַיִּשְׁמְתוּ.}$

Chapters 32–37. *The Episode of Elihu.* It is now generally recognized that the figure of Elihu was unknown to the original poet. See the Introduction. When, however, the text has been cleared of some of the manifold and glaring corruptions which disfigure it, a Christian

reader at all events will hardly fail to admit that these chapters have great and substantial merits of their own and were well worthy of preservation, at least as an appendix to the matchless original.

### Chapter 32.

v. 1. *these three men*: i. e. Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, neither of whom, according to the existing recension of the text, has said a word since chap. 25. In the interval editors would appear to have forgotten their existence. See the remarks on 26<sup>5ff.</sup> 27<sup>11ff.</sup> 28. Ο οἱ τρεῖς φίλοι αὐτοῦ = שְׁלֹשָׁה רֵעָיו (cf. 2<sup>11</sup>). Not a various reading, but explanatory. *because he was righteous in his own eyes*; and they had failed to convince him. Ο ἦν γὰρ Ἰὼβ δίκαιος ἐναντίον αὐτῶν (so ס; בְּעֵינֵיהֶם pro מִכְעֵינֵי); implying that Eyob's arguments had convinced them of his innocence, which can hardly be the author's meaning: cf. 42<sup>7f.</sup> and v. 3.

v. 2. Cf. these fuller details of Elihu's parentage and tribal connexions with the little told of Eyob's three friends, 2<sup>11</sup>. Ο adds τῆς Αὐσείτιδος χώρας, *of the land of Uç*: 1<sup>1</sup>. An obvious gloss. Buz was the brother-tribe of Uç, to which Eyob belonged (Gn 22<sup>21</sup>). (Copt. σωλήτης is a mere curiosity pro Ο Βουζείτης.)

v. 3. *but let Elohim appear unrighteous*: adopting the traditional correction of the Scribes (*Tiqqûn Sôpherîm*) האלהים pro איוב מ. מ must mean: *Because they found no answer* (to Eyob's arguments), *and (because) they treated Eyob as guilty—or and (so) condemned Eyob*: cf. 9<sup>20</sup> 10<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>9</sup>. But by their failure to refute Eyob's arguments, they seemed to leave the Divine justice unvindicated. Ο *because they were not able to answer in opposition* (ἀντίθετα, things opposed) *to Eyob, and they made him to be ungodly* (καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀσεβῆ: so ἝΒ<sup>NA</sup>A<sup>2</sup>C but Ἕ<sup>Mc</sup>.CA<sup>\*</sup>Ἕ<sup>H</sup> marg. εὐσεβῆ, *godly*; implying וַיַּצְדִּיקוּ pro וַיַּרְשִׁיעוּ).

v. 4. מַחְבֵּרִים בְּדִבְרֵים חָכָה *waited for Eyob with words* can hardly be right. חָכָה is usu. *to wait*, abs., or *to wait for* c לָ (3<sup>21</sup> Is 8<sup>17</sup>), and is nowhere else found c Accus. Pers. We therefore read בְּדִבְרֵם אֲתִיאִי (Gn 17<sup>3</sup> 50<sup>17</sup>). This is confirmed by st. ii. Elihu waited, because he did not venture to speak before his seniors had finished what they had to say. Ο Ἐλιοῦς δὲ ὑπέμεινεν δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν (τῷ) Ἰὼβ smooths over the difficulty by a loose paraphrase (cf. v. 5 15<sup>2</sup> 33<sup>5</sup> 35<sup>4</sup> for δοῦναι ἀπόκρ.), which does not help.

v. 6. After the usual form of heading the words of Elihu follow in the same metre as the original poem.

*in years*: lit. *in days* (Ο τῷ χρόνῳ: so again v. 7 Gn 26<sup>1.16</sup> al.; but v. 4 ἡμέραις; cf. 1 Sa 1<sup>3</sup>). *all of you*: כֻּלְכֶּם inserted metr. grat.; cf. 27<sup>12</sup>. *aged*: 12<sup>12</sup> 15<sup>10</sup> 29<sup>8</sup> (ישישים pec. to Job; but cf. יָשֵׁשׁ or יָשֵׁשׁ 2 C 36<sup>17</sup>). The יָשֵׁשׁ is perhaps akin to יָשֵׁשׁ *dry, withered*: cf. Aram. קִישִׁישׁ (*elder*). *therefore*: עַל-כֵּן and דָּע *knowledge or opinion* (vv. 10, 17; 37<sup>16</sup>) = דָּעַת (10<sup>7</sup> 13<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>2</sup>) occur only in the Elihu-section of Job (דָּעַת, דָּעַי, דָּעִים,

nowhere else). *was I fearful*: *זחלתי* (אפ.) = Aram. *דחל* *to fear* (of which *זחל* might be the older sound: cf. the Zengirli inscr.). In Aram. (Tg. see Levy HWB) *זחל* is *to run* or *flow*, of liquids, and *to crawl*, *glide*, of reptiles (cf. *זחל* *worm* 13<sup>18</sup>). Hence others would render *זחלתי* here *I held back*, comparing Arab. *حج* *to withdraw, retire to a distance, to hang back, lag behind* (see Lane). The Primary Root of *זחל* in these various senses may be Sum. *ĠAL*, *to run, flow* (= *חל*), *quick motion* (like that of a lizard or a snake when startled) being the primitive idea. *ἡσύχασα* = *חרלתי* (14<sup>6</sup>); but *רחלת* *I feared*. With st. ii cf. 13<sup>17</sup> 15<sup>17</sup> *אֶתְכֶם* not *אֶתְכֶם* is prob. right) 36<sup>2</sup>.

v. 7. Lit. *I said, Days, &c.* Cf. *ᾠ Sperabam enim quod aetas prolixior loqueretur.* *ἡ* awkwardly inserts a Neg. in both members, and points *יָדְעוּ* *they know* pro *יְדִיעוּ* *they teach* in st. ii. Metre demands *וְרַב־שָׁנִים* instead of *וְרַב־שָׁנִים*.

v. 8. *But*: or *Still*: *אֵין* (Ps 31<sup>23</sup> Is 49<sup>4</sup>) not elsewhere in Job. Lit. *But indeed the (or a) spirit is (not there is a spirit) in man.*

Moreover, a || to *Shaddai* is wanted, prob. *אֵל*: cf. 33<sup>4</sup>. *informeth*: or *maketh intelligent*. We should have expected *תְּבִינֶיהָ* (Is 40<sup>14</sup>) > *וְעַתָּה תְּבִינֶיהָ* (here only), as *אֵינוֹשׁ* even in Coll. sense takes Sing. Predicates and Pronouns of reference (7<sup>1.17</sup> 9<sup>2</sup> al. 33<sup>26</sup> 36<sup>25</sup>). *ἡ* app. *תְּבִינֶיהָ* (cf. *ἡ*\* + *σέ*, *ἡ*\* + *μὲ* = *נִי*—).

v. 9. *seniors*: *רַבִּים*: cf. Gn 25<sup>23</sup> *רַב* *the elder* opp. to *צָעִיר* *the younger*, v. 6). The *לֹא* is emphatic, and therefore stressed separately. *ἡ οἱ πολυχρόνιοι*, *ᾠ longaevi* (= *רַבִּים*). Perhaps *רַבִּי יָמִים* (*hîc tant.*); cf. *ἡ*, which implies *יָמִים*, *רַב*, and phrases like *רַב־יָמִים*.

v. 10. *וְעַתָּה שְׁמָעָה* *hearken thou!* Sing. cannot be right, as he is addressing the Three. Read therefore *שְׁמָעוּ* c *ἡ* *ἡ*: *Therefore I say, 'Hearken ye to me!'* And *I too, &c.* *וְאִנֹּכָה*. (Exc. 1 post 1.)

v. 11. A tristich, and certainly corrupt on other accounts. St. ii *עַד־תְּבוֹנֶתְכֶם* looks like dittogr. of *אֶתְכֶם אֶתְבוֹנֶתְכֶם* v. 12<sup>3</sup>; and *מִלֵּן* (st. iii) is the natural parallel to *רַב־יָמִים* (st. i), while *אֶזְרִין* (st. ii) may conceal the vb. required by metre and sense in st. iii, possibly *אָזַן* (or Pf.) *I weighed* or *pondered*, which is followed by *תִּשָּׁר* Ec 12<sup>9</sup> as here by *תִּחַ*. We might also read *אֶזְרִין* *I gave ear* (so 5 codd. *ἡ* *ἡ* *ἡ*) unto (ער Nu 23<sup>18</sup>; cf. *עַד* *הַתְּבוֹנָה* v. 12 38<sup>18</sup> ? leg. *עַל* = *אֵל* in all, as Ps 39<sup>13</sup>) *your reasonings*, and make the stichus the first of v. 12 (also a tristich), thus turning it into a quatrain. But the plur. of *תְּבוֹנָה* is not found again in Job, and is strange in this sense, while v. 12<sup>3</sup> is metr. short. Both may be rejected as accretions to the genuine text, which may have run thus:

Lo, I waited for your words,—

I pondered (or gave ear) while ye sought what to say:

And behold, Eyob had none to confute him,

To rebut his speeches,—among you!

v. 13. Lit. *Lest* (cf. 36<sup>18</sup> Is 36<sup>18</sup>) *ye say*, 'We have found Wisdom!' (Pr 3<sup>13</sup>), i.e. We have discovered that it is folly to argue with him; he is too clever or subtle a reasoner for us. Or perhaps, 'We have come upon (unexpected) Wisdom!' in Eyob; a wisdom which only God can overcome (st. iii; Driver). *rout him*: or *drive him off*: 13<sup>26</sup> Ps 1<sup>4</sup> (נָדָה). One cod. has יהרפנו *thrust him out or away* (18<sup>18</sup>). For st. ii 6 has only Κυρίῳ προσθέντοι = באל רבנו (cf. Dt 13<sup>5</sup>) or נרבה; but 3 Deus proiecit eum, non homo = מ.

v. 14. 'Job has not yet tried conclusions with me' (Dr); and I have something fresh to say. 6 *I will not speak against* (him) (mere) words; app. reading אָלֵי אֲעֲרֶה, which is perhaps to be preferred, as a better || to st. ii. But cf. 33<sup>5</sup>. (6 *But to a man permit to speak such words* looks like a guess at the reading of a defaced text.) 8 exc. p. 8, unde אָלֵי (sic 2 codd.) mut. in אָלֵי.

v. 15. Prob. a gloss. St. i לא ענו עור *they have not answered again* = v. 16<sup>b</sup>; and העתיקו וני *They have removed words from themselves* (cf. 9<sup>8</sup>) seems rather strange. (Cf. also עתק Qal Intr. 14<sup>18</sup> 18<sup>4</sup>.) 6 ἐπαλαίωσαν = מ (cf. 21<sup>7</sup> עתק *grow old*). Of course we might take Hi. here as Intrans. (Gn 12<sup>8</sup>): *Words have departed from them*; but cf. 3 Abstuleruntque a se eloquia. In any case, the 3rd Pers. of the verbs suspends the direct address to the Friends and implies the beginning of a soliloquy or *sotto voce* address to himself.

v. 16. St. ii leg. ולא pro מ לא. (1 exc. p. 1.) So many codd.

v. 17. מ אענה app. the (non-existent?) Hi. Point אענה Qal, ut v. 20. Cf. 15<sup>2</sup> for ענה c *Accus. rei*. Instead of מ's isolated חלקי *my share* (3 partem meam) leg. לקחי (with) *my learning*, which seems a better parallel to רעי. Yet cf. חלק Pr 7<sup>21</sup>. Does מ mean: *I also will let my persuasiveness answer*? St. ii = v. 10<sup>b</sup>. Instead of this verse 6 ὑπολαβὼν κατλ. = ויען אליהו ויאמר *And Elihu answered and said* (!).

To cancel v. 10 and transpose vv. 15-17 to follow v. 9, as has been proposed, does not eliminate the difficulty of the 3rd Pers., v. 15, unless, contrary to the context, we suppose v. 9 to have a particular > a general reference.

v. 18. In st. i Qerî et Codd. circa 20 מלאתי rectè. But the stichus is metr. short (ב' is metr. a Proclitic). Perhaps אֲדַבֵּר *I will speak* has fallen out before ב'; cf. 6 Πάλιν λαλήσω· πλήρης γάρ εἰμι ῥημάτων. Others would read אֲנִי *I* (emphatic) pro מ ב' *For*.

*in my bosom*: lit. *of my belly*. For the belly (בֶּטֶן) as the seat of the mind or intellectual faculties, cf. Pr 22<sup>18</sup> ch. 15<sup>35</sup> Ps 40<sup>8</sup> (מעי). Grotesque as this may seem to us, we must remember that antiquity knew absolutely nothing about the physiology of man. If even an Aristotle could regard the brain as a cold mass intended to act as a counterpoise to the excessive heat of the heart, we can hardly be astonished at the crudeness of Hebrew

notions on the same subject. It is interesting to find that similar ideas have always prevailed among the Chinese, with whom 肚 *tu*, *the belly*, is also the temper or mind; cf. the phrases *tu-li ming-pai*, 'to understand', 'be intelligent' (*belly-in clear-bright*), *ta tu-tzü-li yiu hioh-wên*, 'He is a man of learning' (lit. *he in the belly has learning*).

*constraineth*: or *urgeth*: Ju 14<sup>17</sup> 16<sup>16</sup> (הציק). 𐤇𐤍𐤔𐤕 *sygkaiei* = הצית or הדליק. (𐤇 ὀλέκει, ἰ ἡνικ *injureth*: Aram.)

v. 19. Cf. Mk 2<sup>22f.</sup> Leg. 𐤓𐤓 pro 𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓 metr. gratia (cf. 8<sup>19f.</sup> al.), et תבנק pro 𐤓𐤓 יב' (cf. 15<sup>35</sup> al.). The word יין *yain*, *yein*, *wine*, is interesting as a culture-term, and as being apparently of the same origin as *foînos*, *vinum*, *vinea*, and other 'Aryan' terms. It was natural that, as in other instances, with the plant its primitive name should spread over the whole world. The initial w (= m) appears in Ethiop. ወን: *wain*, *vine*, *vineyard*, *wine*, Ar. وَبْن *wain*, *black grapes*, Assy. inu (2 R 25. 38: Sum. MU-TIN = GESH-TIN). The same word may be recognized in the Sum. MUN, an intoxicating liquor or fruit-syrup (*lābtu*; *šikaru ša KASH*), and in the Chinese 酉 𩺰 *wên*, *yün*, *ún*, *fermented liquor*, *wine*, *spirit made from fruit*. 𐤇 *But my belly is as a skin boiling over with new wine* (γλεῦκος ζῶν), *fastened* (= not opened); a paraphrase of 𐤓. In st. ii 𐤇 read חרשים *smihs* pro חרשים *uww*, and understood אבות *skins* as skin (leather) *bellows* (ἡ ὥσπερ φυσητὴρ χαλκῆως ἐρρηγῶς).

v. 20. Lit. *I will speak, that there may be relief or respite to me*: 1 Sa 16<sup>23</sup> tant. Cf. the noun Ex 8<sup>11</sup>. The primary root of 𐤓𐤓 is RAĠ, which we see also in רחב *broad, wide, open* (cf. Ps 4<sup>2</sup>), from which it has sprung by Internal Trilateralization: cf. Eth. ረሳወ *rah-awa*, *open*, as well as the Ar. رح *be wide*, with weakened Gutt. RAĠ becomes RAB in רבב (cf. Assy. *rap-āšu*, *widen, broaden, multiply*). It is perhaps ultimately identical with Sum. RA(G), LAĠ, *walk, go*, the idea being freedom of movement, room to go.

v. 21. 𐤓 Lit. *Let me not lift up a man's face!* See 13<sup>8.10</sup>. *And to no man* (+ כל) *will I be indulgent*: or *And no man will I address endearingly*, אֶכְנֶה (v. 22). The word is only found besides in Is 44<sup>5</sup> 45<sup>4</sup>, where it is usually explained *to betitle* or *give a title of honour*. But the clue to the meaning of this rare Heb. verb seems to be given by the Assy. *kunnû* (Pael), 'to treat tenderly', 'to be indulgent to', 'to spare', 'cherish', or the like (Sum. GEME-DUGA 𐎶 𐎶𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶𐎶 written *woman + mouth*; also 𐎶𐎶 ZUR *kunnû*, id., written *young one*). Thus Is 44<sup>5d</sup> might mean *And shall use 'Israel' as a pet-name* or title of affection (but point יִכְנֶה Pass. *shall be endearingly called 'Israel'*), and Is 45<sup>4</sup> *I did lovingly address thee* (אֶכְנֶה = Assy. *ukannika*), or *cherish thee*. 𐤇 Et Deum homini non aequabo, reading 𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓 𐤓𐤓 (cf. Is 40<sup>18</sup> 46<sup>6</sup>), which is possibly right. But 𐤇 ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ βροτὸν οὐ μὴ ἐντραπῶ, *I will*

not pay regard or respect to a mortal (= אכנה?).—מ's אל should prob. be כל; or if we retain אל we must add כל.

v. 22. For I know not showing favour: reading לשאת פנים (ל) after ט (θαυμάσαι πρόσωπα: cf. 13<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>8</sup>) instead of מ אכנה, which is hardly grammatical (repeated from v. 21<sup>b</sup>). ט I seem to imply לִכְנוּת Infin.

carry me off: ישאני: perhaps a play on the different meanings of שא with reference to the preceding לשאת (cf. Gn 40<sup>13,15</sup>). But ט εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ ἐμὲ σῆτες ἔδονται suggests something very different, viz. ואם לא ואם לאו And if not, may the moth devour me! (? עשׁ for 'עשׁ = עשׂי): cf. Is 50<sup>3</sup> 51<sup>8</sup>.

### Chapter 33.

v. 1. St. i has four stresses in מ. The introd. ואולם seems superfluous. See 11<sup>6</sup> 12<sup>7</sup> 17<sup>10</sup>.

v. 2. palate: or mouth: cf. 12<sup>11</sup> 20<sup>13</sup>. (חך, Syr. حَنَكَة, Ar. حَنَك, may be from √ חנ bend, curve, cf. חנה, c Afform. כ, and thus mean 'curve-like', the arched roof of the mouth. √ חנ is weakened from GAN, GAM, Sum., bend, bow.)

v. 3. מ lit. The uprightness of my heart (are?) my words; And the knowledge of my lips pure(ly?) they have spoken. The verse is metr. faulty and grammat. improb. Instead of מ ישׁר we might perhaps point ישׁר Juss. of שׁר (37<sup>3</sup>): Let my heart release words of knowledge (leg. אִמְרֵי דַעַת. Pr 19<sup>27</sup> pro אִמְרֵי דַעַת וְעַתָּה יִשְׁרָם museth. Others may prefer the ἀπ. רַחַשׁ is astir with words of knowledge (Ps 45<sup>2</sup>). All these conjectures, however, leave the stichus with four stresses. Read perhaps יִשְׁרָבְלִי אִמְרֵי דַעַת There are in my heart words of knowledge; or יִשְׁרָבְלִי אִמְרֵי דַעַת Indeed my heart speaketh knowledge.

St. ii. My lips shall speak (Pf. Fut. Cert.) what is purified of error or falsehood. Cf. Zp 3<sup>3</sup> and perhaps Ps 2<sup>12</sup> (בר).

v. 4. This verse, which some would reject as a variant of v. 6 or 32<sup>8</sup>, might better follow v. 6; while v. 5 seems a natural sequel to v. 3.

did give (or giveth) me life. ט ἡ δὲ δόξα μου = תְּחִינִי (cf. 32<sup>6</sup>) pro תְּחִינִי מ.

v. 5. St. i is metr. short. Add מְלִין: see 35<sup>4</sup>. (ט + πρὸς ταῦτα = לֹא from v. 6<sup>a</sup>? cf. Ju 5<sup>29</sup>.) So ט.

Marshal them: ערכה, which implies מלין as the Obj. (32<sup>14</sup>; cf. 13<sup>18</sup> 23<sup>4</sup>). ט ἐπόμεινον = עמדה. ט connect לפני with 'התני; but cf. 23<sup>4</sup>.

v. 6. 'I am in the proportion of thee (כפיר) as regards God, i.e. I stand towards God even as thou dost' (OL), does not seem very probable. It is certainly an odd way of saying 'I am a man like myself'. It is not easy to parallel such a use of כְּפִי. Read perhaps כְּמוֹתְךָ like thee (cf. ט), et post לֹא-אֱלֹהִים pro לֹא-אֱלֹהִים: Lo, I, like thee, am but human (lit. am not El, am no god or a non-god, Dt 32<sup>21</sup> al.). B Ecce, et me sicut et te fecit Deus (perhaps אל כְּמוֹן פֶּעַל; cf. Is 45<sup>9</sup>). ט paraphr. From clay hast

*thou been prepared* (δηρῶσαι hic tant.), *thou as also I; From the same (clay ὧα) we have been prepared* (δηρῶσμεθα).

St. ii. *From clay was I nipt off, I also*, is now generally recognized as a clear allusion to the Babylonian myth which relates how the goddess Aruru (who according to one of the Creation-legends was Merodach's partner in the creation of man) 'washed her hands, *clay nipt off*, threw on the waste, (and made) Engidu, created a warrior' (NE I. ii. 34 sq.). The תִּיט וִיטָרִיץ (טִיט יִטָרִיץ) of that passage throws welcome light on מַחֲמֵר קִרְצָת here.

v. 7. A reference to Eyob's own words, 9<sup>34</sup> 13<sup>21</sup> 23<sup>2</sup>. *my palm*: כַּפִּי = ט ἡ εἶρ μου (confirmed by 13<sup>21</sup>, cf. 23<sup>2</sup>) pro אַכְפִּי ἄπ. [The Syr. אַכְפִּי is *care, necessity*, and the verb *to be careful, anxious, urgent*; meanings unsuitable here, as affording no parallel to אִמְתִּי and not agreeing so well as כַּפִּי (= יָדִי) with the verb תַּכְבֵּר (sic leg. pro יָבִי): 23<sup>2</sup>. Ps 32<sup>4</sup>.] זַמִּי *my burden*; ט *my anxiety for thee*; both imply מ. Eloquentia mea = פִּי אֵךְ פִּי surely *my mouth* (cf. Ex 4<sup>11</sup>) = מ divided!

v. 8. *a sound of words*: מִטְבֵּל. But טῶα + σου so טῶ the *sound of thy words*. The latter agrees better with st. i *thou hast said*. Leg. מִלִּיךְ pro מִלֵּךְ. (In st. i וְאֵת *this* may have fallen out after אֵךְ; cf. v. 12. Its restoration would improve the rhythm.)

v. 9. Leg. בְּלִי מִ בְּלִי (י exc. post). So ו et absque delicto. *clean*: leg. בֵּר parallel to וְ as in 11<sup>4</sup> = ט ἀμεμπτος in both locc. In 11<sup>8</sup> 9<sup>20</sup> ἀμεμπτος = תָּם *blameless*, of which מִן תָּם might be a misreading; but 11<sup>4</sup> seems decisive for בֵּר. As to חָף, the Mass. note וְעִירָא ח' prescribes writing it with a small ח, as though some doubt attached to the letter, or as if it had been supplied by conjecture. The Syr. חֲפִפָּא is *soap, soaping, shampooing*; but there is really no evidence for the ἄπ. חָף *clean* in Heb. usage, and the word is almost certainly corrupt. *I have no guilt*: so מ, but ו et non est iniquitas *in me* (בִּי pro לִי) is probably right.

v. 10. *pretexts*; lit. *occasions*, i.e. *grounds of quarrel*, reading תִּנְאוֹת (Ju 14<sup>4</sup>; cf. the vb. Hithp. 2 K 5<sup>7</sup>) pro מִן תִּנְאוֹת *frustrations* (cf. Nu 14<sup>34</sup>). ט תִּשְׁאוֹת (μέμψιν 39<sup>7</sup>, cf. 36<sup>20</sup>) *shoutings*.—Cf. 10<sup>13-17</sup> and for st. ii see 13<sup>24b</sup>. In מִן אוֹיֵב *foe* we may recognize an allusive play on the name אוֹיֵב.

v. 11. A virtual quotation of 13<sup>27ab</sup>. Point יֵשׁ (יֵשִׁים); מִן יֵשִׁים after 13<sup>27</sup>. Perhaps עַל should be inserted before כֵּל; cf. 14<sup>16</sup>. [The suggested והוא *But He* pro הֵן *Lo* ad init. (enclitic) spoils the metre.]

v. 12. מִן לֹא־צִדְקָתָא אֵעֲנֶךָ *Lo*, (in) *this thou art not right* (or *hast not spoken the truth*: Arab. use?): *I will answer thee: For* (or *That*) *Eloah is greater (?) than man*. Cf. RV and RV marg. The first stichus is disjointed and unnatural, whichever way we take it, and the use of יִרְבָּה in st. ii is unique. ט Πῶς γὰρ λέγεις Δίκαιός εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἐπακήκοέν μου; Αἰώνιος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἐπάνω βροτῶν = (9<sup>20</sup> 34<sup>5</sup>) תָּמִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ צִדְקָתִי (חֵד) אֵיךְ



: צַעֲקָתִי וְלֹא אֶעֱנָה (v. 13) | כִּי מַעֲלָם עָלִיּוֹן מֵאֲנוּשׁ: which suggests צַעֲקָתִי pro צְדָקָתִי here. But this anticipates the next verse. Cf. also 30<sup>20</sup>. Nothing can be made of 6's st. ii. Did 6 think of עֲתִיק יוֹמִין (Dan 7<sup>9</sup>) and suppose יִרְבֶּה = יָמִים? The conjecture מַעֲלִים *hideth* (42<sup>9</sup>) pro יִרְבֶּה, on the ground of 6 (αἰώμιος = מעולם), is very improbable. Perhaps the anomalous יִרְבֶּה is a distortion of הִיָּרִיב, and we may read וְיִלְוֶה עִם-אֱנוּשׁ *Will Eloah contend with a mortal?* Eyob had often desired that God would meet him fairly, and argue out his case with him; neither overawing him with His Majesty, nor confounding him with His Terrors. Cf. 9<sup>3,14-21</sup> 10<sup>2</sup> 13<sup>3,19</sup> 23<sup>8-7</sup>; 40<sup>2-6</sup>. But another possibility is אֵיךְ תֹּאמַר צְדָקָתִי אֲנִי הִירִיב אֱנוּשׁ עִם-אֱלֹהִים *How couldst thou say, 'I (emph.) am righteous'?* Should a mortal contend with Eloah? (אֶעֱנֶךָ pro אֲנִי.)

v. 13. Lit. *Why toward (= against) Him hast thou contended (or made complaint), For that all thy (leg. c בְּ דַבְּרֶיךָ pro וְ—) words He would not answer?* (= That He would not answer any of thy protests or appeals?). For רִיב אֵל cf. Je 2<sup>29,35</sup> 12<sup>1</sup>. (We might also read אִתּוֹ *with Him*, Is 45<sup>1</sup>.) בְּ Adversus eum contendis, | Quod non ad omnia verba responderit tibi. (וְ דַבְּרֵיּוֹ his *words* refers to אֱנוּשׁ, v. 12<sup>b</sup>.) The root רִיב *strive, quarrel, contend* (esp. at law), is prob. cogn. with רָהַב, and the orig. idea may be that of *clamour*, noisy contention (cf. the Syr. use). Both may be Internal Trilateralizations of the same primitive root (cf. perhaps Sum. RI, *blow, rage*, of the wind = RIG, RIB?; or R-B = L-B in Assyr. *labābu*, 'rage'). 6 λέγεις δέ (= וְתֹאמַר explanatory add.) Διὰ τί τῆς δίκης μου οὐκ ἐπακήκοέν μου (sic 6<sup>B</sup>, om. NAC rectè) πᾶν ῥῆμα = יַעֲנֶה (13<sup>6</sup>) מדוע רִיבֹתִי (misreading of וְ).

v. 14. God, on the contrary, does speak to man (1) in dreams, vv. 15-18, and (2) in the visitations of sickness, vv. 19-28.

לֹא יִשְׁוֶרָה cannot mean 'though man regardeth it not' (RV). The Subj. of the vb. must be אֵל as in st. i: so the Verss. But the vb. itself is corrupt. Read perhaps יִשְׁנֶה *he changes it* (i.e. what He says):

*For at one time (or once) El speaketh,  
And at a second He changeth it not.* (Cf. Ps 89<sup>35,36</sup>.)

בִּאֲחַת scil. פַּעַם; בְּשֵׁנִים scil. פַּעֲמִים. The purpose and purport of the Divine word is always the same. Or we may read לֹא יִשְׁנֶה *he repeats not*, i.e. does it not again, or speaks not a second time: cf. 29<sup>22</sup> 40<sup>6</sup>:

*For, once for all, El speaketh,  
And doth it not again.*

Cf. בְּ: Semel loquitur Deus, et secundo id ipsum non repetit. 6 לֹא מוֹסֵף *he addeth not* (cf. בְּ 29<sup>22</sup> 39<sup>35b</sup> = מְ 40<sup>6</sup>). Considering, however, that בְּחֹלֶם *In a dream* immediately follows, defining the mode or method

of God's speaking (cf. also v. 19 במבוא), it will prob. be best to translate the verse thus:

*For in (or with) one thing speaketh El,  
And in two (or a second) He changeth not.*

Cf. Ma 3<sup>6</sup>. The other possible emendation לא ישיבנה (Nu 23<sup>20</sup> Am 1<sup>9</sup>) *He doth not reverse it* (viz. His intention) certainly accounts more easily for מ' לא יסורנה *He seeth it not*.

v. 15. Cf. 4<sup>13</sup>. 'Elihu' accepts Eliphaz's source of Divine intimations. Leg. בחיון (+ב) c 6 codd. טבט. מ' wrongly turns the distich into a tristich by interpolating 4<sup>13b</sup> (*When sound sleep falleth on men*). *slumbers*: Pr 6<sup>4.10</sup> Ps 132<sup>4</sup> †. (Instead of בחיון טבט *ἐν μελέτῃ* = בהגיון *in meditation*, Ps 19<sup>15</sup> La 3<sup>62</sup>; a respectable variant.)

v. 16. bareth or uncovereth men's ear: ט men's intelligence or inward perception (סוֹן). Cf. Assyr. *uznu, uzunu*, ear, attention, intelligence. For the Heb. phrase see 36<sup>10</sup> 1 Sa 9<sup>15</sup> 20<sup>2</sup>.

St. ii. מ' ובמסרם יחתם, which is metr. defective, is supposed to mean *And on their discipline setteth seal*. But חתם is to seal with (e.g. a ring). The other would be חתם בער (9<sup>1</sup> and the corrupt 37<sup>1</sup> q. v.). ט *ἐν εἰδεσιν φόβου τοιούτοις αὐτοὺς ἐξέφόβησεν* = יחתם (אימים) *יבמראה מוֹרָאִים* *And with an appearance of terrors affrighteth them*. ט *And in their rebellion humbleth them*. (ט ובמראי מראים fort. dittogr.) This, however, is not quite satisfactory. יבמסר אלהים יבמראה *And with Elohim's monition He warneth them* is perhaps preferable: cf. 5<sup>17</sup> 13<sup>10</sup> 36<sup>10</sup> Pr 3<sup>11.12</sup>. Or read: יבמראה אלהים יחתם *And with divine apparition alarmeth them*.

v. 17. מ' להסיר אדם מעשה מ' is quite impossible, unless we point מעשה *from doing*. The most natural emendation is מ' מ' *from his doing(s)*. מ' might easily have fallen out between the two מ's, and ו before the following ו. So ט *מ' מעברו* *from his works*; cf. ט Ut avertat hominem *ab his quae facit*. But ט has the more definite ἀπὸ ἀδικίας = מ' מ' 11<sup>14</sup> 15<sup>16</sup> (cf. 34<sup>32</sup> ἀδικίαν = עול, 36<sup>33</sup> ἀδικίας = מ' עלה) or possibly מ' מ' *from wickedness*. (ἐξ ἀδικίας 36<sup>10</sup>). מ' מ' *from oppression* is less likely. This noun does not occur elsewhere in Job, although we have the verb מ' = ἀδικεῖν once (10<sup>3</sup>; 40<sup>23</sup> is corrupt).

St. ii must continue the statement of God's purpose. But to 'hide pride from [a] man' (RV) is altogether improb. ט 'to free (or deliver) him from pride' (et liberet eum de superbia) is much more natural (though not as a translation of מ'). Even if ג' *pride* (22<sup>28</sup> Je 13<sup>17</sup> Dan 4<sup>34</sup>), an apparent Aramaism, be right—and parallelism requires some kind of sin—it is still difficult to guess what vb. has been supplanted by יבסה. ט *τὸ δὲ ὥμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πτώματος ἐρύσαστο* = יבסה *And his body* (perhaps ג' cf. Ne 9<sup>26</sup>) *from disaster* (31<sup>20</sup>) *to ransom* (פרה 5<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>23</sup> ῥύομαι) or *to rescue* (יפצה Ps 144<sup>12</sup> Aram.). ט *And the body of the man*

*He covereth.* As פָּנָה *turn out or away* is the parallel to הָסִיר in Zp 3<sup>u</sup>, it may perhaps be so here also. (Cf. Gn 24<sup>31</sup> Le 14<sup>36</sup> *clear out or up, empty a house*, Is 57<sup>14</sup> *clear the way of obstacles*.)

v. 18. *He holdeth back*: the verb seems to be co-ordinate with יָלָה v. 16 > with יָכַס v. 17. Perhaps we should read לַחֲשֹׁךְ *To hold back*; cf. להסיר v. 17. But ἡ ἐφέστατο δὲ = יוֹחֲשֵׁךְ.

into *She'ol*: בִּשְׁלַח מֵ (but 36<sup>12</sup> בִּשְׁלַח) *by a missile* is extremely improb. The usual parallel to שַׁחַת *the Pit* is שְׂאוֹל *Hades* (cf. 17<sup>13,14</sup> Ps 16<sup>10</sup> 49<sup>15</sup>); and the idea that עָבַר בֶּשֶׁר might mean *rush upon missiles* [and perish] (OL 1019 col. 2) is wholly incredible. Elihu may be thought laboured and longwinded and deficient in originality; but his defects are mostly to be ascribed to corruptions of his text rather than to ignorance of Hebrew and the rules of Hebrew verse. For עָבַר *to pass away, vanish* cf. 30<sup>16</sup> 34<sup>20</sup>. Ὡς om. vb. *And his life from אַבְדֹּנָא = Abaddon, syn. of She'ol, 26<sup>6</sup> al.*

v. 19. A second mode of Divine warning. Cf. 5<sup>17,18</sup>. מֵ וְהִכָּחַת (Hoph. here only) can hardly be right. Ὡς πάλιν δὲ ἡλεγεξεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ (Ὡς ἂν ἐν recitè) μαλακίᾳ ἐπὶ κοίτης = (v. 15) וְיִוְכִיחוּ בְּמַכָּאוֹב עַל-מִשְׁכָּב (cf. 13<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>4</sup>) or perhaps, prefixing אוּ or, הוֹכִיחוּ אוּ הוֹכִיחוּ (cf. 2 Sa 7<sup>14</sup>) or אוּ הוֹכִיחוּ (abs.) *Or He chideth (or correcteth)*. Ὡς Increpat quoque per dolorem in lectulo.

St. ii. *strife*: רִיב. Some codd. Ὡς ὅτι רִיב *multitude*: see 4<sup>14</sup> (= *all his bones*). רִיב (ἄπ.) *pining through disease* (cf. Le 26<sup>16</sup>) may be suggested. *The strife (or pining?) of his bones is perpetual* would be a good description of rheumatic pains. But יָאֵתָן (= אֵתָן 12<sup>16</sup>) seems doubtful. A verb was to be expected: cf. Ὡς Et omnia ossa eius marcescere facit; Ὡς *And the multitude of his bones are benumbed* (ἐνάρκυσεν). Did Ὡς think of Syr. לִ (תָּנַן) *to be or become numb, rigid*? *And all his bones He stiffeneth* (?? יָאֵתָן) would not be incongruous with st. i.

v. 20. *his soul*: lit. *his life* (חַיֹּת v. 18) = *his appetite* (38<sup>30</sup>), for which we have the syn. *his soul* (נַפְשֹׁ) in st. ii.

*loatheth*: מֵ וְהִתְמַתּוּ וְנֹא' app. *So that his life makes nauseous to him bread* (וְהִתְמַתּוּ c dupl. accus.). We must read either וְהִתְמַתּוּ (an archaism like אֹלֶת Dt 32<sup>36</sup>) or וְהִתְמַתּוּ *maketh stinking or foul*; an Aramaism (cf. 13<sup>14</sup> וְהִתְמַתּוּ *soiled, of a garment*; Syr. וְהִתְמַתּוּ *to be greasy, dirty, rank or stinking*; Arab. وَهَمَّ *stinking, &c.* Arab. رَجَمَ *stink, of flesh, رَجَمَ, فَحَمَ, فَحَمَ, فَحَمَ, &c.*)<sup>1</sup> Ὡς *And all food of corn he cannot receive*; where βρωρὸν is perhaps an error for βρώμων (βρόμων), *stink*: cf. 6<sup>7b</sup>. σῖτον = לֶחֶם as in 6<sup>7</sup> 30<sup>1</sup>. Possibly, however, Ὡς represents וְהִתְמַתּוּ לֶחֶם. Cf. Ps 107<sup>14</sup>. *dainty fare*: תַּאֲוָה מִאֲכָל *food of desire*. Ὡς βρωσιν ἐπιθυμήσει, pointing מִאֲכָל תַּאֲוָה.

v. 21. מֵ corrupt in both stichi. Neither *His flesh is consumed away*,

<sup>1</sup> With this root cf. Sumerian SIM, Chinese sing, *scent, smell*.

that it cannot be seen (רא = *seeing*), nor *His flesh is*, &c., without (healthy?!) appearance (ר = *appearance* 1 Sa 16<sup>12</sup>), as OL takes it, is at all prob. מראי (or the word it conceals) should rather express the cause of the wasting (e.g. מרעב *from famine* or want of food, cf. the last verse and Gn 41<sup>30</sup>, or מדוי *from sickness* Ps 41<sup>4</sup> see note on 6<sup>7</sup> and cf. Le 26<sup>16</sup>, or as others suggest מריון or מרון *from leanness or emaciation*, Is 10<sup>16</sup> 17<sup>4</sup> Ps 106<sup>15</sup>?). But the stichus may be a reminiscence of Pr 5<sup>11b</sup>, and we may read וישארו instead of מראי *His fleshly tissue wasteth* (ו exc. p. 1; W = ו). Cf. also Ps 73<sup>26</sup> וְלִבִּי יִלְכְּבִי.

The לא ראו of st. ii looks like a variant or marg. gloss on מראי, as if it meant (so that) *they were not seen*. But the Pu. of ראה is unique (why not the usual Ni. נראו?). The Ketib שפי *bareness* (?), *a bare height*, is dub. in Nu 23<sup>3</sup> and occurs nowhere else (plur. שפיים Is 41<sup>16</sup> + seven times). The Qeri שפין should mean *are broken or crushed* (שפין : cf. Ps 51<sup>10,19</sup>); but this does not suit here. The bones may also be spoken of as *dried up* (Ez 37<sup>11</sup> יבשו cf. Pr 17<sup>22</sup>) or *watered* (cf. 21<sup>24</sup> Pr 3<sup>8</sup>). We therefore suggest ויבשו pro וישפו and either בלא־רְאִי (= בלא־רְוִי, cf. Ps 23<sup>2</sup> נאות = נוֹת) *without moisture* or בלא־רְוִי (יִרְוִי?) *and are not watered* pro לא ראו. See also note on 37<sup>11</sup>. כלה and יבש are || Is 15<sup>6</sup>. ☩ Tabescet caro eius (om. מראי) et ossa, quae tecta fuerant, nudabuntur (= Qeri: *and bared are his bones which were not seen*). ☩ Until his flesh have rotted (מִרְקָב pro מִרְאִי) | *And he show his bones empty* (!).

v. 22. Verses 20, 22 look like an expansion of Ps 107<sup>19</sup>. St. ii is metr. short and, moreover, הַמְּמַחֲתִים *the slayers* (supposed to mean Angels of Death) is a strange parallel to השחת *the Pit of Hades* (v. 18), for which ☩ gives εἰς θάνατον while rendering לממחים εἰς ᾗδῶν = (ב)שְׁאוֹל in She'ol (the usual || to שחת Ps 16<sup>10</sup> al.). Read either לבית (ה)מחים *to the House of the Dead* (cf. 17<sup>13</sup> 30<sup>25</sup>) or למקום מחים *to the Place of the Dead* (cf. note on 34<sup>26</sup>; Ec 3<sup>20</sup>). ☩ לפנות *to Death* (cf. 28<sup>22</sup> 38<sup>17</sup>). (The references Ex 12<sup>23</sup> 2 Sa 24<sup>16</sup> Ps 78<sup>49</sup> all relate to the *coming or sending* of Destroyers to men; here, on the contrary, the man's life 'draws nigh' and comes to the verge of the grave.)

v. 23. *beside him*: or *over him*: or perhaps *on his behalf*: lit. *upon him* (עליו). *an Angel*: or *Messenger* (the proper meaning of the word: the ✓לאך is internally triliteralized from לך which we see in הֵלֵךְ *to go*, perhaps weakened in שִׁלַּח *send*, i.e. *cause to go*: cf. Sum. LAĞ *go*, Caus. *lead, bring, drive*, RA-G? *aláku*). A prophetic or priestly messenger might be intended (cf. Is 42<sup>10</sup> Ma 2<sup>7</sup>). The מְלִיץ *Interpreter* (Gn 42<sup>23</sup>) or Envoy, Ambassador (2 C 32<sup>81</sup>; cf. 2 K 20<sup>12</sup> מְפָרִים *letters*, סִפְרִים *scribes*), is a person qualified to explain the terms of one language in those of another, and so to serve as a medium of communication between people of alien speech. Here, as in Is 43<sup>27</sup>, it may signify the priest (Ma 2<sup>7</sup>) or prophet who conveys a Divine message and explains

the Divine meaning of events . . . not necessarily an 'Angel'. [The primary sense was perhaps simply *speaker*. The Canaanite  $\sqrt{\text{לין}}$  may be akin to  $\text{לעז}$  Ps 114<sup>1</sup>, and even to  $\text{לשון}$  the *tongue*, as the organ of speech: cf. Sum. LI, *cry aloud, sing*, I-LU, id., *wail* (so the Assy. *turgumannu*, 'dragoman', *interpreter*, from *ragāmu*, *cry out, lament, &c.*); LI-LIZ (= LIZ-LIZ), also read LI-LESH, *guitar-playing* (= Ch. *li*.)] *one out of* (= among) *a thousand*. The phrase implies the rarity of the interpreter's gifts. Hardly one man in a thousand could play the part. Cf. Ec 7<sup>28</sup>  $\text{אדם אחד מאלף מצאתי}$  *One man in a thousand have I found*; Ct 5<sup>10</sup>  $\text{דגל מרבבה}$  *gazed at among a myriad*. (Not one of the thousand; implying that there were many capable of such a service. Spiritual gifts are rare. Ec l.c. suggests the rendering *One Interpreter among a thousand*, in spite of the Accents.  $\text{אחר}$  would be superfluous, if it were not emphatic.)  $\text{ו}$  thinks of an Angel of Intercession, and joins  $\text{מלין}$  with  $\text{מלאך}$ , to the detriment of the metre: *Si fuerit pro eo angelus loquens, unus de millibus*.  $\text{ו}$  *If there be a thousand death-bringing Angels, not one of them shall wound him. If he have purposed in his heart to return to the Lord* (22<sup>29</sup> Ma 3<sup>7</sup>), *And announce to a man his own blame, And show his folly* ( $\text{אָנוּלִי}$  =  $\text{אָנוּלִי}$  Pr 22<sup>15</sup>; but  $\text{אָנוּמִיָּא}$  =  $\text{אָנוּ}$ ,  $\text{עָוֹן}$ ,  $\text{פֶּשַׁע}$ ,  $\text{זָרָעָה}$ ); a notable expansion of the verse, app. reading stt. i, ii, somewhat thus:  $\text{אָנוּמִיָּא}$  ( $\text{עָוֹן}$ )  $\text{מִלְּאָכֶם מִמָּתִים}$  |  $\text{לֹא־יָצֵא}$  ( $\text{עָוֹן}$ )  $\text{אֶחָד מִנִּי־אֱלֹהִים}$ . The  $\text{θανάτηφόρος}$  =  $\text{מִמָּתִים}$  obviously belongs to v. 22 ad fin. (*ubi*  $\text{ו}$  *mortiferis*).  $\text{ו}$ 's next line is app. a gloss ( $\text{אֶחָד מִלְּאָכֶם אֲשֶׁר בָּלְבוּ אֲשֶׁר אֶדְרִיָּא}$  or the like), while the next corresponds to  $\text{ו}$ 's st. iii  $\text{לְהַגִּיד לָאָדָם יִשְׁרָו}$ . For  $\text{ו}$  ( $\text{ἀναγγέλλει δὲ}$ )  $\text{ו}$  *And he declare* (or *explain*) to the man; and instead of the dubious  $\text{יִשְׁרָו}$  his *uprightness* ( $\text{יִשְׁרָ}$  semper sine Suff. Pr 14<sup>2</sup> leg.  $\text{יִשְׁרָ}$ )  $\text{ו}$   $\text{ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ μέμψῳ}$  (v. 10 39<sup>7</sup> tant.) suggests  $\text{פֶּשַׁעוֹ}$  his *transgression* (v. 9 34<sup>6.37</sup> 7<sup>21</sup> al. Mi 3<sup>8</sup>). The stichus seems, indeed, to be a reminiscence of Mi 3<sup>8</sup> ( $\text{וְהִגִּיד לְיַעֲקֹב פֶּשַׁעוֹ}$  *To declare to Jacob his transgression*); an impression confirmed by the addition in  $\text{ו}$   $\text{ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ δειξίῃ}$  ( $\text{ἀνομιάν?}$ )  $\text{αὐτοῦ δειξίῃ}$ , which recalls the closing stichus of Mi l.c. ( $\text{וְלִי־יִשְׂרָאֵל חַטָּאתוֹ}$  *And to Israel his sin*), and suitably converts  $\text{ו}$ 's tristich into a quatrain. A line like  $\text{וְיַגִּיד לוֹ יִשְׁרָו}$  *And to make known to him his sin* may have fallen out between  $\text{יִשְׁרָו}$  and  $\text{ו}$ , owing to the resemblance of letters.

v. 24. Unmetrical and corrupt. By inserting the Subj.  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  between the two verbs in -st. i, and restoring  $\text{נַפְשׁוֹ}$  (Ex 30<sup>12</sup> Pr 13<sup>8</sup>) or  $\text{לְנַפְשׁוֹ}$  (Nu 35<sup>31</sup> Pr 21<sup>18</sup>) after  $\text{בִּפְדָּר}$ , as necessary to sense as well as to metre (exc. ante  $\text{רַב־פֶּשַׁח}$ ), we get a passable tristich:

*And Eloah be gracious to him and say,  
'Redeem him from descending to the Pit;  
I have found a ransom for his life!'*

*redeem him*:  $\text{וְיַפְדֵּהוּ}$  pro  $\text{וְיַפְדֵּהוּ}$  (some codd.  $\text{וְיַפְדֵּהוּ}$  which is no im-

provement). Cf. v. 28 and Ho 13<sup>14</sup> *Out of the hand of She'ol will I redeem them; From Death will I ransom them.* Cf. also Is 35<sup>10</sup> 43<sup>3</sup> Je 31<sup>11</sup>; Ps 49<sup>8,16</sup> and chaps. 5<sup>20</sup> 6<sup>23</sup>. Since it is always God who delivers from Death (to whom can פָּרְדֵּה Redeem thou him refer?), we should prob. restore אֶפְרָהִי I will redeem him. (It is possible that ὁ τὴν δὲ ἀνοίαν αὐτοῦ δείξῃ is not an addition but represents another reading of וַיַּחַנּוּ וַיֵּאמֶר, e.g. וַיַּחַנּוּ אֶפְרָהִי or וַיַּחַנּוּ יֵאמֶר.)

ὁ ἀνθίσταται τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν εἰς θάνατον = (v. 22) יִפְרְדֵּה מִרְדַּת שָׁחַת. Instead of מִצְאָתִי כֹפֶר ὁ gives a complete distich: ἀνανεώσει δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὥσπερ ἀλοιφήν ἐπὶ τοίχου | τὰ δὲ ὀστά αὐτοῦ ἐμπλήσει μυελοῦ =

וַיַּחַדֵּשׁ בְּשָׂרוֹ בְּפִימָה בְּקִיר  
וַעֲצָמָתָיו יִמְלֵא (וַיִּשְׁבַּע מִ) בֶּחַיִּים

Cf. Ez 13<sup>12-15</sup> and for the second line 9<sup>18</sup> 19<sup>22</sup> 21<sup>24</sup>. Possibly וַיַּחַדֵּשׁ שָׂאֵרוֹ in the first line is a perversion of וַיַּחַנּוּ וַיֵּאמֶר, and מִצְאָתִי—בְּקִיר of מִצְאָתִי כֹפֶר; but the whole distich looks like an alternative or doublet of v. 25. It seems probable that M's third stichus (כֹּפֶר [נִפְשׁוֹ] מִצְאָתִי כֹפֶר) is a marg. gloss: cf. v. 28.

v. 25. The ἀπ. Quadrilit. רִמְפֵּשׁ, an anomalous form which can hardly be right, may have grown out of an exaggerated ὁ mistaken for ר (as in some other instances), the original word being רִמְפֵּשׁ, or may be due to dittogr. of the preceding ר, in which case the word might have been the Pf. טַפֵּשׁ. ὁ And he will soften (or make plump: ἀπαλυνεῖ: cf. 2 K 22<sup>16</sup> ὁ = ἡπαλύνθη) his flesh like an infant's (reading בְּנֵעַר pro בְּנֵעַר | And will restore him when become a man among men (reading יָשִׁיב pro יָשִׁיב; which is mainly a paraphrase of M. The Syr. word טַרְפִּשְׁתָּא lean flesh suggests no suitable sense for רִמְפֵּשׁ (His flesh is become thinner than that of childhood: but children are normally plump and fat). The Aram. טַפִּישׁ to be fat (cf. 1 Is 61<sup>0</sup> ט' = השמן) favours טַפֵּשׁ or יִטַּפֵּשׁ: cf. Ps 119<sup>70</sup> טַפֵּשׁ לֶב־יִשְׁבֵּן. (Cf. also Assyr. akala tapšáku, 'with food I am waxed fat', lupuš ašnan, 'fatness of wheat', as an offering, cf. Dt 32<sup>14</sup>.)

Does the verse continue the Divine utterance (cf. M Consumpta est caro eius a suppliciis; Revertatur ad dies adolescentiae suae! 1 אֲחַלְשֵׁה אֶת־בָּשָׁרִי His flesh is weakened. . . Let him return, &c.); or does it express its immediate consequence? In the one case, we must render: Let his flesh wax fatter, &c. (or His flesh shall wax, &c.; cf. 6 Let his flesh be changed like as it was in his childhood); in the other, His flesh waxeth (or will wax) fatter, &c., He returneth (or will return: M יָשִׁיב. Let him return would require יָשִׁיב, not יָשִׁיב as Kittel suggests), &c.

v. 26. An וַיִּעֲתֵר pro וַיִּעֲתֵר? cf. vbb. seqq. with joy: תְּרוּעָה joyful shouting: 8<sup>21</sup>. So 6 א' ἐν ἀλαλαγμῷ. An accompaniment of psalmody in public worship (Pss 27<sup>6</sup> 33<sup>3</sup> al.). seeth His Face: i. e. visits the Sanctuary

for worship: cf. Gn 33<sup>10</sup> (joined with יָצָה as here) Ps 42<sup>3</sup> Is 1<sup>12</sup> (pointing לְרִאיוֹת). ט app. misread ויבא pro וירא and בתורה or בתורה pro בתרועה (cf. 8<sup>21</sup> 22<sup>22</sup>).

St. iii may be an addition. It perhaps means: *And he restoreth to the man his wellbeing* (cf. Pr 8<sup>18</sup>) > *his righteousness*: cf. 42<sup>10ff</sup>. Instead of וישב we might perhaps read וישלם (ט αποδώσει, cf. 22<sup>27</sup> 34<sup>11</sup>; yet cf. also 39<sup>12</sup>): *He recompenseth to the man his righteousness* (i.e. his penitence regarded as such): but hardly ויספר or ויבשר (!).

v. 27. 'The restored sinner is here represented as giving public expression to his gratitude in a short psalm of confession and thanksgiving' (Driver). *He singeth unto* (Pr 25<sup>20</sup>) *men*: pointing יִשָּׁר (?) (יִשָּׁר or יִשָּׁר) pro יִשָּׁר מֵ, *he looketh* (= יִשָּׁר) וְ Respiciet homines. ט I think of יִשָּׁר, *straight*, (יִשָּׁר to sing may be compared with Sum. SIR, SUR, zamāru.) ט's paraphrase εἶτα τότε απομέμψεται ἄνθρωπος αὐτὸς εαυτῷ λέγων may indicate the same root יִשָּׁר (reading perhaps (יִשָּׁר עליו אנשו) or, pointing יִשָּׁר, יִשָּׁר = יָסַר to correct, admonish: cf. ט v. 23<sup>c</sup> ἡν ἑαυτοῦ μέμψιν, מֵ יִשָּׁר. *I sinned*: חטאתי. ט οἷα συνετέλουν; = מִהֶעֱשִׂיתִי. ט continues: καὶ οὐκ ἄξια ἤτασέν με ὧν ἥμαρτον = לִי: וְאִשָּׁר הָעֵינִי לֹא-שָׁנָה לִי. Cf. 11<sup>6</sup>. מֵ's וְיִשָּׁר (וְאִשָּׁר) looks like dittogr. of יִשָּׁר ad init. vers., and ויש' העיני is a dub. phrase, for which we might substitute וְדַרְכִּי הָעֵינִי and *my way I made crooked*, after Je 3<sup>21</sup> La 3<sup>3</sup>. St. ii לֹא-שָׁנָה לִי *He was not like* (or *equal*: Is 40<sup>25</sup> Pr 26<sup>1</sup>) *to me* cannot be right. It offends both metre and sense. Read perhaps וְלֹא-שָׁלַם פְּעָלִי לִי *And He requited not my work to me* (cf. 34<sup>11</sup> 36<sup>9</sup>), or וְכַעֲשָׂה לִי לֹא-עֲשָׂה (Ps 103<sup>10</sup>) *And acc. to my sins He did not unto me*. If לִי could mean *to do equal things to, deal equally or in like manner with a person*, the reading וְאִלָּה לֹא-שָׁנָה לִי might be adopted as involving the least change in the traditional text. (וְאִלָּה lie flat, be level, equal, may be cogn. c נוה lie down, since primitive N may become Š both in Sumerian and Semitic.)

v. 28. Cf. v. 18. מֵ *He redeemed my soul from* passing into the Pīl overweights st. i. Read מִכִּי-שָׁחַח (v. 18) and om. מִכִּי. ט σωσον = פָּרַה ut מ v. 24. So ט I. my soul... my life: so rightly Ketib טט; his soul, &c., Qerī טז.

v. 29. *Twice, yea thrice*: i.e. two or three times, more than once. Lit. *two beats, three* (beats: subaud. פְּעָמִים). ט ὁδοὺς τρεῖς, *three ways*: cf. v. 14. ט pointed פְּעָמִים ש' (three footsteps) instead of פְּעָמִים ש' (the Dual).


v. 30. God's purpose in warning the sinner by dreams or sickness. Cf. ו Ut revocet animas eorum a corruptione, et illuminet luce viventium. (ט ἀλλ' v. καὶ ἐρύσατο κτλ., ט מוֹפֵךְ Ptcp. But ט ut מֵ ו rectē). St. ii is dub. The Niph. Infin. לְאֹר (ἀπ. = לְהֹאֹר) would seem to require a following לִי to give it a personal reference (cf. 2 Sa 2<sup>32</sup>: Ps 76<sup>6</sup> is corrupt). Read either לְרִאיוֹת (= לְהִרְאֹתוּ Hi. Inf.) *to let him look* (on the

light of life), cf. v. 28<sup>b</sup>; or הָאֵלֹהִים ( = לְאִיר) *to let shine on him the light*, &c. (cf. Ps 119<sup>135</sup> for the Construction). הָאֵלֹהִים בְּאֵוֶר חַיִּים = : טו (ἵνα ἡ ζωὴ μου ἐν φωτὶ αἰνῇ αὐτόν); wrongly making vv. 29, 30, the close of the penitent's psalm. Cf. Is 38<sup>19</sup> חַי חַי הוּא יוֹדֵךְ. It has been suggested that we should read בְּאֵרֵץ הַחַיִּים *in the land of the living* > בְּאֵוֶר הָחַי *on the light of life*. For the former phrase see 28<sup>19</sup> Is 38<sup>11</sup> (53<sup>9</sup>) Ps 27<sup>13</sup> 116<sup>9</sup> al. The other does not seem to be found elsewhere except in Ps 56<sup>14</sup> and Joh 8<sup>12</sup>. Light and Life, however, are connected together in 3<sup>16,20</sup> Ps 36<sup>10</sup>, and אֵוֶר הַחַיִּים suits the present context better (unless we choose to substitute אֶרֶץ הָחַי *To show him the way of life*: cf. Ps 16<sup>11</sup>). טו may be right with its לְמַחֲזֹא נֹהֵרָא רַחֵיָא = לְרִאֻת בְּאֵוֶר הָחַי *To behold the light of life*. We need not resent an original phrase in Elihu, even if it should clash with a theory.

Verses 31-33, which have somewhat the effect of an anticlimax here, might well be transposed to precede 34<sup>18</sup>, where the change to the 2nd Pers. Sing. seems to require some such introduction.

v. 31. ט's καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμι λαλήσω, which ט<sup>A</sup> corrects with ἵνα λαλ., is a slip due to mechanical word-for-word translation.

v. 32. Lit. *If there be words*. The *be* (שׁוֹ) is emphatic, as always: *If you really have anything to say in reply*.

v. 33. *teach*: Pi. of אָלַף *learn* Pr 22<sup>25</sup>: 15<sup>5</sup> 35<sup>11</sup> (all). Aram. = Heb. לָמַד. The Bilit. Root is LAP, LAB, which we see in Assy. labû, 'surround', e.g. with walls, Perm. lābi, lāpi, Pi. lubbû, 'enclose', 'bind', ulāpu, 'bond', 'league', lapātu, lupputu, 'handle', 'touch', with the hand (cf. also note on 6<sup>18</sup>), cognate with LAM in lamû, 'surround', לָמַד, 'bind', לָאִם, 'tribe', 'people', Assy. lîmu = kîmtu, 'family', cf. Ar. لَأَمَ la'ama, 'bind up' a wound or rupture, Sum. LIM, 'a thousand', as a number of things *bound together*, cf. Heb. אֶלֶף 'thousand', 'a family', Sum. LAB, 'mighty', Aram. אֲלִים 'be strong', well-knit or bound together, and (since L and D interchange) with Sum. DAB, lamû, 'surround', 'seize', 'grasp', 'hold', sandqu, tamāhu, DIB, 'take', 'grasp', 'catch', 'bind', sabātu, ahāzu, tamāhu, kamû, &c., DUB, 'surround', lamû, sahāru, DIM, 'to bind', 'fasten', sandqu (lā sanqu, 'unbound', i.e. rebellious, unsubmitive), 'a rope', riksu. The character  LU, DIB, the Determinative of oxen and sheep, orig. a picture of a fold or enclosure with a rod or crook inside it, suggests the idea of *enclosed* (i.e. stalled or folded) animals, as opposed to wild ones roaming at large. The primary meaning of alpu, אֶלֶף 'ox', may have been the *bound* (i.e. tamed and submissive to the yoke); cf. אֶלֶף tame and gentle: that of אָלַף *to learn*, Pi. *to teach*, may have been *to seize, grasp, take in* ideas, and *to cause to seize*, &c., respectively (cf. Assy. ahāzu, ilhuzu,



'to learn', Shaph. *šuhuzu*, 'to teach', and לָמַךְ *learning, teaching*, from לָקַח *to take*).

Chapter 34. The heading *And Elihu answered and said*, repeated chap. 35<sup>1</sup>, seems perfectly irrelevant in both instances, as none of his hearers has made any reply to what he has said hitherto. The formula of 36<sup>1</sup> *And Elihu added and said* (i.e. said further) would be more suitable; but both may be due to some later editor who thought it desirable to break up Elihu's lengthy address into sections, with formal headings like those of the original poem.

v. 2. Elihu appeals to the wise in general, not to the three Friends of Eyob, who (in his opinion) had so signally fallen short of Wisdom (cf. vv. 10, 34 : see also 35<sup>4</sup>).

v. 3. Quotation of 12<sup>11</sup> (from marg. 1). *tasteth food*: so טַעַם. מַן *tasteth to eat* (לֹאכַל) has prob. grown out of יִט' לוֹ אֹכֵל *tasteth for itself food*: see 12<sup>11</sup>. טַעַם naturally omit the *Dat. Commodi*. (This is more probable than that they read לֹאכַל, since טַעַם does not occur c. 1 of Direct Obj.)

v. 5. A reference to Eyob's words 9<sup>20,21</sup> 27<sup>2</sup>.

v. 6. St. i has only two metr. stresses, and מִשְׁפָּטִי looks like dittogr. of v. 5 ad fin. The line cannot mean *Notwithstanding my right I am accounted a liar* (RV; pointing אֶכְזֹב); אֶכְזֹב is *I lie*, 6<sup>28</sup> Pr 14<sup>5</sup>. מִי is tolerant of no meaning but *Against my right I lie* (or Interrog. *shall I lie* cf. AV). We might read עָלַי שְׁפָטִי יִכּוֹב *Against me my Judge lieth*; i.e. by treating him as guilty when he was innocent (cf. 9<sup>28-31</sup>). For יִכּוֹב cf. ט εἰψέσαστο; for עָלַי see ט; for שְׁפָטִי 23<sup>7</sup>. Possible also seems אֶכְזֹר *cruel*: see 30<sup>21</sup> 41<sup>2</sup>: but the former suggestion yields a better parallel to st. ii *Deadly is my wound, without fault* (of mine). Perhaps מִכְאָבִי יִכּוֹב *Against me my pain lieth*: cf. 33<sup>19</sup> Je 30<sup>15</sup> (אֲנִישׁ מִכְאָבִי). His sufferings falsely suggested that he must have been a great sinner.

St. ii. אֲנִישׁ *sore, incurable*, is a natural epithet of wounds and pain (Je 15<sup>18</sup> al.); but מִחֲצִי *my arrow* can hardly be a fig. equivalent of *my wound*, and if we read חֲצִי *His arrow* (cf. 6<sup>4</sup>) the epithet becomes suspicious. Read therefore מִחֲצִי (Is 30<sup>26</sup>) or פָּצְעִי (9<sup>17</sup> Gn 4<sup>23</sup>); cf. the verb מָחַן 5<sup>18</sup> 26<sup>12</sup>.

v. 7. St. i is metr. short and begins with unusual abruptness. Restore וְאֵלִים *But* (cf. 33<sup>1</sup>); of which וְאִרָּה (v. 8) may perhaps be a distortion. *Howbeit, what man is like Eyob*? Or read מִי־הוּא *Who then is a man*, &c. (4<sup>1</sup> 13<sup>19</sup> al.). In st. ii אִשֶּׁר *Relat.* may have fallen out before יִשְׁתֶּה *drinketh in*; but 15<sup>18b</sup> (of which the stichus is obviously an echo) suggests אִישׁ שְׁתֶּה *One that drinketh* (i.e. revelleth in) לַעֲנֵי (*stammering, jabbering*, of a foreign tongue; then *mockery*; and in the sphere of religion *blasphemy*: akin to לַעֲנֵי and לִיץ Ps 1<sup>1</sup>).

v. 8. St. i is metr. too long. Omit the strange אָרַח which is found nowhere else as a Verb. Fin. (Ptcp. only, in sense of *traveller*) and may perhaps have originated in dittogr. of the following word (see also note on v. 7<sup>a</sup>), and read וּלְחַבְּרָה *And is for joining with*, &c. (for the Constr. see OL s.v. לָ 7. h.), or else understand the two Infinn. in the ordinary sense of purpose: *To ally himself with . . . And to walk with . . .* Cf. 22<sup>18</sup> Ps 1<sup>1</sup> for the thought. (ט δδσδ pointing אָרַח, and prefixing οὐχ ἀμαρτῶν οὐδὲ ἀσεβήσας, a mistaken gloss.)

v. 9. *gaineth nothing*: לֹא יִסְכֵּן 15<sup>3</sup> 22<sup>2</sup> 35<sup>3</sup>. Or *profiteth not, is of no use*. ט *For say not that* 'There will be no visitation (10<sup>12</sup> Nu 16<sup>29</sup>) of a man!', *When* (there will be) a visitation to him *from* (the) *Lord*. Due perhaps in part to deliberate alteration. But ט may have pointed יִסְכֵּן or even read יִפְקֹר in a similar sense: cf. the T. A. use of the vb. *sakdnu*, 'see about', 'attend to', 'look after' (= פִּקֵּר), e.g. *liskin šarru ana mātūšu*, 'let the king look after his country!', and of (*amēlu*) *sukinu*, 'overseer' (= פּוֹקֵר), 'superintendent' (syn. *rābiṣu*). The ultimate Root may be Sum. KIN = Bab. *šilē'u*, 'look for', 'seek', 'attend to', 'care for', from *šē'u* = שָׁעָה.

St. ii is metr. short. Moreover the sense of מֵ is unsatisfactory. Read 'ברצות עמו' *When Elohim is well-pleased with him*, pro מֵ עֵמָּא 'ברצותו'; thus restoring both metre and sense. For the Constr. cf. Ps 50<sup>18</sup>.

v. 10. A tristich. By inserting חכמים האוּינוּ *ye wise give ear!* after לִבָּן (cf. v. 2) we turn st. i into a suitable distich, making a quatrain of the verse. *men of mind* (lit. *heart*): recurs v. 34 only. *to deal wickedly*: leg. מִהֲרָשָׁע (Ps 106<sup>6</sup> Ne 9<sup>38</sup> Dan 12<sup>10</sup>) > מִרָשָׁע (Qal Infin. is not found). St. ii is clearly mutilated. Read וּלְשָׂרֵי מַעֲוֵה צָדִיק; cf. ט *ταράξει τὸ δίκαιον*: 8<sup>3b</sup> *ταράξει τὸ δίκ.* = יַעוֹת צָדִיק and v. 12 *ταράξει κρίσις* = יַעוֹת מִשְׁפָּט.

v. 11. *For according to a man's work*: leg. בִּי כַּפְעַל א' (בי exc. post. כ). *causeth to befall him*; cf. Nu 32<sup>23</sup>. (ט read וּבְאָרַח pro וּבְאֵר and pointed וּבְמַצָּאֵי: *And in a man's path He findeth him*. A good sense, but not so close a parallel.)

v. 12. For the strong asseverative אִף-אִמְנֵם see 19<sup>4</sup> (ט *vai ḥē*) Gn 18<sup>18</sup>. *dealeth not wickedly*: לֹא-יִרְשָׁע; see note on v. 10. We need not substitute יִרְשָׁע for this well-attested late use of Hiph. ט *And thinkest thou the Lord will do absurd things* (ἄτοπα = אָה 4<sup>8</sup> 11<sup>11</sup> 36<sup>21</sup> שׁוֹא 35<sup>13</sup>) = אִף-אִמְרָה אִף-אִמְרָה אִף-אִמְרָה prob. אִמְרָה misread אִמְנֵם om. לֹא).

v. 13. *Who made the Earth His charge?* or made Him responsible for the care of the Earth, made Him its פִּקֵּר or Overseer? For פִּקֵּר עַל in this sense cf. 36<sup>23</sup> Nu 4<sup>27</sup> and Aram. usage. (Leg. הָאָרֶץ or simply אָרֶץ pro מֵ אֶרֶץ > אֶרְצוּ = אֶרֶץ *his earth*; cf., however, 37<sup>13</sup> Pr 8<sup>31</sup>.) ט *ἐποίησεν γῆν γῆγ* as add. to v. 12. To bring st. ii (מֵ lit. *And who set the world all of it?*) into parallelism with st. i read שָׁם מֵ שָׁמוּ עַל-: *And*

who set Him over the whole world? Cf. Gn 47<sup>8</sup> Ex 11<sup>11</sup> Ps 105<sup>21</sup> (שָׁמוּ).  
 ט suggests (וּמִלְאָהּ) וְכָל-בְּרָא וְיִמְעַשְׂהָ תָּבֵל And who made the world and all  
 therein (and the fullness thereof? Ps 50<sup>12</sup>)? ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανόν = אָרֶץ 2<sup>3</sup> 38<sup>10, 24, 33</sup>  
 42<sup>14</sup> תָּבֵל Pr 8<sup>26</sup>.

God is no Delegate or Viceroy. As Creator, He is supreme over all  
 - and accountable to none.

Verses 14, 15 are an expansion of Ps 104<sup>29bc</sup>: חָסַף רִחְמָם יִנְעֻזוּ וְאֶל-עַפְרָם : יִשׁוּבוּן : יִשׁוּבוּן : If Thou gather in their spirit, they expire, | And unto their dust  
 they return.

v. 14. The best that can be made of מִן is: *If He were to set His heart  
 upon* (= give sole attention or confine His regard to) *Himself,—His  
 spirit and His breath to Himself gather in . . .* Apart from the strange  
 idea (unique in the OT) of God's fixing His attention upon Himself,  
 which is no || to the second stichus, st. ii itself at once arouses suspicion  
 by its metrical redundance (four stresses). Read לְשִׁיב (c 5 codd. Or<sup>k</sup> and  
 ט מפניא) pro יִשִּׁים מִן, and om. לְבֹ (added after יִשִּׁיב had become יִשִּׁים).  
 This yields the satisfactory distich:

אִם-יִשִּׁיב אֵלָיו רוּחוֹ  
 : וְנִשְׁמָתוֹ אֵלָיו יֵאָסֵף :

*If He cause His spirit to return to Him, | And gather in His breath to  
 Himself.* Cf. Ps 104<sup>29, 30</sup>. The verse constitutes the Protasis to the  
 Apodosis which follows in v. 15. Cf. also 12<sup>10</sup>.

v. 15. In st. ii עַל should rather be אֵל (Gn 3<sup>19</sup>): cf. ט εἰς γῆν. ט adds  
 the gloss θεὸν καὶ ἐπλάσθη: cf. 10<sup>8, 9</sup> Gn 2<sup>7, 8, 19</sup>.

It is futile for a mortal to question the justice of his Maker. However  
 it may be with inferior potentates, the supreme Judge, the absolute Lord  
 of all living, must be supposed superior to every form of injustice. Cf.  
 Rom. 9<sup>14-21</sup>.

v. 16. מִן וְאִם-יָבִינָה RV marg. (*Only understand!* (cf. Gn 23<sup>13</sup>) is dub.  
 Hebrew. Read בִּינָתָה (plene): *And if thou hast understanding* (for the  
 form cf. Dan 9<sup>2</sup>): cf. בִּנְתָה Ps 139<sup>2</sup>: or perhaps add לָךְ after יָבִינָה (which  
 would justify the accentuation). ט εἰ δὲ μὴ (1) νοῦθεῖν (cf. 38<sup>18</sup>); Σ Si  
 habes ergo intellectum.

v. 17. מִן מִשְׁפַּט יִחְבֹּשׂ הָאֵף שׁוֹנֵא would be extraordinary Heb. for  
*Shall even one that hateth right govern?* (RV). For חֲבֹשׁ see the note  
 on 28<sup>11</sup>. It occurs but once in Job, and that in the ordinary sense (5<sup>11</sup>).  
 Read לְשׁוֹנֵא-מִיֶּשֶׁת הָאֵל Accountest thou *El* the foe of right? cf. 13<sup>11</sup>  
 33<sup>10</sup> and טΑ οὐκ οἶει. In st. ii the Asyndeton צְדִיק בְּבִיר is improb. Read  
 צְדִיק justice (|| to מִשְׁפַּט, st. i; 29<sup>14</sup> 35<sup>2</sup> 36<sup>3</sup>) and cf. 8<sup>3</sup>. This gives us: *Or  
 condemnest thou the Justice of the Mighty One?* (בְּבִיר Abs. of God;  
 so here only: cf. 36<sup>6</sup>). (τὸ ἄνομον = לֹא-מִשְׁפַּט; καὶ τὸν ὀλλύμενον τοὺς  
 ποταμούς = וּמִשְׁבִּית רְשָׁעִים; αἰώνιον = בְּבִיר aged 15<sup>10</sup> cf. Dan 7<sup>9</sup>.) (Σ sanati

potest = יִחַבֵּשׁ; st. ii Et quomodo tu eum qui iustus est, *in tantum condemnas*? = מ; taking כביר as Adv. = *greatly*.)

v. 18. Point האמר (c cod. 1 5 5), referring to אל v. 17. God proves His Justice by administering His rebukes to high and low alike, without fear or favour (vv. 18, 19). For *worthless* see note on 24<sup>6</sup> (בלעל pro בליל). St. ii in מ has only two stresses. Read perhaps לנריבי (רשעים) (עמ'ם): cf. Nu 21<sup>18</sup> Ps 47<sup>10</sup> (or keep אל and read אל-מלך in st. i). Possibly רשע is a gloss on בלעל which has displaced (על) השופך בן (על) (*Who poureth contempt upon nobles*: cf. 12<sup>21</sup>). Or, assuming that אשר ad init. v. 19 may be a disguise of some other word belonging to the end of this verse, we might read לנריבי ארץ or רשעים (17<sup>14</sup>) or ר' לנריבים יקרא (17<sup>14</sup>) *qui vocat duces impios*. Cf. Is 32<sup>5</sup>.

v. 19. St. i seems overloaded: om. אשר *Who* (see last note). *showeth no partiality*: 13<sup>8.10</sup> 32<sup>21</sup>. *preferreth to*: lit. *regardeth before*. . . נכר לפני. Pi. so here only (cf. 21<sup>20</sup>). Perhaps הִפִּיר Hi. (six times in Job, e.g. v. 25); cf. Dt 17 לא חבירו פנים במשפט *Ye shall not recognize faces* (show partiality) *in judgement*. (The Semitic נִכַּר I. *attend to, regard, know*, may perhaps be compared with Sum. 𐎧𐎶𐎵 KUR *paqādu*, and 𐎧𐎶𐎵 II. with Sum. 𐎧𐎶𐎵 KUR *aḥā, šand, nakru, nakāru, nukkuru*, &c., 'other', 'another', 'different', 'strange', 'foreign', 'enemy', 'to be or become other', 'to change', 'alter', &c. The primitive Root is trilateralized by the Pronom. Preform. נ = Sum. NA, NI, is, ille, iste.) Instead of שוע *noble or generous* (Is 32<sup>5</sup>) it seems natural to read עשיר *rich*, on account of the parallel דל *poor* (Ex 30<sup>15</sup> Pr 10<sup>15</sup>). St. iii, which 5 app. omits, is probably a gloss, though apt enough in sense; unless perhaps a line has fallen out before it. (5's version of the two preceding stichi appears to be more or less conflated: *Who was not abashed at an honoured one's face* = אשר לא חפר מפני נכבד cf. Dt 28<sup>28</sup> Is 1<sup>29</sup>, | *Nor knows to give honour to great ones, so that their faces be admired* = ולא ידע להפיר פני גדלים cf. Dt 1<sup>17</sup> Je 5<sup>5</sup> 2 K 10<sup>6</sup> [ἀδποι = גדלים but 29<sup>9</sup> ἀδποι = שרים] cf. 13<sup>10</sup> 22<sup>9</sup>. Possibly st. ii was originally something like: ולא ידע פני גדלים or ולא ידע ולא יקר נשואי פנים: 22<sup>8</sup> Is 3<sup>9</sup> 13<sup>12</sup>.)

v. 20. Another tristich. St. i מ lit. (*In*) *a moment* (Ps 6<sup>11</sup> Is 47<sup>9</sup>) *they die and* (at) *midnight* (Ps 119<sup>82</sup> Ex 11<sup>44</sup> 'הל' זכח). The second Adv. phrase is dub. Read perhaps ויחצצו pro ל' וחות (21<sup>21</sup>). St. ii ינאשו Pu. here only. *A people are convulsed* (OL) or *The people* (i.e. of these potentates) *are shaken* is not prob. in the context, which relates to God's overthrow of the Mighty. (נעש is prop. and nearly always used of physical convulsions. Cf. Ps 18<sup>8</sup> Je 25<sup>10</sup> dub. cf. 46<sup>7.8</sup> sim.). And why not ינעשו עם ויעברו? Read ינעשו עם-עש ויעברו (9<sup>26</sup>) or ינעשו יג' קעש *They expire like the moth, and pass away*. Cf. 4<sup>19</sup> 27<sup>18</sup> Ps 39<sup>12</sup> Is 51<sup>6</sup> (כמורכן). St. iii מ lit. *And they remove the mighty one not with hand*. אביר here only in

Job; the plur. אַבִּירִים occurs in 24<sup>22a</sup> (a similar statement). Read either וַיִּסֹּר אַבִּירִים *And He removeth the mighty ones, &c.*; or וַיִּסֹּרוּ אַבִּירִים *And the mighty ones depart, &c.*, c 1 cod.: cf. 6. The former seems preferable on account of v. 21; cf. 12<sup>20.24</sup>: but the stichus is prob. an addition based on La 4<sup>6cd</sup> Dan 2<sup>34</sup> 8<sup>25</sup> (*without hand*; i.e. without human, or by supernatural agency). 6's version of this verse does not so much indicate a difference of reading as a guess at the meaning of a more or less injured text identical with that of 11.  $\kappa\epsilon\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\pi\omicron\beta\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\alpha\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$  (6<sup>c</sup>  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ) = רִיק יָתְמוּ צוּחַם לָמוּ וְשׁוּעַם (ריק = רָנַע; יתמו = יָתְמוּ; צוּחַם = חֲצוֹת לַיִל; וְשׁוּעַם = יְשׁוּעַם); רִיק יָתְמוּ = יָתְמוּ וְשׁוּעַם. The second stichus is  $\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma,\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu\ \alpha\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$  = וַיִּתְּנוּ וַיִּסֹּרוּ וַיִּתְּנוּ אַבִּירִים. Here עָבַר is understood in the sense of *transgressing*; and 'אבִּיר' is misread 'אבִּיר' as in 24<sup>22</sup>. Cf. also 24<sup>4</sup> (*They turn the needy out of the way*) which seems to have influenced 6's interpretation here. Further, 6 may have taken לֹא בִיר in the sense of 'without strength', as an epithet of אַבִּירִים, and so omitted it as already implied in  $\alpha\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ .

v. 21. Cf. 31<sup>4</sup>.

v. 22. Cf. Ps 139<sup>11f</sup>. Am 9<sup>9</sup>. It is impossible to escape the notice of the Allseeing (or, as we say, the Omniscient), and so to evade His Justice. 6 gives a free paraphrase of both verses.

v. 23. 11 lit. *For not upon a man setteth He* (scil. *His heart or mind*) *still (or again), | To go (= That he should go) unto El in the judgement.* God has no need to investigate like an earthly judge: He knows (cf. 11<sup>11</sup>). But the Heb. is doubtful, and the two stichi have a look of incoherence. Read either  $\epsilon\tau\ \alpha\ \text{time}$  (cf. Ec 8<sup>6.8</sup> + וּמִשְׁפָּט + מוֹעֵד *a set time* (Ex 9<sup>5</sup>; see Bateson-Wright) instead of  $\epsilon\tau\ \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\lambda\ \text{still}$ . (יָצִים-עֵת ?) Cf. 9<sup>19b</sup>. Point perhaps לְהֵלֵךְ *to bring him*.

St. ii. Cf. 22<sup>4b</sup>. Perhaps אֶת-אֱלֹהִים pro אֱלֹהִים; cf. Ps 143<sup>2</sup>. There may be an allusion to Eyob's desire to argue his case with God (13<sup>18ff</sup>. 23<sup>9ff</sup>. 31<sup>35ff</sup>.) as in a court of justice. Cf. 9<sup>32</sup>. God knows without inquiry whether a man is guilty or not, and smites at once when He pleases (v. 24).  $\epsilon\tau\ \delta\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \text{Κύριος πάντας}$  (6<sup>A</sup>  $\tau\alpha\ \text{πάντα}$ )  $\epsilon\phi\omicron\rho\alpha\hat{\epsilon}$  (28<sup>24</sup>) = הִלֵּל אֱלֹהִים (due to omission and transposition of letters).

v. 24. *He breaketh*: יִרָע (Je 15<sup>12</sup> Ps 2<sup>9</sup>). Aramaism = יִרָע (יִרָע): see note on 20<sup>10</sup>.  $\epsilon\tau\ \delta\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu$  = יִרָע (cf. 6<sup>10</sup> Je 15<sup>12</sup>). *without trial*: lit. *without* (leg. בְּלֹא pro לֹא) *search* or investigation. For לֹא-חִקֵּר *beyond search* see 36<sup>26</sup> and cf. 5<sup>9</sup> 9<sup>10</sup> 8<sup>8</sup> 11<sup>7</sup> Pr 25<sup>3.27</sup>. For the sense of st. i cf. perhaps 11<sup>11</sup>. With st. ii cf. 8<sup>19</sup> 18<sup>20</sup> (?) 21<sup>8.33</sup> ?. Instead of this verse 6 repeats 5<sup>9</sup>, except that it has  $\delta\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu$  here in place of  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha$  there. Did it understand כְּבִיר as equivalent to גִּבּוֹר and 'נפלאות אחר' ? 3 Conteret *multos et innumerabiles*: cf. 31<sup>26</sup> Is 16<sup>14</sup> and chap. 36<sup>26</sup>.

v. 25.  $\epsilon\tau\ \text{לֵכֵן}$  *Therefore* seems inconsequent here. 6 om. 3 Novit enim:

We might read **הָיָה**, making **יָבִיר** more emphatic (*He well noleth, &c.*); or **אָבִן** *But indeed* (32<sup>s</sup>); or **כִּי־הוּא** *For HE* (emph.) *noleth, &c.* **לָבִן** (or **עַל־לָבִן**? vid. v. 27) may belong to v. 26. *their doings*: **מַעֲבֵרֵיהֶם**: an Aramaism (Dan 4<sup>34+</sup>); here only in OT. Heb. Elsewhere Elihu uses the ordinary words **מַעֲשֵׂה** (v. 19, 33<sup>17</sup> 37<sup>7</sup>) and **פַּעַל** (v. 11 36<sup>24</sup> 37<sup>12</sup>); and it is possible that this verse as far as **לִילָה** merely preserves variants to verses 20, 21, as some think, and that the closing vb. **וַיִּרְבֹּא** should begin verse 26 (so **ס** but not **ט**). It is perhaps an improvement of **מ** to read **וַיִּהַרְסֵם** *And He overthrows them* (9<sup>5+</sup>) *pro וַיִּהַרְסֵם* *are crushed* 5<sup>4+</sup>. Cf. 4<sup>13</sup> 6<sup>9</sup> 19<sup>2</sup> 22<sup>9</sup> for other forms of the verb.

v. 26. **מ** lit. *Under the wicked He slappeth them in(10) the place of seers*; which is neither sense nor metre. Read

**לָבִן יַחַת רָשָׁעִים  
סַפְּקָם בְּמָקוֹם רָפְאִים:**

*Therefore He shattereth* (Is 9<sup>3</sup>) *the wicked*; | *He hath smitten (?) them into the place of the Dead* (i.e. She'ol). *Therefore*; viz. for the reason assigned in the next verses. (For **לָבִן** or **עַל־לָבִן** see verses 25, 27.) The verse might perhaps be better restored as follows:

**יַנְחֵת רָשָׁעִים שְׂאוֹל  
וַיִּסְפְּקֵם בְּמָקוֹם רָפְאִים:**

*He makes the wicked go down to She'ol* (cf. 21<sup>13</sup>) | *And casts them down* (Pr 28<sup>9</sup> **סוֹחֵף**) *into the Place of the Dead*. **ט** *ἔσβεσεν δὲ ἀσβεῖς* looks as if **וַיִּרְבֹּא** was read **וַיִּנְבֹּא** (cf. **ט** 30<sup>s</sup>) or **וַיִּרְעֹב** (18<sup>s,6</sup>) and **יַחַת** omitted. St. ii *ὁπατοὶ δὲ (ἐγένοντο **ט**<sup>A</sup>) ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ* (v. τῶν ἐχθρῶν) suggests that **ט** pointed **רָאִים** or read **רָאוּ** (33<sup>21</sup>), while representing **בְּמָקוֹם סַפְּקָם** either by **קִדְמוֹ**, *before him* (Aram.) or by **לפני קמ(ים)** *before enemies*. **ס** renders the verse: *And they shall be humbled under the wrong of their deeds in the fearful place* (reading **מִוְרָא** pro **רָאִים**).

v. 27. *Because*: **כִּי־עַל־כֵּן**; us 1. compared with **כִּי־עַל־כֵּן** (Gn 18<sup>3</sup> al.). But **אֲשֶׁר** alone might mean *because* (**ט** *ὅτι*), and **עַל־כֵּן**, as we have seen, may not belong here. (**מ** ingeniously: Qui quasi de industria = **מ**.) Some would delete this verse as a gloss; which is probable (see next note).

v. 28. If verse 27 is genuine, this one states either the consequence or (ironically) the purpose (cf. **מ**) of the oppressive behaviour of the wicked, as though they were bent on their own ruin. But it seems more natural that the Subj. of both stichi should be the same, viz. God; in which case the verse expresses the Divine purpose in the destruction of the oppressors (v. 26): *To bring in to Himself* (**אֵלָיו** c 2 codd. **מ** ad eum) *the outcry, &c., And to hear the call for help* (**שְׁוֹעַת** Ps 18<sup>7</sup> pro **מַעֲשֵׂה**; cf. 35<sup>9</sup>) *of the oppressed*. Cf. Gn 4<sup>10</sup> 19<sup>21</sup>.

2. 29. *יִשְׁקֵט* (*יִשְׁקֵט*) cf. *יִסְחָר* may mean *show quietness* = keep quiet (37<sup>17</sup>); or we may point *יִשְׁקֵט* *be quiet, inactive* (Is 18<sup>4</sup>), which comes to the same thing. Instead of *יִרְשָׁע* *condemn* (verses 12, 17), which is incongruous with the previous verb, we propose *יִרְעָשׁ* (*ני*) *make Him spring up* (39<sup>20</sup>) or *rouse Him* (41<sup>2</sup> = 10 cf. 8<sup>6</sup>). For the general sense of the verse cf. Is 51<sup>9</sup> Ps 44<sup>24ff.</sup> *Awake! why sleepest Thou, O Lord? . . . Why hidest Thou Thy Face?* (Also 13<sup>21</sup> Ps 30<sup>8</sup> 78<sup>65</sup> Is 54<sup>8</sup> al.); 19<sup>27</sup> *I shall see Him*; 35<sup>14</sup>. Men 'see' God in His active intervention to help and save.

It is only by forced interpretation that anything can be made of st. iii as an integral portion of this verse (cf. RV). Perhaps it really belongs to verse 30, which is metr. and otherwise defective. We might read:

אִם-עַל-גּוֹי אָפוּ יָחַר  
וְיִמְלֹךְ חֲנָף עֹשֵׂי-רָעָם:

*If against a nation His Wrath be kindled,  
And He make king a profane one (8<sup>18</sup>), an oppressor of the people:*

such a one e.g. as Antiochus Epiphanes. For *עַל חָרָה אָף* see 19<sup>11</sup> Zc 10<sup>1</sup>; usually c ב, 32<sup>2,3</sup> 42<sup>7</sup>. Or read *יָחַר-לִי* pro *יָחַר* and *וְיִמְלֹךְ* pro *יִמְלֹךְ*, concluding with *מַעֲשֵׂי-רָעָם* (Pi. אָפ. cf. Is 23<sup>12</sup> Pu.): *And should He be wroth against nation or man, &c.* (The repeated *אָדָם* is certainly dubious; and *חָנָף* occurs nowhere else as epithet of *אָדָם*: cf. 36<sup>18</sup>. *וְ* may mean: *That a profane man, one of the snares of the people, reign not*; but the phrase is unique and improb. *וְ* propter peccata populi = app. *מַעֲשֵׂי עָם* or *מַעֲשֵׂי עַם*. *ὁ ἀπὸ δυσκολίας λαοῦ* = *מַעֲשֵׂי-רָעָם* cf. Dt 9<sup>7</sup> or *מַעֲשֵׂי-רָעָם*.) It is possible that st. iii of v. 29 is spurious. In that case v. 30 might perhaps be restored as follows:

מִמְלֶכֶת אָדָם חֲנָף  
מִקְשָׁה עָלָיו עַל-עָם:

*Who maketh a profane fellow king, | Who maketh hard his yoke on the people (1 K 12<sup>4</sup>). Cf. *Qui regnare facit hominem hypocritam propter peccata populi* = *ὁ βασιλεύων ἀνθρώπων ὑποκριτὴν κτλ.**

v. 31. *וְ* *If (or When or For) unto El hath he said?* is evidently due to wrong division of the letters. Read *אִם-לֵאלֹהִים אָמַר (יִאמַר ה')* *If (When) unto Eloah he* (i.e. the tyrant; or *it*, i.e. the oppressed nation) *sailh*: cf. 7<sup>13</sup> 19<sup>28</sup>. In st. ii pro *וְנִשְׁאַתִּי* *I have borne* read *וְנִשְׁאַלִּי* *Forgive me!* (cf. Ps 10<sup>12</sup> Ho 1<sup>6</sup> Is 2<sup>9</sup>). We can hardly understand *my punishment* (*עֲוֹנִי* Gn 4<sup>13</sup>), since his punishment has not been mentioned. And to supply the missing third stress add *עוֹד* *again* after *אֶחָבֵל* (see note, v. 32): *I will deal wrongfully no more!* (This seems better than pointing *וְנִשְׁאַתִּי* *Ni. I have lifted myself up*, in the unusual sense *I have been haughty* or *overbearing*: cf. Pr 30<sup>13</sup>). We might perhaps point *וְנִשְׁאַתִּי* *I was beguiled* (Is 19<sup>15</sup>). With *אֶחָבֵל* cf. Assy. *habālu*, 'injure', 'ruin', 'destroy'; e.g.

Sargon Cyl. 50: *Kīma zikir šūmīa, ša ana naṣār kitti ā mīšari, šutešur lā lī'i, lā ḥabāl enši, imbūinni ilāni rabūti, &c.* 'In accordance with the import of my name (qs *šarru kēnu*, 'righteous king'), which the mighty gods called me, that I might keep righteousness and justice, deal justly by the powerless, and not wrong the weak,' &c. (He goes on to say that he paid the full value for a site which he required.)  $\Theta^{\circ}$  ὅτι πρὸς τὸν ἰσχυρὸν ὁ λέγων (הַאֲמִיר) Εἰληφα, οὐκ ἐνεχυράσω (I. חבל Dt 24<sup>8,17</sup>) =  $\mathfrak{M}$ , but misconstrued.  $\mathfrak{W}$  Quia ergo ego locutus sum ad Deum, te quoque non prohibebo = אֶל-אֱלֹהִים אָמַרְתִּי נִגְמָתִי אַחֲרַי לֹא-אֶחְבֵּל (אֲנִי) כִּי (taking חבל in sense of *binding*?). For חבל see further note 17<sup>1</sup> Ne 17.

v. 32.  $\mathfrak{M}$  *Apart from* (that which) *I see, do Thou* (emph.) *teach me!* But the use of בלערי *apart from, besides*, is unique (not elsewhere c verb: hence  $\Theta$  ἀνὲ ἐμαυτοῦ = בְּלִעְרִי); and the word may well be dittogr. of ער (עור, עור) (v. 31 ad fin.). Restore אֶם-אֶחְטָא If *I err*, or אֶם-חָטָאתִי If *I have erred*; cf.  $\mathfrak{W}$  Si erravi, tu doce me. Or we might substitute הָאֶרֶץ *the way* (Pss 25<sup>4</sup> 27<sup>11</sup>) pro אֶחָוה: *The Way do Thou teach me!* Then (st. ii) *And if* (ואם: exc. 1 p. י) *I have done wrong, &c.*  $\mathfrak{W}$  si iniquitatem locutus sum; perhaps reading מִלְחִי pro מִעֲלִיתִי.

v. 33. A strangely incoherent tristich, with metr. short third line. The cumbrous st. i perhaps preserves the remains of a complete distich, which may have run somewhat thus:

הַמַּעֲפֵךְ יִשְׁלַם אֱלֹהִי  
כִּי מוֹסֵר נְשִׁי מֵאִסְתָּ:

*Is it by thy thinking* (lit. *from thee*) *that Eloah should requite, That thou despisest the chastening of Shaddai?* Cf. 5<sup>17</sup>. Instead of הַמַּעֲפֵךְ (מַעַם) 2 Sa 3<sup>28</sup>) read perhaps הַכְּטַעֲמֵךְ *Is it according to thy taste* (judgement; 12<sup>20</sup>) *that, &c.,* or הַמַּטְעֵמֶךְ.

The meaning may perhaps be: Would you deny a *locus paenitentiae* to the wicked ruler? Does your notion of Divine Justice involve his instant destruction, even if he repent and promise amendment? (Cf. 33<sup>22-28</sup>.)

The reference may be to the repentant nation rather than to the oppressive monarch; in which case we must render v. 31<sup>a</sup> *When unto El it* (i.e. the nation) *hath said.*

v. 34.  $\mathfrak{M}$  lit. *Men of heart will say to me, And the wise man who listens to me.* It makes a better couplet to read יִאָּמְרוּ pro יִשְׁמְעוּ and יִשְׁמְעוּ pro שִׁמְעוּ. This improves the parallelism, and yields a distich which is more in the manner of Elihu.

v. 36. St. i is overweighted in  $\mathfrak{M}$  (four stresses). אָבִי יִבְחֵן may have grown out of אֶבְחֵן by dittogr. of the first two letters: *I will test Eyob unto the end.*  $\Theta$  Οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ μάθε, Ἰώβ, | μὴ δῶς ἔτι ἀνταπόκρισιν ὥσπερ οἱ ἄφρονες = אֵין חֲשַׁב כְּאִנְשֵׁי אֵין | עַר נִצַּח אֶל חֲשַׁב כְּאִיּוֹב | עַר נִצַּח אֶל חֲשַׁב כְּאִיּוֹב.  $\mathfrak{W}$  gives the literal meaning of  $\mathfrak{M}$ 's st. i: Pater mi, probetur Iob usque ad finem; but



for st. ii it gives *ne desinas ab homine iniquitatis* = אל תִּשְׁכַּח מֵאִנּוּשׁ אֶן (pts!).

v. 37. A tristich, and otherwise corrupt. St. i *For he adds to his sin* (i.e. the sin which had caused his calamities) *rebellion* (in exclaiming against the Divine Judge) may pass muster all right; but st. ii *בינינו יספוק מ* *Between us he claps* (scil. his hands? cf. 27<sup>23</sup> La 2<sup>15</sup>) can hardly be regarded as satisfactory. Inserting *כפים hands* as necessary to sense and metre, we get the tolerable stichus *Among us he claps his hands* (in scorn); viz. against God, as appears from st. iii *And multiplies his words against El* (leg. *וירבה pro מ וירב אל and לאל pro מ לאל*). Perhaps the superfluous *בינינו* is a disguise of *לשירי (ע) Against Shaddai* (parallel to *El*). St. i may be rejected, except the introductory *כי*. Others reject st. ii. *That we add not upon our sin; | But transgression upon us will be reckoned* (עלינו pro בינינו and יספיר pro יספוק), *speaking many words before the Lord*. *Quia addit super peccata sua blasphemiam (= מ st. i) inter nos interim constringatur (= Aram. בינינו יִזַּק); et tunc ad iudicium provocet sermonibus suis Deum (= באמריו עִמָּאֵל).*

Chapter 35. For the heading see note on 34<sup>1</sup>. *Pro מ אליהו* read, of course, *אליהו* as elsewhere.

v. 2. *Right: or just (מִישָׁפֵט)*: 34<sup>4</sup>. The parallel in st. ii is *צֶדֶק > צֶדֶקִי מ*.

*This dost thou reckon as right,—*

*Think (or Call) it just with (or before: cf. 4<sup>17</sup> 9<sup>2</sup> 25<sup>4</sup>) El,—*

Leg. *צֶדֶק עִמָּאֵל pro מ צֶדֶקִי מֵאֵל*. *This: viz. That thou sayest, &c. (v. 3). Is that demand consonant with ideal right and truth?*


*¶* paraphrases: *Why didst thou think this in (ב pro ל?) judgement? Who art thou that thou saidst, 'I am just before the Lord'?* *צֶדֶקִי עִמָּאֵל* 25<sup>4</sup> ἐναντὶ Κυρίου ut hic; cf. 9<sup>2</sup> παρὰ Κυρίῳ). *¶* om. v. 3; *¶* add hic ἡ ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσω ἀμαρτών; = *מִחֲטָאֵי מִהֲאֶפְעַל מִחֲטָאֵי* (a mutilated form of v. 3; both v. 2<sup>b</sup> and v. 3 are starred in Hexapl.): cf. *¶* vel quid tibi proderit, si ego peccavero = *וְמִהֲיִעִיל אִמִּיחֲטָאֵי*.

v. 3. Continues the rhetorical question of v. 2. For the verbs see 15<sup>1</sup> 22<sup>2</sup> 34<sup>9</sup>. In st. i leg. *לִי* pro *מ לך*, and perhaps *וְמֵה* pro *מֵה* as in 21<sup>15</sup> (a virtual parallel), st. ii. The usual rendering of *מ* is *What shall I gain* more than *from my sin* (i.e. more than if I had sinned); but the natural meaning of the Heb. surely is: *What advantage shall I gain from my sin?* Read therefore *מִחֲטָאֵי מִחֲטָאֵי* more than *sinner's pro מ מִחֲטָאֵי* (and insert *אִי* metr. grat.?). Eyob had more than once argued that God makes no difference in His treatment of just and unjust (9<sup>22</sup> al.).

v. 4. Lit. *I, I will return thee words* (i.e. arguments). In st. ii add *שְׁלֹשׁ three p. א א c* *¶* metr. grat. et sens. (The v.l. *וְרַעַךְ*, though gramm. correct, is too short metr.). Cf. 21<sup>1</sup> 32<sup>1</sup>.

v. 5. Cf. 11<sup>7-8</sup> 22<sup>12</sup> Is 40<sup>26</sup> 55<sup>9</sup>. The idea here seems to be that God is

too high above man and, therefore, too remote from him, to be affected by his conduct. (Or can it be meant that the majestic march of Heaven goes on day by day, unaffected by anything that happens here below? Cf. verses 6, 7.)

St. ii. *the Skies*: שחקים. So 36<sup>28</sup> 37<sup>18,21</sup>. *Clouds*? 38<sup>37</sup>. Often a mere syn. of שמים: Dt 33<sup>26</sup> Ps 68<sup>35</sup>. The Sing. שֶׁחַק *fine dust* (on a balance: Is 40<sup>15+</sup>) recalls Na 1<sup>3</sup> אֶבֶק רִנְלִיו וְעֵנָן, and suggests an original connexion with the Sumerian  SAĜAR, *epru*, 'soil', 'dust'. The verb occurs 14<sup>19</sup> (= *terunt*: cf. Aram. *to beat small, pound or pulverize*).

*far above thee*: lit. *which are higher than thou*. There seem to be four stresses here. Perhaps כִּי has fallen out after כִּי, and מִמֶּךָ been added: cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$  et contemplant aethera quod altior te sit:  $\mathfrak{C}$  ὡς ὑψηλὰ ἀπὸ σοῦ: *And see the Skies, how high from thee!*

v. 6.  $\mathfrak{C}$  אֱלֹהִים = לוֹ *to Him* in both stichi (so 2 codd.), which may be right, as כִּי עֲשֵׂה does not seem to be used in the general sense of affecting another by one's behaviour, and st. i = st. ii. ( $\mathfrak{C}$  om. in both stichi.) Cf. v. 8. With verses 6, 7 cf. 22<sup>3,4</sup> (Eliphaz). Verses 8, 9 were starred in Hexapl.

v. 8. Man can do good or harm only to his fellows, not to the Most High. (It does not seem to be meant that right or wrong conduct benefits or injures the doer himself.)

v. 9. *oppressors*: pointing עֲשִׂיקִים c 1 cod. and  $\mathfrak{A}$  (טְלוֹמִין)  $\mathfrak{B}$  (calumniatorum).  $\mathfrak{M}$  עֲשִׂיקִים *oppression*; an abstr. like עֲלִימִים: Am 3<sup>9</sup> Ec 4<sup>1</sup>. Some codd. have עֲשִׂיקִים defect. (? עֲשִׂיקִים cf. 10<sup>3</sup> 34<sup>30</sup> Ec 4<sup>1</sup>). Pro  $\mathfrak{M}$  יוֹעִיקוּ leg. fort. יוֹעִיקוּ יוֹעִיקוּ (cf. v. 12): La 3<sup>8</sup> וְאִשְׁשֵׁעַ אֶת־הָעָם ut hic.

*the mighty*: perhaps כְּבִדִּים (cf. 34<sup>24</sup>); but  $\mathfrak{M}$  רָבִים seems defensible in the same sense: cf. Is 53<sup>12</sup>.  $\mathfrak{B}$  tyrannorum.  $\mathfrak{C}$  πολλῶν =  $\mathfrak{M}$ .  $\mathfrak{A}$  *princes* (דּוֹרְבַנִּיא; cf. Sing. 34<sup>20</sup> = אֲבִיר; perhaps errors for דּוֹרְבַנִּיא or דּוֹרְבַנִּיא et Sing.). Keeping עֲשִׂיקִים, we might read רָבִים pro רָבִים: see 38<sup>15</sup>.

v. 10. If the verse is in its proper place, אֲמַרְי and עֲשִׂנִי must be read c  $\mathfrak{C}$ . The anomalous form עֲשִׂי (Paus. pro עֲשִׂי = עֲשִׂי) need not detain us. It requires no grammatical subtleties to account for it, if the final נִי—was dropped inadvertently before the following תָּנוּ. Cf. עֲשִׂנִי 32<sup>22</sup>. (For אִיה cf. 15<sup>28</sup>.)

vv. 9–13 seem to assert that the cries of the oppressed are merely instinctive, like those of a wounded animal. Not being inspired by faith, they make no appeal to God. This, however, does not agree with 34<sup>29</sup>.

v. 10. Cf. 36<sup>13</sup>. *Where* (21<sup>28</sup>) *is Eloah my (our) Maker?* A mode of invoking Divine aid which was probably as ancient as it seems to us peculiar: see 2 K 2<sup>14</sup> and cf. Dt 32<sup>37</sup> Je 2<sup>6,8</sup> Ps 42<sup>4,11</sup>. Leg. fort. אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵנו (cf. Is 17<sup>10</sup> al.) > אֱלֹהֵי עֲשִׂנֵנו (at cf. Is 51<sup>13</sup>). St. ii is usually taken to mean, 'Who enables those whom He has delivered to utter songs of thanksgiving in the night; cf. Ps 42<sup>9</sup>' (Driver). If this is right, it con-

firms ישענו in st. i. The 'night' might be metaph. for the night of sorrow; times of affliction and calamity. But the phrase is unique and far from perspicuous. נָתַן (sine לָנוּ or לִי; cf. v. 7, 36<sup>a</sup>) would naturally mean, Who *putteth* (Ps 40<sup>a</sup>), *setteth*, or *appointeth*, acc. to context; while the constr. נָתַן is used of *giving* or *exchanging* one thing for (= תַּחַת) another, which may even suggest בִּלְלִילָהּ pro בִּלְלִילָהּ (Who *giveth songs* for wailing: cf. Is 15<sup>a</sup> 61<sup>a</sup>). ט' ὁ κατατάσσων φυλακὰς νυκτερινὰς = נָתַן (א) שְׁמֵרוֹת (ב) לַיְלָה (cf. 7<sup>12</sup> 20<sup>a</sup> Ps 90<sup>a</sup> 77<sup>a</sup>), Who *ordereth* (the) *night-watches* or *setteth watches in the night*. The 'night' (lit. or fig.) is not indefinitely long, but limited by periods marked off by the Divine Will. See also Ex 12<sup>42</sup> Dt 16<sup>1</sup> Is 21<sup>a.11</sup>. As astrological ref. seems not impossible (cf. v. 5; \*and v. 11 Who *teacheth us*, viz. by observation of the nightly heavens?). In that case, perhaps זְמֵרוֹת should be מְזֻמֵּרוֹת (38<sup>32</sup>). Or is the reference to 'the music of the spheres'? Cf. 38<sup>7</sup>.

v. 11. An apparent allusion to Eyob's words 12<sup>7.8</sup>; cf. also 28<sup>7.8.21</sup>. The beasts and birds know what they see; knowledge of the Unseen is restricted to man (cf. 28<sup>28</sup>). מַלְפָּנוּ = מַלְפָּנוּ (Aram. 15<sup>b</sup> 33<sup>33</sup> Pr 22<sup>24</sup>). The form corresponds to Syr. مَلَفَّ = (مَلَفَّ) fr. تَلَفَّ. ט' ὁ διορίζων με = מְבָרֵלֵנִי (Who *separateth me* from the four-footed things, &c.; om. verb in st. ii).

v. 12. *There* (in the case imagined; picturing an instance: cf. Pss 14<sup>b</sup> 36<sup>13</sup>). Leg. fort. הֵם *They* (emph.); i.e. the wronged. *They cry, and He answereth not*. Cf. Mi 3<sup>4</sup> אֲנִי יוֹעֵקֵי אֱלֹהִים וְלֹא יִעֲנֵה אוֹתָם; where the reason is added ad fin. vs. בְּאִשֶּׁר הִרְעוּ מַעֲלִילֵהֶם. And since a parenthesis in st. i is improb., מַפְנֵי נָאֹן (st. ii) should perhaps be emended into מַפְנֵי נָאֹן רַעֲתָם (גִּבְלוֹן) *Because of their overweening* (or *great*) *wickedness*. The word *bad men* (Je 15<sup>21</sup> Pr 4<sup>14</sup> 15<sup>3</sup>) occurs here only in Job (cf. Sing. 21<sup>30</sup>). For *wickedness* see 20<sup>12</sup> 22<sup>5</sup>; and for 'רַע' Je 44<sup>a</sup> Ho 10<sup>15</sup>. מַפְנֵי נָאֹן *pride* seems hardly a suitable term for the violence which provokes cries for help (cf. Ps 123<sup>4</sup>); and elsewhere in Job (37<sup>4</sup> 38<sup>11</sup> 40<sup>10+</sup>) the word has the good sense of *majesty* or *loftiness*. We should rather have expected a word like חֲמָס *violence*, or לַחֲץ *oppression* (36<sup>15</sup> Ps 42<sup>10</sup> cf. Is 19<sup>20b</sup>), if st. ii expressed the reason for the outcry of the wronged. There may, however, very probably be a reference to Eyob's complaint, 19<sup>1</sup>: *Lo, I cry . . . and am not answered* (Ni. cf. also 11<sup>2</sup> Pr 21<sup>13</sup>) and 30<sup>20</sup>. In that case, we may read יַעֲנֵהוּ pro יַעֲנֵהוּ: *There they cry, unanswered, | Because of the insolence of wicked ones*. (This may lessen the objection raised above, without anticipating the reason of their cries not being heard which is given in the next verse.)

v. 13. Cf. Hab 1<sup>13</sup>. Since שׁוּא is masc., read יְשׁוּרֵנִי pro שׁוּרָהּ ad fin. vs.; unless we prefer to substitute שְׁוֵתָם *their cry for help* pro שְׁוֵא *emptiness* (i.e. a cry *void* of religious content or significance; a *vain* or *ineffectual* plaint). ט' renders שָׁמַע by ἰδεῖν as in Is 30<sup>13</sup>; and instead

of st. ii (which seems metr. short) it gives: *For the Almighty Himself is a beholder of those who perform the lawless things* (τῶν συντελούντων τὰ ἄνομα. cf. 34<sup>18,22</sup> Je 6<sup>13</sup> Pr 1<sup>19</sup>); app. a paraphr. of: *וְשָׂרִי הָאֵל יִשְׁרֹנוּ* (ἀνόμων = שוא 11<sup>11</sup>). Read perhaps *וְשָׂרִי הָאֵל יִשְׁרֹנוּ* And Shaddai, HE will not notice it. ⑤ adds καὶ (A ὅς) ὥσωσε με = וְיִשְׁעֵנִי And will save me (22<sup>29</sup>), which may be a var. of *יִשְׁרֹנוּ* (which perhaps should really be read *יִשְׁעֵנוּ*: see next note). But a line like *וְשָׂרִי הָאֵל יִשְׁרֹנוּ מְרֵמָה* (וְיִשְׁעֵנוּ? שָׁקֵר? 11<sup>11</sup>) And Shaddai hearkens not to deceit (31<sup>5</sup>) would be a better and more metrical parallel. Cf. Ps 66<sup>18</sup>.

v. 14. ⑧ lit. *Yea, when thou sayest thou seest Him not, | The cause is before Him and thou shouldst wait for Him*; or perhaps rather: *Much less (will He give heed) when thou sayest thou canst not see Him; | The cause is before Him and thou art waiting for Him* (i.e. to give judgement: cf. 13<sup>18-22</sup>). Neither sense is satisfactory, and the Heb. is open to question; e.g. *לֹא תִשְׁרֹנוּ* after *לֹא יִשְׁרֹנָה* (ו) v. 13, apart from the repetition, ought either to be *לֹא תִשְׁ* or else the direct *לֹא אִשְׁרֹנוּ* I see Him not. The Subj. of *לֹא תִשְׁ* can hardly be the same as that of *תֹּאמַר*. (Cf. ⑧ Etiam cum dixeris: Non considerat (= לֹא יִשְׁ).) Eyob, however, had said the contrary (19<sup>25</sup> *אִשְׁרֹנוּ*). Read, perhaps, *לֹא יִשְׁרֹנִי* He will (doth) not regard me, or *לֹא יִשְׁעֵנִי* He will not save me (cf. ⑤). (⑤ seems to have read *לֹא יִשְׁבַּחְנָה* in v. 13 and *לֹא תִשְׁבַּחְנוּ* thou wilt not praise Him here.) The line might then be rendered: *Yea, though thou sayest (thinkest?), He will not save me*; or *Dost thou really say, &c.* (cf. Gn 3<sup>1</sup>).

St. ii *לֹא וְתַחֲוֹל לֹא* is app. an echo of Ps 37<sup>7</sup>; *Be still for Jahvah and wait patiently for Him.* (Defect. might easily have been misread *רִינִי*). Cf. also Hab 2<sup>20</sup> Zp 1<sup>7</sup>. (Polal 39<sup>1</sup> peperit, Polal 15<sup>7</sup> Pass., cf. 26<sup>5</sup> Hithpol. writhe in pain 15<sup>20</sup>.) Perhaps it should be: *לֹא וְתַחֲוֹל לֹא* (Even if thou think, He regardeth me not, Thou shouldst be dumb before Him, and wait for Him).

⑨ κριθεὶς δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, εἰ δύνασαι αἰνέσαι αὐτὸν ὡς ἔστιν = וְרִינִי לִפְנֵי (cf. ⑤) *אִם-תּוּכַל לִשְׁבַּח*. It looks as if st. i were omitted (owing to homoeoteleuton?); or possibly the two stichi of the verse were transposed. ⑤ *And even if thou hast said thou wilt not praise Him, judge (plead) before Him and supplicate Him* (= וְתַחֲוֹל לֹא).

v. 15. The pointing is anomalous, and the verse otherwise corrupt. Moreover the phrase *פָּקַד אָפוּ* is contrary to usage. It should at least be *פָּקַד בָּאָפוּ* He visited or punished with His anger (cf. 31<sup>14</sup> Ps 89<sup>33</sup>). We may perhaps restore *וְעַתָּה כִּי-אֵין פָּקַד בָּאָפוּ* And now, because He is not visiting with His anger; cf. ⑥ καὶ νῦν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπισκεπτόμενος ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ (i.e. fort. punishing Eyob's anger??—an leg. ὀργῇ?). The stichus, however, seems overweighted; and it is possible that *אָפוּ* is a gloss: *And now, because he is not visiting* (or attending, giving heed: cf. 7<sup>18</sup> 31<sup>14</sup>), | *Nor marketh* (or noticeth or careth for) *rebellion much* (leg. בְּפִשְׁעֵךְ or בְּפִשְׁעֵי אֵיבֶךָ a rebel); *Eyob, he idly openeth his mouth, &c.* (v. 16). For the constr. יָדַעְךָ

cf. 37<sup>16f</sup>. Je 38<sup>24</sup>. But  $\mathfrak{C}$  seems to have read פשע (sine ב): καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω παραπτώμα τι σφόδρα (an παραπτώματι Cas. Dat.?). παράπτωμα = פשע 36<sup>9</sup>. (Verses 15, 16 are starred in Hexapl.). For st. ii we may perhaps suggest מֵאֵר בְּפִשַׁע מֵאֵר וְלֹא-יָרֵעַ Nor hurteth He the rebel greatly: cf. Zp. 1<sup>12</sup> (constr. Je 25<sup>29</sup> I C 16<sup>22</sup>).

v. 16. *multiplieth*: יִבְבֵּר an Aramaism: cf. Syr. and Old Aram. (S. A. Cook, *Glossary*, ZP<sup>4</sup>) 36<sup>21</sup> (cf. also יִבְבֵּר much 31<sup>26</sup>).  $\mathfrak{C}$  βαρύνει = יביר.

For v. 15 another conjecture may be offered, viz. וְעַתָּה כִּי-אֵלֶּה פָקַד וְלֹא-יָרֵעַה נַפְשׁוֹ מֵאֵר And now, because Eloah hath visited, And within him his soul is sore shaken (cf. Is 15<sup>4</sup>); *Eyob idly*, &c. (v. 16). Eyob's flood of futile talk is the mere delirium of his intense affliction. (St. ii might also be וְלֹא-יָרֵעַ בְּפִשַׁע מֵאֵר And hath hurt HIM sore for transgression: Je 31<sup>30</sup> ב because of.)

Chapter 36. v. 2. *wait for*: פָּתַר an Aramaism אַפ. (In Heb. *surround* Ps 22<sup>13</sup>.) *a little*: i.e. a little waiting, or a little while. So here only. Cf. Is 28<sup>10, 13</sup> (a little amount, or quantity). St. ii, as  $\mathfrak{M}$  has it, can only mean: *For Eloah still hath words* (i.e. arguments). לֵאלוֹהִי is perhaps a scribal error for לְאֵלִיהוּא: *For Elihu still hath somewhat to say*: cf.  $\mathfrak{C}$  ἔτι γὰρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν λέξις:  $\mathfrak{B}$  adhuc enim habeo quod pro Deo loquar.

v. 3. *from afar*: לְמֵרְחוֹק 39<sup>29</sup> 2 Sa 7<sup>19</sup>, cf. also 2 K 19<sup>26</sup>. Does Elihu perhaps mean *I will lift my cognisance* (or *thought*) *to Him that is far away*; or *I will bring forward my knowledge for the Distant One* (i.e. God; cf. st. ii)? Cf. Ps 139<sup>2</sup> מֵרְחוֹק לִרְעִי בִנְתָה לִרְעִי (where some codd. לִרְעִי). A closer parallel; cf. however,  $\mathfrak{B}$  Repetam scientiam meam a principio.

*My Maker*: פָּעַל so here only (= עָשָׂה cf. 35<sup>9</sup>).  $\mathfrak{C}$  ἐργους μου = לְפָעַל (pts.).

v. 4.  $\mathfrak{C}$  connects ἀμנם, ἐπ' ἀληθείας with v. 3, omitting introd. כִּי and continuing with καὶ οὐκ ἄδικα ῥήματα = וְלֹא-יִשְׁקַר מִלִּים; thus making st. i part of v. 3<sup>b</sup>, in total disregard of the metrical structure.

*indeed*: אֱמֵנִים 34<sup>12</sup> (19<sup>4, 6</sup>). Here perhaps אֱמֵנִים: *For faithful, not false, are my words*.  $\mathfrak{C}$  gives only ἀδίκως συνίεις = לֹא-יִשְׁקַר חָרַע (cf. Ex 36<sup>1</sup>) for st. ii (dittogr.).  $\mathfrak{M}$  תָּמִים דַּעוֹת עִמָּךְ; upon which Driver remarks, 'Elihu means himself.' But cf. 37<sup>18</sup>, where the phrase (דַּעוֹת) denotes God, the *Perfect* in all kinds of knowledge. Should we read here עִמָּךְ pro עִמָּךְ (*The Perfect in Knowledge is with me*)? Elihu seems to claim inspiration, 32<sup>8, 18</sup>. Cf. also 1 Sa 2<sup>3</sup> אֵל דַּעוֹת יְהוָה. If *One that is perfect in knowledge* be the meaning (RV), we should expect אִישׁ דַּעוֹת; otherwise the natural meaning of the phrase will be 'The Perfect in Knowledge', which even Elihu would hardly claim to be. The two stichi, in any case, do not hang well together; and perhaps we should read אִמְרָתִי (or וְאִמְרָתִי) pro תָּמִים: (*And*) *I (will) declare knowledge with thee*: cf. Ez 13<sup>7</sup> Ps 40<sup>11</sup> for אִמְרָתִי.

v. 5. כביר<sup>2</sup> is prob. dittogr. of כביר<sup>1</sup>. מ lit. *Lo, El (is) mighty and despiseth not* (sine Obj.); *Mighty (in) strength of heart*. This leaves something to be desired in the way of perspicuity and relevance to context. St. ii is metr. defective. We would read יָפִים (Is 13<sup>7</sup>), or point יָפִים (7<sup>5</sup>? Ps 58<sup>9</sup>), pro מִיָּמָם; and in st. ii (which seems to be an echo of 9<sup>1</sup>) לֵבב יָכֵב וְחָכָם בֶּחַ אֲמִיץ *Strong in power and wise of heart*. Cf. also Is 40<sup>26.28</sup>. ט γίγνσκε δὲ (ἡ γίγνσκε δὲ ἐγὼ) ὅτι ὁ Κύριος οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσεται τὸν ἄκακον = 8<sup>20</sup> (הַיָּאֵל לֹא יִמָּאס תָּם) ὁ γὰρ Κύριος οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσεται τὸν ἄκακον. This suggests לֹא יִמָּאס תָּם for st. i here; but this obviously does not cohere with what follows in מ. (St. ii and vv. 6–11 were wanting in the original text of ט.) © *Lo, the mighty God despiseth not him who is pure as milk* (ברור כחלב pro לב כביר כח לב).

v. 6. St. i insert נפיש (Gn 19<sup>19</sup>, cf. Ez 13<sup>19</sup>) or אדם (27<sup>13</sup>) metr. grat. *the right*: 27<sup>2</sup> 34<sup>5</sup>. Leg. fort. לָעֵן (*And giveth justice to the opp.*) on account of יתן (cf. Zp 3<sup>8</sup>). The usual phrase is עֲשֵׂה מִשְׁפָּט: see Dt 10<sup>18</sup> 1 K 8<sup>59</sup> Is 10<sup>2</sup> al. We incline to read ירין pro יתן (cf. Je 21<sup>12</sup>): *And the cause of the oppressed He judgeth*.

v. 7. A tristich. The rendering of RV implies יִשְׁיִבֻם pro וַיֵּשׁ, and is merely a desperate expedient. Cf. Non auferet a iusto oculos suos *et reges in solio collocat in perpetuum, et illi eriguntur*. Possibly st. i should be read *He withdraweth* (v. 27, cf. 15<sup>1.8</sup>) *not justice from the humble* (צָדִק מִעֲנִי pro מִצָּדִק עֲנִי), and the line be regarded as a var. or gloss to v. 6<sup>b</sup> (unless its fellow stichus be lost). Then וַיָּאֵח may conceal a verb, viz. וַיָּאֵח or וַיָּחַא Hi. (ἀπ. cf. Is 21<sup>14</sup> התין Imp.) or וַיִּבֵּא: *He bringeth kings to the throne, | And seateth them in splendour, and they wax proud or behave haughtily*: Zp 3<sup>11</sup> Is 3<sup>16</sup>. (For the supposed Hi. form of וַיָּאֵח, cf. וַיָּאֵח Qal Is 41<sup>25</sup>.)

לִנְצַח, usually *for ever*, may here have the meaning *in splendour* or *glory* (1 C 29<sup>11</sup>, cf. 1 Sa 15<sup>29</sup> La 3<sup>18</sup>?); acc. to the Aram. use of the Root (cf. Syr.  $\text{ܢܝܚܐ}$  *bright*,  $\text{ܢܝܚܐ}$  *shine out, flame upwards, be brilliant*, and  $\text{ܢܝܚܐ}$  *dazzling, glowing*,  $\text{ܢܝܚܐ}$  *conduit*, La 4<sup>7</sup>; Sum. ZAG, a value of the Fire-character, ZA, *bright, shining*, ZAL, id.).

v. 8. The consequence of their sinful pride. Leg. יִאָּסְרוּ pro וַיִּאָּסְרוּ; or, as the metre halts, and אֲסוּרִים looks genuine (it is not likely to have been substituted for a finite verb), and as some verb fin. seems needed to complete the sense as well as the metre, insert יִלְכּוּ after it (Is 45<sup>14</sup> ubi leg. fort. אַחֲרֵי יִלְכּוּ בִּקְוִים et om. יַעֲבֹדוּ dittogr., cf. also Is 49<sup>3</sup> 61<sup>1</sup> Ps 146<sup>7</sup>): *And if bound they walk in fetters*; like prisoners of war, e.g. Manasseh, 2 C 33<sup>11</sup> (ubi leg. בַּחֲבָלִים pro בַּחוּמִּים); to the story of whose captivity, repentance, and restoration vv. 8–11 allude, though not exclusively (cf. 2 C 36<sup>6.10</sup> Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin; 2 K 24<sup>2.12.16</sup>: Zedekiah 2 K 25<sup>6.7</sup>). ילכו exc. ante ילכו.

caught (or taken) in the cords (or snares: 18<sup>10</sup> Ps 18<sup>6</sup>) of distress (or oppression: עָנִי): cf. 2 C 33<sup>11</sup> (ῥ) וילכדו את־מנשה בחבלים (Ps. 107<sup>10-14</sup> אֲסִירִי (עָנִי וברזל).

v. 9. With the whole passage, vv. 7-15, cf. 33<sup>14-30</sup> 34<sup>24-32</sup>.

they dealt arrogantly: or were overbearing, played the tyrant: תִּתְנַבְּרוּ (15<sup>25</sup> of impious defiance of God. Is 42<sup>13</sup> of God as displaying puissance—'playing the hero' (G. H. Box)—against His foes).

v. 10. and He open their ear: so v. 15<sup>b</sup> 33<sup>16</sup>. ὁ ἀλλὰ τοῦ δικαίου εἰσακούσεται = לִישֶׁר אֲזַן אֲנִי (or לְמִישָׁפֶּט or לְמִי־שָׁרִים ῥ); misunderstanding the phrase גִּלָּה אֶזְנִי (1 Sa 9<sup>15</sup> al.). And bid them return: וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי יֵשׁׁ. ὁ καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐπιστραφήσονται, And said that they will return; the usual meaning of אָמַר כִּי does not denote purpose (= ut c Subjunct.), cf. B et loquatur ut revertantur, but simply introduces the Object-clause (like ὅτι followed by the Indic.): And say that they should return; cf. אֵיךְ Ne 13<sup>19</sup>.

v. 11. St. i is metr. short. Leg. fort. אֲמִישְׁמְעוּ עָלָיו ויעברנו If they hearken unto him (2 K 20<sup>18</sup> עַל = אֵל) and serve Him.

they complete their days: they are not untimely cut off (Ps 55<sup>24</sup>), but bring their lives to a full end, dying in a good old age. The stichus is an echo of 21<sup>13a</sup>; see the note there. (70 codd. יכלו ut Is 65<sup>22</sup> ubi leg. יכלו ut hic). Stt. ii, iii make a distich which might have been modelled on Ps 78<sup>39</sup>: ויכל בהבל ימיהם | ושנותם בבהלה; but st. iii, which is metr. short, is superfluous here: cf. 21<sup>13a</sup>. (π. ἄν. Ps 16<sup>6</sup> = in the pleasant places. Cf. נַעֲמֻת pleasures Ps 16<sup>11</sup>.)

v. 12. Om. ישמעו ditogr. (v. 11). into She'ol: בשׂאול pro מָוֶת 33<sup>18b</sup> (ubi ὁ ἐν πολέμῳ): cf. שׂוֹאֵל = באֶבְרוֹן. For עֲבָר, see 30<sup>16</sup> 34<sup>20</sup>. (rush upon weapons [and perish] OL is improb. Jo 2<sup>8</sup> is no parallel. השלח there may perhaps mean the outer wall of the city; cf. Assy. šalḫā, šalḫu: 'And behind the wall they alight (or drop). and are not stopped thereby': leg. fort. ולא־יעצרו.)

Ἐ quite differently: But impious ones He saveth not, because of their not willing to know the Lord, | And because, though warned, they were disobedient (ἀνῆκουσ ἦσαν = לא ישמעו Pr 13<sup>1b</sup>) = ורשעים לא־יִשְׁמְעוּ בְּשִׁלָּה (21<sup>14f</sup>. (יהפצו. יאבו ויהפצו) לרעת אל (cf. Je 7<sup>25</sup>). ὁ's st. ii looks like a var. rendering of st. i.

v. 13. מֵ לֵב חֲנָפִי the godless in heart is a dubious phrase (elsewhere only in the corrupt line Ps 35<sup>16a</sup>). The sing. חָנָף (7 times in Job) is never qualified by a following genitive. For חֲנָפִים plur. abs., see Is 33<sup>14f</sup>. Read perhaps וְחֲנָפִים בִּלְבָב וְגו' And the impious, in heart they lay up anger (cf. Ps 13<sup>3</sup> Pr 26<sup>24</sup>); resenting their misfortunes as unjust. An indirect thrust at Eyob. Or: וְחֲנָף רַב יִשְׁמִי But the godless are greatly confounded (21<sup>15</sup>); וְלֵאלֹהִים לֹא־יִשְׁמְעוּ And to El they cry not, &c., when He hath bound them (cf. v. 8): but perhaps we should read יִסְרָם chastised them, or

יִפְּרֶם *chastiseth them*, pro מִן אֲסָרָם. Cf. 33<sup>18</sup> 36<sup>10</sup> Dt 8<sup>5</sup>. (The verse was starred in Hex.)

v. 14. *their soul dieth*: תָּמַת pro מִן תָּמַת Juss., which seems due to reminiscence of the phrase נָפַשׁ תָּמַת *let my soul* (i. e. me myself) *die*! Nu 23<sup>10</sup> Ju 16<sup>30</sup> (only). If בְּנֵעֹר *in childhood* or boyhood is right, בְּעַלְמִים *in youth* will naturally follow in the parallel stichus, as in 33<sup>25</sup>, instead of מִן's בְּקִרְשִׁים in cinaedis (1 K 14<sup>24</sup> 15<sup>12</sup> 22<sup>27</sup> 2 K 23<sup>7</sup>), which 𐤂 pointed בְּקִרְשִׁים (ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων); cf. 5<sup>1</sup>. Such a statement was not likely to be made of bad kings generally. Moreover, st. ii being metr. short, we may insert תַּחֲלֵךְ *passeth away* (9<sup>26</sup>) as Predicate of חַיֵּיהֶם: *And their life, it passeth away in youth*: cf. 𐤂 ἡ δὲ ζωὴ αὐτῶν τιτρωσκομένη ὑπὸ ἀγγ. (20<sup>24</sup> תַּחֲלֵכֶוּ = τρώσαι αὐτόν): or perhaps חֲלָהָה *sickeneth* (cf. 2 K 20<sup>1</sup>). 𐤂 Morietur *in tempestate* (cf. I נָעַר *growl, roar*; = מִן? at fort. בַּפֶּעַר, et vita eorum *inter effeminatos* (= מִן). 𐤆 הִיָּה מְרִי וְנִי pro מִן בְּקִרְשִׁים (a natural guess, based on the idea that the Hieroduli were shortlived). 𐤂 בַּכַּפְנָא *by famine*.

v. 15. The verb יַחֲלֵךְ seems almost to demand מִן > בְּעוֹ; cf. 𐤂 Eripiet *de angustia sua pauperem*; Pss 116<sup>8</sup> 140<sup>2</sup>. מִן may perhaps mean *by* or *through* (ב instrument.) his affliction. Trouble is not punitive but remedial. The verse begins a new paragraph. St. ii. Cf. v. 10. Leg. אָזְנוֹ *his ear* c 𐤂 aurem eius pro מִן אָזְנֵם *their ear*. 𐤂 *their way* = אֶרְצָם. 𐤂 ἀνθ' ὧν ἐθλιψαν ἀσθενῆ καὶ ἀδύνατον = כִּי לַחַצוֹ עָנִי וְאִבְיוֹן *Because they oppressed the poor and needy*; a good reason for the statement of the last verse. But 𐤂 continues: κρίμα δὲ πράξεων ἐκθήσει = וְיִגַּל מִשְׁפַּט עֲנִיִּים or יתן ומשפט עניים (v. 6<sup>b</sup> repet.; cf. Es 9<sup>14</sup> 𐤂), which agrees better with מִן's st. i (as emended) than with its own. It seems possible that the verse originally ran: יַחֲלֵךְ עָנִי מִן אִבְיוֹן | וְיִצֵּל מִלְחָצוֹ אִבְיוֹן *He draweth the poor out of his misery, | And snatcheth away (?)* cf. Ho 13<sup>14</sup> Ps 72<sup>14</sup>) *the needy from the oppressor (or from oppression)*.

v. 16. A very corrupt tristich. מִן lit. *And also he enticed thee* (v. 18) *out of the mouth of straits* | Breadth not narrowness (37<sup>10</sup> Is 8<sup>23</sup>) *under her* | *And the quiet* (17<sup>16</sup> ?) *of thy table (which was?) full of fatness*. Sticklers for the purity of the Massoretic text may defend this nonsense. We prefer to do our best to relieve 'Elihu' from the discredit of it. The verse appears to continue the subject of v. 15, viz. the restoration of the repentant oppressor. We may therefore suggest for st. i: וְאִתּוֹ הִסִּיעַ | מִן יַצִּיר (יִמְלֹט 29<sup>12</sup>) *And him* (the penitent; as distinguished from the reprobate, v. 13 f.) *he bringeth out* (Ex 15<sup>22</sup> Ps 80<sup>9</sup>) or *delivereth* (62<sup>29</sup> 29<sup>12</sup>) *from straits*. Cf. 𐤂 Igitur salvabit te de ore, &c. (? ישׁיעַ). מִן יַצִּיר could only mean *out of the mouth of the adversary* (not straits: cf. Ps 22<sup>22</sup>); and מִן = מִן is common in Job, and might easily be misread מִן. מִן הִסִּיחַ *incitavit te* seems to have been copied inadvertently from v. 18 inf. Then the parallel st. ii might be read: וְהִכְבִּילוּ מוֹצֵק (מְצוֹק ?) תַּחֲתָיו *And*



the narrowness (37<sup>10</sup>) under him (v. 20, 40<sup>12</sup> Ps 119<sup>143</sup> Ex 10<sup>23</sup>) *becometh broad*, or better: וַיִּרְחַב־לּוֹ צַעְדּוֹ תַּחְתָּיו *And he maketh broad his footsteps under him*: cf. Ps 4<sup>2</sup> 18<sup>37</sup> ch 18<sup>7</sup> Pr 4<sup>12</sup> 18<sup>16</sup>. St. iii may have grown out of dittogr. (נחת of תחת st. ii; 'מלא רש' of 'מלא' v. 17). [ἘΒΑΝ\* καὶ προσεπιπάτησεν prob. scribal error for καὶ προσέτι ἡπάτησεν (ἘΒΑ) = מ' ואף הסית; ἄβυσσος = רהב = רחב; καὶ κατέβη = וַיִּנְחַת pts.; κατὰχυσος = מוצק qs de יצק effudit (= מ). Ἐ om. לא.] *His table is filled with fatness*: perhaps due to reminiscence of 2 K 25<sup>29f</sup>. (Evil-Merodach's kindness to Jehoiachin).

v. 17. מ' lit. *And with the judgement of the wicked thou art filled; Judgement and justice, they lay hold*. Dividing the letters differently, and following Ἐ οὐχ ὑστερήσει = לא-יחדל (cf. Ps 39<sup>6</sup> Nu 9<sup>13</sup>), we submit לֹא-יִחְדַּל (רִדְוֹן רִשְׁעִי) *But the doom of the godless faileth not* for st. i; and for st. ii צדק ומשפט יחמכום *Justice and judgement lay hold of them*. (Cf. Ἐ οὐχ ὑστερήσει δὲ ἀπὸ δικαίων κρίμα = the entire verse!) The Pron. Suff. ם is possibly concealed under בי v. 18, where that Conj. is not wanted. V. 17 thus becomes a natural sequel to v. 16.

v. 18. Corrupt. Some would render: *Because there is passion, (beware) lest it incite thee to mockery*. Driver: *For beware lest wrath (i.e. resentment at God's dealings with thee) allure thee into mockery*. But the note of Eyob's language is hardly 'mockery'. As to כי *For* see on v. 17<sup>b</sup>. *Beware* (cf. v. 21) may be recognized in חמה *See!* (חִמָּה); an Aramaism mispointed חִמָּה *wrath* in מ'. (For פן, see also 32<sup>13</sup> Is 36<sup>18</sup>). The Subj. of the verb יסיתך is prob. concealed under the dubious בשפק, for which we may substitute שחר (parallel to כפר Pr 6<sup>36</sup>; cf. st. ii). St. ii gives a clue to the right reading of st. i (cf. also v. 19<sup>b</sup> and Ἐ). We thus get the distich:

*See that a bribe seduce thee not,  
Nor abounding graft incline thee!*

In this and the following verses Elihu hints, under cover of precepts couched in proverbial form, that Eyob may have been guilty of certain sins common at the time among the rich and powerful.

v. 19. On st. i Driver truly remarks: 'Throughout this line RV. and RVm. are both extremely questionable. The Hebrew text must be corrupt; but no convincing emendation has hitherto been proposed.' Now in 6<sup>22</sup> כֶּסֶף means *wealth*; and in 28<sup>17.19</sup> ערך is used of *comparing* one valuable thing with another (cf. Is 40<sup>18</sup> Ps 40<sup>6</sup> 89<sup>7</sup>). And since בצר, pointed בָּצָר (22<sup>24</sup>) may be a syn. of חרוץ *gold* (see note on 22<sup>24f</sup>), and שוע may denote *safety, welfare*, we may recognize in these words the two terms necessary to a comparison, and suppose that the question originally ran: *Shall thy welfare be valued in gold?* (היערך שועך אל-בצר or היערך שועך אל-ישעך בצר). St. ii certainly lends itself to and almost demands this view of the sense; whether we understand the ἀπ. מאמצי *vires* as denoting

the *resources* or *rich supplies* of wealth, or prefer to substitute some other word for it, e.g. אֲצִרוֹת *treasures* or מִצְפוֹנֵי *hoards* (Ob 6). Leaving st. ii as it stands in מ, we might also read st. i: הִיעָלָהּ לְיִשְׁעָהּ אוֹצָר (but perhaps 'Elihu' wrote שוֹעֵן לְאוֹצָר).

It is evident that vv. 18–19 are closely connected in sense. ⚡ *But wrath* (וְרוּחַ) *upon impious ones will be* | *On account of impiety of gifts* (= שָׁחַר Pr 6<sup>35</sup>) *which they used to receive upon injustices. Let not the mind wilfully turn thee* (μὴ σε ἐκκλινάτω = אֶל־יִטֵּן v. 18 ad fin.) *from a prayer* (שֹׁעַן) *of powerless ones in straits* (ἐν ἀνάγκῃ ὄντων = מִצְרָה) | *And all* (accus.) *who strengthen* (pointing מְאַמְּצֵי) *might* = מ. A paraphrase of a misunderstood and partially corrupted text.

v. 20. St. i is metr. short. מ lit. *Pant not for* (5<sup>5</sup> 7<sup>2</sup>) *the night* | *That peoples may go up under them* (where they stand?). This is obviously corrupt. Driver: 'Challenge not the Divine judgement ("night" being named as a time of disaster, xxxiv. 20, 25), which may prove to be of a kind in which whole peoples perish. Job had often desired to meet God in judgement (e.g. xiii. 22, xxiii. 3–7).' But Eyob had never expressed a wish for a catastrophic 'judgement' or 'Day of the Lord'. What he craved was a personal interview with his Judge, that he might vindicate his cause face to face with his Divine Adversary. Elihu may be supposed to be indirectly accusing Eyob of another fault, viz. tipping; which is associated with taking bribes in Is 5<sup>22,23</sup> as, possibly, here. Cf. 1<sup>4,5,13</sup>. ⚡ μὴ ἐξελεύσῃς τὴν νύκτα = אֶל־תִּמְשָׁךְ הַלַּיְלָה (Gn 37<sup>28</sup> Ps 36<sup>10</sup>) *Draw not out or Prolong not* (Is 13<sup>22</sup>) *the night* seems to give the clue; and perhaps we may venture to insert בַּיַּיִן *with wine*, for the sake of metre and sense: as we might say, 'Drink not far into the night.' But Pr 23<sup>30</sup> suggests the possibility of אֶל־תִּתְּמַחֵר עַל־הַיַּיִן *Linger not over the wine* בַּלַּיְלָה *in the night* (cf. Is 5<sup>11</sup>). Cf. also Ec 2<sup>3</sup>. An fort. leg. אֶל־תִּתְּמַשֵּׁךְ (חֲמַסֵּךְ) *Mingle not strong drink in the night* (?). At ⚡ Ne *protrahas* noctem. In accordance with this, we propose עַד־לַעֲלוֹת יוֹם תַּחֲתִּי *Until Day* (= שָׁחַר Gn 19<sup>15</sup> 32<sup>25</sup>) *go up in its place*, instead of מ's unintelligible לַעֲלוֹת עִמָּם תַּחֲתִּי. For עַד־לַעֲלוֹת see I K 18<sup>29</sup>.

v. 21. *Beware! turn not . . .* Cf. Ex 10<sup>28</sup> (וְאַל־ Ju 13<sup>1</sup>). ⚡ μὴ πράξῃς = אֶל־תַּפְעַל pro מ' אֶל־תַּפֵּן אֶל־: fort. recte. St. ii leg. תִּבְחָרְךָ בְּע' *thou wast tried with affliction* (Aram. use; בָּחַר = בָּחַן); see Is 48<sup>10</sup> בְּחָרְךָ *I have tested thee in the furnace of affliction*. בְּבֹר עֲלֵי: *on account of this*, viz. אֵין: cf. 34<sup>36</sup>. (An leg. נִבְחַנְחַ et hic: cf. Gn 42<sup>16</sup>?). So ⚡ *For because of this thou wast tried with poverty*. (⚡ Hanc enim coepisti sequi post miseriam; mistaken paraphr. of מ.)

v. 22. Begins a new paragraph. *doeth loftily*: יִשְׁנִיב = ⚡ κραταιώσῃ, cf. Ps 139<sup>6</sup>. Better perhaps נִשְׁנִיב Ptcp., cf. ⚡ excelsus; Is 2<sup>11</sup> 33<sup>6</sup>. *And who*: מִי pro מ' (exc. post ו) *a teacher*: מוֹרֶה cf. Is 30<sup>20</sup>. ⚡ δυνάστης

= Aram. קרָא (haud recte). Cf. v. 10 33<sup>14ff.</sup> 35<sup>11</sup>. God teaches by affliction. (B paraphr. Et nullus ei similis in legislatoribus; understanding מורה as a teacher of the Torah.) מרָא, however, gives a closer parallel to st. i.

v. 23. Cf. 34<sup>12a</sup>. God chooses His own course and methods of procedure, in absolute independence of all His creatures.

who shall say; i.e. having given Him a charge, and found Him unfaithful to it. Leg. מִי אָמַר מִי יֹאמַר pro מִי אָמַר מִי (cf. B and RV who can say). ט ρίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἐτάλων αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα; B Quis poterit scrutari vias eius? יחקר (32<sup>12</sup>, cf. La 3<sup>39</sup>) pro יפקד (?) ; ἔργα = ארחות paths 13<sup>27</sup> דרכי ways 34<sup>21</sup>. But פקד was perhaps understood by B in the sense of *visiting to test or try* (cf. 7<sup>18</sup> 31<sup>14</sup>); and no difference of reading seems to be implied. In ordinary use, פקד עליו דרכו would mean *Who hath (ever) punished Him for His way?* (cf. Am 3<sup>2</sup> 110 4<sup>9</sup>); which would agree very well with B st. ii (but cf. 34<sup>13</sup>); *And who*, i.e. what human judge, *hath ever said* in giving judgement, *'Thou hast done wrong'*? The Almighty is superior to all jurisdictions; none can question His justice, or call Him to account for His doings. (ט st. ii = וְמִי אָמַר פִּעַל And who saith, 'He hath done,' &c.)

v. 24. magnify: or praise: Hi. שָׁנָא (8<sup>11</sup> 12<sup>23</sup> +). Aramaism peculiar to Job.

So only here. B Memento quod ignores (?) חָשָׂא = חָשָׂה forgettest? or לא־תדע v. 26) opus eius. ט μνησθητι ὅτι μεγάλα ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ('שָׁנָא cf. v. 26. 37<sup>23</sup>) may be right. St. ii מִי אָנְשִׁים אשר שָׁרְרוּ אנשים, B de quo cecinerunt viri. But שָׁוֵר Pol. of שִׁיר is so used nowhere else (Zp 2<sup>14</sup> Impf. sine Obj. Ptcp. singer, 1 C 6<sup>18</sup> al.); and ט ἡγξαν = שָׁוֵר (Ju 9<sup>22</sup> Is 32<sup>1</sup>), i.e. שָׁר in the unpunctuated text. And as שָׁוֵר have ruled gives no satisfactory sense, while שִׁיר to see is a favourite word in Job, we may perhaps point שָׁרִי have seen. The idea that God's creative power is visible in His works is emphasized in the next couplet (cf. Ro 1<sup>20</sup>). If we go a step further and read מִי־אֵשֶׁר pro מִי־אֵשֶׁר, we seem to recover a stronger distich than that of B:

*Remember that great is His work  
Beyond what mortals have seen.*

For the construction, cf. Jos 10<sup>11</sup> Ju 16<sup>30</sup> Ec 3<sup>22</sup>. For 37<sup>24</sup> אֲנָשִׁים. (It is perhaps worthy of note that, as שֹׁר, חֹזֶה, הַבִּיט, occur together in vv. 24, 25, here, so do שֹׁר, חֹזֶה, רָאָה, in 19<sup>26.27</sup>.) As regards B, it may be remarked that, while appeals to men and other creatures to sing to the Lord are common in OT poetry, the statement that men in general do sing of God's work would be unique in the sacred literature of the Hebrews. (Otherwise, one might be inclined to read אֲנָשִׁי קְדָם the men of old pro מִי אֲנָשִׁים, and to think of the famous Babylonian Epic of

Creation with which the Jews must have become acquainted during the Exile, if not long before.)

v. 25. Vv. 25-8 def. in 6. *All mankind*: insert בְּנֵי? cf. Ps 33<sup>14</sup>. St. ii read וְאִי בִיטְנוּ וְאִי *And a mortal may behold it* (i.e. God's work) *far away* (and therefore imperfectly: 26<sup>14</sup>): 39<sup>29</sup> Gn 22<sup>4</sup>. Cf. 3 Omnes homines *vident eum* (i.e. God); unusquisque intuetur procul. The verse, however, does not affirm universal intuition or recognition of the existence of God (a question not raised in the book). 6 curiously: πᾶς ἀνθρώπος εἶδεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ (= חוּהוּ בּוּ); of inward consciousness of God; or perhaps rather, of seeing in his own being a 'work' of God: ὅσοι τιτρωσάμενοι εἰσὺν βροτοί, app. pointing אֲנוֹשׁ first as אָנוֹשׁ and then as אָנוֹשׁ (conflate rend); but more prob. 6 represents: מְדַבֵּר: (יְבִיט) בְּלִי-אֲנוֹשׁ (cf. Pr 12<sup>18</sup>).

v. 26. Is this verse a variant of v. 22? It might, no doubt, begin a new paragraph or strophe; but st. ii ('the number of His years', cf. Ps 102<sup>25, 28</sup>) seems hardly relevant to what follows. We might perhaps read מַעֲשָׁיו *his works* pro שָׁנָיו *his years*.

beyond knowledge: וְלֹא-יָדָע, lit. *and we know not*. Point perhaps יָדָע (= נִדָּע): *unknowable*, i.e. not fully known, cf. 26<sup>24</sup> Ps 77<sup>20</sup>. וְלֹא om. 1 (ditt.). So 3. Or read בְּלֹא *without*.

vv. 27-33. Rain and clouds as instances of the work (or works) of God (v. 24). Nothing was then known of the real genesis of these physical phenomena (cf. 28<sup>25f.</sup> 38<sup>28, 31ff.</sup> Ec 11<sup>3</sup> 1 K 18<sup>44f.</sup> Is 5<sup>6</sup> Je 10<sup>13</sup> Ps 135<sup>7</sup> Gn 1<sup>6f.</sup> 7<sup>11</sup>). In dealing with these corrupt and difficult verses we must not, therefore, read into the text any of the more exact ideas of modern science, such as are represented by such t.t. as Evaporation, Rarefaction, Condensation. To the Hebrew mind, every shower that fell was a fresh miracle; every thunderstorm, nay, every single raindrop, was the immediate handiwork of God.

v. 27. St. i. The verb גָּרַע (a younger by-form of גָּרַע *cut off*? cf. Aram. use of גָּרַע *shave*) means to *cut off from* so as to *lessen* or *diminish* (Ex 5<sup>8</sup> Ec 3<sup>14</sup>; see notes on v. 7 15<sup>4, 8</sup>) > either to 'draw up' or to 'draw down': *For He maketh small the drops of water* (AV). St. ii further explains: *And bindeth up the rain in His mist*; or *And squeezeth, compresseth, the rain into His mist* (Gn 2<sup>6</sup> אָר). Cf. 26<sup>8</sup> *Who bindeth up* (צָרַר; so Pr 30<sup>4</sup>) *water in His clouds*; which suggests the reading וְיָצַר (or וְיִצֵּר). So 6. But the word וְיָצַר *fetters* and the Aram. וְיָקַם *to bind* (only in Ptcp. Pass. וְיָקַם *bound*; cf. also the NH use) suggest the possibility of וְיָקַם. יָצַקוּ = וְיָלְפִין: see 29<sup>6</sup> for this equivalence. 3 renders the whole verse: *Because He withholdeth* (יִמְנַע) *the drops* (or *streams*: מַיִם v. מַיִם) *of water*; *They trickle the rain to (?) His clouds*. 6 *If He count* (נִמְנָא = יִמְנַע) *the pillars of Heaven* (= עַמּוּדֵי שָׁמַיִם), *And bind up* (צָרַר = יָצַר vid. supr.) *the drops of rain by itself* (= לְבַדּוֹ; misreading of וְלֹא). 3 Qui aufert (= וְיָקַם) stillas *pluviae* (cf. 5<sup>10</sup>), Et effundit (= וְיָצַק: cf. 29<sup>6</sup>) imbres *ad instar*

*gurgilum* (= מַיִם?). Ὁ ἀριθμηταὶ δὲ αὐτῶ σταγόνες ὑετοῦ = וַיִּסְנוּלוּ נַטְפֵי מַיִם (cf. 1 Sa 24<sup>1</sup> ἀρίθμησον = מִנֵּה): so Ὡ (cf. יִמְנַע); καὶ ἐπιχυθῇσονται ὑετῶ εἰς νεφέλην = וַיִּזְעַקוּ מִטָּר לְאוֹר (Le 21<sup>10</sup>). The proposed reading מִיָּם נִטְפִים מֵיָּם (He withdraweth drops from the sea) suggests the formation of clouds by the process of evaporation; but this hardly agrees with st. ii, and cf. 14<sup>11</sup>. In Gn 2<sup>6</sup> the אָר 'used to go up from (out of?) the earth' (not the sea), 'and water all the face of the ground'. (Can this baffling word be a transcription of the Sumerian ID, *river*? Ὡ πηγὴ there, but νεφέλη here.) And in 1 K 18<sup>44</sup> it is 'a little cloud' that the servant sees 'going up from the sea' (עַב קְטַנָּה . . . עֹלָה מֵיָּם), not 'drops of water', which soon overspreads the sky, and is followed by a down-pour of rain (cf. v. 28). Instead of יִנְרַע (Pi. here only) we might perhaps read יִצְנַר *colligit* (Pr 6<sup>8</sup>); and for לְאוֹר either בְּאוֹר or בְּנֶאֱרוֹ (Ps 56<sup>3</sup>) or בָּאֵרוֹ in *His water-skin* (32<sup>10</sup> plur.), cf. 2 Pss 33<sup>7</sup> 78<sup>13</sup>.

v. 28. *Wherewith the skies flow down*,— (*Wherewith*) *they drop*, &c. See Dt 32<sup>2</sup> for both verbs. Cf. also Pr 3<sup>20</sup> Is 45<sup>8</sup>. *on the ground*: עַל־אֲדָמָה pro עַל־אָדָם *on man*: surely, an obvious correction; cf. Dt 32<sup>2</sup>. Ὡ *Which the heavens send down* in the season (= בְּעֵתוֹ Dt 11<sup>14</sup>) | *And the clouds drop upon men*, and they rejoice greatly. Instead of the dubious רַב ad fin. vers. we might read עֲבִים *clouds* (including the superfluous אֶף = ים—ad init. v. 29?), or perhaps רַבִּיבִים *in showers* (= רַב + אֶף + ים?); cf. Ju 5<sup>4</sup> Dt 32<sup>2</sup> Ps 72<sup>6</sup>. The original distich may have been either

. *Wherewith the skies drizzle in its season,*  
*And the clouds drop on the ground*  
 (or, *They drop on the ground in showers*).

It is hard to account for B. Qui (imbres) de nubibus fluunt, st. i, raises no difficulty; but whence came st. ii, Quae (nubes) praelexunt cuncta desuper? praelexunt looks like an error for praelegunt (or praelexerunt) = יַעֲרֹפוּ qs *overcloud, becloud* (cf. עֲרַפֵּל, עֲרִיף); and cuncta desuper may perhaps paraphrase עַל־יְרֵכָאֲדָם (cf. Pr 20<sup>6</sup>) or עַל־כָּל־אֲדָמָה; cf. Ὡ ἐσκίασεν δὲ νέφη (= ? וַיַּעֲרֹפוּ; cf. Assy. erpu, erpitu, urpatu, *cloud*) ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτῳ βροτῶ, and *clouds shadowed over untold* (87) *man* = עַל־יְרֵכָאֲדָם. Ὡ's st. i ῥυήσονται παλαιώματα, *Ancient things will flow* (cf. Wordsworth's 'the most ancient heavens') depends on misreading שְׁחִים as עֲחִים antiqua (so again 37<sup>18,21</sup>).

Ὡ has here an interesting addition, consisting of two distichs, which in Hebrew might have run somewhat as follows:

עַתָּה שָׁם לְמִקְנָה  
 וַיִּדְעוּ מְקוֹם רִבְצָם;  
 עַל־כֵּן לֹא־יִשָּׁם לְפָךְ  
 וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה לְפָךְ בְּנִיחָה;

For מקום cf. 38<sup>12</sup> and for רבצם Je 50<sup>6</sup>. For ישם cf. Is 52<sup>14</sup> Je 2<sup>12</sup> (fort. יפס לבך Jos 2<sup>11</sup>). For יהפך לבך Ex 14<sup>5</sup> (an ישנה טעמך?). בנך Aram. *within thee*. (Pro לבך<sup>2</sup> leg. fort. בלך Aram. *thy heart, mind*. Cf. Sum. BAL, *speak = think?*). The two couplets are probably a marginal citation; or they may belong to a different text of Elihu.

v. 29 begins a new paragraph. (Verse 31 should perhaps precede it. The rains make the ground productive, Le 26<sup>4</sup> Dt 11<sup>17</sup> Is 5<sup>55</sup><sup>10</sup> al.)

Who: מי (or ימי But who? so ט) pro מ (יבין) Also if (he understand). 'Yea, can any understand' (RV) is not a translation of מ. (See note, v. 28.) *spreadings*: מפרשי = ט ἀπεκτάσεις (hic tant.); cf. v. 30 ἐκτείνει = פרש and ἐκτείνων = נוטה, syn. 26<sup>7</sup> Ps 104<sup>3</sup>; Ez 27<sup>7</sup> מפרשך *thy spread* of sail. One cod. מפלשי (37<sup>16</sup> ubi leg. מפרשי ut hic). The wonder was the rapid spread of a small cloud over the whole sky (cf. 1 K 18<sup>44f.</sup>). St. ii חשאות כנחו is metr. short. ט ἰσότης ἀσκητῶν αὐτοῦ (?) חשנות cf. 30<sup>22</sup> Ketib). ט gives the verse thus: *And who understandeth? And He spread the clouds from the multitude of His pavilion(s);* 2 st. ii מלליה ענניה ריכפת the mass (or pack) of His clouds, His shellers, (screens?). ריכפת = המון noisy crowd, mob, mass, bulk, quantity (cf. Je 51<sup>16</sup> Ps 65<sup>8</sup> Job 31<sup>34</sup> 2 C 11<sup>23</sup> 31<sup>10</sup>). In 26<sup>14</sup> it represents רעם thunder (see note ad loc.), which might suit here: סכתו [רעם] חשאות The thunder-crashes of His covert ('חש' 39<sup>7</sup> Is 22<sup>2</sup>). But the thunder comes in, with a special introduction, later on (37<sup>14f.</sup>). Here therefore it seems better (cf. the || stichus) to insert ענן > רעם, and either to point חשאות (?) *upliftings, risings* (cf. the word נשיעים rising mists Ps 135<sup>7</sup> Je 10<sup>13</sup> 51<sup>16</sup>) or to read משאות (cf. Ju 20<sup>38,40</sup>, sing. of smoke): *The rising of the cloud-masses His covert*: cf. Ps 18<sup>12</sup> 105<sup>30</sup> ענן למסך. מ om. חשאות: Si voluerit extendere nubes | quasi tentorium suum = אסיאבה לפרש ענים יסכתו.

v. 30. מ lit. *Lo, He hath spread over Him* (or it, i.e. the cloud) *His light*, | *And the roots of the sea He hath covered*; instead of which we propose: עליאור (עב) הופרש בענן כסה | לשמש בענן קסה *Lo, He spreadeth the cloudmasses over the light*, | *And the sun with clouds He covereth*: cf. Ez 32<sup>7</sup> אכסנו בענן שמש; Ps 147<sup>8</sup>. מ is merely an incorrect paraphrase of מ (continuing the construction from v. 29). Instead of אורו *His light* ט<sup>B</sup> ה' הדלף (ungrammat. error; leg. הדלף c ט<sup>A</sup> = אורו *His mist* v. 27 ? ט<sup>A</sup> τὸ τόξον = יורה 1 C 10<sup>3</sup>): 2 מיטרא the rain. ט *Lo, He spreadeth above them* (i.e. the clouds) *His light* (= מ).

v. 31. See note ad. v. 29. nourisheth: or feedeth: יזין Aram. (cf. Je 5<sup>8</sup> Ho. Ptcp.) pro מ ירין *judgeth* (|| grat.). Driver explained ירין as follows: 'The storm is the agent both of judgement, and, by fertilizing the earth, of beneficence.' But, so far, we have had to do with the rise and spread of clouds; we have not yet come to the storm. Besides, if ירין were

right, st. ii ought to run: *He giveth and withholdeth food*. The parallelism demands a different expression.

*in abundance*: לְמַכְבִּיר. So the word is gen. understood (= לֹב OL); but the expression is very strange in such a sense. Elihu has already used לְמַכְבִּיר *he makes many or multiplies* (35<sup>16</sup>); and according to this, and the ordinary use of לְמַכְבִּיר אֵל should mean *He giveth food to the multiplier* (or *to him who showeth greatness*). Read rather: יֵת אֵל לְכָל־בֶּשָׂר *He giveth food to all flesh* (Ps 136<sup>26</sup>), which also suits the parallel stichus better. (לְמַכְבִּיר cf. Is 6<sup>10</sup> ט. Et dat escas multis mortalibus = לְכַפְּרִים? So לְכַפְּרִים to many.)

v. 32. מִלִּיט. *lit. Over the two palms Light hath covered* (עַל כַּסֵּה *is to cover over*, 21<sup>26</sup> al.) | *And He hath laid charge on her (!) against an intervener (or assailant)*. This, of course, is unintelligible. אֹר is masc. always (Je 13<sup>16</sup> is corrupt); some codd. עָלָיו rectè. But כָּסֶה אֹר prob. means *He covereth the Light* (עַל־סְכֵיט *al'scondit lucem*). The poet is still describing cloud-effects. Then עַל־כַּפַּיִם must be a distortion of some word denoting the means or instrument; e.g. בְּעָרִיפִים (Is 5<sup>30</sup>) *with clouds*, or בְּעָרְפֵל *with cloudmirk*, or בְּעָבִים *with clouds* (Ps 147<sup>8</sup> שָׁמַיִם בְּעָבִים; Ez 32<sup>1</sup>). In st. ii we might read וַיִּצֵּר עָלָיו *and besiegeth it, shutteth it in* כַּמְפִּיעַ (so some codd. pro 'במ' *like an assailant*; or possibly כַּמְפִּירָשׁ *as with a sheet*: v. 29 (cf. Ez 27<sup>7</sup> Is 29<sup>8</sup>). This is not entirely satisfactory, though we do speak of clouds 'sailing' over the sky; but it involves less change, and seems to agree better with the context, than וַיִּלְעָקוּ בְּמִפְּנֵי | עַל־כַּף יִפְלֹם הָאֹר *On palm He poiseth the lightning | And slingeth it forth at the mark* (7<sup>20</sup> 1 Sa 25<sup>29</sup>). The idea of weighing light or lightning on the palm (or in the 'bought' of a sling, 1 Sa 25<sup>29</sup>) is at once unique and improbable. The lightning is fig. God's 'arrow' (Ps 18<sup>15</sup> Dt 32<sup>41f</sup> Hab 3<sup>11</sup>), 'sword' or 'spear' (Dt 32<sup>41</sup> Na 3<sup>3</sup> Hab 3<sup>11</sup>), but never His 'sling' or 'stone' (אֲבִי־קֶלֶעַ 41<sup>20</sup>). He 'slings out' people, but not 'at' them (1 Sa l.c., Je 10<sup>18</sup>); not even at Eyob whom He attacks in so many various ways, and whom He makes the target of His 'arrows' (cf. 6<sup>9</sup> 17<sup>20</sup> 16<sup>19</sup> 20<sup>24f</sup>). For the light and lightning, see also 37<sup>9,11,16</sup> 38<sup>19,24,35</sup>. Perhaps st. ii orig. ran: וַיִּצֵּר עָלָיו מְהוֹפֵיעַ *And chargeth it not to shine forth* (37<sup>10</sup>); cf. Is 5<sup>6</sup> עַל־הָעָבִים אֵצֶוֶה מְהוֹמֵטִיר. וַיִּצֵּא עֲלֵיהֶם וַיִּפְגְּעוּ־בָם. I *Because of hand-rapine He withholdeth the rain* (אֵר i.e. אֶר pro אֹר ut v. 30); *And chargeth it to descend because of one praying* (= מֵ; cf. Is 53<sup>12</sup> 59<sup>16</sup>; Et praecipit ei ut rursus adveniat). Driver's comment on this verse forcibly illustrates the impossibility of extracting any probable sense from the traditional Hebrew text. Assuming the translation *He covereth His hands with the light; And giveth it a charge against the mark* (?), he explains as follows: 'Jehovah is represented poetically as plunging his hands into the flood of light about him, for the purpose of taking lightning-flashes out of it.' Compare this grotesque notion with the

language describing Iahvah's mode of action with lightning in other passages cited above.

- v. 33. *The noise thereof telleth concerning him,  
The cattle also concerning him that cometh up (!).*

This is perhaps the best that can be made of מ; and so Driver takes it, with the comment, 'The thunder (line 1), by its sound, and the cattle (line 2), by their presentiments of a coming storm, alike announce that Jehovah is approaching in the thunder-cloud. But in line 2 many moderns (changing only some of the vowel-points) prefer to render, *As one that is jealous with anger against unrighteousness.*' The thunder, however, is not mentioned in the verse (unless we read רעמו pro מ רעו); and even if רע could mean *noise* (which is dub.), to attribute noise to light is certainly strange. It reminds one of 'making a noise like a turnip'. In ordinary Heb. גידר עליו רעו means *His friend (גידר) tells upon him* (1 Sa 27<sup>11</sup> Es 6<sup>2</sup>), as we still say in colloquial English; and so י understands it: *He who telleth a slander* (lit. *a third tongue*, cf. Gn 1<sup>18</sup> י) *against his friend, Jealousy and wrath upon him will go up* = גידר (מגיד ?) עלי; רעו קנאה ואף עלי עולה; a bit of gnomic wisdom, quite irrelevant to the context, which appears to have suggested the pointing מקנה (א) אף על-עולה mentioned by Driver. But how strange is אף in the connexion, whether as Conj. or as Subst. (*anger*)! Cf. י He declares to his friends his possession, | And also to the unjust = על-עולים מקנהו ואף על-עולים. This, though conflicting with the context, shows at least a truer apprehension of Hebrew idiom than RV. Possibly we may recognize an Aramaism in גידר (גידר draw, draw out, spread, e.g. a tent, Je 6<sup>3</sup> 43<sup>12</sup>), and read רעה curtain pro רעו: *He draweth over it (the light) a curtain*. St. ii is very difficult; leg. fort. מקום אהל על-עולה *The place of the tent of the storm* (see י 4<sup>15</sup>; Aram., NH): cf. Is 54<sup>2</sup> (+ יריעות); Ps 18<sup>12</sup>. (Or חביון אפי על-עולה *The veil of the face of the storm*: cf. Hab 3<sup>4</sup>: or even מקום ארב על-עולה *The lurking-place of the storm.*)

So far the poet would seem to have been describing the darkening of the skies, overcast with clouds that shut in the light, before the coming of a storm. He passes on, with hardly a pause, 37<sup>1-5</sup>, to speak in awe-struck tones of the most terrifying of all displays of the Might and Majesty of God—the thunder which is His actual Voice, and the lightning which He wields at will.

Chapter 37. v. 1. *At this too: אף-לואח (אף-עליו?)*. But why אף? Nothing alarming has been spoken of hitherto. Perhaps אך (cf. Le 11<sup>21</sup> אך אחריה *But this*). Since, however, there is no real break between this verse and 36<sup>33</sup>, we might perhaps read (ב) פלצות *With terror* (21<sup>8</sup> 9<sup>8</sup> Is 21<sup>4</sup>): *With terror my heart trembleth* (1 Sa 28<sup>8</sup>); viz. at the thunder and lightning: cf. Ex 19<sup>16</sup>. St. ii is metr. short:



add בְּקִרְבִּי *within me* (Ps 55<sup>s</sup> al.). The word fell out owing to homoeoteleuton c לְבִי ad fin. st. i. For נָחַר *leap or spring up*, see Le 11<sup>21</sup> Dr. (ὁ ἀπερρύνει = ἰνὸν? cf. Ps 1<sup>2</sup>.)

v. 2. St. i is metrically too long. Leg. שָׁמַע c ט (ט<sup>Mc.aA</sup> + 'Iωβ) & pro מְ plur et om. שָׁמוֹעַ (ditto). *to the rumble of His voice*: ט ἐν ὄργῃ θυμοῦ Κυρίου = אֶל בְּרִיָּהּ pro מַעַלְלֵהּ; cf. 3<sup>17</sup> θυμὸν ὀργῆς = רִיָּהּ. מַעַל is, of course, correct; the thunder is the Voice of Iahvah: Ex 19<sup>19</sup> Ps 29. *mutter*: הִנָּה (Ez 2<sup>10</sup>) any *low, deep sound*; cf. the verb הִנָּה used of the *growling* of a lion and the *moaning* of a dove or a mourner, and (Hi.) the *muttering* of wizards: prob. cogn. c הִמָּה. (Is יהוה, as distinct from יהו, יה, to be derived from a √המה=הוה, and so 'The Thunderer' cf. the Bab. *Gamar-Iāma* = Gemariah.) & bene: Et sonum de ore illius procedentem. (וְבוֹהֶה?)

v. 3. Cf. Ps 19<sup>6</sup>. *He letteth it go*, lit. *looseth it*; יִשְׁלַחֲהוּ Aramaism: 3<sup>30</sup> Ex 3<sup>5</sup> CIS 145 A<sup>7</sup> *to liberate* (S. A. Cook, *Gloss.*, p. 117), שְׁלַח, שְׁלַח Impf. But read perhaps יִשְׁלַחֲהוּ (12<sup>16</sup> or 1 Sa 20<sup>20</sup>). (ὁ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ confirms מַעַל: cf. Ezr 5<sup>2</sup> שָׁרִי *incepterunt*. & considerat = יִשְׁאֵר. & יִשְׁבַּחֲהוּ *they praise him*.) *corners*: lit. *wings* = skirts, ends: 38<sup>13</sup> Is 11<sup>12</sup>. *Unto*: עַל = אֶל; an leg. עַר? & super (= עַל) terminos terrae. Here God's 'light' is the lightning.

v. 4. *After it*: i.e. the 'light', which the thunder always follows (because, though the flash and the explosion are simultaneous, light travels far more swiftly than sound).

*His Voice*: reading קוֹל c 2 codd. pro מַעַל; cf. the || stichus. The third stichus appears to be a mutilated distich. Read perhaps

וְלֹא יִעֲקֹב שְׁפָעַת מַיִם  
בִּי-יִשְׁמַע קוֹל רַעְמֹו:

*And He keeps not back the multitude of waters* (22<sup>11</sup> 38<sup>34</sup>),  
*When His Voice of Thunder is heard* (Ps 77<sup>18.19</sup>);

or perhaps קוֹל רַעַם (cf. 26<sup>14</sup>). עֲקֵב *to hold back*; an Aramaism (I: cf. Gn 22<sup>12</sup> NH). It is possible, however, that עֲקֵב *to heel*, i.e. *seize by the heel*, was used in the sense of *holding back* (cf. Ho 12<sup>4</sup>). In Syr. Pael is *to trace out, investigate*: so & here *et non investigabitur* (pointing וְלֹא יִעֲקֵב).

v. 5. St. i is metr. redundant, besides being a feeble repetition of v. 4<sup>b</sup> (וְלֹא יִעֲקֵב) and grammatically dubious. בְּקוֹלֵי, no doubt, is mere ditto; and יִרְעֵם has displaced some similar word, e.g. יִדְעֵנוּ (= יִדְרִיעֵנוּ) *showeth us* (cf. Ps 88<sup>19</sup>), or יַעֲמֵל *doeth* (33<sup>29</sup>), or יִרְאֵנוּ *maketh us see* (Mi 7<sup>15</sup> Ps 78<sup>31</sup>). פֶּעַל נִפְלְאוֹת (= עֲשֵׂה נֶפֶשׁ) everywhere else, 5<sup>9</sup> Ps 136<sup>4</sup>; because עֲשֵׂה follows in st. ii, with which cf. 5<sup>9</sup> 42<sup>3</sup>. The verse evidently begins a new paragraph or strophe, dealing with other wonders of the natural world as the

immediate work of God. (6<sup>c</sup> adds here the two verses which follow v. 28 in 6<sup>BA</sup>. Vid. supr.)

*we know not how*: lit. *and we know not* (8<sup>9</sup> 36<sup>26a</sup> 42<sup>3</sup>). 6 and *is not known* (pointing נָדַע pro נִדַּע): cf. Pss 76<sup>2</sup> 77<sup>20</sup>.

v. 6. The כִּי *For* is explicative (cf. 36<sup>27.31</sup>). הוּא אָרָץ *Fall to earth!* (supposed Arabism; cf. هوى *to fall*) seems very unlikely. Perhaps הִרְיֵה אֶרֶץ *Water the earth!* (cf. Is 55<sup>10</sup>). St. ii presents a clear example of dittography in (וּנְשָׁם מִטֵּר וּנְשָׁם מִטֵּר); and עוֹ ad fin., as an epithet of 'מִטֵּר', is difficult. A verb seems wanting; a need which might be satisfied by reading וּלְנֶשֶׁם וּמִטֵּר תַּעֲזוּ *And to the downpour and the shower, Be strong!* or וּלְנֶשֶׁם מִטֵּר תַּעֲזוּ *And to the torrent-rain, Prevail thou!* (cf. מִטֵּר וּנְשָׁם Zc 10<sup>1</sup> and for נֶשֶׁם וּנְשָׁם K 18<sup>44f</sup>). (Ez 38<sup>22</sup> suggests וּנְשָׁם יִמְטֵר עָלֶיהָ *And downpour he raineth upon her*; i.e. upon the earth.) An objection to st. i as it stands in 6 (as also to the emendation suggested above) is that it has four stresses, and so is metr. redundant. הוּא אָרָץ may be a disguise of a single word (א ditt.), e.g. הָאֶצֶר *Be stored up!* (cf. 38<sup>22</sup> אֶצֶר Is 23<sup>18</sup> Ni.). And עוֹ ad fin. may represent וְשׁוֹ (טף) (belonging to v. 7):

*For to the snow He saith, Be amassed!*

*And to the torrent-rain, Overflow!*

(נֶשֶׁם) is rain in *body, bulk, or mass*, qs 'solid rain'; i.e. the heavy continuous torrential rains of the rainy season in tropical and subtropical countries. Cf. Aram. נושמה *the body* (Syr. נְשִׁים *embodied, material, solid*), Ar. جِسم *the body, a body, a solid*, and by rhotacism جِرم *body, self, bone as solid*; גֶּרֶם *rainstorm*. But גֶּרֶם cut off = גֶּרֶם, גֶּרֶם, &c.)

v. 7. Heavy snows and rains 'seal up' (cf. 24<sup>16</sup>) mankind, i.e. keep them under cover, and stop all out-of-door work. Wild beasts find shelter and hibernate in their dens (v. 8). Pro מִיָּד מִיָּד leg. בָּעֵר (9<sup>7</sup>; 33<sup>16</sup> is corrupt: see note there). In st. ii om. כָּל (dittogr. fr. st. i) and read אֲנָשִׁים (v. 24, 36<sup>24</sup>) pro אֲנָשִׁי מִ (מ exc. ante מ): cf. 3 ut noverint singuli opera sua. The meaning seems to be, as Driver put it: that they may 'recognize His hand in their enforced inactivity'. (6 *That every man might know הוּא עָזְרוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה, his own weakness*; the little he can do; a paraphrase? 6 *And He maketh known to the world His works.*) If בָּ הָאֵם, which usually means *to seal with* (instrum.), could also bear the sense *to set a seal upon* (like the Aram. equivalent בָּ רִשָּׁם), we might transpose יד and מַעֲשֵׂה, with this resulting distich:

בַּמַּעֲשֵׂה אֵרָם יַחֲתוּם

לְרַעַת כָּל-אָנוּשׁ יָדוֹ:

*On man's work He setteth a seal | That every mortal may know His Hand.*  
Cf. Ps 109<sup>27</sup>.

v. 8. *into a lair*: בְּמִצְרֵי תֵּן pro בְּמִצְרֵי אֶרֶב? see 38<sup>40</sup> Pss 10<sup>9,10</sup> 104<sup>22</sup> (where man's labour is mentioned in the next verse). ὁ ὑπὸ σκέπη (= אֶתֶּל 21<sup>28</sup>). ἐπὶ κοίτης = 'מעונ'; sic 38<sup>40</sup> Je 10<sup>21</sup>.

v. 9. The insertion of הַיָּמִין *the South* after הַיָּבֵשׁ (הַיָּבֵשׁ), on the ground of 9<sup>9</sup> (where see note), violates the metre with a fourth stress. The '(store-) chamber of the stormwind' is the magazine (cf. Ps 135<sup>1</sup>) in which God holds it in reserve, as He holds the snow and hail in other 'treasuries' (38<sup>22f.</sup>). ὁ ἐκ ταμείων = חֲרָרִים (Pr 7<sup>27</sup> 24<sup>1</sup> Ps 105<sup>30</sup>). Leg. fort. מְיֻחָדִים *Out of the Storehouse*. (ταμείον, late form of ταμιεῖον.) Cf. the classical myth of the Cave of Aeolus and the Winds. It was not then known that the winds are caused by variations of atmospheric temperature. סופה prob. *turbo, cyclone*; cf. B tempestas. ὁ δύναι; prob. a scribal error for αἱ δύναι (*ut alii*), *the whirlwinds*. Cf. ἡ σφοδρὴ *the stormwind*; ὁ σφοδρὴ *a sudden storm* of wind, snow, or sand.

The metr. defect of st. ii may be supplied by inserting תִּתְּנֵה *cometh* (cf. v. 22) as || to חֲבָה st. i. But what is מְמַזְרִים? The expression can only mean *from the scatterers*; improb. supposed to be an epithet of the winds, as scattering the clouds and bringing cold. Read מִמְּוִיִּם *out of the garners* (Ps 144<sup>19</sup>) or storehouses; a suitable || to חֲדָרִים (so Driver). ὁ ὑπὸ ἀκρωτηρίων (*זרפתא*); a guess. ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων *And from the window of the mezarim* (Heb. word repeated, because not understood). ὁ ἀπὸ δὲ ἀκρωτηρίων, *from the ends or extremities* (i.e. of earth or sky?); or *from the peaks or summits* (ἀκρων τῶν ὀρέων) = מְנִיחָרִים? B Et ab Archuro frigus; which perhaps implies ἀρκτηῶν or ἀρκτοῦρον in ὁ pro ἀκρωτηρίων.

v. 10. Cf. 38<sup>29f.</sup> Is 40<sup>7</sup>. Point יָתֵן *is yielded, produced*, pro יָתֵן Impers. The *breath of El* is the icy blast of the north (Ecclus 43<sup>20</sup>). Four stresses: ? יִתְּנֶה *it freezes* (cf. NH). St. ii. *And the breadth of the water is in constraint* (OL; cf. RV); 'I.e. *narrowed, contracted*,—the edges of the stream being frozen' (Dr): qs √צִיָּק (32<sup>18</sup>; 36<sup>16b</sup>? vid. annot.). But surely the wonder is not the gradual narrowing of the stream or pool, which at first would hardly be noticed; but the whole breadth of it becoming solid, as molten metal does when it cools (cf. מִצָּק v. 18 √צִיָּק 38<sup>38</sup> vid. ad 11<sup>16</sup> 22<sup>16</sup> 41<sup>16,18</sup>). An leg. c cod. 1 כְּמוֹצָק *like a casting* (1 K 7<sup>37</sup>)? If the meaning were *And the breadth of waters is narrowed*, would not יִצָּק (or יִצָּר לִר' מ') be the natural way of expressing it? Cf. B Et rursum latissimae funduntur aquae (√צִיָּק); ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων *in pouring out or casting*: cf. 28<sup>2</sup> 41<sup>16</sup>. ὁ very strangely: οἰακίλει (adnot. διασχίλει | χωρίζειν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων B<sup>a</sup> mg. inf.) δὲ τὸ ὑδωρ ὡς ἐὰν βούληται. This seems to imply (כְּחֶפְצוֹ ? כְּחֶשֶׁק ?) מִיָּם בְּרִצָּנוּ (v. 12<sup>1</sup>)! ; thus at least favouring ב' > ב with the last word.

v. 11. St. i is supposed to mean *Also He ladeth the thick cloud with moisture* (RV); but the ἄπ. רִי (= רִי' from רָוָה *drink one's fill*) is dubious, and the *moisture* of the clouds is no longer the poet's topic (see v. 6 36<sup>27f.</sup>).

Ⲯ (ἐκλεκτόν = בר pure Ct 6<sup>10</sup>) and Ⲯ frumentum (= בר corn Am 5<sup>11</sup>), in fact, treat ב in בר as Rad. Hence we may conjecture ברר hail, which is associated with lightning ('Fire' of God, Ex 9<sup>23f.</sup>), snow and stormwind, Ps 148<sup>8</sup>, and is a frequent accompaniment of thunderstorms (perhaps Ⲯ misread ברר as ברר = ἐκλεκτόν Is 49<sup>2</sup>), and would naturally not be omitted here (cf. Ps 18<sup>13</sup>); or else ברק lightning—a closer || to st. ii. The vb. יטריח, also ἀπ., can hardly be regarded as certain. Ⲯ Et nubes spargunt (Ps 147<sup>16</sup>) lumen suum app. read יפור pro יטריח; in harmony with יפין, st. ii. We might do worse than adopt this: *The heavy cloud scattereth Hail (or the Flash), | The thundercloud streweth His (its?) Light.* (Ⲯ καταπλάσσει, *plasters over or besmears* = ימרח (Is 38<sup>21</sup>) pro יטריח וע; but the var. Ⲯ<sup>ca</sup>AA καταπλήσσει, *terrifies* = יבעת 13 14<sup>21</sup> suits ἐκλεκτόν, the Chosen or Pure One, better.) Elsewhere in OT the מרח only occurs in the Subst. מרח a burden Is 1<sup>14</sup> Dt 1<sup>12</sup>: cf. the NH (Tg Talm) use of the verb. The proposed Arabism יטרח proiecit (abiecit) is improb. אף ברק יטרח Also the clouds hurl lightning). The clouds pour down rain; but the Heb. poets do not conceive them as hurling the lightning (cf. Ps 18<sup>15</sup> 29<sup>7</sup> 77<sup>18</sup> 144<sup>6</sup>). Possibly we should read יטרח or יטרח (the latter Aram., Assyr., TA, Ar.): *Also the flash putteth the clouds to flight | His light scattereth the cloudmass.* In any case, we must point ענן in st. ii pro ענן c 15 codd. ⲮⲮⲮ. From moment to moment the whole sky is lighted up, and the clouds appear to have vanished.

v. 12. The verse contains two distichs. RV treats it as a tristich; metr. overweighting st. i (and also st. ii?). But יהוה (which prob. refers to the lightning > to the cloud; cf. המתהפכת Gn 3<sup>24</sup>) demands a verb or Ptcp. as its Predicate, e.g. משובב (so Ⲯ or Ⲯ<sup>ca</sup>), of which the ἀπ. מסבוב (supposed to be used Adv. in the sense of *all around, in all directions*) might be an easy corruption. Adding שמים as Obj. of the verb (cf. Pss 26<sup>6</sup> 59<sup>7</sup>), we get the stichus *And it (emph.) goeth about the heavens.* (Otherwise, מסבוב might be regarded as a gloss on מתהפך turning round and round, of the appearance of zigzag lightning; and so st. i would be: *And it turneth about at His steerage*, Pr 1<sup>5</sup> plur. Qerî hic rectè.) Then the purpose of these quickdarting motions of the lightning is expressed in the words (st. iii or ii?): *That it (not they: the מ belongs to כל: cf. Le 5<sup>24</sup> 11<sup>34</sup>) may do whatever He commandeth* (leg. יצוה מכל אשר יצוה). St. iv (iii?), defining the place, is perhaps not indispensable to the sense: *Upon the face of the world of His earth.* The phrase תבל ארצה (so point c Ⲯ) is from Pr 8<sup>31</sup> משחקת (בתבל ארצה); a passage of which we have had earlier echoes in Job. It is found nowhere else in OT, תבל being gen. used as a poet. syn. of ארץ and always anarthrous (Ps 24<sup>1</sup>). The word is prob. a Canaanite loan from Assyrio-Bab. *tabalu*, the land, dry land, syn. *nabalu*, id., as opp. to the sea and other waters. (The Aram. Ⲯ and Ⲯ is from OT

Heb.) The primitive meaning is perhaps that which *bears*, is firm, *terra firma* (as we say 'The ice will bear'): cf. Sum. MAL (= BAL?) = GAL, *kānu*, 'be fixed' or 'firm', *našū*, 'to carry': cf. also סָבַל *bear a burden*; יָבֵל *bear, bring*. (Possibly the meaning is land as *rising above the water, surmounting it*: cf. Sum. BAL, to *scale walls and mountains*, TA-BAL, *surmount, overstep, &c.*). ℳ paraphrases the verse: Quae (i. e. nubes) lustrant per circuitum, quocunque eas voluntas gubernantis duxerit, ad omne quod praeceperit illis super faciem orbis terrarum. Ὡ καὶ αὐτὸς κυκλώματα διαστρέψει | ἐν θεεβουλαθῶθ (κυβέρνησις Pr 1<sup>6</sup> 11<sup>1</sup> al.) εἰς ἔργα αὐτῶν | πάντα ὅσα ἂν ἐπιτείλῃται αὐτοῖς, | [ταῦτα συντέτακται παρ' αὐτοῦ, vers. dupl.] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (= 𐤒). Ὡ is much nearer the mark: *And it (His light) circleth and turneth about* (מַחֲכֵר וּמַתְהַפֵּךְ); *to do the purposes all that He commandeth them, on the face of the world of His earth*.

v. 13. Both stichi are metr. short. In the first we might read אָף or אָפוּ for אָפִי<sup>2</sup> (cf. Is 10<sup>6</sup> אָפִי יִשְׁבֵּט) and לַעֲרֵץ for לְאַרְצוֹ (Is 2<sup>19</sup> לַעֲרֵץ הָאָרֶץ): *Whether for a Rod of Wrath, to awe*. The ו belongs to אָפִי seq. For שְׁבֵט see also 9<sup>24</sup> 21<sup>2</sup>. (Instead of לַעֲרֵץ leg. fort. יִרְיָצֶהוּ: *Whether for a Rod of Wrath He cause it to run*: cf. Ps 147<sup>15</sup>.) In st. ii there can be little doubt that we must read יוצֵאוּ pro יִמְצְאוּ. The line may then be completed either thus: *Or to do mercy He send it forth*: or 'ואִם-לְחֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת יוֹצֵא' *Or for mercy and faithfulness. He send it forth*. Possibly, however, the whole verse should be read:

אִם-לְשֵׁבֶט אָף עַל-עֲרִיץ  
וְאִם-לְחֶסֶד לְאַרְצוֹ יוֹצֵאוּ:

*Whether for a Rod of Wrath upon the Tyrant, | Or for mercy to His land, He send it forth*. God's lightnings deal out both judgement and mercy: cf. Jos 10<sup>10, 11</sup> Ps 18<sup>14</sup> 144<sup>6</sup> Is 30<sup>30f</sup>. But the verse may very well be a marginal intrusion; inasmuch as the whole passage, 36<sup>22</sup>-37<sup>12</sup>, dwells rather on the wonder and mystery of the works of God than on His use of them for moral ends. ℳ took שְׁבֵט in the sense of *tribe*: Ὡ ἐὰν εἰς παιδείαν qs שְׁבֵט = *castigatio*; Ὡ שְׁבֵט = *sceptre* = *scepteriferi*; ℒ app. שֶׁמֶת *rain-flood*, 38<sup>25</sup>, pro שְׁבֵט, with the following extraordinary version or rather perversion: *Whether the rain of vengeance in the seas and wildernesses, or the heavy rain for the trees of the mountains and valleys (?), or the gentle rain of mercy for the fields of fruit and vineyards, He supply him* (= יִמְצְאוּ; cf. Nu 11<sup>22</sup> al.).

v. 14. Begins a new strophe or apostrophe. Cf. 33<sup>1, 31</sup> 35<sup>2</sup>, &c. Whether we connect it with the first or the second stichus (וְעַד), עַד gives one stress too many for the metre. It is probably an insertion by some one who remembered locc. like 1 Sa 9<sup>27</sup> 12<sup>7</sup>. The sense is complete without it.

v. 15. The verse is suspicious on several grounds; st. i being metr. overloaded, and הופיע being app. *Trans.* in st. ii, although it is *Intrans.* everywhere else (cf. 3<sup>1</sup> 10<sup>3</sup> Pss 50<sup>2</sup> 80<sup>2</sup> al.). *Knowest thou* (i.e. Understandest thou? cf. 37<sup>29</sup>), *when Eloah attends to* (שום sc. לב 1<sup>8</sup> Is 41<sup>20</sup>) *them?* cannot be regarded as a satisfactory sense. *Knowest thou when God imposeth a decree upon them?* (cf. RV), *And made shine the clouds of His rain?* But there is no clear reference for עליהם in the preceding context; and we may well be uncertain as to the relation of this verse to the following, which also begins with התרע and mentions the clouds. Is either, in whole or in part, a dupl. or var. of the other? OL, citing Je 38<sup>24</sup> for the Constr., renders: *Dost thou know about God's enjoining upon them?* and so v. 16: *Dost thou know concerning the balancings of clouds?* But we cannot avoid asking 'Enjoining what?' and 'Upon whom?' cf. 34<sup>23a</sup>. (And what is the connexion of thought with v. 17?) *¶* hardly helps us with *We know* (*¶* Thou knowest) *that God set (= made) His works | By making Light out of Darkness* (a ref. to Gn 1<sup>2.3</sup>) = גרע בִּירֶשֶׁם אֵל פִּעְלֵיו = מופיע אור מענן. *¶* Numquid scis quando praeceperit Deus pluviis (cf. *¶* supr.), *ut ostenderent lucem nubium eius?* (= והופיעו plur. *Trans.*). *¶* Behold, thou knowest pro התרע alioq. = *¶*.

It seems possible that vv. 15, 16, should be transposed:

*Knowest thou the spreadings* (מפרשי מ *pr* מפלשי ut 36<sup>29</sup>) *of cloud* (om. על),—*The doings* (leg. מפעלות Ps 46<sup>9</sup> pro מפלאות voc. nil. 6 codd. (נפלאות) *of the perfectly Wise* (leg. דעות 36<sup>4</sup> 1 Sa 2<sup>1</sup>)\*,—*When He setteth* (om. יהתרע ut dittogr.) *His tent* (אלוה מ *pro* אהל) *upon them, And the light of His thundercloud shineth forth?* Cf. 36<sup>29.30</sup> Ps 18<sup>12.13</sup>. [The variation of the phrase מפרשי עב 36<sup>29</sup> which meets us here, מפלשי עב, supposed to be a mode of writing מפלשי ע, is not prob., whether we take it to mean *weighings out* or *levellings of* the clouds. The point is their *spreading* over the heavens: cf. 1 K 18<sup>44f</sup>. *¶*'s διάκρισις νεφῶν may = מפלשי עב (cf. Le 24<sup>12</sup>).] We may also suggest a bolder reconstruction of the two verses, viz.:

הַתְּרַע מִפְּרָשׁ עָבִים  
 יְחַאֲלֶף חֲמִים דְּעוֹת  
 בְּשׁוֹם עָב לְבִישׁוֹ (מַעֲלִיל)  
 יְהוֹפִיעַ אֹר עֲנָנָו

*Dost thou teach* (32<sup>1</sup>) *Him that spreadeth the clouds,*  
*And instruct the Perfectly Wise,*  
*When He maketh the cloudmass His cloak* (cf. 38<sup>9</sup>),  
*And the light of His cloud shineth out?*

(Or read for the third line: בִּלְבִישׁ אֱלֹהֵי עֶרְפֶּל *When God clotheth Himself with cloudgloom*: 22<sup>13</sup> Ps 97<sup>2</sup> Is 59<sup>17</sup>.)

\* *¶* רעים is found nowhere else, and *¶* ת' רעים is an ugly jingle.

Ⲯ v. 16<sup>b</sup> ἐξαισία δὲ πτώματα πονηρῶν = יִפְתָּאוּם אִיד (מַפְלֵת ?) רָעִים; cf. 9<sup>23</sup> 22<sup>10</sup> 18<sup>12</sup> 31<sup>29</sup> Pr 29<sup>18</sup> (but also Job 16<sup>14</sup> 20<sup>6</sup>). This appears altogether improbable.

v. 17. Apparently a sarcasm. *Thou whose garments are (unbearably) hot, When the earth is still* (Is 57<sup>20</sup> ch. 34<sup>20</sup>) *from the South*; i.e. 'in the sultry stillness preceding a sirocco' (Dr). How can you pretend to be His equal or mentor, Who at will wraps the fiery stormcloud about Him? (Cf. Ps 104<sup>2</sup>.) Perhaps we should read מַחֲרִיב *from the heat* (Is 4<sup>6</sup> 25<sup>5</sup> al.) pro מִדְּרוֹם *from the South* (i.e. on the south; cf. Gn 2<sup>8</sup>). Ⲙ seems more natural than Ⲙ: *Nonne vestimenta tua calida sunt, Cum perflata fuerit terra Austro?* = (fort.) הֲלֹא בְּנִי חֲמוּם | בְּהֶשֶׁב בְּאֶרְצוֹ דְּרוֹם *Are not thy garments warm | When He maketh the Southwind blow over the land?* Ps 147<sup>8</sup> Is 40<sup>7</sup>. Ⲯ *Thy clothes grow warm; And will thou remove* (rg. ? ותעתיק cf. 9<sup>6</sup> 32<sup>16</sup> pro Ⲙ בהשקט *the land from the south? And will thou extend with Him, &c.* (v. 18). דְּרוֹם (mostly in Ezekiel) is probably of Babylonian origin. In Babylonia the south was the region of clouds and storms. For the Rt. we may perhaps compare Sum. DA-RI, 'to blow hard' (*zāqu*), from RI, id.; qs DARIAM, the 'stormy' or 'blustering' region.

v. 18. Leg. יִתְחַרְקֶיץ. The verb רִקַּע is *to beat out* metal (Pi. Nu 17<sup>4</sup>), and so *to spread out*, e.g. the earth (Is 42<sup>5</sup> 44<sup>24</sup> Qal Ptcp.); whence רִקִּיעַ the *firmament* or solid arch of the visible heavens (Gn 1<sup>6</sup> al.), upholding the waters of the celestial ocean. The prim. Rt. is seen in רָקַע *thin*, qs *beaten out*; cf. Sum. RAĜ, *strike, thresh* (and perhaps RA, RA-G, *walk, str. tread, tramp, stamp?*), cogn. c DAG, DA, *outspread, broad*, רָק *thin*, רַקק *pound, beat small*, and רַכַּא, רַכַּךְ, רַךְ, &c.

*Like Him* (lit. *with Him*: 9<sup>26</sup> 40<sup>15</sup>) *didst* (or *canst, couldst*) *thou beat out the Sky* (v. 21, 35<sup>6</sup> 36<sup>28</sup> 38<sup>97</sup>), *Hard* (Ez 3<sup>9</sup>) *as a cast-bronze mirror?* The idea seems to be: How canst thou match thy wisdom with God, unless indeed thou wast His partner in Creation? cf. 9<sup>8</sup> 15<sup>8</sup> 38 *passim*. An leg. יִתְחַרְקֶיץ pro חֲרָקִים? sive יִתְחַרְקֶיץ? cf. Ⲯ *Will thou spread out* (or *make firm*: ⲙⲟⲩ Qal) *with Him the Firmament* (Ⲭⲙⲥⲁ = ⲕⲁⲣⲓⲕⲓⲥ), *To support* (it) *together?* Ⲙ, freely but with elegance: Tu forsitan cum eo fabricatus es coelos, Qui solidissimi quasi aere fusi sunt. *mirror*: רָאִי (ἄπ.) = מִרְיָא Ez 38<sup>8</sup> (also ἄπ.). For מוֹצֵק *poured out, molten, cast*, see v. 10. Ancient mirrors were of burnished metal, usually bronze (copper). I possess Etruscan and old Chinese specimens.

v. 19. *Teach us*: so Ⲙ. Some codd. and ⲮⲮⲘ *Teach me. What we shall* (or *should*) *say to Him* (or *of Him* Ps 3<sup>3</sup>; but cf. 23<sup>6</sup>). The words are apparently ironical. St. ii: cf. 13<sup>18</sup> 23<sup>4</sup> 32<sup>14</sup> 33<sup>6</sup> for עָרַךְ *to arrange* a case, or words. But מִפְּנֵי חֹשֶׁךְ (23<sup>17</sup>) *because of* (the) *darkness*, i.e. of ignorance (Driver) is hardly what we should expect from Elihu. Ⲯ καὶ πανσώμεθα (Ⲯ<sup>NC</sup> πανσόμεθα) πολλὰ λέγοντες. Perhaps

וְעִירָהּ (וְלִעְרָהּ) מִלִּים נִחְשֶׁה And from marshalling words let us refrain. At *U nos quippe involvimur tenebris.* *U And we will not hide* (נִסְתַּתֵּר); perhaps rg. נִעְרָה *flee*, Aram., or scribal error pro נִסְתַּתֵּר; cf. *U*) from the darkness.

v. 20. *U* הִסְפֵּר is very dubious (RV *Shall it be told him that I would speak?*). Read rather הִכְעֵם (or הִיחַר לוֹ אִף) *Will He be annoyed or angry?* or הִסְעֵר *will He storm, be enraged?* (cf. 38<sup>1</sup>); and metr. grat. either *אֵלֵי at me* (2 C 16<sup>10</sup>) or *אֵל El*. In st. ii we might transpose the verbs and read *אִם-יִבְלַע אִישׁ כִּי-אָמַר Will He swallow up a man for mere speech?* *כִּי* may be dittogr. But *אִם-כִּי-אָמַר אִישׁ יִבְלַע Or because a man hath said, will he be swallowed up?* would also satisfy both metre and sense. Cf. *U etiamsi locutus fuerit homo, devorabitur; U And if the man speak, he will be swallowed up.*) *U* app. = *לִי* הִסְפֵּר וְסִפֵּר *the spoiler and the spoiler* (כִּי-אִישׁ עָמַד אֲבִלַע: or) *כי אֶעֱמַד וְאִישׁ אֲבִלַע*: הִסְפֵּר, and *לִי* pro *לוֹ*. Om. כִּי-אָדַבֵּר.

vv. 21-22 appear to herald the Theophany (ch. 38), which is the dramatic climax of the poem. At all events, we are reminded of the thrilling anapaestics with which Aeschylus closes the great lyrical drama of *Prometheus Bound*:

καὶ μὴν ἔργῳ κοῦκ ἔτι μύθῳ  
χθῶν σεσάλευται κτλ.

*is not seen*: leg. fort. *יָרָא* pro *רָאָה* (= *רָאָה*? cf. *U* οὐχ ὁρατὸν τὸ φῶς, and 41<sup>25</sup> הָעֵשֶׂה). *dim*: בְּהִיר *π.* is compared with Syr. *ܕܫܝܬܐ dusky, dim, pale, of colour*; *ܕܫܝܬܐ dimness, faint light*; *ܕܫܝܬܐ dawn, twilight*; *ܕܫܝܬܐ lux subobscura*; *ܕܫܝܬܐ a faint cloud*; *ܕܫܝܬܐ dim, uncertain*. See also Levy, s. v. *בְּהִיר cloudy*. *U* τηλαυγής, *far-shining*, *U* *ܕܫܝܬܐ bright*; cf. *ܕܫܝܬܐ, שבהורא, שבהר*, in Tgg. Jer. and the Syr. equivalent forms. St. iii, which is extra-metr. as such, may begin the next distich: *But the wind hath passed over and cleared them* (*U* ὥσπερ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ νεφῶν: perhaps another interpr. of st. ii: ἐπὶ νεφῶν = *בשחקים*: cf. 35<sup>6</sup> 38<sup>37</sup>; but cf. 38<sup>1</sup> 40<sup>1</sup> νεφ. = *סערה*; an leg. *רוח סערה הטהרהם*. *But the stormy wind cleareth them*, cf. Ez 1<sup>4</sup>), *And out of the North a Brightness cometh* (v. 22; leg. *זָהַר* Ez 8<sup>2</sup> Dan 12<sup>3</sup> pro *U* זָהַב et *אֲדִית* ad init. *U* ἀπὸ βορρᾶ νέφη χρυσαυγούντα = *עַב זָהַב* or *זָהַב = צָהַב* *U* om. vb.). The clue to the gen. sense seems to be given by the description of the Theophany, Ez 1<sup>4</sup>: *And I saw and, behold, a wind of storm came from the North, (and U) a great cloud (therein U) with brightness around it and selfcatching* (? leg. *מחלכת selflicking*) *fire* (cf. *לשון אש* Is 5<sup>24</sup> and 1 K 18<sup>38</sup>). For *the North* and the Mountain of the Gods, see 26<sup>7</sup> Is 14<sup>13</sup> and cf. Ps 48<sup>3</sup> Ez 8<sup>5,14</sup>.

Then follows in *U*: *על-אלוה נורא הוד Upon* (or *Beside*) *Eloah awful is (the) Glory*; (v. 23) *Shaddai, we have not found Him.* (*U* 22<sup>b</sup>, 23 =



נָאֵר הוֹר וְהָרָה מִשְׁרֵי : וְלֹא מִצָּאֵנוּ שָׁוָה לִכְחוּ שִׁפְט צָדִיק לֹא-יַעֲנֶה. We may perhaps substitute the more coherent distich : *עֲלֵעוּלָה נֹרָא מֵאֵד* *His tempest* (36<sup>89</sup>) *is exceeding awful* ; *וְשֵׁרִי לֹא-נִמְצָא בּוֹ* : *But Shaddai is not to be found therein* (cf. 1 K 19<sup>11f.</sup>). Yet *הוֹר נֹאֵר* *seems possible*, cf. Ps 76<sup>5,8</sup> ; etc. ut *מ*. The word *הוֹר splendour, majesty*, which appears rather isolated in Semitic (not akin to Ar. *هَام* *repent, speak or go or behave gently* : see Lane), is perhaps akin to Sum. *𐎶𐎵 UD* ; a primitive Asiatic word for *the Sun, light, bright* (Tibetan *od* ; cf. also Sum. *ĜUD, bright, shine*). Slight changes in the remainder of v. 23 give the distich : *וְיָרֵב צָדִיק לֹא-יַעֲנֶה* *He showeth great Might and Justice, And the cause of the righteous He humbleth* (? *perverteth or wrestleth* : *יַעֲנֶה* 33<sup>27</sup> or *יַעֲנֶה* La 3<sup>9</sup>) *not*. For *שֵׁנָא* cf. 36<sup>(22)24</sup>. If *שֵׁנָא מַע* (36<sup>26</sup>) were right, we should expect *הוּא שֵׁנָא* : *He is great in power* (? 36<sup>22</sup>) *and justice*. V. 24 adds the concluding remark that it is because God combines irresistible power with inflexible justice that man pays Him worship and service, instead of disregarding Him altogether, as despair might induce him to do. Cf. Ps 130<sup>4</sup>. *ט* points *יִרְאֶהוּ* (cf. *יִרְאֶהוּ* 1 K 8<sup>40</sup>) : *Wherefore men will fear Him* (which seems less apt in the context), and continues with *And the wise in heart also will fear Him* (*יִרְאֶה* pro *יִרְאֶה מַע*) ; which is quite improb. *ז* suggests *וְלֹא-יִרְאֶה* (et non audebunt contemplari) : cf. Ps 11<sup>7</sup> Mt 5<sup>4</sup>. But it is doubtful whether *לֵב חֲכָמִי* *the wise of heart* (Ex 28<sup>3+</sup>) can mean *wise in their own conceit* (= *חֲכָמִים בְּעִינֵיהֶם* Is 5<sup>21</sup>, cf. Pr 3<sup>7</sup> Sing.). God Himself is *לֵבב חֲכָמִים* (9<sup>4</sup>) ; cf. *לֵבב חֲכָמִים* Pr 10<sup>8</sup>. In spite of *ז* (omnes qui sibi videntur sapientes), the sense must be either *God regards not human wisdom*—He baffles and confounds it (cf. 5<sup>12,13</sup> 12<sup>13,17,20,24</sup> 1 Cor 1<sup>26</sup> 3<sup>19</sup>), or *the wise fail to apprehend God by their Wisdom* (*וְלֹא-יִרְאֶהוּ*) : they do not see Him (23<sup>5</sup>, cf. 42<sup>5</sup>).

Chapter 38. v. 1. *And Iahvah answered Eyob out of the storm* (or *whirlwind*) : cf. 2 K 2<sup>1,11</sup> : app. the storm whose rise is described 37<sup>1f.</sup> *ט* *But* after Elihu had ceased from speaking (*τῆς λέξεως* 36<sup>2</sup> *λέξις* = *מִלִּים* : cf. also 29<sup>9</sup>), *the Lord said to Eyob through a whirlwind* and clouds (cf. add. *ἐκ τοῦ νέφους* 40<sup>1</sup> and Ex 24<sup>16</sup> Mk 9<sup>7</sup>). *λαλαψ* = *סַעַר* (= *סַעַר* Je 25<sup>32</sup> ; *סִפְפָּה* 21<sup>18</sup>) ; *ז* turbo, de turbine.

v. 2. If *עֲצָה* *advice, counsel, purpose, plan, wisdom*, meant 'God's plan, or method, of governing the world, which Job had "darkened" or obscured, by rashly declaring it to be arbitrary and unjust' (Dr), we should have expected *עֲצָתִי* *My plan*. The meaning seems rather to be : Ignorance, however eloquent, is not illuminating—contributes nothing towards a wise conclusion. The problem is only made more obscure by talk which is not founded on full knowledge of all the pertinent facts. *ט* *ὁ κρύπτων με βουλὴν* (pro *מַחֲשִׁיךְ* ut 42<sup>3</sup>) : *haud recte*. *ז* *Quis est iste involvens sententias sermonibus imperilis?* is nearer to the true sense. *ט* st. ii *συνέχων δὲ ῥήματα ἐν καρδίᾳ, ἐμὲ δὲ οἶεται κρύπτειν* ; (= *כִּלְכַּל* pro

מחשיך מלין בלב וממני יעלים (?) מחשיך (!) מחשיך and בָּלַי (at cf. 34<sup>14</sup> εἰ γὰρ βούλοιτε συνέχειν = לבו אִם-יִשִּׁים אֵלָיו לבו).

v. 3. *like a mighty man*: pointing כְּגִבֹר c cod. Ken<sup>147</sup> ㊤ pro ㊤ ㊤ ㊤ ㊤. Many codd. and ㊤ ㊤ ㊤ ㊤ sine 1. But the stichus is metr. short already; and the 1 (=י) may be a relic of אֲנִי or אֲנִי I (emphatic): *I myself will question thee*, &c. But perhaps וְאַתָּה הוֹדִיעֲנִי *I will ask thee, and do thou (emph.) inform Me!* (cf. ㊤ σὺ δέ μοι ἀποκρίθητι)—an ironical demand—would be better.

v. 4. *Where wast* would express the sense more clearly. The verb is emphatic, not the pronoun. *If thou knowest insight* means *If the ultimate truth of things is open to thy vision*; if thou canst penetrate the mysteries of being. The phrase יָדַע בִּינָה occurs Pr 4<sup>1</sup> Is 29<sup>24</sup> (Dr). [The Assyr. use of *idû* = יָדַע suggests that the primary meaning of this verb was *to see*. Cf. the Sumerian IDÉ, 'eye' (= IGI); which may be akin to DAG, DI or DE, *bright, shine*: cf. also DI, *judgement*.]

v. 5. *her measurements*. מְמָדֶיהָ (מִמֶּדֶד ?) ㊤. looks like an error pro מְדִיָּה (ditogr. מ post מ). *since thou must (or shouldst) know*; ironically spoken. Or *if thou know* (Impf.): Pr 30<sup>4</sup>.

v. 6. *bases*: or *plinths, pedestals*, on which rest the *pillars* supporting the earth (9<sup>6</sup> Ps 75<sup>1</sup> 104<sup>5</sup>). ㊤ κρίκοι (= κίρκοι); but ㊤ στῦλοι. ㊤ bases. The word אֶדְנִי (Ct 5<sup>15</sup>) is perhaps akin to the Assyr. *adannu* (also *adinnu*), a syn. of *dannu*, 'strong', 'firm'; אֲדֹנָי *lord* may be simply 'mighty one'. *planted*: lit. *sunken*. Pr 8<sup>25</sup>. ㊤ πεπήγασιν.

v. 7. The language of this verse recalls the time when (as in Babylonia) the stars, 'the Host of Heaven', were regarded as divine beings, 'Sons of Elohim' or 'Angels' (cf. 25<sup>6</sup> Dt 4<sup>19</sup> 32<sup>8</sup> ㊤ Am 5<sup>25</sup> Is 40<sup>28</sup> ?). ㊤ gives the doctrinal paraphrase *When the stars came into being, all my angels praised Me with loud voice* (om. בָּקָר). ㊤ read בָּרָא *He created* pro בָּרַן *when shrilled or cheered*. The stars of Morning occur nowhere else. For the Morning Star see Rev 2<sup>28</sup> (cf. Is 14<sup>12</sup>). The phrase כּוֹכְבֵי בֹקֶר may perhaps be compared with כּוֹכְבֵי נֶשֶׁף *its (morning-)twilight stars*, 3<sup>9</sup> (cf. 7<sup>4</sup>).

v. 8. *And who shut the Sea in*. If ㊤ יִסָּךְ is right, it must be regarded as immediately consecutive to יָרָה v. 6, while v. 7 will be parenthetic. But why not read c ㊤ מִי קָךְ (Quis conclusit ostiis mare)? For the verb cf. 1<sup>10</sup> 3<sup>22</sup>. ㊤ ἐφραξα δὲ θάλασσαν πύλαις = וַאֲסַךְ (or וַאֲשַׁךְ cf. Ho 2<sup>8</sup> and ㊤). ㊤ *And shut* (㊤) *the doors of the sea*. As דְּלָתִים recurs v. 10, we should perhaps read: *בחול with the sand* (cf. Je 5<sup>22</sup>) or *בחיל with a rampart* pro *בְּדָלָתִים* (the ים—might be ditogr. of ים seq.); or even *בְּגִבּוּל (בְּגִבּוּלוֹת ?) with a boundary* Je 5<sup>22</sup> Ps 104<sup>9</sup>. Cf. the Syr. phrase *יממא סגירין בחלא the seas confined by the sand*.

St. ii. *burst forth*: נִיחַ 40<sup>23</sup> (Trans. Mi 4<sup>10</sup>); cogn. c נִיחַ *thrust* (cf. the labialized בוע, כִּבַּע, expressing various kinds of *eruption*). After בָּנִיחוּ

another ו has fallen out: leg. ומרחם. Lit. *When he burst forth, and from the womb began to issue.* ט *ὅτε ἐμαίμασεν* (Ep. = ἐμαίμα), *when it was eager, &c.* (The add. μητρός αὐτῆς = אִמּוֹ spoils the metr.)

v. 9. עָנָן and עָרַפֶּל occur together some six times. חֲשָׁךְ Dt 4<sup>11</sup> might perhaps be added here st. ii metr. grat. (וְחֹשֶׁךְ עָרַפֶּל חֲתָל And mirk of clouds his swathingband). But possibly אחתל (Qal? Hi.? Pi.? cf. Ez 16<sup>4</sup>) or אחבש (cf. Ez 30<sup>21</sup>) has fallen out before the אֲנִי חתלתו (And cloud I bound on as his sw.). ט ἐσπαργάνωσα, pointing חֲתָלָתִי or חֲתָלָיו; cf. *Et caligine illud quasi pannis infantiae obvolverem.* (ט He made the clouds his clothing, &c., ut מ.)

v. 10. מ ואֶשְׁבֵּר And I broke finds no support in the Versions, and is intrinsically improb. ט ἐθέμην δὲ (αὐτῇ ὄρια) suggests ואֶשְׁבֵּית (cf. 14<sup>13</sup> חֲשִׁית חק), which we adopt. *Circumdedi illud terminis meis; And he made for him a statute; And I cut* (וּפָסַקְתִּי) i.e. *determined for him my decree.* Leg. חֶק c ט pro מ חקִי (י dittoqr. seq. ו). Cf. also Je 5<sup>22</sup> Ex 23<sup>31</sup>. Otherwise we might read חקו his boundary (Pr 8<sup>29</sup>). The idea that מ may mean *And I made its boundary a line of broken rocks and cliffs* (see Dr) is more ingenious than probable.

With st. ii cf. what is told of Merodach in the Bab. Epic of Creation, Tab. IV: *He drew a bolt, a watch he set; Not to let her waters forth them he charged* (iṣḏud parku maṣṣaru uṣaḥbit | mēša lā šuḥḏ šūnūti umlā'ir). This refers to the waters above the firmament, the celestial ocean.

v. 11. Each member of this distich has four stresses in מ. We may perhaps regard ואֶמַּר as extra-metrical, like the introductory heading v. 1; or we might omit it, inasmuch as the following words may be taken as defining the nature of the limit or expressing the decree (חֶק). This seems better than to omit either תבוא or ולא-תסיר, weakening the force of the line. For the latter, ט ולא-תעבר (cf. 9<sup>11</sup> 14<sup>6</sup> Je 5<sup>22</sup>). St. ii is corrupt. The best that can be made of מ is *And here shall one set it* (the חֶק) *in* (or *against*) *the swell of thy waves*; which is forced and unlikely. ט ἀλλ' ἐν σεαυτῇ συντριβῇ σέταί σου τὰ κύματα יִשְׁבְּרוּ נְלִיךְ וְכֶכָּה (which may imply the mispointing of a v. l. וְכֶכָּה = וְכֶכָּה and here: cf. Gn 31<sup>37</sup>). Cf. *Et hic confringes tumentes fluctus tuos.* *And here thou shalt stay* (יִשְׁבֵּל), &c. It will be noticed that ט omits נאון, which possibly originated in dittoqr. of נליך; or נאוןך and נליך may have been var. readings of the ancient text. Either וְכֶכָּה יִשְׁבְּרוּ נְאֻנְךְ (And here shall thy swell be broken!), or וְכֶכָּה יִשְׁבְּרוּ נְלִיךְ (And here shall thy waves break!), would yield an adequate sense and rhythm. Cf. the phrase ים משברי Ps 42<sup>8</sup> 93<sup>4</sup>. (Possibly we might read וְכֶכָּה יִשְׁבֵּחַ pro יִשְׁבֵּחַ: thou shalt still thy waves. Cf. Ps 65<sup>8</sup> 89<sup>10</sup>. The suggested וְכֶכָּה יִשְׁבֵּחַ נְאֻנְךְ is metr. redundant.)

v. 12. מ lit. *From thy days hast thou commanded the Dawn?* Even if this could mean *Ever since thy life began hast thou, &c.*, the question

would be irrelevant; for what of the time before Eyob's birth?  $\Theta \eta \epsilon \pi \iota$  σοῦ συντάραχα φέγγος πρωινόν; *Was it in thy time that I ordered (or arranged), &c.* = הַבִּיטִיךָ צִוִּיתִי וְנֹר = cf. v. 4, 14<sup>1</sup>.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Numquid post ortum tuum praecepisti diluculo = מ. We propose הַמוֹצָאוֹ צִוִּית לְבָקֶר *Didst thou appoint his going forth (rise or starting-point) to the Dawn?* Cf. Ps 19<sup>7</sup> 65<sup>9</sup>. In st. ii leg. c  $\mathfrak{B}$  וַיִּדְעָתָהּ (cf. Ketib for the verb). Qerī divides the letters wrongly (וַיִּדְעָתָהּ שָׁחַר). שָׁחַר should be anarthrous, like the parallel בָּקֶר. The Pi. of יָדַע here only (unless it should be read in Ps 104<sup>19</sup> also). Perhaps we should read (וַיִּדְעָתָהּ) *And didst thou appoint (?) the Dawn his place?* So also Ps 104<sup>19</sup>: *The sun He appointed his (place of) going down (?)* יָדַע c dupl. Accus.): cf. 2 Sa 20<sup>6</sup> Je 47<sup>7</sup>.

v. 13. מ lit. *That it (the Dawn) might seize on the wings (corners or ends or skirts) of the Earth | And the godless be shaken out of her.* Some see a reference to 24<sup>13-17</sup>, and suppose the meaning to be that light exposes and disperses evil-doers. But a reference to 'the godless' is quite out of place in this poetical description of natural phenomena. Nothing of the kind occurs in the previous (vv. 4-11) or following context (vv. 14-41; chap. 39: for v. 15 see note); and the  $\epsilon$  *suspensum* (רָשָׁעִים) indicates conjectural restoration of a lost letter, which might perhaps be פ (רָשָׁפִים) *flashes, flashes of light*; cf. 5<sup>1</sup>). *Shaken out* does not seem very suitable as a description of the fires of dawn flashing up from the far ends of earth. Perhaps וַיִּנְעֹר (14<sup>12</sup> Je 25<sup>32</sup>): *And that flames might awake out of her* (or וַיִּנְעֹר or וַיִּנְעֹר: *And that it might stir up flames, &c.*: cf. Ps 57<sup>9</sup>); or possibly וַיִּבְעֵר (וַיִּלְבֵּעַר) *And that it might kindle, &c.* The fires of dawn seem to spring up out of the ground at the horizon.  $\Theta \epsilon \kappa \tau \iota \nu \acute{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \iota$  = לְנֹעַר. וַיִּנְעֹר חֹשֶׁךְ מִמֶּנָּה) *And shake Darkness out of her* may also be suggested.)

v. 14. *She (the Earth) changeth (or is transfigured) like the clay of the seal (הוֹתֵם ? הוֹתֵם sealed):* cf. Driver's comment: 'As the clay takes shape under the seal, so the earth, formless in the darkness, receives shape and form in the light.' In a sense, the light may be said to create anew the world which disappears in darkness. Cf. Gn 1<sup>2,3</sup>. We are reminded of the miracle by which Merodach, the Bab. God of the Morning Light, convinced his peers of his claim to supremacy:

*They placed between them a single garment,—  
Unto Merodach, their first-born, spake they:*

*'Thy destiny, Lord, be before the gods!  
Speak destruction and creation; let them be done!*

*Open thy mouth, be the garment destroyed!  
Speak it again, be the garment whole!'*

*He spake with his mouth, the garment was destroyed ;  
He spake it again, and the garment was created anew.*

*When the gods, his fathers, had seen the issue of his mouth,  
They rejoiced, cried in homage, ' Merodach is King !'*

(Creation Tab. IV, 19-28.)

The test was, of course, the power of creating and destroying by a mere word. Gn 1<sup>s</sup> Ps 33<sup>s</sup>.

St. ii is metr. short, since *בְּמוֹ* is proclitic (cf. 6<sup>15</sup> 14<sup>s</sup> al.). Moreover, the sense is obscure. OL *And they* (terrestrial things) *stand forth* (in the light) *like a garment*. But the def. Subj. is lacking (RV supplies *all things*!); and how can *in the light* (*בְּאוֹר*) be omitted? and what can standing forth *as a garment* mean? Driver explains (continuing the sentence quoted above) 'and the things upon it stand out *each in its proper colour and relief*, like a garment *in folds*'; but there is nothing in the Heb. to suggest the phrases we have ventured to italicize. Others think that the earth is compared to a carpet embroidered with many-coloured designs (reading *וְתִצְבֵּעַ* or *וְתִצְבְּעַתָּהּ* and *she is dyed*; cf. Ju 5<sup>30</sup> Je 12<sup>s</sup> and Aram. use of the verb); but *לְבוֹשׁ* is not a carpet. *Et stabit* sicut vestimentum = *לְבוֹשׁ בְּמוֹ לְבוֹשׁ*. Adopting this form of the verb, and restoring *בְּאוֹר* after it, we get the tolerable sense and rhythm: *And standeth in the light as (in) a garment*: cf. Ps 104<sup>2</sup>: or, pointing *לְבוֹשׁ*, like one apparelled. (Ps 65<sup>14</sup> might suggest *וְתִצְבֵּעַתָּהּ אֶל־בְּאוֹר* *And she donneth light as a garment*.) Further, in view of the Aram. (Syr.) use of *צִבְעָה*, we might possibly read: *וְתִצְבֵּעַתָּהּ אֶל־בְּאוֹר* *And adorneth herself with light as a garment*.

¶ very differently: *ἡ σὺ λαβὼν γῆν* (Ἦ<sup>C</sup> γῆς) *πηλὸν ἐπλασας ζῶον* | καὶ λαλητὸν αὐτὸ(ν) ἔθου ἐπὶ γῆς; cf. 10<sup>s</sup> *πηλὸν με ἐπλασας*. *λαβὼν γῆν* (γῆς) may be due to *הֶאֱרַי . . . אֶחָד* v. 13; but cf. Gn 2<sup>7</sup>. *πηλὸν* = *חֲמִיר* as usually (or *כֵּיט* Is 41<sup>26</sup> both); *ζῶον* = *חַיָּה* (חַיִּית) = *חַיָּה*. The language is evidently influenced by Gn 2<sup>7.8.10</sup> Ἦ. Perhaps Ἦ read or guessed at a text something like this:

וְתִצְבֵּעַתָּהּ מִחֲמִיר חַיָּה  
וְתִשָּׂם מִמִּלְּי בְּאוֹרִי

Lastly, we may observe that it would yield a closer parallel to st. i, if we might read *רִפֵּשׁ* (Is 57<sup>20</sup>) *לְבַשׁ(וֹ)*, making the line *וְתִצְבֵּעַתָּהּ כְּמִדְּמִיט וְרִפֵּשׁ* *And taketh shape like clay and mire*.

v. 15. The distich is perfect, but seems out of place, and may be an intrusion. It is certainly improb. that *their light* can mean darkness, even ironically (Dr). 24<sup>16.17</sup> does not justify this interpretation. Cf. 18<sup>s</sup>. For st. ii, see Ps 37<sup>17</sup>. (Ἦ makes the verse interrog., reading . . . *וְתִצְבֵּעַתָּהּ אֶל־בְּאוֹר* *Didst thou take from the wicked the light* | *And the arm of the haughty ones didst thou break*?)

v. 16. *springs*: so Θ πηγῆν: cf. B *profunda* maris; so Σ. The rare נְבִי (see 28<sup>11</sup> Θ βάθη, Pr 8<sup>24</sup> τὰς πηγὰς, M נַבְרִי) may be cogn. c Assy. *labāku* (Sum. 𒅗 DUR *labāku* and *raṣbu*); cf. *tabāku*, 'pour out' and Syr. ܬܒܝ rise, spring up, and ܬܒܥ well up, flow, &c. The 'fountains of the great Deep' (Gn 7<sup>11</sup> Pr 8<sup>28</sup>) which supply the terrestrial seas from the abyss of 'the waters under the earth' (Ex 20<sup>4</sup> Ps 24<sup>2</sup> al.) appear to be intended.

*the bottom*: קֶרֶר search, and that which demands it; something hidden or mysterious and beyond human investigation. Θ (ἐν) ἔχνευσ (so ἔχνος 11<sup>7</sup>); but B et in *novissimis* abyssi deambulasti? (= in the *extremest* parts). (For the possible etymology see note on 11<sup>7</sup>.)

v. 17. *Gates of Death*: cf. Ps 9<sup>14</sup> 107<sup>18</sup>. As elsewhere, מוֹת is here a syn. of שְׁאוֹל, and denotes the place of the Dead, which was believed to lie below the subterranean waters of Ocean (26<sup>6</sup>). There is something wrong with st. ii. M lit. *And the gates* (שְׁעֵרֵי rep.) *of Gloom* (צְלֻמוֹת 10<sup>21</sup> *Land of Gloom*) *seest thou?* We might read, after 10<sup>21</sup>, וְאַרְצֵן צְלֻמוֹת רְאִיתָ *And the Land of Darkness hast thou seen?* or we might suppose that the repeated שְׁעֵרֵי has supplanted דְּלָתֵי *doors* (v. 10). The phrase *Doors of Darkness* sounds well enough in English; but we should have expected שְׁאוֹל > צְלֻמוֹת, which is hardly used in this concrete way as a name or syn. of She'ol elsewhere (cf. Θ ἄδου = שְׁאוֹל). Θ seems to incorporate duplicate pointings in both stichi. ἀνοίγονται δέ σοι φόβῳ πύλαι θανάτου | πυλωροὶ δὲ ἄδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπηξαν; = וְשְׁעֵרֵי | מוֹתֵי | שְׁעֵרֵי שְׁעֵרֵי מוֹתֵי : שְׁאוֹל רְאִיתָ וְיָרָאן : Interesting as this may be from the point of view of mythology, it is hardly probable, as such a ref. to the 'Porters of Hades' would be quite isolated in the entire OT. (שְׁעֵרֵי שְׁעֵרֵי may be mere dittography.)

In the Bab. legend of the Descent of Ishtar, when the goddess arrives at the 'Gate of the Land of No-return', she demands admittance of the Porter, who passes her through seven successive gates, at each of which she has to surrender some part of her ornaments and clothing, until at last she is quite naked (cf. 1<sup>21</sup>).

v. 18. *Hast thou considered* (M הִתְבָּר; an leg. הִתְבָּר?): or *discerned*, or *ascertained*, 26<sup>14</sup>. עַד should prob. be עַל (31<sup>1</sup> Ps 37<sup>10</sup>) or אֵל Is 14<sup>16</sup> (cf. Nu 23<sup>18</sup> עַד). In v. 16 also עַד may have displaced the more usual אֵל (cf. v. 22). *breadth*: M רִחְבֵּי אֶרֶץ. (The Sing. רִחַב 36<sup>16</sup> is prob. corrupt; see note there.) The breadth of the earth both ways (from N. to S. and E. to W.) may be intended; but why not read רִחַב הָאָרֶץ *the breadth of the earth* (Gn 13<sup>17</sup>) instead of M רִחְבֵּי אֶרֶץ? Cf. B Numquid considerasti latitudinem terrae? Θ νενουθέτησαι τὸ εὖρος τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανόν;

*how great it is*: reading בְּמָה = Θ πόση τίς ἐστιν pro M כֻּלָּה *all of it* (i. e. the earth). Cf. Zc 2<sup>6</sup> לְרֹאוֹת בְּמָה רִחְבָּהּ *to see how great is its breadth*.

v. 21. This ironical remark seems to have been displaced in מ. Following v. 18, it completes the quatrain. Cf. v. 4, 15<sup>7</sup>.

v. 19. מ can hardly mean *Where is the way to the dwelling of light* as RV (= אִינִי הַדֶּרֶךְ מִשְׁכְּנֵי אֹר). The ה of הַדֶּרֶךְ might be dittogr. of the preceding ה. But *the way* (to where) *light dwelleth* (cf. 1 K 13<sup>12</sup> 2 K 3<sup>8</sup>) is not exactly parallel to *the place of darkness*. אִינִי הַדֶּרֶךְ is prob. due to v. 24, which begins so. We may either read אֶרֶץ אִינִי pro הַדֶּרֶךְ after ט (ποία δὲ γῆ αὐλίζεται τὸ φῶς;), *Where is the land where Light dwelleth* or more simply אִינִי הַדֶּרֶךְ אֶרֶץ אִינִי *Where dwelleth Light*. Light and its negation are regarded as separate entities, each having its own proper abode, from which it issues in its turn to cover the earth.

v. 20. Might be understood ironically: *For thou takest* (i. e. conductest) *it unto its bourn* (or *territory*: fines), | *And discernest the paths to its house*. For לָקַח of *taking* to a place, see Nu 23<sup>27</sup>. Cf. B. There is no reason to alter either verb. The rendering of RV: *That thou shouldst take it*, &c., is also possible: cf. B Ut ducas unumquodque ad terminos suos, | et intelligas semitas domus eius. (Τι εἰ ἀγάγους με = בִּי תִקְחֵנִי pro מִי תִקְחֵנִי is not prob.)

v. 22. Snow and Hail, again, like Light and Darkness, are regarded as independent substances (not as forms of water), amassed in unknown 'storehouses', whence God brings them forth for His purposes.

*sawest thou*: or *didst* or *canst thou see*? תִּרְאֶה as in v. 17. But C εὐόρακας, B *aspeexisti* suggest רָאִיתָה. (In st. i C ἐπὶ = עַל pro מִן.)

v. 23. *I reserved for the time of stress*: cf. 21<sup>30</sup>. So B Quae praeparavi in tempus hostis (= III. צָר). An leg. צָרָה ut Ps 37<sup>39</sup> al. C ἐχθρῶν צָרִים. By God's ordinance the elements play a part in the drama of human struggle and conflict: cf. Jos 10<sup>11</sup> Ju 5<sup>20f</sup>. Is 28<sup>21</sup> 30<sup>30</sup> Ps 18<sup>13ff</sup>. 77<sup>17ff</sup>. Ex 14<sup>21</sup>. (Was the original rhythm לָקַחְתָּ לָּהֶם צָרָה? C ἀποκειται (C<sup>A</sup> pl.) δέ σοι eis . . . , *And hast thou them laid up for . . .* A mistaken paraphrase.

v. 24. Cf. v. 19. מ = either *Where is the way* (to where) *the light* (= lightning, 37<sup>8,11</sup>) *divideth itself* or *Where is the way* (along which) *the light*, &c. (= B Per quam viam spargitur lux etc.). B seems to transpose the verbs of the two stichi, as it continues with *dividitur aestus super terram*. But C πόθεν δὲ ἐκπορεύεται πάχνη (C<sup>A</sup> φῶς) = מִי הָאֵשׁ? Whence cometh the hoar frost? cf. 2<sup>2</sup> 41<sup>11</sup> v. 29 for the equated words. This looks like a variant of v. 29; but st. ii ἡ διασσεδάννυται νότος (= צָרִים Ex 10<sup>13</sup> 14<sup>21</sup>) εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν; = מ. (If πάχνη = קִיטוֹר here, as in Ps 119<sup>83</sup>, it would be strange that C should use it again (v. 29) to represent the totally different קִיטוֹר.) The idea of *the east wind* (15<sup>2</sup>) being *scattered* over the earth cannot be regarded as appropriate or natural. The winds may scatter things, but are not themselves scattered. The verb מָוַן Hi. is used 37<sup>11</sup> 40<sup>11</sup>, app. in relation

to lightnings or thunderbolts (cf. also Ps 18<sup>16</sup>). We might therefore read *בְּרָקִים* pro *מַרְרִים* and *וַיִּפֶּן* (or *וַאֲשֶׁר־יִפֶּן*) pro *יִפֶּן*: *And (Which) scattereth lightnings upon the earth.* It seems possible, however, that both in v. 19 and here *הַדֶּרֶךְ* has displaced *יֶדְרֶךְ*, in the rare poet. sense of *marching on* or *forth* (cf. Nu 24<sup>17</sup> Ju 5<sup>21</sup>). In that case, we might read

אִרְמוֹה יֶדְרֶךְ אֹר  
מִפִּין בְּרָקִים עַל־אֲרִין :

*Whence marcheth forth the lightning | Scattering flashes over the earth?* (*יֶשֶׁן* and *יֶחֱלֵק* v. 19 being regarded as conjectural supplements after the corruption of the previous word).

v. 25. The words seem to imply a material conduit (*חַעֲלָה* Is 7<sup>3</sup>), conveying the water of the torrential rains (the 'downpour') from the celestial ocean above the Firmament. *שֶׁטֶף* *overflow, flood*, Na 1<sup>8</sup>, is correctly paraphrased vehementissimo imbri by *שֶׁטֶף* and *ὑερῶ λάβρως*, *violent rain* by *שֶׁטֶף*. *bolts*: reading *לַחֲוִי* plur. (cf. Zc 10<sup>1</sup>) pro *מַרְרִים*. *שֶׁטֶף* (*ḥōn* δὲ) *κυσσομῶν* (*And a way*) of *uproars* (Epic word; *שֶׁטֶף* in *שֶׁטֶף*). But cf. 28<sup>26</sup> b (same Heb. st.).

v. 27. *the desert waste*: see 30<sup>3</sup>. St. ii *מַרְרִים* lit. *And to make sprout the outgrowth* (or *growing-place*) of *herbage*. Instead of *מַרְרִים* *outgoing* it is better to read *מִצִּיָּה* *out of the dryness*, i.e. the parched land or arid desert: see 30<sup>3</sup>. Perhaps rather *צִמְאָה* (?) *צִמְאָה* the *thirsty*: Is 44<sup>3</sup>. In that case, render: *And to make the thirsty ground sprout grass* (dupl. Accus. ut Ps 147<sup>8</sup>).

v. 28. The 'rain' here may perhaps mean the gentle showers falling in drops (cf. st. ii), as distinct from the torrential downpour of v. 25. The ideas of paternity and generation, so strange to us in such a connexion, would not appear so to the ancient world. (In Sumerian *𒂗* A, 'water', is also 'seed', 'to beget', 'father', &c.) According to the transparent myth, Heaven is the husband of Earth.

*שֶׁטֶף* *Who is the father of rain?* in closer agreement with the parallel stichus. *the drops of dew*: so *רִסְיִי טֵלָא* (cf. Ct 5<sup>2</sup>); *שֶׁטֶף* stillas roris; *שֶׁטֶף* βάλους δρόσου, *lumps of dew* (cf. Ecclus 22<sup>10</sup>); *שֶׁטֶף* simply *טֵלָא* the *drops* (of rain?). *אֶנְלִי* *שֶׁטֶף* may be etym. akin to *עֵנִיל* *round*, *עֵנִיל* *ring*, &c. (*√* *ענל* + *א*, *ע*, Preform. Cf. *גִּלְלִי* *roll*).

v. 29. For *קָרָח* *ice* see 6<sup>10</sup> 37<sup>10</sup>. Prim. *קָרָח*; cf. *קָרָח*, *קָרָח* *cold*. But the original meaning may be *smoothness, cleanness, brightness, whiteness*, rather than *coldness*; cf. *קָרָח* *make bald* = *גִּלְחָה* *shave* = *גִּלְבָּה*; *חֹר* (Intern. Tril.) *be white*; Sum. *𒊕𒊕* | *𒊕𒊕* | KAR-KAR, *glitter*.

*who bare it*: or *who begat it*. If a *mother* were intended (cf. st. i), *יִלְדָהּ* would be more natural than *יִלְדָהּ*. But *הוּלִיד* was *begat* in the last verse (where *שֶׁטֶף* *Quis genuit*, as here; cf. also *שֶׁטֶף*).



v. 30. *stiffen*: reading יתקפאו, of which יתחבאו are *hidden* might perhaps be a mishearing in dictation; cf. Ex 15<sup>8</sup> קפאו תהמות *The Deep* *congealed or became solid*; chap. 10<sup>10</sup> Hi. *didst curdle me* like cheese; קפאון *ice*, Zc 14<sup>6</sup>. מ admits of the rendering *As with stone* the waters are hidden; but *are covered* or *shut in* would be more natural, and יתחבאו is not a good parallel to יתלכרו, st. ii, which recurs, 41<sup>9</sup> (AV<sup>17</sup>), of the *sticking together* or closeness of the crocodile's scales, and may be regarded as an Arabism: cf. تَلَكَّدَ *become matted together*, of hair; *stick or cleave to*, of dirt; Conj. 5 تَلَكَّدَ (= התלכד) *it clave together, one part to another; he became thick and compact* in flesh (Lane). It is evident from 41<sup>9</sup> that לכד may be used as a syn. of רבק *cleave* or *stick to* (cf. also 41<sup>15(23)</sup>). Others would transpose the two verbs of the verse; but 'The surface of the Deep is *hidden*' does not seem a likely statement. Cf. 3 In similitudinem lapidis aquae *durantur*, Et superficies abyssi-constringitur. 6 Like stones the waters *become hard* (מתקשין); perhaps reading יתחוקו pro יתחבאו.

If we do transpose the verbs, we might perhaps read יתרכרו for יתלכרו; getting the sense

*As with stone the waters are bespread (or confined),  
And the face of the Deep is hidden.*

Cf. Is 44<sup>1</sup> *bespread*, P 7<sup>16</sup>, or Arab. بَدَّدَ *shut in, confine*.

6's version is altogether off the lines both of the Heb. and of probability. It seems to have read

בִּיבֵלָהּ (י) מִים יַחַת  
וּפְנֵי חֹהוּ מִי־בֵלָהּ :

Cf. Is 44<sup>1</sup> *πέον ὑδωρ*; Is 29<sup>21</sup> ἀδύκοις; chap. 11<sup>20</sup>.

In st. ii perhaps rather וּפְנֵי תַעֲהָ מִי־הַתִּיף (יִתְיַף) (*εἰτῆξεν*: cf. Na 1<sup>6</sup>).

Thus 6 ἢ καταβαίνει ὡς περ ὑδωρ πέον; | πρόσωπον δὲ ἀσεβοῦς τίς εἰτῆξεν; (so 6<sup>NA</sup> but 6<sup>B</sup> εἰτῆξεν) seems to imply מ as read in a partially defaced text.

v. 31. For the constellations named in this verse, see notes on 9<sup>3</sup>. It is natural to read מענדות *bonds* (cf. the verb 31<sup>30</sup> Pr 6<sup>21</sup>) instead of מערנות *delights* (ἀπ.); cf. 6 συνήκας (התשכיל) δὲ δεσμὸν Πλειάδος. 7 כִּימָהָא דֹּסְתָא תְּקַמֹּר שִׁירֵי *Dost thou bind on the chains of Kīmah?* (What are these 'chains'? Are they the links that bound the Seven Sisters together in a single group or cluster, or perhaps fastened them to their place in the Firmament?) But 3 Numquid conjungere valebis micantes stellas Pleiadas? suggests a different pointing of מערנות (מְעַרְנוֹת), as if the word were derived from מַעַר *quiver, tremble*, and so *twinkle*, or *sparkle*. 6 *Dost thou shut (the door) in the face of Kīmah?*

St. ii. *the fellers*: מִשְׁכוֹת מִסֵּר supposed to mean the cables with which the rebel giant is *dragged* across the sky. But the phrase מִסֵּר פָּתַח

(12<sup>18</sup>) and the question **וּמִסְרוֹת עָרֹר מִי פָתַח** (39<sup>6</sup>) suggest the reading **מִשְׁרוֹת** = **מִסְרוֹת** *bonds or shackles*. **καὶ φραγμὸν** (= **מִשְׁוִיכָת**; Is 5<sup>6</sup>) **Ὀπίωμος ἤνοιξας**; differs from **מ** in vocalization only. **gyrum** Arcturi, the *ring* (or *course*) of Arcturus; cf. **שְׁבִילִי** (**שבילי**) of the *Giant* hast thou seen? **וְהַמִּצְּלָה** *And the cords which draw Orion* (**נִפְלָא** cf. **נִפְלָאִים** Gn 6<sup>4</sup>) *will thou loose?*

v. 32. **מִזְרוֹת**, **Μαζουρώθ** (**מזרות**), usually identified with **מִזְלֹת** 2 K 23<sup>6</sup> (**τοὺς μαζουρώθ**; **duodecim signis**), is probably a corrupted form of the name of some single star or constellation, rather than that of the Zodiac, or the Babylonian Stations (*manzazu, manzaltu, mazaltu*) of the Great Gods (3 R 59, 35a; Creation Tab. V al.). The parallelism requires this; and it is supported by the Sing. Suff. of **בְּעָתוֹ** *in his season*. So **Numquid producis Luciferum in tempore suo**; **עֵנִילָהּ** (**ענלחא**) **חֲכָאֵל** *the Wain*; but **שְׁמִירִי מִזְלִיָּא** (cf. 9<sup>3</sup> v. 38) = **מִזְלֹת**. What the original term was can no longer be determined with certainty. It may well have been partially assimilated to Mazzaloth by some scribe or editor who took their identity for granted. S. Jerome seems to have connected the word **מִזְרוֹת** or (**מזירות**?) with **יָהֵר** *shine*, Ar. **زَهَرَ** *id.*, of the heavenly bodies, perhaps **מִזְמֹר** *mazhûr, shining*; cf. **أُزْهَرَةُ** the planet Venus. In Is 14<sup>12</sup> he has *Lucifer* for **הַיֵּלִל** *The Shining One*. Conjecture in such a case appears almost hopeless; but if we are to think of a single star, we may perhaps suppose a **מִזְרוֹק** = Arab. **مِزْرَاق** *mizrâq, a lance*. The Babylonians knew of a Lance-star, *kakkab mešrê*, Sum. MUL KAK-SIDI; an expression which is also equated with *šukūdu* and *tartahu, spear or javelin*. Cf. a passage in the Hunting-inscription of Assurnâcirpal, 1 R 28, col. 1, 13-15, which reads: *Ina ûmât kuççi ĥalpê šûrîpi, ina ûmât nipih MUL KAK-SIDI ša kîma êrê iĉûdu*, 'In the days of cold, frost, snow, in the days of the (heliacal) rising of the Lance-star, which glowed like (burnished) copper'. The appearance of this star in the morning twilight was thus associated with the winter season. It has been identified with Antares, the principal star in Scorpio. However that may be (the Chinese call  $\beta$  Boötes 天矛 T'ien-mau, Heaven's Lance), it is perhaps possible that **מִזְרוֹת** has grown out of **מִסְרוֹת** (**Masrô**), which in Hebrew might represent the Assy. *Mašrû* (cf. *šāpiru* = **סִפִּיר**, *šakan* = **סָקַן**, *šigaru* = **סִיגִיר**, and T. A. *zûkin*, an attempt to reproduce in cuneiform the Canaanite pronun. of **סִוְכִין** = *sâkin*). St. ii ap. OL *And the Bear with her children, will thou lead them?* The Arabs call the four great stars of this constellation **نَعَش** Na'sh, the Bier, and the three stars of the tail **بَنَاتُ نَعَش** the Daughters of the Bier, i.e. the mourners following it. Hence Gesenius proposed to read **נָעַשׁ** both here and in 9<sup>3</sup>, as an apocopated form of **נָעַשׁ** = **נָעַשׁ**; which is certainly an attractive conjecture, though it would seem to require **בְּנֵיהָ** > **בְּנִיהָ** (as to **נָעַשׁ**, see Lane). **וְהַמִּצְּלָה** *And the Clucking-hen*

(i.e. the Pleiads; וְנִיחָא, which others suppose to mean Ursa Minor) *with her brood wilt thou lead?* (It is at least a coincidence, if nothing more, that *ki*, 'the fowl', is the animal associated with Mao, the Pleiads, in Chinese astronomy.) ☞ *Or dost thou stand before (or preside over?)* 'īyūlhā (= עֵישׁ pointed עֵישׁ or עֵישׁ; cf. אֵיִיב Arab. 'Ayyūb). ☞ evidently read פָּנִי *face* pro בְּנִי 'Amid all the uncertainties of the text, we may perhaps hazard the conjecture

הַתְּצִיא תַּמּוּז בְּעֵתוֹ  
וְעִשְׁתָּר(ת) עַל־בְּנָהּ תַּנְחֶם:

*Canst thou bring forth Tammuz in his season,  
And comfort Ishtar for her son?* (cf. Je 31<sup>16</sup>).

The reference would be to the return of spring, and the revival of vegetation from the death of winter. In Babylonian myth Ishtar was (among other things) Venus, the Evening Star (cf. ☿ *Vesperum*); and it seems possible that Tammuz (DUMU-ZI, *Du'azu*, *Dūzu*, also *Tamūzu*), her spouse and son, may have had some legendary connexion with the Morning Star (☿ *Luciferum*), although none such has yet been established. (Tammuz and his fellow-god NIN-GISH-ZI or GISH-ZIDA stand 'in the gate of Anu', the god of Heaven, in the legend of Adapa.) However that may be, Ursa Major is out of the question, since, as Burney has pointed out, the four stars or constellations appear to be introduced as betokening changes of weather by their rising and setting (the whole context, vv. 22-38, relates to such changes); whereas Ursa Major never sets, but is always visible in the northern sky, and could not therefore be supposed to have any meteorological significance. (If, as Burney thinks, *EB* s. v. STARS, עֵישׁ is the Pleiads and כִּימָה Canis Major, the Great Dog which lies at the feet of Orion the Hunter southward, perhaps כִּימָה = כִּינָה, with interchange of n, m, such as we find elsewhere, and כִּינָה may be compared with the Aryan base *KWAN*, Gk. κυν-, Lat. can-, Chinese 犬 k'üen, F. k'ëing, hound, Irish and Gaelic cu, dog, Welsh ci, Chinese 狗 kou, J. ku, dog. The last is the sixteenth of the 28 Chinese Zodiacal signs = α, β, γ Aries. Cf. also Sum. UR-KU, *kalbu*, dog.)

v. 33. For *the laws of Heaven* see Je 33<sup>25</sup> (cf. 31<sup>35</sup>). Perhaps הִצִּירָה (cf. v. 12): *Didst thou appoint the Heavens laws?* (or *impose decrees on the Heavens?*). So Ps 104<sup>19</sup> might be read שָׁמַשׁ יַעַר מְבוֹאוֹ *The sun He appointed its setting-place*. We get much the same sense if we point the verb as Pi. הִצִּירָה: *Didst thou make the Heavens to know laws?* (so also Ps 1. c.). But ☞ *Knowest thou τροπὰς οὐρανοῦ the turnings* (i.e. the solstices) or *changes* (of weather) *of heaven?* a doubtful interpretation. ☞ Numquid nosti ordinem caeli? ☞ *Knowest thou the law (νόμος) of the heavens?* ☞ continues: Et pones rationem eius in terra? (= מִשְׁפָּטוֹ pro

משטרו); but ט quite differently ἢ τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ὁμοθυμαδὸν γεόμενα; = בארץ (?) מעשים (שנעשו?) אדם יחד (θου may have fallen out of ט). The adv. יחד = ὁμοθυμαδὸν ten times in Job (יחדו = ὁμοθ. three times also). Possibly ט read or guessed מעשיו *his works* pro משטרו, which is an obscure ἄπ. Ἰ Canst thou set שטריה דגלגליה (acc. to ChWB *sein kreisendes Himmelsgewölbe*) upon the earth? but בארץ makes any such reference improbable; otherwise we might compare the Assy. phrase *šitir šamē* (also *šitirtu šamāmi*), meaning the starry firmament ('The writing of Heaven?') in astrological sense. משטר, which OL renders *rule, authority* ('of the heavens over the earth'; but? the Suff.), in form corresponding exactly to the Assy. *mašṭaru*, 'a writing', 'inscription', can hardly be correct, unless it be supposed to mean (written) *decree* (leg. משטר?). We propose משפטר *thy statute, ordinance*, parallel to חקות: Or dost (didst, canst) thou lay thine ordinance on Earth? (cf. ט).

v. 34. *whelm* (lit. cover) thee: so טבט; but ט ὑπακούσεται σου = תענה. ט appears to have read התקרא לעב (ב) קולך | וישטף מים יענך; cf. v. 25 (שטף = ὑετῶ λάβρω). For שטף מים see Ps 32<sup>6</sup>. This may indicate a real variant. St. ii מ repeats 22<sup>11</sup> verbatim.

v. 35. St. ii מ Et *reverentia* dicent tibi, Adsumus. The added word seems to make the sense clearer. Has וישבו fallen out before ויאמרו? This would agree better with the verbs of st. i. The lightnings would naturally say, 'Here we are!' i.e. ready to do thy bidding, either when they came at call (which would imply ויבוא in st. i), or after they had fulfilled one task and returned ready for another. But perhaps the metre is against this (cf. 23<sup>6</sup> 37<sup>19</sup>); and logical precision need not be pressed in poetry.

v. 36. RV *Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts? Or who hath given understanding to the mind?* But, as Driver remarks, a reference to the intelligence of man [in general] is not favoured by the context. If we could be sure that מוחות meant *kidneys* (so קליין and Jewish interpr.), we might read מי שחן [לך] ונר *Who hath set thee wisdom, &c.*; or simply add the Suff. to the word and read במוחותיך *in thy reins*, as Gesenius virtually did when he rendered the stichus thus: *quis renibus tuis indidit hanc sapientiam?* sc. qua omnia illa cognita et perspecta habes. Ἰ gives the same rendering in the equally difficult Ps 51<sup>8</sup> (the only place where the word recurs). The kidneys (כליות) are associated with the mind Je 12<sup>2</sup> Pr 7<sup>10</sup> 16<sup>1</sup> al.; and in Chinese *sin fuh shén ch'ang*, 'heart and belly, kidneys and bowels' = the whole mind. Antiquity knew nothing of the real functions of the heart and reins; and the brain is not mentioned in OT at all. In st. ii we might perhaps read לשכל (= לשכל) *to a fool* instead of לשבו (cf. ט μεμωραμένω); cf. Ec 1<sup>17</sup> שכלות. The verse would thus be a sarcasm: cf. v. 21. As, however, the context is concerned with the clouds and connected phenomena, it has been sup-

posed that מַחֹת may mean *dark* or *heaven-covering clouds* and שְׁכוֹ *cloud-appearances* or *shapes* (Aram. סָכָא *see, look out*); and that the idea of the verse is that the clouds, by their motions and varying shapes, evince intelligence! Those who can may accept this view. It is not much more probable than the identification of שְׁכוֹ with NH שְׁכוֹ *gallus* (Is<sup>2</sup> st. ii: *Or who gave to the cock-of-the-wild understanding to praise his Lord?* Is is more sensible with לֵבָא *to the heart*). In all probability, both מַחֹת and שְׁכוֹ are corrupt. The curious translation in G (τίς δὲ ἔδωκεν γυναιξὶν ὑφάσματος σοφίαν ἢ ποικιλιτικὴν ἐπιστήμην; *Who gave to women spinning-craft or broidering skill?*) app. reads טווח women who spin (see Ex 35<sup>25f.</sup>) for מַחֹת, and perhaps שְׁכָל *skill* (cf. G μωραμένω = the same letters pointed differently: vid. supr.) for שְׁכוֹ. G Who put wisdom in concealment (בְּכִסִּיָּא; בְּכִסִּיָּא; cf. Ps 51<sup>6</sup>)? Or who gave form (חֲוִיָּא) to the understanding (= מַחֹת ut M; שְׁכוֹ לבינה)?

v. 37. *Who counteth (mustereth?) the clouds by wisdom?* Cf. Ps 147<sup>4</sup>; לְכוֹכְבִּים . . . מוֹנֵה; Is 40<sup>26</sup>. The idea seems to be that of mustering them skilfully like a flock. Perhaps, however, we should read יִפְרֹשׁ = יִפְרֹשׁ *spreadeth out* (cf. 36<sup>29</sup> 37<sup>16</sup>). B Quis enarrabit caelorum rationem (= M, om. בחכמה). G = M; perhaps pointing יִפְרֹשׁ. waterskins (נִבְלִי): or jars, pitchers. tilteth (יִשְׁכִּיב): or poureth out; a possible Arabism (سكب) *pour out*, both Trans. and Intr.). So here only in OT. The שֶׁכַּב is etym. *cause to bend, bow, or incline, make bending, &c.*; being derived from the Causative or Factitive שׂ and כַּב = קַב, נַב, *bend, bow, &c.* Possibly, וַיִּשְׁפּוּז וַיִּשְׁפּוּז וַיִּשְׁפּוּז *And the streams of heaven (Is 44<sup>4</sup>) who poureth out?* (cf. Ps 22<sup>16</sup>). G οὐρανὸν δὲ εἰς γῆν ζαίνειν; = (?) מִי יִשְׁכִּיב (?). B Et concentum caeli quis dormire faciet? = M (but taking נִבְלִי in the sense of *harps* or *lutes*, and thinking of 'the Harmony of the Spheres'). G Who numbered the clouds in his wisdom? And the pillars of heaven who set up? (Perhaps תַּמְרֵי pro נִבְלֵי M and יַצִּיב pro יִשְׁכִּיב.) Is Who shall count the Seven Heavens by wisdom; And the measures (בִּלְלוֹת; but Ms בִּלְלוֹת curtains) of the heavens who shall lay out (or set up; נִשְׂרִי) M. Is Who shall count the stars of the heavens by wisdom; And the clouds which are likened to the waterskins of the heavens, who shall lay out? מִן יִשְׁכִּיב (ut M). Neither I suggests any difference of reading. נִבְלִי cannot mean *meteor* (cf. Assy. *nablu*, 'fire'), if only because of v. 38. It seems possible that v. 36 is a variant of v. 37, or *vice versa* (repetition of חֲכֵמָה, vv. 36<sup>a</sup> 37<sup>a</sup>, with || בינה in 36<sup>b</sup> but not in 37<sup>b</sup>). Verse 36 may once have read:

מִי יִשְׁפֹּר עֲבוֹת בַּחֲכָמָה  
אוּ מִי נִבְלֵי שָׁמַי' יִמְנֶה:

*Who telleth the clouds by wisdom,  
Or counteth up the waterskins of heaven?*

v. 38. Lit. *in the pouring* (בַּצֶּקֶת Infin. of יָצַק *pour, cast*, as in Ex 38<sup>27</sup>; used Intrans. as in 1 K 22<sup>35</sup>) *of the soil into the casting*; i.e. into solid lumps. (בָּצַק *to swell* is improb. here.) רֶבֶק and יָצַק occur together again, 41<sup>15</sup>, in a similar sense. This determines the meaning here.

In st. ii, which is metr. short, יָחַד *together* may have fallen out at the end, or perhaps רָבַק Adv. Infin. before יִדְבְּקוּ (41<sup>9</sup>). For רִנָּבִים *clods* see 21<sup>33</sup>. ℣ Quando fundebatur pulvis *in terra* looks as if ℣ read בָּאֲרֵץ instead of לְמוֹצָק; cf. Ⓢ κέχυται δὲ (Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> γὰρ) ὥσπερ γῆ (= בָּאֲרֵץ) κοιλία. So also Ⓢ *Who poured the dust upon the earth* (עַל אֲרֵעָא)? But ℣ *When the dust was founded for a foundation* (לְשִׁיתֵאסָא; cf. v. 4) = Ⓜ. In st. ii ℣ (Et glebae compingebantur) agrees with Ⓜ. So also ℣ *And the clods* (בְּיִשְׁתָּא 21<sup>33</sup>) *clave together*. Ⓢ *And the cliffs* (שְׁקִיפָא) *who fashioned?* The text of Ⓢ is uncertain and prob. corrupt: κεκόλληκα (Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> -κεν) δὲ (Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> γὰρ) αὐτὸν ὥσπερ λίθω κύβον (Ⓢ<sup>A</sup> κύβον λίθοις). Did Ⓢ read אֲבָנִים יִכְאֲרֹנְבּ *And like a cairn of stones* (cf. 1 Sa 20<sup>19</sup>) and point יִדְבְּקוּ?

v. 39. *satisfy*: lit. *fill the life* (= soul 33<sup>18,20</sup> Ps 143<sup>3</sup>; and so *appetite, desire*; cf. נָפֶשׁ 23<sup>13</sup>). Ⓢ ψυχάς. ℣ animam. Cf. Pr 6<sup>30</sup> (נֶפֶשׁ). The more usual phrase is מָלֵא בֶטֶן *fill the belly* (20<sup>29</sup>). ℣ פִּרְנִסְתָּא *food* = מִחְיָה. Ⓢ δρακόντων = פִּתְנִים (20<sup>16</sup>) or חֲנִיִּים (7<sup>12</sup>) *pro* כְּפִירִים by confusion of letters.

v. 40. *in their lairs or haunts*: במְעוֹתָם (Ⓜ + Suff.): 37<sup>8b</sup> Ps 104<sup>22</sup>. The addition of the Suff. improves both metre and sense. So Ⓢ ἐν κοιταῖς αὐτῶν. Ⓢ gives for the whole verse: *Who multiplied the animals in the wild?* (reading חַיִּים בְּמִדְבַּר חַיִּים *pro* בִּי יִשְׁחוּ בְּמִעוֹן, with חַיִּים repeated by inadvertence from v. 39<sup>b</sup>).

The Heb. מְעוֹן, מְעוֹנָה *dwelling-place* has nothing to do with Arab. مَعْنٍ *help*. Cf. perhaps Sum. EN, E, EŠ, *house*, or UN (from GUN), *dwelling* (šubtu). ℣ in antris = בְּמַעְרֹת *in the caves* (dens of wild beasts, Is 32<sup>14</sup>). St. ii ℣ Et in specubus insidiatur (parallel to *in antris*); a paraphrase. Ⓢ om.; ℣ ut Ⓜ. Ⓢ ἐν ὕλαις, *in brushwood* = Ⓜ בְּסִכָּה *prob.*, which should perhaps be בְּסִכָּם *in their covert or thicket*: cf. Je 4<sup>7</sup> id. 25<sup>3a</sup> Ps 10<sup>3</sup> 76<sup>3</sup>. The verse resembles 37<sup>8</sup>. The conjecture בְּסִכָּה seems needless. Ⓜ לְמוֹ-אֲרֵב looks strange; cf. בְּמוֹ-אֲרֵב 37<sup>8</sup>, and see the note there. Leg. either לְאֲרֵב *to lie in wait*, or בְּמַאֲרֵב *in ambush* (= Ⓢ ἐνεδρεύοντες).

v. 41. A tristich; but st. iii may be marginal. Would the young 'wander' (Ⓢ faint) from the nest if left unfed? We should perhaps read: יִפְעוּ מִבְּלִי אֲכָלָה. *They scream for lack of food*. But the objection to a tristich remains, unless we suppose that a line has been lost; e.g. וְיָבִיא אֵלָיו טָרֶף *And who bringeth him the prey?* as st. ii.

*cry to El*: cf. Ps 147<sup>2b</sup>. Ⓢ πρὸς Κύριον = אֵל יְהוָה. Ⓢ πλανώμενοι τὰ σῖτα ζητοῦντες = יִחְזְעוּ לְבָקֵשׁ אֲכָל: Ps 104<sup>21</sup> chap. 39<sup>29</sup> (τὰ σῖτα = אֲכָל). *They wander to seek for food* may be right.

Chapter 39.—The division is quite arbitrary, and far from happy. The same general subject is continued—the marvels of the animal world as ordered by God not man.

v. 1. St. i appears to be metr. overweighted, unless we point עת־לֶרֶח, so as to secure but three stresses for the line. Even then, יעלי־סלע (here only: cf. Ps 104<sup>16</sup>) is questionable as representing a single stress; cf. e.g. 13<sup>4</sup>. Further, the recurrence of לרֶחַת עַת יִרְעַת in v. 2<sup>b</sup> is suspicious. We might perhaps read לִיעָלִי סִלְעַת הִיעֵרַת *Didst thou fix the time for the chamois?* (cf. 1 Sa 20<sup>5</sup>). The phrase לרֶחַת עַת (cf. Ec 3<sup>2</sup>) would then be a marginal gloss. תִּאֲנַח *rutting-time* (Je 2<sup>24</sup>) is not a prob. substitute for it. St. ii add ! *And* (ⓈⓈ δὲ) or אִם *Or* (Ⓢ vel).

v. 2. Instead of st. ii (Ⓢ Et scisti tempus partus earum?) Ⓢ gives: ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν (v. 3<sup>b</sup>) ἐλυσσας (v. 5<sup>b</sup>); = וְחִבְּלֵיהֶן תִּפְתַּח *And their pangs dost thou loosen?*

v. 3. *They bow*; sc. in travail: 1 Sa 4<sup>19</sup>. *They liberate*: תִּפְלְטֵנָה (21<sup>10</sup>; cf. מִלֵּט Is 34<sup>15</sup>) pro מִפְּלֹחָנָה *they cleave or split* (16<sup>19</sup>). So Ⓢ pariunt (cf. 21<sup>10</sup> vacca *peperit*). St. ii lit. *Their pains* (Ho 13<sup>15</sup>) *they send forth*; i.e. their young, the cause of their pains—a quite possible metonymy, though apparently not found elsewhere. Others would transpose יִלְרִיחַן—חִבְּלִיחַן (Ⓢ הם—; 11 codd. Kenn הן—); but this involves an unlikely change of Subj. in st. i (*They bow*; *their pains pierce them through*). Ⓢ ὠδῖνας αὐτῶν ἐξαποστελεῖς = חִבְּלֵיהֶם חֲשֵׁלָה = Ⓢ. Ⓢ et rugitus emittunt (app. taking חִבְּלִי in sense of *cries of pain*). Instead of st. i, Ⓢ gives us ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παῖδιά ἐξω (A ἀνευ) φόβου; = וְיִרְבֶּה יִלְרִיחַן or something similar. Illegible text? But in Ⓢ the whole verse appears thus: *And when they bow and bring forth*. Possibly פֵּרִי *fruit* or בְּנֵי *sons* has fallen out before חִבְּלֵיהֶם, as st. ii is metr. short: *The fruit (or sons) of their sorrows* (cf. Gn 35<sup>18</sup>) *they let forth*. But a more satisfactory suggestion will be found in the next note.

v. 4. St. i has four stresses. It seems prob. that יִחַלְמוּ (leg. וְיִחַלְמוּ) belongs to v. 3<sup>b</sup>, which would then run: *Their pains they cast forth, and are well*; i.e. after delivery they recover health (Is 38<sup>16</sup>) at once; an appropriate reference to the ease with which such animals bring forth their young. The verb חָלַם (cf. Syr. حَلِم strong, well), like the n. קֶרֶם (Aram. כְּרָא) *the open country*, is an Aramaism. Pro יִחַלְמוּ Ⓢ ἀπορρήξουσιν, 'break away'; cf. Ⓢ separantur = וְיִפְרְדוּ? but Ⓢ וְיִמְלֵאוּ *are weaned* (*Their sons grow up and are weaned*; for the verse). לָמוּ: Ⓢ ad eas is prob. right (cf. Ⓢ αὐτοῖς) > Dat. Ethic. The adult offspring forsake their mothers for good. Pro בָּבֵר Ⓢ ἐν γεν(ν)ήματι = בִּפְרִי; Ⓢ (pergunt) ad pascuum = (יַעֲבֹרוּ) בַּמִּדְבָּר (בְּרִבְרִי?).

v. 6. *the salty waste*: reading אֶרֶץ מְלֶחָה *the land of saltiness* (Je 17<sup>6</sup>, cf. Ps 107<sup>24</sup>) *metri gratia*. Ⓢ om. אֶרֶץ. Ⓢ ἁλμυρίδα, *saltiness* (Diod.) and *salt soil* (Theophr.). Ⓢ in terra salsuginis.





*behind thee?* ' is unlikely; unless the meaning be 'behind thy back', i.e. when left to himself (cf. v. 11).

v. 11.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Numquid fiduciam habebis in magna fortitudine eius =  $\text{הֲתִבְטַח בְּרַב כֹּחַ}$  *Will thou trust in the greatness of his strength?* yields a better rhythm; but  $\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{Z}$  support  $\mathfrak{M}$  ( $\text{בּו}$  and  $\text{כִּי}$  both enclitic). *Thy labour*: i.e. thy fieldwork, or possibly thy produce (cf. v. 12).

v. 12. Q  $\text{יָשִׁיב}$  seems preferable to K  $\text{יָשׁוּב}$  *he will return or come home*, when his work is done. Cf.  $\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{Z}$ . ( $\mathfrak{G}$  *Dost thou trust him to purge thy floor, | And gather in thy seed?* app. reading  $\text{יִזְרֶה נֶרְנָן וְיִסַּף}$ .) St. ii  $\mathfrak{M}$  is too brief for sense and metre. It may be supposed that, owing to similarity of letters,  $\text{כֹּרֶן}$  *corn* has fallen out before  $\text{נֶרְנָן}$ . This would give us *And gather in the corn of thy threshing-floor*. Or we might read:  $\text{וְנִרְנָה דְנִנְךָ יִסַּף}$  *And into the thr. gather thy corn* (cf. Mi 4<sup>12</sup>).  $\mathfrak{B}$  *et aream tuam congreget?* =  $\mathfrak{M}$ . So  $\mathfrak{G}$ .

v. 13. The context (vv. 14–18) shows that the ostrich, with its apparent lack of parental instinct, its proverbial stupidity, and its marvellous running powers, is intended; but no ingenuity can extract any reasonable sense from this verse as it stands in  $\mathfrak{M}$ . RV is simply childish. The  $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}$  which introduces st. ii indicates a double question, such as we have in vv. 9, 10; 11, 12. We propose

(ה)בבת יענה תתעלם

: (אם תאהב חסרת עצה :

*Joyest thou in the ostrich, | Or lovest her that lacketh counsel?*  $\text{בַּת יְעֵנָה}$  is the usual name of the ostrich (30<sup>29</sup> plur.  $\text{בַּת הַיְעֵנָה}$  Dt 14<sup>15</sup>); but  $\text{יְעֵנִים}$  (La 4<sup>3</sup> Q only) is not prob. here, if only because of the fem. Sing. in vv. 14 ff. We might perhaps read  $\text{נַעֲלַסְתָּה}$  *hast thou rejoiced?* pro  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\text{נַעֲלַסְתָּה}$ , but Ni. occurs nowhere else, while Hithp. is found Pr 7<sup>18</sup> in a sense that suits the parallel line. With *חסרת עצה* cf.  $\text{כֹּסֶר לֵב}$  Pr 7<sup>17</sup> al. (fem. of  $\text{כֹּסֶר}$  here only).

$\mathfrak{G}$   $\text{πέρνυξ τερπομένων}$  ( $\mathfrak{G}^{\text{NC.CA}} + \text{νεελασα}$ , i.e.  $\text{נַעֲלַסְתָּה}$  translit.),  $\text{ἐὰν συλλάβῃ ἀσιδὰ καὶ νεσσά}$  =  $\text{אִם הִרְתָּה חֲסִידָה וְנָצָה}$  ( $\text{συνλαμβ.} = \text{הָרָה}$  as oft; the other words translit.).  $\text{τερπομένων} = \text{רִנְנִים}$  (pts.): Zc 2<sup>14</sup>. Did  $\mathfrak{G}$  read  $\text{ἀφῆρι}$  (Syr. *bring forth*) for  $\text{אַבְרָהָה$ ?  $\mathfrak{B}$  *Penna struthionis similis est pennis herodii (the heron) et accipitris* (v. 26) =  $\text{בְּנֵי יְעֵנִים? נִמְשָׁלָה עִם־אַבְרָהָה}$  (v. 26) =  $\text{בְּנֵי יְעֵנִים? חֲסִידָה יִנְיָ}$  (see La 4<sup>3</sup>,  $\mathfrak{B}$  *sicut struthio* =  $\text{כִּיעֵנִים}$  Q). Cf.  $\mathfrak{Z}$  *The wing of the cock of the wild which lauds and praises* (cf.  $\mathfrak{Z}$  38<sup>36</sup>), *is it the pinion of the stork (or heron) and the hawk* (Levy: *and its plumes*)? =  $\mathfrak{M}$ ?  $\mathfrak{G}$   $\text{כִּנְפֵי רִנְנִים}$ ; understanding  $\text{רִנְנִים}$  of shouting or singing praise to God (cf. Ps 5<sup>12</sup> al.): cf.  $\mathfrak{Z}$ . It renders: *The kenfai-sabbāhīn magnifies (or rouses) herself and soars (!), and comes and nests (!)*. About ostriches the poet was evidently better informed than his translator.

v. 14. *leaveth her eggs to the earth*: cf. v. 11<sup>b</sup> Ps 16<sup>10</sup>  $\text{לִשְׂאוֹל}$ .  $\mathfrak{B}$  in

*terra*; but ט *eis* γῆν = מ. *layeth them*: תַּנְיִחַם pro תַּחַם = ט *θαλάσσει*, מחממא, B calefacies. But א *חרגור* collect or heap up; sc. her eggs: Is 34<sup>15</sup>. Did א read חממר *heapeth* (NH Aram.)? Cf. Heb. חֲמֵר *a heap*. And *heapeth them on the dust* makes good sense; but the point is that the ostrich takes no care at all for her progeny, but leaves them to chance. (B *When she forsaketh her eggs on the ground*, tu forsitan in pulvere calefacies ea, *will thou perchance warm them in the dust?* is ingenious, but hardly correct.)

v. 15. *press it*: or *squeeze* and so *crush* it: ור Ju 6<sup>38</sup> Is 1<sup>6</sup>. *It*; i.e. one or other of the eggs. Or the fem. Sing. may be Coll. ט *σκορπιεί* = תִּנְרָה (pts.); but B (rectè) *conculcet ea*.

v. 16. The verb masc. cannot be right, with verbs and Suffixes fem. preceding and following. We must either point הַקְשִׁיחַ Infin. Abs., or c 2 codd. Kenn read תַּקְשִׁיחַ *she deals hardly with* . . . *her young*: בָּנִים is used of eggs and young birds Dt 22<sup>6f</sup>. לֹא לָהּ (making them) *into none of hers* (OL) or *according to not hers*. But it is simpler to read פָּלָא (Ob 16): cf. B *Duratur ad filios suos quasi non sint sui*. ט *ὥστε μὴ αὐτῇν* (?) *αὐτῇ* = מ. לֹא לָהּ. א *She warms* (broods; שיחנא) *over the sons* that are not hers (וְלֹא רִילָהּ); ט *She has multiplied the sons* that are not hers (ut א); app. reading השניאה pro הקשיח (error of dictation?). ט א ט favour הַקְשִׁיחָה > תַּקְשִׁיחַ. In view of Is 63<sup>17</sup> חֲקִישָׁה לָבָנוּ (the sole recurrence of the verb), הַקְשִׁיחָה לָבָהּ לְעֻלְלָהּ *She has hardened her heart to her* (unhatched: cf. 3<sup>18</sup>) *young* seems possible.

St. ii lit. *Fruitless* (For emptiness or naught) *is her labour without fear* (i. e. apprehension of possible mischances and provision against them). But a verb יַנְעָה would be more natural (cf. Is 65<sup>23</sup> Le 26<sup>20</sup>, also Is 49<sup>4</sup>): B *Frustra laboravit*; ט *εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασεν ἄνευ φόβου*. מ. can hardly mean: 'Though her labour, in laying and sitting on the eggs, be in vain, she is unconcerned about it' (Driver) = לִרְיָק יַנְעָה בִּלְתַּפְחָר. The point is that she is careless about the safety of her eggs (v. 14); she lacks *foresight* to provide against danger (v. 17). We may suggest לִרְיָק: יַנְעָה לְהַפְרָהּ *In vain hath she laboured to have young*. הפריח Denom. from אפרח *young bird* (but cf. 14<sup>3</sup>); cf. Ar. فَرَّخَ 2. *to hatch*: or בְּהַפְרָהּ *at laying*? or even לְהַפְרָהּ (Arabism).

v. 17. It is hardly necessary to remark that popular ideas about the ostrich are based upon imperfect observation. The habits of this bird are peculiar, but neglect of its young is far from being one of them. Three or four hens deposit their eggs in the same nest or hole in the soil; and the male shares with them in the duty of brooding. A number of eggs are dropped about outside the nest, which are afterwards broken to feed the young when hatched. This may explain v. 14. (See *Encyc. Brit.*, s. v. Ostrich.) *made her forget*: הִשָּׁחָה. The expression is rather

strange. We should rather have expected *has withheld from her*.  $\mathfrak{B}$  *Privavit enim eam Deus sapientia*;  $\mathfrak{C}$   $\delta\tau\iota$  κατεσιώπησεν αὐτὴν ὁ θεὸς σοφίαν (= החשה? Ne 8<sup>13</sup>);  $\mathfrak{S}$  again  $\text{השניא}$  *has multiplied*; but  $\mathfrak{I}$  as  $\mathfrak{M}$ .

v. 18. *What time in the race she flieth*; or *When she flieth along in the race*: reading במרוץ תאביר pro במרום תמריא. The comparison of the  $\alpha\pi.$  תמריא with Ar. مَرَى is altogether improb. (see Lane Suppl. p. 3019: 'The wind *tamrī-ssahāla* draws forth the clouds'). On the other hand, the Denom. אבר Hi. *to wing*, i.e. *work or ply the wings* occurs, v. 26, of the flight of the hawk, and might be used here of the swift 'flying', i.e. running, of the ostrich (cf.  $\mathfrak{I}$  טִיָּסָא = טושׁ 9<sup>26</sup>). Cf. also  $\mathfrak{I}$  5<sup>7</sup> 20<sup>8</sup> (עוף = מוס). That the poet did not think of the ostrich as 'soaring on high' (as  $\mathfrak{I}$  seems to do) is evident from st. ii.

במרום *in the height*, whether of the air or of high ground, suits neither the bird nor its hunters. It is on the plains of the desert, not among the mountains, that the running powers of the ostrich are seen at their best. Read therefore בַּמְרוֹץ and cf. Ec 9<sup>11</sup>.  $\mathfrak{C}$   $\epsilon\nu$  ὑψεὶ ὑψώσσει = במרום תרום; cf.  $\mathfrak{S}$  במרום תתרים איך דקלא *In the height she raises herself* like a palm-tree (כתמר; a double rendering).  $\mathfrak{B}$  in altum alas erigit; perhaps to suggest the flapping of the bird's wings as it flies along the ground.

vv. 13-18 are starred in Hexapl. and are said to have been wanting in the original text of  $\mathfrak{C}$ ; but there seems no sufficient reason for rejecting a section which is quite in character with the others, and as lively and striking as any in the chapter.

v. 19. *strength* or *prowess* (גבורה). *Terror*: אִיָּמָה (v. 20) pro רָעָמָה  $\alpha\pi.$ , usually identified with רָעַם *thunder* (26<sup>14</sup> 39<sup>26</sup>).  $\mathfrak{C}$  φόβον = אימה (9<sup>34</sup> 41<sup>6</sup> al.).  $\mathfrak{S}$   $\text{וְיָנָא}$  *armour* (a guess?); but  $\mathfrak{I}$  תוקפא *might* (= רָעָמָה? a good parallel to גבורה). Leg. fort. רום *haughtiness* (Is 2<sup>11</sup>) vel רומה (Mi 2<sup>3</sup>). The tossing of a horse's neck might inspire fear; but רעם or רעמה *thunder*, however appealing to the imagination and however poetical it may sound, is really inappropriate here, for the simple reason that a horse's neck or mane emits no sound, whereas the רעם and its deriv. always denote some kind of sound (cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$  aut circumdabis collo eius *hinnitum*? i.e. 'neighing' or 'whinnying'). The same objection lies against rendering רעמה (רעם) *vibration*, which is supposed to be equivalent to *quivering mane* (OL). In this sense רעש would suit better than רעם; but the mane is a feature of lions as well as horses, and does not seem to be either distinctive or poetical enough without further qualification.

v. 20. St. i is metr. short. Perhaps ארץ or אדמה has fallen out before (or after) כארבה: *Dost thou make him shake the earth like the locust?* Cf. Jo 2<sup>4,10</sup>, where the locusts are compared to horses, and earth and air tremble and quake at their onset. Or, since 'running' is repeatedly ascribed to the locusts (Jo 2<sup>4,7,9</sup>), Iahvah's 'army', we might

read התריצנו בארץ כארבה *Dost thou make him run on the earth like the locusts?* 𐤁 Numquid suscitabis eum quasi locustas? (תעירנו?). 𐤄 περιέ-  
θηκας δὲ αὐτῷ (cf. v. 19<sup>a</sup>) πανοπλίαν; (= הַתַּעֲמִינֵנוּ חֲלִיצָה? cf. 2 Sa 2<sup>20</sup> Is 61<sup>10</sup>)  
bears little resemblance to 𐤄. St. ii is almost certainly corrupt. Lit.  
*The glory (or majesty) of his snorting is a terror.* So 𐤁 gloria narium  
eius terror (pointing נַחְרוֹ = נַחְיָרִי nares eius 41<sup>12</sup> pro 𐤄 נַחְרוֹ 𐤁π.); cf. 𐤄  
*The splendour of the chain of his nostrils is a terror.* The analogy of the  
context, however, requires a second question: cf. 𐤄 *Or dost thou terrify  
him with terror?* (𐤄 is dubious). We suggest הַתּוֹרֵנוּ נַחְרָה רַעְמָה *Dost  
thou teach him his snort of thunder?* (רַעְמָה v. 19<sup>b</sup> trs. Je 81<sup>8</sup> chap. 127<sup>8</sup>  
Is 28<sup>9</sup>). (𐤄 δόξαν δὲ στηθέων αὐτοῦ = ? הוֹדִר חֲרִי? Aram. חרי = στῆθος.  
Is τόλμη 𐤄<sup>A</sup> τόλμη an error for τολμᾷ: *And the glory of his breast dost  
thou dare?*)

v. 21. St. i 𐤄 is metr. too long with four stresses. Leg. בָּכַח, and  
transpose בעמק to st. ii (cf. 𐤄). *He paweth*: leg. יחפור *fodit* c 𐤄 𐤄 𐤄  
pro 𐤄 plur. The distich thus becomes:

יחפור וישש בכח  
בעמק יצא לקראת נשק;

*He paweth and exulteth in his strength; | He goeth forth into the valley  
to face arms.* Cf. Ju 5<sup>15</sup> Ho 1<sup>5</sup> Is 61<sup>10</sup> al. שִׁישׁ ב'. For נשק 20<sup>24</sup> Ps 140<sup>8</sup>.  
𐤄 *Digging in the plain he prances, | And goes forth into the plain in  
strength.* 𐤄 appears to repeat בעמק; but εἰς πεδῖον may represent  
another expression, e.g. בנחל, which we actually find in 𐤄 (*He paweth  
in the vale and exulteth in the wady | And goeth forth to the encounter in  
arms*). 𐤄 connects לקראת נשק with the next verse.

v. 22. *He laugheth at fear* (פחד), *and is not terrified* (scared, dismayed),  
besides being something of an anticlimax, does not suit the parallel  
stichus. If we read רמה pro פחד we get a good parallel: *He laugheth  
at the spear, &c.* After נשק *arms or battle*, v. 21, the mention of  
particular weapons is natural; and this is continued in v. 23. 𐤄 has  
συναγῶν βασιλεῖ (but 𐤄<sup>acc.aa</sup> βέλει) prob. = לקראת נשק ישחק. Possibly  
𐤄 substituted נֶשֶׁךְ ruler or lord (Is 3<sup>12</sup> 60<sup>17</sup> Zc 10<sup>4</sup>) for נשק. Three codd.  
have פחת *pitfall* instead of פחד; which might perhaps be understood of  
pits dug in the battlefield to hamper cavalry. So 𐤄 נומצא *pit*. If this  
be right, יח might be from נחת > חתת (21<sup>19</sup>): *He laugheth at the pitfall  
and descendeth not* (into it). Some think that 𐤄 βασιλεῖ = לפחת (the  
word being mistaken for פחה constr. פחת *pasha*); which does not seem  
very probable. 𐤄 om. ולא יחת (a good paronomasia with לפחת).

v. 23. *rattleth*: 𐤄 תִּרְנֶה 𐤁π. The more usual form תִּרְן (רנן) has  
been proposed; but רנה may be defended on the analogy of הנה, הנה,  
קצה, קצץ, and the Aram. רָנָא, רָנָא *to think*. Moreover, the suggested

division of the letters תרן האשפה (pro תרנה אשפה *ṯ*) is improbable, because אשפה *the quiver* (Is 22<sup>6</sup> only; elsewhere c Suff.) is not found c Artic., and all the other instruments of war mentioned in the context are anarthrous. *ṯ* ἐπ' αὐτῷ γαυριᾷ τόξον καὶ μάχαιρα = קִשֶׁת תְּרִנְהָ קֶלֶבַע וְחֶרֶב; *ṯ*'s Heb. text may have been corrupt here; but *ṯ* prob. failed to understand להב and כירון (the latter also in 41<sup>21</sup>). The verb γαυριᾷ (= שׂוּט v. 21) occurred 3<sup>14</sup> (οὐ ἡγαυριῶντο ἐπὶ ξίφεσιν = לחמו: *ṯ* evidently misread רִנִּים pro בָּנִים. This favours the reading תְּרִנְהָ here. *ṯ* has חֶרֶבָּא שְׁנֵנָּא *the sharp sword* for להב *flame* = flashing blade or head (cf. Ju 3<sup>22</sup> 1 Sa 17<sup>7</sup>). For אשפה *ṯ* has זינא *the weapon*; but *ṯ* קטירקא *pharetra* rightly. *ṯ* (st. ii) *vibrabit hasta et clypeus* is interesting, as suggesting a verb pro להב, which indeed one would have expected.

v. 24. *In his eagerness: or rage: בָּרָגוּ: cf. ṯ καὶ ὀργῇ. ברעש ורגו ṯ*; but one or the other of the two nouns must be a gloss, as this gives a line with four stresses. *ṯ Fervens et fremens sorbet terram = ṯ* (so *ṯ*). *he diggeth into the ground: i.e. makes holes by pawing it in his impatience to charge. The verb יגמא, AV RV he swalloweth* (cf. Gn 24<sup>17</sup> Hi. *let drink*), is usually compared with Aram. נָמַע, נָמַע *to sip or suck in* (*ṯ* v. 30 = ילעלעו); cf. *ṯ sorbet: and this is understood of galloping swiftly* (cf. *ṯ* רחם על ארעא *he runneth over the ground*). But the charge does not begin before the trumpet gives the signal; and *ṯ עביר נומא בארעא he makes a pit in the ground* appears to refer the verb to Aram. נִמְסַתָּא, NH נִמְסָא *pit or hole. We might even read ינמין he digs* (Aram. נִמְיִן) pro טא. St. ii *ṯ* can hardly be right. A verb is desiderated after כי יאמין (cf. v. 12, 9<sup>16</sup>). And if we read בָּקוּל pro כִּי קוּל *ṯ*, the sentence will naturally mean *And he trusts not in the sound of the trumpet* (cf. 4<sup>18</sup> 15<sup>15, 22, 31</sup> 24<sup>22</sup> 29<sup>24</sup>). The sense might perhaps be: *He does not 'believe in' the sound of the trumpet; i.e. he is so impatient to be off, that he thinks the signal will never be given. ṯ = ṯ. ṯ And he is not afraid of the sound of the horn. ṯ And he will not believe until the trumpet have signalled. But He does not stand still at the sound of the trumpet* would suit the context better; and perhaps the Hi. (or Ni. ?) of אמן may bear this sense here, though it is not so used elsewhere. Cf. Ex 17<sup>12</sup>. In any case, ולא יימין ולא ישמאל, בקול שופר *And he turns not to the right nor to the left, &c.*, is non-metrical and pure prose.

v. 25. The repetition of שופר is suspicious, and the phrase כִּי ש' (supposed to mean *As often as the trumpet soundeth* = חֲזָרָה יִשְׁמָע) is anomalous. *ṯ בְּמִסְפַּת שׁוֹפְרָא With enough of the trumpet = ṯ*; but *ṯ* בקלא At the sound (*he saith*), omitting שופר. This may suggest the reading בָּקוּלוּ At the sound of it; cf. *ṯ σάλπιγγος δὲ σηματονούς (λέγει εὐγε.), But when trumpet signalleth, &c. We might read בְּמִסְפַּת שׁוֹפְרָא At the sound* (Ps 150<sup>5</sup> || תרועה), or perhaps מְדִי יִשְׁמָע or מְדִי שְׁמָע *As often as*

he heareth it; but the required sense seems rather to be *The moment he hears it*.

The verse, as it has reached us, is a tristich; and, as the zeugma *he scents the battle, the thunder . . . and the shouting* seems rather too bold, sense as well as metre may justify the assumption that a line has fallen out after st. ii (unless st. i be somehow a variant of v. 24<sup>b</sup>, which seems possible); e.g. לֹא־יִחַח מִקוֹל גְּבָרִים *He is not daunted by the cry* (cf. Is 31<sup>a</sup>) *of the warriors*, or לֹא־יִחַחֵנוּ קוֹל גִּבּוֹר *The cry of warriors daunts him not*. In st. iii ט = ט; but ט gives *And makes the princes tremble* (מְזַעֵזֵעַ) with his neighing = וִירְעַשׂ שָׂרִים בְּתִרְעוּעָה, while ט has the strange equivalent σὺν ἀλματι καὶ κραυγῇ (*From afar he gets scent of war*) with a bound and a cry = רָעַם שָׂרִים וְתִרְעוּעָה וְעַם־רַעַשׁ pro רָעַם שָׂרִים וְתִרְעוּעָה.

v. 26. *ply his wings*: יֹאבֵר *make wing, wing it, wing his way*, or simply *fly* (cf. v. 18<sup>b</sup> note) > *soar* (יִנְבִּיחַ עוֹף, cf. v. 27, 5<sup>7</sup>, but also Is 40<sup>21</sup>). ט ἔστηκεν ἰεραξ, *Doth the hawk exist?* = ט יָסַן (hath the hawk come into being?); both prob. reading יִבְרָא (or נִבְרָא) *is the hawk created?* pro יֹאבֵר (why not יִבְרִי?). *And spread*: וַיִּפְרֹשׁ or וַיִּפְרֹשׁ pro וַיִּפְרֹשׁ. The bird flies south at the coming of winter. (After ἀναπετάσας τὰς πτέρυγας ט adds the gloss ἀκίνητος, *motionless*; which may imply for ἔστηκεν the more usual meaning *stands still* or *stops* (יַעֲמֹד pro יֹאבֵר); i.e. the bird hangs motionless in the air, looking southward.)

v. 27. St. ii וְכִי appears to be corrupt; and this is borne out by ט, which makes a single tristich of this and the following verse:

אִם־עַל־פִּיךָ יִנְבִּיחַ נֶשֶׁר  
וְאֵיךָ עַל־קִנָּה תִּשְׁכֵּן וְתִחַלֵּן  
עַל־שֵׁן סֹלֶעַ וּמִצּוֹרָה;

*At thy command doth the eagle* (or griffon-vulture 9<sup>20</sup>) *mount up* (sc. 5<sup>7</sup> עוֹף) *And the vulture* (נֶשֶׁר = אֵיחָ 28<sup>7</sup>) *on her nest alight and lodge* | *On the point* (ἐξοχῇ = שֵׁן *tooth* here only; cf. 1 Sa 14<sup>4</sup>) *of the crag and fastness* (τὸ ἀποκρυφῶν *hiding-place?* but τὸ ἀρχαῖωματος?) Thus ט om. יָרִים and יִסְלַע, besides reading וְאֵיחָ pro וְכִי. ט Upon the word of thy mouth is the eagle lifted up (יִנְבִּיחַ = נִתְּחַרֵּם?) | When he raiseth his nest (כִּי pro וְכִי) to the crag | And alighteth and lodgeth on the tooth of the crag? (Thus another tristich; but ט not so.) The objection to ט's נֶשֶׁר v. 27<sup>b</sup> is that the following verses refer to a single bird which, like the נֶשֶׁר ἀετὸς of st. i, is of the masc. gender. Perhaps, therefore, we should emend v. 27<sup>b</sup> by reading וְלָךְ instead of וְכִי: *And for thee set high his nest?* (cf. Je 49<sup>16b</sup>); or else וְכִיבְרַךְ *And at thy word, &c.* It may be noted that ט st. ii is metr. defective, having only two stresses, besides being grammatically dubious. Then we supply עַל־ before יִסְלַע v. 28; and יִסְלַע<sup>2</sup> need not be regarded as dittogr., since it emphasizes

the idea of inaccessible rocks (cf. B). The proposal to make a distich of the two verses by reading

אם-על-פיר ירים קנו  
ויתלנן על-שן-סלע ומצודה :

*At thy command doth he set high his nest,  
And lodge him on tooth of crag and fastness ?*

makes the whole section (verses 26-30) refer to the hawk (נץ) only. But v. 30<sup>b</sup> is characteristic of eagles and vultures (נשר) rather than the hawks (cf. 9<sup>26</sup> Pr 30<sup>17,19</sup> Mt 24<sup>28</sup>). Moreover, st. ii in the suggested form is metrically overweighted.

v. 29. *searcheth*: חפר, lit. *diggeth* (v. 21, 3<sup>21</sup> Gn 21<sup>30</sup> Jos 2<sup>3</sup>). *see far away*: or *to a distance*; *to what is far off*: cf. v. 25, 28<sup>24</sup> 36<sup>3</sup>: > *behold it* (i.e. the food) *afar off*. So ט; but טב from afar (πόρρωθεν, de longe) *his eyes look out* (σκαπεύουσιν, prospiciunt).

v. 30. B *Pulli eius lambent sanguinem* (om. 1 ad init. recte: dittogr.); ט *لحم* *lap or lick up*; י *נמען* *sip or suck in* (cf. v. 24); טא *ἐστομ-σμένον*. Hence it is proposed to read ילעלע (√ לע or לעע) pro יעלעו אπ. But lapping, licking, and sucking are not bird-actions. We might read ילעלע *swallow or gorge* (20<sup>15</sup> al.); or ילעע (cf. ט: Ob 16 is dub.) or ילעלע, in the sense of drinking. (√ לע = LAG = Sumerian 𒂗 NAG *drink, give drink*, Assyr. šalû, šagû.) ט φύρονται ἐν αἵματι, *are mixed (or wetted, defiled) with blood* (= ילכשו acc. to ט 7<sup>5</sup>).

St. ii מ הוא ים ובאשר חללים *And where the slain are, there is he* is terse and vivid, but not a close parallel to st. i. The letters sufficiently resemble ובשר חללים *And are glutted with the flesh of the slain* (cf. Ez 39<sup>17-20</sup>). Possibly ישאפו *are fain for*: cf. 5<sup>5</sup> 7<sup>2</sup>.

Chapter 40. v. 1. *Iahvah*: ט + δ θεός = אלהים (Gn 2<sup>4</sup> al.); app. combining a suggested substitute with the original reading. The verse is starred in Hex. Cod. 1 (Kenn. 431) om. The Versions make verses 1-5 the conclusion of chap. 39; which is certainly more suitable (cf. 40<sup>1,3</sup> c 38<sup>1,3</sup>).

v. 2. The pointing of מ seems questionable. If the meaning of st. i be *Will the caviller (or faultfinder OL) still contend with Shaddai ?* (Dr), why the Infin. Abs. (הִרְבֵּ), so used nowhere else in the book, instead of the usual Impf. (הִרְבֵּ)? And why is עוד *still* (or some equivalent word) omitted? Moreover, the אπ. יסור *reprover* is very dubious. ט Μη κτίσιν μετὰ Ἰκανοῦ ἐκκαλινεῖ; = הִרְבַּ עַם-יִשְׂרָאֵל יִסֹּר. This might mean *Shall strife with Shaddai end ?* (Am 6<sup>1</sup>). Cf. also B *Numquid qui contendit cum Deo* (= רב Is 45<sup>9</sup>) *tam facile conquiescit ?* (= יסור *turns aside, gives up*). I appears to have read הִרְבַּ עַם-יִשְׂרָאֵל יִסֹּר *Will he who contendeth with Shaddai be admonished ?* This is rather attractive; esp. if we read for

st. ii יַעֲנֶה וּמוֹכִיחַ אֱלֹהִים *And is he who chideth Eloah answered?* ⑤ *Many are the counsels of God* (= רַב עֲמֻשָּׁרִי סוֹר | *And he who reproveth God giveth answer* (= וּמוֹכִיחַ אֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶה). St. ii ③ is lit. *The reprover of Eloah should answer it* (viz. the argument of chaps. 38-39). ①② *should answer Him*. But it yields a better parallel to treat st. ii also as Interrogative (cf. ⑥ ἐλέγχων δὲ θεὸν ἀποκριθήσεται αὐτῇ;). The original form of the verse may have been

הרב עמ־שרי יוסר  
ומוכיח אלוה יענה:

*Is the disputer with Shaddai corrected | And the critic of Eloah answered?* (For רַב עֲמֻשָּׁרִי see 9<sup>3</sup> 13<sup>19</sup> 23<sup>6</sup>; and for יַעֲנֶה Ni. 11<sup>2</sup> 19<sup>7</sup>.) The meaning will be: Are you now satisfied, or do you require further proof of the folly of arguing against the Supreme?

v. 4. *I am little*: or *light, slight, insignificant, of small weight or account*. The √קל may be recognized in שִׁקֵּל, ③, ④, ⑤: *lift up, weigh (make hang)*, Assy. *šaḡālu*. The primary Root is probably the Sum. ①②③ GAL *to lift (našû)*. 'Light' = easy to lift.

⑥ τί ἐτι ἐγὼ κρίνομαι, νοουθετούμενος καὶ ἐλέγχων Κύριον ἀκούων τοιαῦτα οὐθὲν ὦν; (= שְׁמַע כְּהֵן קִלְתִּי | יוֹסֵר וּמוֹכִיחַ יְהוָה | לִמָּחָה עוֹרְפִי רַב, app. prefixing a variant rendering of v. 2 to קִלְתִּי. For the equations cf. 13<sup>19</sup> Pr 9<sup>7</sup>).

v. 5. *Once . . . And twice*: Ps 62<sup>12</sup> cf. ch. 33<sup>14</sup>. *repeat it*: אֶשָּׁנָה pro answer. The vb. תִּנָּא שְׁנָה Assy. *šanû, do (or say) twice, repeat*, is of the same origin as שְׁנַיִם *two*, and is also cogn. c תאם *twin* (Intern. Trilit. from TAM=TAN=SHAN); cf. the Sum. TAM, TAN, DAM, *brother, companion, spouse*, and TAB (= TAM), *companion, twin, to double, repeat*; and the Chinese shwan, shan, san, *to bear twins, shwang, two, a pair*, and the old Egyptian sen, *two, sen, brother, companion*.

Some would transpose verses 4-5 to precede 42<sup>2</sup>; and cancelling v. 6 (= 38<sup>1</sup>) and v. 7 (= 38<sup>3</sup>), they would transfer verses 8-14 to follow immediately on v. 2. Considering the manifold uncertainties of the text, we prefer the traditional arrangement.

v. 6. *out of the stormwind*: leg. מִן־הַפֶּעַרָּה ut 38<sup>1</sup>. ⑥ ἐκ τοῦ νέφους = מִן־הָעָב (38<sup>4</sup> al. Ps 104<sup>3</sup>) or מִן־הָעָנָן (38<sup>6</sup> al.). Cf. 38<sup>1</sup>. ② *out of the clouds*. For *cloud* and *whirlwind* combined in Theophany see Ez 1<sup>4</sup> and cf. Na 1<sup>3</sup>.

v. 7. *like a man*: so וְכַנְבָּר ⑥ ὡς ἀνὴρ, ③ sicut vir; but ① הֵיךְ גִּבְרָא = כַּנְבָּר *like a mighty man* or *champion*, and so ⑤.

St. ii should perhaps be אֶשְׁאַלְךָ וְאַתָּה הוֹדִיעֵנִי. So also 42<sup>4</sup>. (Or 'אש' וְהוֹדִיעַ *I will ask, and teach thou me wisdom*. Cf. Is 28<sup>9</sup> 40<sup>14</sup>.) Cf. ⑥ σὺ δέ μοι ἀποκρίναί

v. 8. הָאֵף Gn 18<sup>13</sup> ch. 34<sup>17</sup>. ⑥ Μῆ = אַל; but cf. 15<sup>4</sup> אֶת־אֵתָה תִּפְרַר יִרְאָה ⑤; but cf. 15<sup>4</sup> אֶת־אֵתָה תִּפְרַר יִרְאָה ⑤. For תִּפְרַר *annul*,



make void, frustrate, cf. also 5<sup>12</sup> Is 14<sup>27</sup>. Eyob had all along affirmed his own innocence, and maintained that God was dealing with him unjustly (cf. esp. 27<sup>2-6</sup>). On current theories he could not logically do otherwise. (ט softens הרשיעני *dost thou make me wicked*, i.e. *condemn me as guilty of injustice*, 9<sup>20</sup> 10<sup>2</sup> 15<sup>6</sup> al., into *thinkest thou that I have dealt at random or perversely—ἄλλως—with thee?*)

v. 9. *Hast thou*; reading נא Num? pro ונא Or hast thou ..., as the second member of a Disjunctive Question (*Utrum—An*); cf. 34<sup>17</sup>. ו Et si habes... implies ונא; so also ונאין. But ונא Hast thou? arm: ונא as five times in Job. ונא once (31<sup>22</sup>); cf. Aram. ונא.

v. 10. *grandeur*: נבזה loftiness. ו δύνανται = ונבזה (12<sup>13</sup> +): so ו in sublime erigere = ונבזה Imperat. (pts.).

v. 11. 'Scatter the outbursts (or overflows) of thine anger' is strange. If lightnings be intended (OL), וברקי אפך or וברקים בנאפך would be more natural. For ונאין see 37<sup>11</sup> 38<sup>24</sup> Ps 18<sup>15</sup>. ו Pour out (אשור) the fury of thy wrath suggests ונאין (Ho 5<sup>10</sup> Is 42<sup>25</sup> La 4<sup>11</sup>, ch. 12<sup>21</sup> al.) = ונא misread backwards (?). But ו Disperge superbos in furore tuo | Et respiciens omnem arrogantem humilia gives a better parallel. ו is peculiar: ἀπό-στειλον δὲ ἀγγέλους ὄργῃ = ונאין מלאכים באפך (Ju 9<sup>31</sup> et saepius): cf. Ps 78<sup>49</sup> ונאין עברה ונאין אפך חרון אפך עברה ונאין. St. ii πάντα (ὁ πάντα rectius) δὲ ὑβριστὴν ταπεινώσον = ונאין sine ראה et 12<sup>1</sup> et Suff. Verbi ונאין השפיל ונאין וכל נאה השפיל which some have adopted. But ונאין השפיל ונאין improves the rhythm and gives a more lively sense: *And every proud one—bring him low!* Did ו read ונאין (= ἀγγέλων, Ps 78<sup>25</sup>) or ונאין (Pr 25<sup>13</sup>) pro עברות in st. i? For the former, cf. 24<sup>22</sup> 34<sup>20</sup>. Scatter the mighty (or haughty; ? ונאין Ps 40<sup>5</sup>) in thine anger would be a fair parallel (cf. ו).

v. 12. ונאין repeats ונאין כל נאה (v. 11<sup>b</sup>), and 12<sup>a</sup> looks like a mere variant of 11<sup>b</sup>. The poet may have intended to lay emphasis on the overthrow of the proud. Both stichi are good metre as they stand. But ו omits 12<sup>a</sup>, and ו υπερήφανον δὲ σβέσον = ? ונאין (רע) ונאין; cf. 38<sup>16</sup> and Is 2<sup>12</sup> ונאין ונאין = ונאין (v. 11<sup>b</sup>) καὶ υπερήφανον. Instead of ונאין humble him ונאין gives ונאין and shatter him! but ו et confunde eos. St. ii ונאין α. Since a ונאין is unknown in Semitic, we must either point ונאין (Aram. ונאין; but no Aph.), or read ונאין or ונאין and crush (down) (for ונאין see 4<sup>19</sup> 6<sup>3</sup> 19<sup>2</sup> al.). The Ar. وندس = وندس pull down buildings seems apocryphal (see Lane Suppl.). where they stand: or in their place: see 34<sup>24</sup> 36<sup>20</sup> Ex 16<sup>29</sup> al. Cf. ו et contere impios in loco uo; ו And throw down the sinners in their place (בדוכתהו); ו And pulverize the guilty in their places (באתריהו). ו (haud recte) ὁσπερ παρακλῆμα = ונאין ונאין (cf. Zc 14<sup>12</sup>).

v. 13. Cf. Is 2<sup>10</sup> hide thyself in the dust! Also Gn 35<sup>4</sup> Ex 2<sup>12</sup> (hide = bury). It is difficult to believe that ונאין can be correct ad fin. (cf. טמא).

ad init.). The context suggests that 'She'ol, the dark and hidden abode of the dead' (Dr), is meant. Cf. *Et facies eorum demerge in foveam*; *And their faces imprison in the dust!* (سَحَسَهُمْ دَبْسَلًا). *And their faces* כְּבוֹשׁ בְּטוֹמָעַת = מ? *τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἀτιμίας ἐμπελησον* = (La 3<sup>15</sup>) *וּפְנֵיהֶם מִלֵּא קֶלֶחַן* or *וּפְנֵיהֶם הַשְׁבַּע בְּקֶלֶחַן*. Cf. also 10<sup>16</sup>. We might read *וּפְנֵיהֶם הִתְבָּא (חֲבֵא?)* *And their faces hide thou in darkness* (or *בְּשֵׂאוֹל* in *She'ol* or *בְּאַבְדּוֹן* in *Abaddon* 26<sup>6</sup> al.); or, keeping *חֲבֹשׁ*, *And their faces bind about* (= enwrap, shroud) *with darkness* (בְּעֶלְמָה? בְּעַפְתָּה?). See Ez 16<sup>10</sup> for the constr. NE 127 *kullat ténisēti itūra ana tūni*, 'All mankind had returned to clay' may perhaps suggest *חֲבֵא בְטִיט* *conceal in clay*.

v. 14. St. i *וּגְמֵאֲנִי אֹרֶךְ* is metr. defective (two stresses only). Leg. *כִּי־אֲנִי נִגְמֵאֲנִי* *For then (emphat.) I also, &c.* Cf. 11<sup>15</sup> 13<sup>20</sup> 22<sup>26</sup>.

St. ii. Cf. Ps 44<sup>1b</sup> Is 59<sup>16c</sup>. The irony of this and the preceding verses appears somewhat irrelevant. Eyob has never made any such claims. That God does, in fact, always destroy the wicked (cf. vv. 11-13) had been the steady contention of the Friends. Eyob had argued from his own case that, when He pleases, He destroys good and bad alike, without difference or discrimination. The description of the hippopotamus and the crocodile (40<sup>15</sup>-41<sup>34</sup>) might very naturally follow immediately upon that of the other creatures, ch. 39; in which case 40<sup>1-14</sup> would be an editorial interpolation.

v. 15. *the riverhorse* = Gk. *hippopotamus*; the most prob. meaning of the Heb. בְּהֵמוֹת q's 'the monster-beast' or 'the super-cow' (*Plur. Intens.* of בְּהֵמָה *beast or cattle*). Ps 73<sup>22+</sup> (with which cf. ch. 7<sup>12</sup> תַּנִּין). The word has been referred to a supposed Egyptian *pehemaut*, compounded of *p the + ih ox + mw water*; but no such compound has yet been found in the Eg. monuments. *Behemoth*, ut NPr. *θηρία* *Plur. et εσθίουσιν* in st. ii (מַרְעֵי יֶאֱכַל Sing.); so *בְּעִירֵיָא*, at seq. יִיבֹל. St. i is non-metrical and prosaic: 'Lo, now, Behēmōth which I made along with thee' (*Ecce Behemoth quem feci tecum*), i.e. thy fellow creature. *ἀλλὰ ὅθ' ἰδοὺ ὅθ' θηρία παρὰ σοί* (*beside thee*) om. *אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי* recte. But corruption has gone further than the addition of this gloss. The monster would hardly be 'beside' the poet at the time of writing (*παρὰ σοί* = *beside thee*, or *apud te*, or *coram te*). The word עֶמֶךְ (prob. due to reminiscence of Ps 73<sup>22</sup> *בְּהֵמוֹת הַיָּמִי עֶמֶךְ*) may be a disguise of some other word descriptive of *בְּהֵמוֹת*; e.g. קֶנָּה (cf. Ps 68<sup>31</sup> *חַיַּת קֶנָּה the beast of the reeds* = the crocodile). We might then restore *בְּהֵמַת קֶנָּה the brute of the reeds*; no bad name for the hippopotamus. Or we might suppose *אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי* עֶמֶךְ to be a gloss on an original *מַעֲשֵׂי my work*. Possibly, however, the altered word was *עָלָה coming up* (scil. from the water; cf. Gn 41<sup>2</sup> Je 49<sup>19</sup>); *הִנֵּה־נָא בְּהֵמוֹת עָלָה* *Lo, now, the riverhorse cometh up!* presenting a picture of the huge animal climbing up from the river-bed to graze on

the banks: cf. st. ii *Grass, like the oxen, he eateth* (Is 11<sup>b</sup>). The hippopotamus, we are told, still abounds in many of the river-courses of Africa; and its food is chiefly rank grasses and aquatic plants. It can walk quite rapidly under water along the bottom of rivers; and climb up steep banks and precipitous ravines with ease (EB. s. v. *Hippopotamus*).

v. 16. in the *thrus* בְּשֵׁרֵירִי (אַπ.); but ט' ἐπ' ὀμφαλοῦ = 𐤔 in umbilico; so בִּפְרֵת דְּכַרְיִסְיָהּ. (𐤔 give only *and his strength in his side(s)* for the whole verse.) Cf. Ez 16<sup>a</sup> שֶׁרֶךְ *thy navel-string*; Ct 7<sup>a</sup> שֶׁרֶךְ ὁ ὀμφαλός σου. The context suggests the meaning *sineus, muscles, or thews* for this אַπ. The שֶׁרֶךְ seems to denote *hardness, firmness, strength*; but the original idea may have been that of *binding, being bound*, as in the case of other words denoting strength; cf. שֶׁרֶךְ Assy. *šaršarratu*, 'chain' (Sum. SHER, *to bind*).

v. 17. ט' ἔστησεν οὐρὰν ὡς κυπάρισσον, *He set up a tail as a cypress*; 𐤔 Stringit (*he draws tight*) caudam suam quasi cedrum; but 𐤔 בִּפְפָּה *he bends*; 𐤔 אָקַף *he sets up or erects, &c.* The meaning of the אַפּ. יִתְפַּץ is far from clear. OL *he bendeth down (extendeth down stiffly) his tail like a cedar* (comparing Ar. حَفَضَ *he lowered a thing*: e.g. a bird its wings). But why *like a cedar*? The cedar is a tall (Am 2<sup>a</sup>) straight tree, with widespreading branches; a frequent symbol of majesty and strength. It seems a ridiculous exaggeration to compare the short thick tail of the hippopotamus, with its few tufts of hair at the end, to such a stately tree. Such a comparison suggests a mythically gigantic creature rather than an animal actually existing in ancient or modern times; but there is nothing mythical in the rest of the section, nor any touch incongruous with a poetical description of the hippopotamus. Lane, however, registers another meaning of حَفَضَ, viz. *he remained, stayed, or abode in a place*. Regarding יִתְפַּץ as an Arabism in this sense, we may render: *His tail is as rigid (firm or inflexible) as a cedar*. An Intrans. > a Trans. verb is required by parallelism; and the simile ceases to appear inapt, in view of the short, round, stiff-looking tail of the animal (see the engravings in Smith's BD).

St. ii. *The muscles or sinews* (גִּיד 10<sup>11</sup> Gn 32<sup>38</sup>; cf. Sum. GID, *long, extend*) of his thighs are interlaced or woven together, close-knit (leg. פִּתְחָיו יִשְׁרְנוּ pro פִּתְחָיו יִשְׁרְנוּ; Qr פִּתְחָיו). 𐤔 nervi testicularum eius perplexi sunt; cf. 𐤔 *The veins of his testicles are intertwined* (וְהַיָּסָדִים וְהַיָּסָדִים see 𐤔 Le 21<sup>20</sup> פִּתְחָיו = אִישָׁן); but such a fact would hardly be open to observation of the living animal. We must therefore accept the equation of the אַפּ. פִּתְחָיו with the Ar. فَخْدُ thigh. 𐤔 renders: *And erected are the sinews of his loins* (فَخْدَايَا وَفَخْدَايَا: according to PS فَخْدَا means *testiculus; femora; venae iugulares*!). For שֶׁרֶךְ = Aram. שֶׁרֶךְ, see La 1<sup>14</sup> Hithp. שֶׁרֶךְ Pi. Je 2<sup>28</sup> is of the same origin. The prim. Rt. is seen

in אָרְנָא *weave*.  $\Theta$  τὰ δὲ νεῦρα αὐτοῦ ( $\Theta^A + \omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$  σχοινία) συμπέλεκται = (פְּחָלָיִם) וְיָרִיו שְׁרָנִי *And his sinews are intertwined like ropes*.

v. 18. *tubes*: or *pipes*: אַפִּיק: see 6<sup>16</sup> 12<sup>21</sup> 41<sup>7</sup>.

*lengths of wrought iron*. As the hollow bones containing the marrow are poet. called 'bronze (or 'brazen') pipes', so the solid ones (ribs, &c.) are *beaten lengths of iron* (? מַמְטוּל בְּרוֹז; cf. Ar.  $\text{مَطْرُول}$  *iron beaten into a long shape*; i.e. forged into bars: see Lane): another Arabism. מַמְטוּל *like a beaten length of iron*; but why the Particle of Comparison ( $\Theta$  om.; cf. st. i), and why not Plur. בְּמַמְטוּלִי (ut אַפִּיקִי st. i)? If we might read some word denoting *rods*, e.g. מַטּוֹת or even מַקְלוֹת instead of מַמְטוּל, we should be rid of this isolated Arabism. מַמְטוּל *his bones* (Pr 17<sup>22</sup>; Aram. גַּרְם = Heb. עֲצָם) may perhaps mean here *his limbs*, i.e. his legs.  $\Theta$  *His ribs or sides* (πλευραὶ = צַלְעוֹתָיו Gn 2<sup>21</sup>) *are brazen ribs* | *And his backbone cast-iron* (σίδηρος χυτός = מוֹצֵק בְּרוֹז cf. 38<sup>38</sup> 1 K 7<sup>16</sup>). מוֹצֵק or מוֹצֵק seems at least preferable to מַמְטוּל (hardness and rigidity being the idea > flexibility).  $\mathfrak{B}$  *Cartilago illius quasi laminae ferreae, His gristle is, as it were, iron plates*. But  $\mathfrak{X}$  *His limbs (אֲבָרָיו) are strong as tanks? (פַּצִּירִי) of brass* | *His bones are as a load (הֵיךְ מְטָלָא) or bars (מַמְטוּלָא) of iron*: cf. 1 Sa 17<sup>8</sup>  $\mathfrak{X}$  מַמְטוּל = מַמְטוּל כִּירוֹן *lance*. מַמְטוּלָא (Regia מַמְטוּלָא) connects מַמְטוּל with נִטְל (cf. גַּמְל *burden* Pr 27<sup>8</sup>) improbably.  $\Theta$  *His bones are strong as brass and as iron* simply evades the difficulties of the verse.

v. 19. *prime fruit*: the first product of El's creative activity (Dr). For 'ראשית ררכ' see Pr 8<sup>22</sup> and cf. Gn 49<sup>3</sup>. Instead of רַרְכִּי leg. fort. רַרְכִּי *my Way* metr. grat. (st. i has four stresses); cf. 41<sup>4</sup> (1st Pers.) and 26<sup>14</sup> note.  $\Theta$  τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ πλάσματος (al. ὁδῶν) Κυρίου;  $\mathfrak{B}$  Ipse est principium viarum Dei (= מַמְטוּל);  $\Theta$  *He is the head of all the creatures of God*;  $\mathfrak{X}$  = מַמְטוּל.  $\Theta\Theta$  paraphrase רַרְכִּי (or perhaps read בְּרָא Gn 5<sup>1</sup>).

St. ii is more difficult, and certainly corrupt. מַמְטוּל יָגֵשׁ חֶרְבוֹ *Let Him who made him* (but יָגֵשׁ = עָשָׂה is a solecism) *bring near His sword!* is obvious nonsense.<sup>1</sup> 41<sup>25(39)}</sup> מַמְטוּל לְבַלְיָחַת has suggested the correction מַמְטוּל לְנִשְׁחָת *He who was made master of his fellow(creature)s*. The hippopotamus might perhaps be regarded as lord (נִשְׁחָת *driver* 31<sup>8</sup>) of the amphibia, hardly of the land-animals; but what then of the 'leviathan', which is also an amphibious creature, and so far one of his חֶבְרִים?  $\mathfrak{B}$  Qui fecit eum applicabit (?) gladium eius = מַמְטוּל; but  $\mathfrak{X}$  מַמְטוּל יָקַרְבַּת מַמְטוּלָא *He who made him, let His sword come nigh!* (יָגֵשׁ);  $\Theta$  (God) *Who made him, that he might make war* (לְנִשְׁחָת מַמְטוּלָא).  $\Theta$  is more helpful: πεποιημένον ἐνκαταπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ (41<sup>26b</sup>) =

<sup>1</sup> The rendering 'He who made him that he might apply his sword' (i.e. his sharp teeth or tusks which shear off the grass as neatly as a scythe) is little better. As a version of the Hebrew, it is dubious if not impossible, not to mention its grotesque incongruity with st. i.

לְשַׁחַק לְרֵבּוֹ? (עָשִׂיוּ) הָעָשִׂיוּ *Made for a jest to His Great Ones* (i. e. the Angels? or perhaps לְחֻבְרֵי *to His Companions*, in the same unusual sense). Ps 104<sup>26</sup> לְשַׁחֲקֵבּוֹ לְוִיתָן זֶה יִצְרָתָהּ *The leviathan whom Thou didst fashion to sport with* may very well have been in the poet's mind. (The comp. vb. ἐγκαταπαίττειν only here and 41<sup>25</sup>; the simple form παίττειν = שָׁחַק v. 29 and eleven times al.; cf. ἐμπαίττειν = צַחַק Gn 39<sup>14,17</sup>.) Possibly he wrote הָעָשִׂיוּ לְשַׁחֲקֵי בּוֹ *whom I made to sport withal*; or if מ is right in st. i, עָשָׂה לְשַׁחֲקֵי בּוֹ *He made him to sport withal*. The metre would be improved by reading: הוּא רֵאשִׁית דְּרֵבּוֹ | אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה לְשַׁחֲקֵי-בּוֹ: *He was the firstfruits of His Way*; | *Eloah made him to play with*. Cf. v. 9; Pr 8<sup>22</sup>.

v. 20. מ lit. *For* bûl (supposed = יָבוּל *produce* 20<sup>28</sup> Ju 6<sup>4</sup>) *the mountains bear for him* (cf. Ps 72<sup>3</sup>) | *And all the living creatures of the field sport or play* (v. 29, Zc 8<sup>5</sup>) *there*: 'without fear', explains Driver, 'because the monster lives only upon grass'. But this last fact has already been stated, v. 15<sup>b</sup>; and 'the mountains' are not the usual feeding-grounds of the hippopotamus, nor the playground of 'the beasts of the field'.

The two stichi hang loosely together, without any real parallelism of ideas. It seems possible that the א.פ. בּוּל = Assyr. būlu, beasts, four-footed animals, wild and tame; e.g. būl šēri umam šēri . . . ušēlī, 'The cattle of the field (and) the wild beasts of the field . . . I put aboard' (NE xi. 86). Then בּוּל הַרִים will be a good parallel to חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה in st. ii; and if we point יִשְׁתָּאוּ (or read יִשְׁתָּאוּ cf. Gn 24<sup>21</sup> + לָהּ), we get the excellent sense *The cattle of the hills gaze at him* (in wonder), which is naturally followed by *And all the beasts of the field are astounded* (חָשַׁם 17<sup>8</sup>; יִשְׁחָקוּ מֵ; perhaps from v. 19<sup>b</sup>; or יִשְׁתּוּמִם Is 63<sup>5</sup> 59<sup>16</sup>). The land-animals are amazed at the sight of the monster coming up out of the water and grazing on the banks of the river.

Ἡ ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ' ὄρος ἀκρότομον = (ה)חלמיש; cf. 20<sup>22</sup> 28<sup>19</sup> Dt 8<sup>15</sup> ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου = 'מצור החל' | ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράπους ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ = יִשְׁמַח בְּשִׂמְחָתוֹ כָּל-חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה. The word τάρταρος occurs nowhere else in either OT or NT (cf. ταρταρώσας 2 Pe 2<sup>4</sup>). Is the text of Ἡ sound, or is there a trace of mythology here? (For χαρμονή = שִׂמְחָה see 20<sup>5</sup> τετραπ. = חֲמִיָּה Nu 35<sup>3</sup>). א = מֵ (בּוּל = עֶלְלָה); מ Huic montes *herbas* (בּוּל pro יָבוּל?) ferunt | omnes bestiae agri ludent ibi (= מֵ om. 1 ad init.). Ἡ *And the multitude* (כִּי-רַבּוֹת pro יָרֵב) *of mountains bear* (sc. fruit? מַעֲבָרִים) *for him* | *And every beast of the field under his shadow lies down* (חַתַּח צֶלֶל + יִשְׁכְּבוּ from v. 21).

v. 21. צִלְמֵי thorny lotus-trees (Zizyphus lotus) occurs again in the next verse. Ἡ ὑπὸ παντοδαπὰ δένδρα κοιμᾶται. Cf. v. 22, μεγάλα δένδρα (another guess at the meaning of צִלְמֵי?). Leg. fort. מְצוּלָה the deep (water) pro צִלְמֵי; cf. 41<sup>23</sup> Zc 10<sup>11</sup> (of Nile) Ps 69<sup>3,16</sup> (of a swamp), and בְּצֵה (8<sup>11</sup>) *marsh or swamp* ad fin. vs. Possible also seems אֲבָהָה (9<sup>26</sup>) or אֲבָהָה the papyrus (8<sup>11</sup>); cf. Ἡ παρὰ πάνυρον, st. ii, and the Egyptian hunting-scene

(Wilkinson, iii. 71). But the former is preferable.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Sub *umbra* dormit (=  $\text{לַל}$  vel fort.  $\text{לַלְלָה}$ );  $\text{לַלְלָהּ תַּחַת הַצִּלּוֹת}$  Under the shadows he lieth. (An objection to joining  $\mathfrak{D}$  v. 20 with v. 21 is that it would overload the stichus metrically.)

St. ii  $\mathfrak{G}$  παρὰ πάπυρον καὶ κάλαμον καὶ βούτομον. In 8<sup>11</sup> βούτομος =  $\text{חֲבִי}$  reeds or rushes (Gn 41<sup>2</sup>). It perhaps denotes the flowering rush (*Bulotus*). In Gn 49<sup>2</sup>  $\mathfrak{G}$  gives  $\text{ὄχθη}$ , bank of a river; and it might well be that the Heb. word is akin to  $\text{חָא}$  which is common in Assy. in the sense of side or bank or shore (*ah Puratti*; *ahī tāmtim*), as well as in that of brother (qs side-one). Παρά suggests that  $\mathfrak{G}$  read בסתר as Aram. בסטר Beside. Κάλαμος = קנה (Assyr. qanû, Sum. GIN, GI) as elsewhere (sixteen times), cf. Is 19<sup>6</sup> καλάμου καὶ παπύρου = קנה וסוף (*ibid.*<sup>7</sup> καὶ τὸ ἄχιν τὸ χλωρόν = and the green  $\text{חֲבִי}$ ;  $\mathfrak{M}$  corrupt).  $\mathfrak{B}$  in secreto calami et in locis humentibus =  $\text{חֲבִי}$ .  $\text{חֲבִי חֲבִי}$  (=  $\text{חֲבִי}$ ,  $\text{חֲבִי}$ ) interpr.  $\text{חֲבִי}$ .

v. 22.  $\mathfrak{M}$  is again dubious. Lit. The lotus-trees screen him, his shade; but  $\text{לִם בַּצִּלּוֹ}$  instr. with their shade would have been more normal (cf. La 3<sup>44</sup> Ps 91<sup>4</sup>). Perhaps we should read  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  for  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$ , in the sense of when lying down or resting (cf. Assy. *çalûlu*) or being submerged or immersed in the water (cf. Ex 15<sup>10</sup>): The lote-trees screen him lying down; which agrees with st. ii.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Prolegunt umbrae (=  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$ ) umbram eius; but  $\mathfrak{G}$  σκιαζονται δὲ ἐν ( $\mathfrak{G}^A$  om. ἐν) αὐτῷ δένδρα μεγάλα =  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$   $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  (see note on v. 21). We should have expected σκιαζουσιν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῷ κτλ. (An leg. σκιαζοντα δὲ ἐστιν αὐτῷ κτλ.?) But the sequel σὺν ῥαδάμοις καὶ κλώνες ἄγρου—better ἄγρου  $\mathfrak{G}^{McA}$ —shows that  $\mathfrak{G}$  really meant And great trees with branches, and boughs of the willow—the *vilex agnus castus*—are overshadowed by him; supposing the monster to be of a fabulous height and size. Cf. Le 23<sup>40</sup> ἄγρου κλάδους (= κλώνας) ἐκ χειμάρρου =  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$   $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  willows or poplars of the wady. For ῥαδάμους (= ὀρόδαμους) vid. 8<sup>16</sup> 14<sup>7</sup> 15<sup>32</sup>.  $\mathfrak{G}$  may therefore imply something like

$\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  ( $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$ )  
:  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$

And the thickets of lote-trees (or terebinths) are shadowed (Ne 13<sup>19</sup>) by him | And the poplars of the wady.  $\mathfrak{G}$  Shadows (cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$ ) encircle him | And willows of the wady encircle him ( $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  bis).

v. 23.  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  12<sup>14</sup> 23<sup>8</sup>. Instead of  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  oppress (10<sup>3</sup>) we might perhaps read  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  overflow (Jo 2<sup>24</sup> 4<sup>13</sup>); cf.  $\mathfrak{G}$  εὖν γένηται πλήμμυρα, If a flood arise. Neither  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  run, scil. upon him (surely  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  must be expressed Is 33<sup>4</sup> Jo 2<sup>9</sup>), nor  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  sink (Am 9<sup>5</sup> of the fall of the Nile) is prob. (Would the fall of the Nile alarm the animal?) Cf.  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$   $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  If the river leap up or rise.  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$   $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$  =  $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$ ;  $\mathfrak{B}$  Ecce absorbebit fluvium, 'Lo, he will swallow down a river ( $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$ ?). 'The River' ( $\text{לִם צוֹלֵל}$ ) is prob. the Nile, as in Is 19<sup>6</sup>. St. ii is metr. too long (four stresses).

יָרָה, ו' ὁ Ἰορδάνης (sic ㉔), may easily be a marginal gloss on נָהָר. The correct gloss would have been יָאֵר (Is 19<sup>7</sup>) or הַיָּאֵר *the Nile*. The hippopotamus was unknown in the Jordan valley. For בָּרַח *break or burst forth*, see 38<sup>8</sup>. ו' here προσκρόνσει, *will strike against* (יָנַע or יָנַח); ㉔ influat (cf. ㉔ גָּיַר *floweth*).

v. 24. St. i is metr. short (only two stresses), and is obviously incomplete as regards the sense. ㉔ בעיניו יקחנו lit. *With his eyes he will take him*. RV (= AV marg.) is, as Driver says, contrary to Heb. idiom. It is likely that מִי־הוּא (an emphatic *Who* ?) has fallen out after the similar letters פִּיהוּ (v. 23 end), and that בעיניו is a corruption of בְּעֵינַיִם (cf. note on 5<sup>5</sup> Pr 22<sup>5</sup>) or בַּצְנוֹת (Am 4<sup>2</sup>) *fish-hooks or barbs* (✓ צָנַן is prob. cogn. c שָׁנָן *sharpen*, שָׁן *looth*); or בְּצַמִּים *with a gin* (but see note on 18<sup>3</sup>; בַּמְצוֹר *with a hunting-net* ? 19<sup>6</sup>): cf. בְּמוֹקְשִׁים (ו) st. ii. ו' In his eye will he receive him (it) ? = ㉔. ㉔ In oculis eius quasi hamo capiet eum (= ㉔ + explanatory addition). ㉔ ㉔ read בְּעֵינָיו pro ㉔ בעיניו: ㉔ In his clouds will he take him | And in his net (כַּחֲבִית־יָאֵר) will he be held or caught (יִלְאֹס) ? ㉔ In a cloud wilt thou take him | And in a net wilt thou hold him ? ㉔ בחוקליא ינקוב נחיריה *With snares will he pierce through his nose* ? = ㉔ c אִפּוֹ recte pro אִף ad fin. ㉔ Et in sudibus (*stakes*) perforabit nares eius. St. ii is suspicious, if only because of באִפּוֹ and חֲקוֹב in v. 26. ㉔ suggest (2<sup>10</sup>) יִבְמֹקְשִׁים (ת) קְדָמָנוּ or יִבְמֹקְשִׁים (ת) קְדָמָנוּ (30<sup>27</sup> Ps 18<sup>8</sup> מוקשי קרמוני מוקשי); and the verse may perhaps be restored thus:

מִי־הוּא בַּצְנִים יִקְחֵנוּ  
בְּמוֹקְשִׁים מִי יִקְדָּמֵנוּ

*Who with fish-hooks can take him, | And with snares (or baits) who confront him ? (or receive him ?)*. It is, however, possible that the verse is a marg. variant or even comment on v. 26, and refers to the capture of the crocodile: *In his eyes he pierceth him* (יִקְבְּנוּ ?) or if we keep יִקַּח *he taketh him*; cf. Pr 6<sup>26</sup>); *With baits he pierceth his nose*. Cf. Hdt. ii. 70 ἐπειὰν νῶτον ὑὸς δαλεάσῃ περὶ ἄγκιστρον κτλ. After swallowing the bait, the reptile is dragged ashore by the rope attached to it. Attracted by the cries of a sucking-pig on the shore, the crocodile meets the floating bait (within which a hook is concealed) as he swims towards the bank. When he is dragged to land, the hunter smears his eyes with mud, and he is then easily dispatched. The marginal note might conceivably refer to this procedure, rather than to spearing in the eye (cf. ㉔): *Through his eyes he takes him, &c.* (= ㉔ c אִפּוֹ pro אִף ad fin.). At the present day the Nubians harpoon the hippopotamus, securing the rope round a tree; or catch the poor creature in covered pitfalls, or by means of a sort of booby-trap.

בְּעֵינָיו cannot mean *in his own sight* (cf. Pr 1<sup>17</sup>) = *though he be on the watch* (EB). It must be instrumental, like the parallel בְּמוֹקְשִׁים. Nor is

בְּשִׁנָּיו a suitable substitute (וְהוּא בְּשִׁנָּיו יִקְחֵהוּ *Who will take him by the teeth*); for the Heb. supposed would rather mean *Who will capture him* with (instr.) *his* (i.e. the captor's) *teeth* (cf. Pr 6<sup>25</sup>), and the idea of seizing the animal, whether hippopotamus or crocodile, by his teeth (וְיִאָּחֲזֵהוּ 18<sup>9</sup>), in order to cope with or capture him, is not likely to have occurred to the poet or to any sane writer.

v. 25. Chap. 41 begins here in AV. For לִיָּתָן 'Leviathan', here certainly the crocodile of the Nile (described side by side with the hippopotamus, as in Hdt. ii. 68-71), see 3<sup>8</sup>. The word is possibly an old dual of לִיָּה *wreath, circlet*—לִיָּתָן = לִיָּתָן—meaning *Double-coils, Coil upon Coil*, and would thus suggest an animal of the serpent kind, and might easily gather mythical associations; cf. Ps 74<sup>14</sup> (104<sup>26</sup> the 'Sea-serpent', probably a huge decapod or cuttlefish) Is 27<sup>1</sup>.

*Canst thou draw up*: leg. הִתְמַשֵּׁךְ (מ + הִ Part. Interrog.) c Cod. Kenn. 157. Certainly not הִתְמַשֵּׁךְ from v. 24 ad fin. For the verb cf. Gn 37<sup>28</sup>. *Et An extrahere poteris Leviathan hamo | et fune ligabis linguam eius?* Ἐ δέξῃς δὲ δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ κτλ. *Will thou take the Dragon* (תִּנֵּן לְסֵטָן Gn 1<sup>21</sup> Is 27<sup>1</sup>) *with a net*? A δράκων is a big snake, either real or fabulous (one with three heads springing from a single neck is described *Il. xi. 39 f.*). St. ii *And with a cord canst thou sink* (pull or press down OL RV) *his tongue*? So מ lit. The cord, of course, is attached to the hook. This is not satisfactory. The ancients supposed that the crocodile had no tongue; that organ in these reptiles being attached all round to the bottom of the mouth (EB., s.v. *Crocodile*). The teeth and sawlike tail are their most formidable weapons. We might perhaps read עַל־שִׁנָּיו תִּקְשֹׁרֶם *And canst thou bind cords on his teeth*? (v. 29 Gn 28<sup>38</sup>). Others would justify תִּשְׁקֹרֶץ by reference to the Samaritan use of the Rt. (וְצִיָּה *bind*); but this does not seem prob., as the verb is not isolated in Heb. (cf. e.g. Ez 32<sup>14</sup>). תִּשְׁקֹרֶץ would be possible in the same sense (Gn 22<sup>9</sup>). *Ἐ περιθήσεις* (Ἐ δὲ εὐσμήσεις) δὲ φορβεῖν περὶ ῥίνα αὐτοῦ (= אָפֹה from v. 24 fin.). Cf. Pr 7<sup>3</sup> קָשָׁרָם = περίθου αὐτούς (Ἐ σύνδησον). *With a cord will thou take him* (אָפֹה as in st. i) *by his tongue*? (perhaps reading תִּשְׁקֹרֶץ); *And with a cord canst thou bore through* (תִּקְרֶץ) *his tongue*? *Et fune ligabis linguam eius?*

v. 26. *a rushen rope or line*; lit. *a rush*, as Is 58<sup>5</sup> (where Ἐ κρίκος, *a ring* or *nose-ring*, as here). *Numquid pones circulum in naribus eius?* *Dost thou put a bridle in his mouth?* (فَهْ فِيْهِ حَصْبَه); perhaps due to reminiscence of Is 37<sup>29</sup>. *Canst thou put a hook* (אָוֶנְקִיָּה = ὄγκινος, *uncinus*) *in his nose*? *Ἐ's ring in his nostril* would seem to be for the purpose of leading him about, or perhaps rather for ornament; cf. Ἐ st. ii *And with an armlet will thou pierce his lip*? (ψελίω δὲ τρυπήσεις τὸ χεῖλος αὐτοῦ; = *Aut armilla perforabis maxillam eius?* but Ἐ χαλινῶ, *with a bridle*; cf. Is 37<sup>29</sup>). Possibly Ἐ may have



been thinking of the Egyptian custom of adorning the tame crocodiles kept in the temples of Thebes and lake Moeris with eardrops (*ἀρτήματα*) and anklets (*ἀμφιδέαι*): see Hdt. ii. 69. But the Greek of vv. 25 f. has been influenced by reminiscence of 2 K 19<sup>28</sup> (Is 37<sup>28</sup>): καὶ θήσω τὰ ἄγκιστρα μου ἐν τοῖς μυκτῆρσίν σου καὶ χαλινὸν ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσίν σου: and the passage refers to the difficulty or impossibility of capturing the crocodile by the ordinary methods of the fisherman, owing to its gigantic strength, formidable weapons and armour, and fiercely untamable nature. The question of various readings of the Heb. text, therefore, hardly arises in this instance. (Θ δῆσεις is a corruption of θήσεις; חִיב *bramble* 2 K 14<sup>9</sup> should prob. be חֶב *hook or ring*, Is 37<sup>29</sup>; so eight codd. Kenn. י as ית: נְיִילִיָּב *with a thorn*; עֹלֵלָב *in his leap or springing*: cf. מְעֵלָב *spirited*?) The sense seems to be: Can you catch a crocodile with hook and line, as you would catch a fish? (V. 24 might very well follow here, if we might restore it somewhat thus:

הַבְצִמִּים תִּקְחֵנִי חַי

וּבְמוֹקְשֵׁים תִּחְזֹק בְּאָפוֹ:

*Canst thou take him alive in a trap, | And with bird-snares (Am 3<sup>6</sup>) catch him by the snout?*

v. 27. Lit. as B: Numquid multiplicabit ad te preces, aut loquetur tibi mollia: cf. Pr 15<sup>1</sup>. When caught, will he beg for mercy or release, in mild conciliatory speech?

v. 28. *Will he make (lit. cut) a covenant or contract with thee?* B Numquid feriet tecum pactum? Will he agree to conditions of perpetual service? *Will thou take him*: G B prefix *And*; making the connexion with st. i clearer. I *Will thou sell him for a working slave for ever?* But the sense of the verse seems rather to be: Will he agree to perpetual service, on condition that you spare his life?

v. 29. *a pet sparrow*. צָפּוֹר, like Assyr. *izcūru*, is simply *a bird* of any sort. Roman ladies appear to have made pets of sparrows (cf. the well-known elegy of Catullus on the death of Lesbia's sparrow, *Passer deliciae meae puellae, Quicum ludere*, &c., Carm. II, and the use of *Passer, passerculus*, as terms of endearment in Plautus); and several varieties of the bird are common in Palestine. The English name is referred by Skeat to the Teutonic base SPARWA, *to flutter*; so that, in spite of the resemblance of sound, it can hardly be related to the Heb. *ṣippōr*, Assyr. *izcūru* (= *izpāru* with Regressive Assimilation; cf. Arab. عَصْفُور), which appears to mean *whistler* (cf. Assyr. *ṣapāru*, 'whistle', 'pipe', 'twitter', 'mutter', &c.; Ar. مَفَرَّ *to whistle*, of a bird).

St. ii is metr. short (two stresses). G ἢ δῆσεις αὐτὸν ὥσπερ στρουθὶον παιδίῳ; supplies the desiderated parallel comparison: ὥσπερ στρουθίον = כְּבִתְיָעֶנָה *like an ostrich* (cf. 30<sup>26</sup> στρουθῶν, Is 34<sup>13</sup> στρουθίων). In Pr 26<sup>2</sup>

בַּצִּפּוֹר is followed by כְּדִרְוֹר like the swallow (Θ ὥσπερ . . . στρουθοί), and דִּרְוֹר is parallel to צִפּוֹר in Ps 84<sup>1</sup> also (where Θ has τρυγών, *turtledove*); perhaps, therefore, it may be read here. The context implies some captive wild bird; בִּינָה like a dove, therefore, seems less suitable, as these birds are too tame to need any 'binding' to prevent their escape. (Θ's word here παιδίον = לָנֶעֱר is due to misunderstanding a scribal abbreviation.) στρουθίον = צִפּוֹר elsewhere in Θ (seven times; e.g. Ps 84<sup>1</sup> = 83<sup>3</sup> Θ). ☩ And wilt thou keep him for the days of thy youth? misreading נֶעֱרֹתֶיךָ וחשמרנו לימי נְעוּתֶיךָ (pls.). כְּעֶנְנִי like a crane (Is 38<sup>14</sup> Je 8<sup>7</sup>) seems also possible.

v. 30. *partners*: i. e. in fishing (cf. Lk 5<sup>7,10</sup> μέτοχοι, κοινωνοί). חֲבֵרִים *socii*; so pointed here only. ☩ amici = חֲבֵרִים. ☩ מַלְאֲכֵי partakers, associates, partners. ☩ ἔθνη (by inadvertence from st. ii; or did Θ read נְכָרִים *foreigners*?). ☩ seems to have read חכמים *wise men* pro חֲבֵרִים *bargain about*: יכרו עליו (6<sup>21</sup>); or *make trade of him*. C Accus. buy (Dt 2<sup>6</sup>). With ✓ כִּרְ- cf. מִכֵּר *sell*, and Sum. GAR, *do, put, give, put down* (cf. mgs. of נָחַן); MUN-GAR, *goods, property, treasure* (*makkāru*). ☩ coincident eum: *cut him up* (= יכרתו); ☩ ἐνσितούνται, *make a meal of*; ἄπ. (III. *give a feast*; cf. 2 K 6<sup>28</sup> and Assyr. *iškunu kērēta*, 'they made a feast'). So also ☩. ☩ assemble over him (יָקוּם or יִקְהַל pro יכרו. Error due to dictation?).

St. ii. *share or divide him*; the Subj. being the partners. Cf. Ex 21<sup>35</sup>. But Θ μεριτεύονται (ἄπ. = μερίζονται) δὲ αὐτὸν Φοινίκων ἔθνη (AC γένη); and ☩ dividēt illum negotiatores? perhaps implying עם *folk* pro בֵּין *between*. בני pro בֵּין would yield a similar sense: *Shall sons of Canaanites* (= Canaanites) *divide him*? i. e. share him out (cf. Ex 23<sup>35</sup>). A closer parallel to st. i. ☩ And will they divide him among many? (app. rg. כְּפָשִׁיִּם *Aram. multitudes* pro מֵרַב *Canaanites or traders*, Pr 31<sup>24</sup>). The question of the verse seems to be: When caught, is the monster cut up and distributed for sale like a big fish? (presumably for human food: crocodiles, though extremely unpalatable to Europeans, are eaten by the people of the Upper Nile; and the flesh of the native species is sold in the markets of Siam).

v. 31. *spikes*: or *barbs*: שִׁבּוֹת ἄπ. cf. (שֶׁךְ), ἄπ. cf. (שֶׁךְ), Nu 33<sup>56</sup>; Assyr. *sikkatu*, 'plug', 'peg', or *sikkatu*, 'point', 'peak', of a mountain; *thorn-hedge* (cf. Is 5<sup>5</sup>); Ar. شَكَّ *pierce through*. The Versions misunderstood the word: ☩ Numquid implebis *sagenas pelle eius*? (rg שִׁבּוֹת *nets*, 18<sup>8</sup>, pro שִׁבּוֹת); ☩ Will thou fill his skin with flesh? (בָּשָׂר); ☩ Canst thou fill his skin with bowers? (בַּמְטָלְחָא = שִׁבּוֹת *booths* = מֵרַב). ☩ πάν δὲ πλωτὸν συνελθὸν οὐ μὴ ἐνέγκωσιν βύρσαν μίαν οὐρὰς αὐτοῦ (Θ<sup>A</sup> more *grammat. ἐνέγκω*); a marvellous version, app. rg. שִׁבּוֹת (Is 2<sup>18</sup> πλοῖον) pro שִׁבּוֹת. Possibly וְכִנּוּ his tail was a *marg. var.* of עוֹר

his skin (suggested by his head in st. ii), so that βύρσαν μίαν οὐρᾶς αὐτοῦ is conflate. ט may thus represent (ונבו) כל-שכיות עורו (החמלא כל-שכיות עורו); πᾶν δὲ πλωτὸν συνελθόν being merely a periphrasis of the plur., and the whole paraphrastic. (Since ἤνεγκε = הביא as a rule, ט may indicate הִתְקַאֵן-; כל-שכיות עורו Could all ships bring his skin?)

St. ii. B Et gurgustium piscium capite illius? where piscatorum (the hut of fishermen) would seem more natural. The notion of hut is due to connecting צִלָּל spear (fr. צלל I. quiver, whizz) with צלל III. shadow (cf. Gn 19<sup>8</sup> צל). So T And his head with the screen (צִלָּל) of fishes, cf. T v. 22. S with the shadow of fire (שֶׁט scrib. error pro שֶׁט). ט και ἐν πλοίοις ἀλείων κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ = ראשו (pro ראשֵׁי דְּגִינִים fishes) וְצִלָּל דְּגִינִים; taking צִלָּל to mean a fishing-smack (cf. Is 18<sup>1</sup> οὐαὶ γῆς πλοίων πτέρυγες = (הו) ארץ צלצל כנפים).

v. 32. M lit. Set thy hand upon him; | Remember the battle; add not! The meaning seems to be Try it once, and you will never do it again. (Leg. אִם-תִּשֶׂה?) B nec ultra addas loqui, 'and say no more!'; wrongly supposing לִדְבַר to be the suppressed Infin. But st. ii seems somewhat disjointed, and וְכִי may be the Infin. (= לִזְכֹּר cf. Gn 8<sup>12</sup> al.): Thou wilt think of a battle no more (אל pro לא). ט ἐπιθήσει should be ἐπιθήσεις (ט<sup>AC</sup>). Perhaps וְכִי (cf. S l). After πόλεμον (= מלחמה) ט adds the explanatory gloss τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ (i. e. the 'battle' which the assailant experienced in his own person); while ט<sup>AC</sup> add to this καὶ μηκέτι γινέσθω = ואל תוסף.

Chapter 41. Continues the same subject.

v. 1. Corrupt. St. i is metr. short, הן being always a proclitic (8<sup>12, 20</sup> 13<sup>1</sup> al.). M lit. Lo, his hope hath proven false (Pr 30<sup>6</sup>); cf. 24<sup>26</sup> Hi. The word לַחֲמוֹ of his assailant (cf. Ps 35<sup>1</sup>), or נִלְחָם of him that fights against him, may have fallen out after the preceding מלחמה (40<sup>32</sup>): The hope of his assailant proveth vain! (תחלתו לחמו pro תחלתו).

ט οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τεθαύμακας; = st. ii (rg. אֶל-אֲמָרִים חֲטָל). ט<sup>AC</sup>vid.<sup>Mc.a</sup> prefix οὐκ (οὐχ) ἐόρακας αὐτόν; which does not help much as a substitute for st. i (= הלא חזיתו pro הן תחלתו). B Ecce spes eius frustrabitur eum, Lo, his hope will disappoint him (= יכזבו Pi. or Hi.). St. ii מַעַל אֶל-מַרְאִי יוֹטֵל Even at his appearance will he be thrown? (RV inserts a 'not'; but see Heb.). The ה is dittogr. from the previous word, and must be omitted. מַרְאִי his visible form or appearance (Gn 41<sup>21</sup>) = מַרְאִיו. The crocodile is such a terrible-looking creature that his would-be assailant is 'knocked down', as we say, at the very sight of him. B Et videntibus cunctis praecipitabitur (= וְכָל רְאִי יוֹטֵל; cf. Is 8<sup>16</sup>): כל pro אל ut saep. ט οὐδὲ δέδοικας ὅτι ἡτοίμασταί μοι (ט<sup>A</sup> σοι); = v. 2<sup>a</sup>. S renders the verse: Lo, loosed is thy foot | And also God will bear his bitterness (= וְנָם אֵל מְרוֹ יוֹטֵל = corruption of M).

v. 2. St. i. RV *None is so fierce that he dare stir him up* makes good sense, but is hardly warranted by the Heb., is a bad parallel to st. ii, and ignores the fact that the stichus is metr. short (two stresses), and that אכזר (30<sup>21</sup>) prob. refers to the beast rather than to the man. The line may be restored thus *הוא אכזר מי יעירו* *He is fell; who shall arouse him?* (וא pro לא and כי pro מי, as is almost demanded by the following ומי הוא לפניו יעירו Ketib pro Qerf יעורו). Then naturally follows st. ii: לפניו לפני, c 27 codd. et 2<sup>ss</sup>). The proposed *לא יזכר* *He remembers not* (40<sup>32b</sup>) leaves st. i metr. short, and is otherwise not much better than the fanciful *מלאך נר* *A hostile Angel* (pro אכזר).  $\Theta$  οὐδὲ δέδοικας οὐτὶ ἡτοίμασται μοι; = לי *כי עתיד* (cf. 3<sup>25</sup> 9<sup>28</sup>; 15<sup>28</sup>); corrupt reading of  $\mathfrak{M}$ . In st. ii τίς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐμὸς ἀντιπάλος; =  $\mathfrak{M}$ .  $\mathfrak{B}$  Non quasi crudelis suscitabo eum = *לא כאכזר אעירו* pro *לא כי יעירו*  $\mathfrak{M}$ ; Quis enim resistere potest vultui meo? =  $\mathfrak{M}$ .  $\mathfrak{I}$  *He is not cruel because he rouses him* | *And who* (emph.) *before him shall take his stand?*  $\Theta$  *He will not go far when he is roused* | *And who is there that shall stand before me?*

v. 3. St. i is again too short.  $\mathfrak{M}$  cannot mean *Who hath first given unto me* (?), *that I should repay him?* (RV). By reading *מִי־הוּא קָרַמוּ* *Who hath ever faced him and remained whole?* (or *מִי־הוּא יִקְרַמְנִי* *Who can face him and remain whole?*), we restore the balance of the metre, and get rid of the dubious Hi. (cf. Am 9<sup>10</sup>), as well as of the awkward reference to God (cf. v. 2<sup>b</sup>). See 9<sup>4</sup> 30<sup>27</sup>.  $\Theta$  ἡ τίς ἀντιπρόσθεταί μοι καὶ ὑπομένει (= *וְיָמִי יִקְרַמְנִי וְיִשְׁלַם*; cf. 9<sup>4</sup> 22<sup>21</sup>  $\Theta$ ). St. ii  $\mathfrak{M}$  lit. *Under all the heavens to me he* (*belongs*) does not cohere with what precedes.  $\Theta$  as  $\mathfrak{M}$ ; but  $\mathfrak{I}$  attempts better sense with *Is not all under the heavens mine?* and  $\mathfrak{B}$  with *Omnia quae sub caelo sunt, mea sunt* (both trs. *כל תחת*).  $\Theta$  εἰ πᾶσα ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ἐμὴ ἐστιν, *If all the earth is mine* (connecting this as Protasis with v. 4<sup>1</sup>). For ἡ ὑπ' οὐρ. = אֶרֶץ see 2<sup>2</sup> 34<sup>13</sup> 38<sup>18,24</sup> 42<sup>15</sup>; = תַּחַת שָׁמַיִם 34<sup>13</sup>; = *לֹא־אֶחָד* *not one* (14<sup>1b</sup>) or perhaps *לֹא־הוּא* (but cf. Je 5<sup>11</sup>), or *לֹא־הָיָה*, *he exists not*, there is none such.

v. 4. In  $\mathfrak{M}$  st. i has only two stresses, while st. ii has four. The metrical balance may be restored by transferring *דבר* to st. i. Then, instead of the dubious *בריו* *his parts*, i. e. members (see note on 18<sup>13</sup>), read *מדיו* *his dress, garb*, esp. military *array*: see 1 Sa 4<sup>12</sup> 17<sup>38</sup> (where *שריון* also occurs as here, v. 5). *בריו* due to reminiscence of 11<sup>3</sup> *מחית* *בדיך* *I will not be silent about his array* agrees with what follows in v. 5 (*לבושו* *his warrior's apparel or cloak*; cf. 2 Sa 20<sup>8</sup> Is 63<sup>1,2</sup>). St. ii should be *וְיִגְבְּרוּתוֹ חֵיל עָרְפוֹ* (*And*) *his might and the strength of his outfit* (or *accoutrements*). Both *גְּבוּרָה* (39<sup>19</sup>) and *חֵיל* (Ps 33<sup>17</sup>)

are used of physical strength; and the *vox nihili* חֵן may be exchanged for the latter with some assurance. For עָרְבוּ we might substitute עָרִי *his attire*, if it were not sufficiently justified by עָרֶךְ בְּגָדִים *an outfit or suit of clothes*, Ju 17<sup>10</sup>. Cf. עָרָה || לְבַשׁ 40<sup>10</sup>. ὁ οὐ σιωπήσομαι (= מִן לֹא-אֲחִירִישׁ) δι' αὐτόν (= בְּרִי? pro מִן (בריו); καὶ λόγον δυνάμεως ἐλέησει τὸν ἴσον αὐτοῦ = עָרְבוּ יְחֵן בְּבוֹרוֹת יְדָבָר And with a word of power he will favour his equal (dupl. accus. ut Ju 21<sup>22</sup>: ἴσον: cf. 28<sup>17,19</sup> יַעֲרֹכָהּ = ἰσωθήσεται αὐτῇ) = text of מ slightly altered. B Non parcam ei (?) (לֹא-אֲחִירִישׁ עָלָיו?) et verbis potentibus (יְדָבָר בְּבוֹרוֹת) et ad deprecandum compositis (וְלֹחֶחַ! עָרִי). C And I will not keep silence on (חֲלֹשׁ) his strength | And on the sinews of his might. I takes בְּרִי as idle talk (11<sup>8</sup>) or lying (בְּרִיבִיָּה), and renders עָרְבוּ יְחֵן by וְכַעֲתָא דְעֵלְיָהּ and the entreaty that is upon him; app. an allusion to the fabled 'crocodile tears' (חֵן connected with חָנָן as in C).

v. 5. Lit. *Who hath stripped off or removed* (נָלָה Is 22<sup>8</sup> 47<sup>2</sup> of removing a covering or veil) *the face of his coat* (i. e. his skin, 30<sup>18</sup>) *who exposed the skin by stripping off the armour of scales which covers it*. Read prob. נָלָה (י om. post.); so C τίς ἀποκαλύψει κατὰ. B Quis revelabit faciem indumenti eius? But the idea required by the context (st. ii) is rather that of penetrating or piercing through the hard surface; and Is 36<sup>6</sup> (וְכָבַד בָּכָפּוֹ וְנִכְבְּהָ *it will go into his hand and pierce it*) suggests the reading יָכַב pro נָלָה: cf. v. 26. (יָכַל fr. נָכַל seen in מְנַל, Ar. مَنَجَل a toothed sickle is also conceivable: *Who can gash the surface of his coat?*) In st. ii we must read סָרִינוּ *his body-armour or coat of mail* c ὁ θώρακος αὐτοῦ (so Je 46<sup>1</sup>; = שָׁרִיִּן 1 Sa 17<sup>5,38</sup> שָׁרִיִּן Is 59<sup>17</sup>. See also v. 18 infr.) pro רָסְנוּ *his halter or bridle*. It is absurd to suppose that 'his double bridle' (RV) can mean his two rows of teeth. סָרִינוּ is a suitable parallel to לְבוּשׁוֹ (1 Sa 17<sup>38</sup> Is 63<sup>1,2</sup>). The obvious answer to the question of RV *Who shall come within (?) his double bridle?* is, Anyone who chooses—at his own risk, *go into* means *penetrate*, as in Is 36<sup>6</sup>. The expression *his double mail* might perhaps denote his scales and hide together (Dr); but more probably the meaning is that his armour is twice as strong as any coat of mail, and quite impenetrable (as we might speak of a sevenfold shield). B Et in medium oris eius quis intrabit? (perhaps reading בָּלָב or בָּלָבָן pro בָּכָפּל, and supposing that רָסֵן might mean the *place* of the bridle, i. e. the mouth: cf. I). C recte εἰς δὲ πτύξιν θώρακος αὐτοῦ τίς ἂν εἰσέλθοι; C And when the net falleth, &c. (בָּכָפּל pro מַצּוֹר; רֶשֶׁת, or some other syn. pro רָסֵן). I as M (Into the doubling of his halter, i. e. the place where it doubles, *who durst enter?*—Levy CHWB s. v. פְּרוּמְבִּיא = φορβεία compares χαλινοί, *bits*, and also the corners of a horse's mouth where the bit rests).

v. 6. *his mouth*: reading פִּי 15<sup>30</sup> 23<sup>12</sup> al. or פִּיהוּ 3<sup>1</sup> 35<sup>18</sup> 40<sup>23</sup> pro מִן *his face*. So C. Cf. the parallel *his teeth*. can open: Impf. יַפְתַּח pro

פתח. So  $\Theta$  τίς ἀνοίξει,  $\mathfrak{B}$  Quis aperiet; but  $\mathfrak{I}$  as  $\mathfrak{M}$ . ( $\Theta$  wrongly divides these vss.: *Who openeth the circle of his teeth, the terror that is in the valley* = אִימָה: בְּנֶאֱמָה or אִימָה נִיא pro אִימָה בְּנֶאֱמָה.)

v. 7. 'Crocodiles', we are told, exhibit 'a partial dermal skeleton, developed in the leathery integument, consisting of numerous square bony plates, keeled in the centre, and forming a complete dorsal shield' (EBr s.v.). This confirms the conjecture נִיא *his back* (1 K 14<sup>9</sup>) or נִיא *id.* (Pr 10<sup>13</sup> Is 50<sup>5</sup>) pro נִיא *pride*. (נִיא *dorsum* does not occur elsewhere in Job: see note on 30<sup>5</sup>.) *His back is furrowed with shields*; a picturesque description of its appearance. Lit. *His back is gullies* (or *water-courses, channels*) of (i.e. formed by) *shields* (i.e. shield-shaped plates). For אִפִּי see notes on 6<sup>15</sup> 12<sup>21</sup> 40<sup>18</sup> and cf. Is 8<sup>7</sup> Ez 6<sup>3</sup>. The grooves between the rows of bony plates running along the animal's back are compared to the gullies between mountains.

The use of the word אִפִּי, however, seems questionable; and a verb would conduce to perspicuity, e.g. יָקִיפוּ (1<sup>5</sup> 19<sup>8</sup> and 1 K 7<sup>24</sup>): *His back shields encompass* (or *enclose*); possibly, perhaps, in view of Ex 14<sup>22</sup> 15<sup>8</sup>, נוֹה יִקְפָּא לְמִנִּים *His back is hardened* (10<sup>10</sup>) *into shields*. In any case, it is the 'shields', not the hollows between their rows, that are important to the armature of the crocodile. St. ii is also difficult. סָגַר Sing. must refer to נוֹה, not to מִנִּים 'א' Plur. (OL, RV). סָגַר חֹתֶם צָר (Shut is a narrow seal!) is really meaningless. It certainly cannot mean *closely joined* (?) as with *tight seal* or (pointing צָר חֹתֶם) *with seal of flint*. We may perhaps read צָר סָגַר חֹתֶם They (the shields) shut it in as (with) wall of flint. 'Seal' (9<sup>7</sup> 14<sup>17</sup>) is not likely, for a seal could be broken. Verses 8, 9 describe how closely the 'shields' are set.

$\Theta$  τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἀσπίδες χάλκεια | σύνδεσμος αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ συμρίτης λίθος. נִיא treated as an Aramaism (נִיא, נִיא middle, the inside, viscera or 'inwards'); cf. Ps 51<sup>12</sup> ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις μου = בְּקִרְבִּי. But 21<sup>24</sup> τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ = עֲטִינִי (!). ἀσπίδες χάλκεια, cf. 40<sup>18</sup> πλευραὶ χάλκεια = אִפִּי נְחֹשֶׁה (!).  $\Theta$  (for the verse) *His mouth is fastened and bound and scaled*.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Corpus illius quasi scuta fusilia, | compactum squamis se prementibus (נִיא pro נִיא; נִיא מִנִּים; נִיא מִנִּים might account for *quasi scuta fusilia*, cf. 1 K 7<sup>32</sup> (33) ad fin., and for ἀσπίδες χάλκεια also, if we might suppose χάλκεια to be a scribal error for χωνευταί: thus מִנִּים pro אִפִּי). In st. ii  $\mathfrak{B}$  perhaps read צָר סָגַר חֹתֶם enclosed with tight (צָר) seal (qs Coll. = the plates or 'shields'); or צָר סָגַר חֹתֶם shut in with an enclosing plate (cf. Ez 4<sup>3</sup> Ct 8<sup>3</sup>), regarding צָר as Ptcp. of צָר (Ps 139<sup>5</sup>).  $\mathfrak{I}$  st. i: גִּיתֵנִת פְּצִירָא Like the swell of ponds (or rivers) are its scales = גִּיתֵנִת פְּצִירָא (cf. אִפִּי); st. 2 (v. צָר) אֲחִיר חֹתֶם צָר (cf. אִפִּי).  $\Theta$  σύνδεσμος ( $\Theta^A$  καὶ σύνδεσμοι,  $\Theta^{MC}$  σύνδ. δὲ) shut in with a close seal.  $\Theta$  ὥσπερ συμρίτης λίθος = אֲדָמָה like adamant (?) pro אִפִּי. Σμίρις Diosc. or σμύρις Hesych. is said to

be Corundum or emery powder. The phrase is only found here. (Schol. σφραγὶς στενή = מ.)

v. 8. Lit. *One to one they approach* (Constr. Is 65<sup>6</sup>); i.e. the 'shields' are set close, side by side. *space*: or *interval*: pointing רִיחַ (Gn 32<sup>17</sup>) pro מִרְיָח *wind* or *air*. (This and the last verses were wanting in G originally.)

v. 9. This verse is an evident var. of v. 8. Cod. Kenn. 34 omits it, and it is starred in G<sup>H</sup>. *clinging*: lit. as 38<sup>38</sup> *they are joined*. *They hold together*: see note on 38<sup>30b</sup>.

v. 10. *his snorting*: lit. *sneezing*. Point עֲטִישָׁתוּ Sing. c G<sup>H</sup> > Plur. מ. The word happens to be ᾤπ. in OT, but the Root עֲטַשׁ *to sneeze* occurs in Ar., Aram., Eth., as well as NH. It is doubtless an onomatopoeia. The allusion of the stichus may be to the flash of the spray shot up in the sunlight from the reptile's nostrils (cf. vv. 11 sqq.). It is curious to note that the Ar. عَطَسَ *to sneeze* means also *to dawn*, and الْعَطَاسُ *is the daybreak*. For יהל see 31<sup>26</sup> Is 13<sup>10</sup>. ו And his orbs (eyes) מְאֵלָה are filled with light | And his eyes (חֲסִקֵּי) are as the rays of dawn (חֲכִיף חָדָא); cf. Sum. ZALAG shine, firelight, and חֲכִיף id.). A better parallel; but how did ו read עֲטִישָׁתוּ אֵשׁוֹן 'the pupil of his eyes'? The crocodile's red eyes 'are said to appear gleaming through the water before the head comes to the surface' (Driver).

v. 11. *flames*: לִפְרִים lit. *torches*. Perhaps *flashes*; cf. Ex 20<sup>18</sup> Na 2<sup>6</sup>. (The לִפְרִי may be cogn. c נבט Assy. nabātu, to shine.) ו λαμπάδες καίόμενοι, *burning torches*. ו perhaps chose λαμπάς (12 times) to represent לִפְרִי because of the likeness of sound. *sparks*: בִּירֵדִי (ᾤπ.) from לִפְרִי = Ar. كَذ *emit fire* (of firestick); akin to לִפְרִי in קָרָה *be kindled*, קָרָה *bore, kindle*, קָדַח *strike fire*, and יָקַד, יָקַד, וְקָד *be kindled, burn*.

*escape* or *slip out*: יתמלטו (19<sup>20</sup> only). Whether we retain מ (and a verb of motion suits the || יהלכו), or read יתלהמו (ᾤπ. Hithp.; cf. v. 13) after ו (cf. W Sicut taedae ignis accensae), which is less prob. (as is also the treatment of the כ in כִּדְרֵי as Caph Compar. ap. W), ו καὶ διαρριπτοῦνται (Is 62<sup>10d</sup>) ἐσχάται πυρός lends some support to מ (diarr. = יִתְמָלוּ or יִתְרָמוּ ᾤπ. ??; cf. 16<sup>11</sup>). ἐσχάται, *hearth, brazier, firewood, altar*, which represents some eight other Hebrew words in ו, may well equal כִּדְרֵי here. ו has a double rendering: And there go forth out of his mouth torches | *Like coals of fire, and like sparks of fire which are flaming*.

v. 12. *like a boiling pot*: בִּדְרֵי נֶפֶחַ: lit. *like a pot blown* (under); i.e. with breath or bellows (נֶפֶחַ Je 6<sup>29</sup>); cf. כִּיר נֶפֶחַ id. Je 1<sup>19</sup> and כִּיר נֶפֶחַ *a blown furnace or crucible* Eccles 43<sup>4</sup>. There is a difficulty about the last word in the verse. מִן וּמִן and rush(es) 40<sup>26</sup> gives no good

sense, at first sight. Possibly, however, the rushes are the fuel which, when blown into a flame, cause the pot to boil and steam. Perhaps באנמון (cf. Zc 12<sup>6</sup>). St. ii ap. 𐤁𐤏𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 like the flame round a pot which is heated; 𐤏𐤍 sicut ollae succensae atque ferventis; 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 like a boiling pot which makes a jet (Wasserstrahl, Levy). Perhaps an Arabism 𐤏𐤍 (𐤏𐤍 the fire burned fiercely, flamed or blazed) might be suggested pro 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍: Like (or As of) a pot blown and blazed under, or blown under and heated. 𐤏𐤍 (καπνὸς) καμίνου καιομένης πυρὶ ἀνθράκων = 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍; reading 𐤏𐤍 pro 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 (which is suspiciously like 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 v. 11), and perhaps anticipating the 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 of v. 13.

v. 13. his breath: 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍; not his fury (OL); cf. vv. 10-12. 𐤏𐤍 rectè: *Halitus eius prunas ardere facit*. There can be little doubt that 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍, Assy. *napištu*, orig. meant *breath*. (Cf. the analogy of 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *breath, wind, spirit*, and 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *scent or smell*, str. *what is inbreathed or inhaled* = 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 Is 3<sup>20</sup> = Assy. *nipšu*, *smell, odour*: *širu ilešēn nipiš šammu*, 'A serpent smelt the scent of the herb', NE xi. 304. The vb. *napišu* is to *breathe, blow*, and also to *expand, broaden*; breathing *expands* the chest: cf. *šiltu kīma imbari inappuṣ eliṣu*, 'Sleep like a (sudden) blast bloweth over him' (NE xi. 210). The prim. Root may be Sum. 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 (PESH, *napišu*, *rapāšu*. Cf. also 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 to blow.) 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 (𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 exc. ante 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍). St. ii = v. 11 st. i. The verse may be a variant of that. 'No smoke without fire', says the proverb. The comparison of the monster's hot breath, steaming from nose or mouth in the sunlight, to smoke and sparks, is intelligible; and travellers' tales may have made him a fire-breathing animal. The poet probably depended on report for his description of the crocodile.

v. 14. 'The vertebrae of the neck bear upon each other by means of rib-like processes, the neck being thus deprived to a great extent of its mobility; hence the difficulty experienced by crocodiles in turning' (EBr s. v.) St. i: so 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍. For 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 see 17<sup>2</sup> 19<sup>4</sup> Is 1<sup>21</sup>.

St. ii: *boundeth Panic*: 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍. Both words 𐤏𐤍. The former might be an Aramaism (𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 Pr 23<sup>24</sup> *exult*; Syr. 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *leap or dance for joy*). So 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *exultat timor*, and 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 = 𐤏𐤍. But 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 = 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 may be right for the verb. Instead of the noun 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 (= 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 Dt 28<sup>65</sup>) *faintness, faintheartedness*, 𐤏𐤍 gives ἀπώλεια = 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 26<sup>6</sup> 28<sup>22</sup>; which, though adopted by some, does not suit here, since it means *the Place of Perdition* (syn. She'ol). Besides, ἀπώλεια = 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 21<sup>30</sup> 30<sup>12</sup> 31<sup>3</sup> Pr 1<sup>26</sup> al., and many other Heb. words: see, e.g., 11<sup>20</sup> 20<sup>5,28</sup>. 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 has ἐκλιμία, *extreme hunger*; 𐤏𐤍 egestas, *want*: both prob. representing 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍. Perhaps 𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 *trembling* (4<sup>14</sup>) may be suggested; but no change is really necessary. Cf. Hab 3<sup>5</sup>. The reference



to the neck seems rather strange; and a line like עו בַּצְעָדוֹ יֵלֵךְ *In his steps* (= Behind him; cf. Dan 11<sup>48</sup>) *marcheth Fierceness* (or אַי אַפ. *Quaking, Panic?*) would improve the parallelism.

v. 15. מ מפלי בשרו *the fallings or hanging parts of his flesh* is very doubtful (מפל Am 8<sup>4</sup>). The crocodile has no visible loose flesh. We may perhaps read כפלי בשר *the folds* (or, according to the Eth. use of the Root, *the parts*; but cf. v. 5) *of his flesh*. The verb דבקו should be pointed as Pu. דִּבְקִי (cf. v. 9 38<sup>36</sup>), since the Qal is not used abs. in Job (see 19<sup>20</sup> 29<sup>10</sup> 31<sup>7</sup>). Cf. M *Membra* carniū eius cohaerentia sibi; G σάρκες δὲ σώματος αὐτοῦ κεκόλληται (= Pu.); I שְׁלֵדֵי בְּסָרְיָהּ מִתְאַדְקִין *The lumps (?) of his flesh stick together* (cf. Syr. حُلُ carcass, trunk); but G Goodly (حَسْب) is *his flesh and fat* (= וְכִרִי); a guess at a defaced text. St. ii. *It* (i.e. his flesh) *is firm* (lit. cast 28<sup>2</sup>) *upon him, it cannot be shaken*; as it might, if it hung loose. G καταχέει merely mistakes יָצִיק as Impf. instead of Ptcp. But M *Mittet* contra eum *fulmina* appears to read יִבְרֹק or יִבְרֹק (Ps 144<sup>6</sup>) pro יָצִיק, and וְכָל יָמָיו (et ad locum alium non ferentur; a paraphr.) pro בְּלִי-יָמוֹת. The word יָצִיק (repeated twice in v. 16) certainly seems dubious; and G<sup>H</sup>, stars the whole stichus. I וְיִתְּנֵם עָלָי דְּלֵא תוֹעַ = וְיִתְּנֵם עָלָי דְּלֵא תוֹעַ and he is supported (connecting יָמוֹת בל with v. 14: וְלֵא חֲדָה And his heart quakes not).

v. 16. Instead of the repeated יָצִיק (3<sup>ce</sup>; unique in the book), we seem to require here other words expressive of hardness and solidity, e.g. חֹק or קשה. Thus we might restore

לְבו קשה כמראבן  
חֹק (יחוק ?) מפלה תחתית :

*His heart is solid as a stone | And harder than the nether millstone*: cf. Ez 2<sup>4</sup> 3<sup>7-9</sup> Je 5<sup>3</sup>. Perhaps יָצִיק should be kept in st. i; or שָׁרִיר *firm, solid*, be read as an Aramaism (cf. Syr. صلب solid rock). G πένηγεν, *is solid* (= נָצַב Ex 15<sup>8</sup>; or קָפָא ibid.); in st. ii ἔστηκεν, *it stands firm* (= יָצַב cf. Gn 43<sup>3</sup> 2 Sa 15<sup>24</sup> מַעֲיָקָי: both prob. represent וַעֲיָק (יָצִיק). G did not understand פֶּלֶח millstone (Ju 9<sup>53</sup>), which it renders ἀκμων, *an anvil*. The phrase ἀκμων ἀνίλατος, *a stubborn (unmalleable) anvil* occurs only here. M Cor eius *indurabitur* (יָצַק cf. 11<sup>15</sup> stabilis; 22<sup>16</sup> 37<sup>18</sup>) *tanquam lapis* | Et *stringetur* quasi *malleatoris incus* (יָצַק from יָצַק I. cf. 37<sup>10</sup> and Aul. Gell. mare gelu *stringi* et consistere; and מָחַת or מַחֲתָת pro מַחֲתִית). I = M. G st. ii: ὡς ὁ σκῆψος And *firm as flint* (= כְּמִרְחֵלִישׁ? pro תחתית).

v. 17. Read (with many codd.) מִשְׁאָתוֹ pro מִשְׁתּוֹ, and point either מִשְׁאָתוֹ *At his uprising* (= M cum sublatus fuerit), or rather perhaps *At his majesty* (cf. 13<sup>11</sup> 31<sup>23</sup>); or מִשְׁאָתוֹ *At his storming* (30<sup>14</sup> Pr 3<sup>26</sup>) or onset. G I from fear of him (cf. I 31<sup>23</sup>). In view, however, of La 3<sup>47</sup>

הַשָּׂאָה וְהַשָּׁבֵר (codd. שׁ וּשׁ) and st. ii מִשְׁבָּר, we may prefer to point מִשְׂאָהוּ *At his noise* or *uproar*. The noise will be that of his rush or breaking through the reeds, since the crocodile utters no cry (though the poet may have imagined or heard that he does): cf. בְּנִי נִשָּׂה Nu 24<sup>17</sup> = בְּנִי שָׂאוֹן Je 48<sup>46</sup>. We may then restore in the parallel stichus, which in מ is metr. short (two beats only), מִשְׁבָּרֵי אֲבָרִים pro מִשְׁבָּרֵי מֵ. We thus get a fairly satisfactory verse:

*At his noise heroes are afraid,*

*At his crashing the brave take to flight.*

This involves little or no change in st. i; and, as regards st. ii, אֲבָרִים exc. p. שָׁבֵרֵי owing to similarity of letters. For אֲלִים (so B *angeli*; cf. Pss 29<sup>1</sup> 89<sup>7</sup> Is 9<sup>7</sup> Ez 31<sup>11</sup> 32<sup>21</sup> al.) some codd. have אֵלִים (Ex 15<sup>15</sup> Ez 17<sup>13</sup>). טִי מִשְׁבָּרֵי, לְמַעַן חֲקִיפִיָּה the mighty. In st. ii ט seems to have read מִשְׁבָּרֵי the strong (Aram.) pro מִשְׁבָּרֵי and יִחַתּוּ pro יִחַתּוּ. *Miss or lose themselves* = are bewildered, lose their heads, is questionable, in view of the mg. of חַטַּא Hithp. in the only other occurrences (Nu 8<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>12</sup> al.), viz. *to purify oneself* (see B). The Eth. use **ተፈጥረ**: *aufugit* (Gn 16<sup>8</sup>) may give the true sense here (Burney), though that meaning is isolated in OT. מִן־חֲבָרִיָּא מִן־עֲלִיָּהוֹן; app. reading יִחַתּוּ he finds them guilty. ט renders the verse very strangely: *στραφέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ φόβος θηρίοις τετραπόσιν* (40<sup>18</sup>) *ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλομένους* = בְּשָׁבֵר מְשֻׁחָת? | לְחִיָּה | בְּשָׁבֵר מְשֻׁחָת? (due to misreading of similar letters). But possibly ἀλλομένους is an error for ἀλωμένους = מִן־חַטַּא (so also in Eth.).

v. 18. Leg. אִם־תִּשְׁנֶה pro מִשְׁנֶה (ungrammat.) c ט B; or simply חֲשִׁנָּה c א, in the same sense (so cod. Kenn. 180). The rare בלי *not* should prob. be בל as in v. 15. *Should the sword reach him, it standeth not*; gets no hold; fails to penetrate his hide and glances off.

In st. ii מִסֶּע *a dart* is very doubtful; and the same may be said of שְׁרִיָּה *javelin* (?). Both are ἄπ. λεγόμενα. A verb is wanted > the three nouns. Note also the Asyndeton. Cf. ט (text incert.) and ט The spears of captains he beareth; יִשָּׂא pro מִסֶּע and שְׁרִיָּה pro שְׁרִיָּה! (cf. אֶסֶס δόρυ ἐπηρμένον = חֲנִית נִשָּׂא: Οὐ μὴ ποιήσωσιν = מַעֲשִׂוֹת; so that ט's text here is conflate.) B has only *Neque hasta neque thorax* (τ θώρακα, Α θώραξ). א also seems to have thought of נִשָּׂא, for it has מִן־נִשָּׂא אֲבָרֵי וְקִלְעָא דְּמִטְלָא אֲבָרֵי the spear and the sling that lifteth stones, and the cuirass (וְשִׁרְיָנָא). We might perhaps read חֲנִית מִסֶּע מִשְׁרִיָּנָה The spear starteth off from his mail (cf. Nu 11<sup>31</sup> נִסַּע); or מִסֶּע שְׁרִיָּנָה The spear-head breaks off from the shaft, or מִסֶּע חֲנִית שְׁבֵר The staff of the spear is broken.

v. 19. Perhaps רִקְבִין > רִקְבִין (נ dittogr.); ט ξύλον σαθρόν, B lignum putridum. (Neither word occurs elsewhere.)

v. 20. The rhythm is inconsistent. There would appear to be only two beats in st. i, but four in st. ii.  $\gamma\eta$  *arrow* may have fallen out before  $\eta$  in st. i; and in st. ii we should perhaps read  $\eta\eta$  for  $\alpha\eta$  (cf. Zc 9<sup>15</sup>).  $\mathfrak{B}$  *vir sagittarius* probably =  $\mathfrak{M}$ ; but  $\mathfrak{C}$  οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτὸν τόξον χάλκειον =  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{לֹא־תַחַלֵּפְנִי קֶשֶׁת נְחוּשָׁה}$ : see 20<sup>24b</sup>  $\mathfrak{C}$ .  $\mathfrak{S}$  *He fleeth not from the bow*.  $\mathfrak{A}$   $\text{וְיִירָא רָקִישָׁא}$  =  $\mathfrak{M}$ . St. ii  $\mathfrak{C}$  ἡγγεται μὲν πετροβόλον χόρτον (cf. v. 19<sup>a</sup>) =  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{קֶשֶׁת יִחַשֵׁב אֶב' קֶלַע}$ .  $\mathfrak{C}$  thought a *ballista* was intended. Cf. Wisd. 5<sup>22</sup> ἐκ πετροβόλου.  $\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{A}$  both read  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{נְחָשָׁיו}$  are accounted (cf.  $\mathfrak{C}$ ) pro  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\text{נְחָשָׁיו}$  are turned; but cf. v. 21<sup>a</sup>.  $\mathfrak{B}$  rightly as  $\mathfrak{M}$ : In stipulam versi sunt ei lapides fundae.

v. 21.  $\mathfrak{C}$  ὡς καλάμη =  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\text{כֶּקֶשׁ}$ . (*καλάμη* =  $\mathfrak{P}$  Ex 15<sup>7</sup> and in five other places; never =  $\mathfrak{K}$   $\text{קֶנֶה}$ , which is *κάλαμος* 40<sup>16</sup> and twelve times al.)  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\text{נָחֲשָׁיו}$  should be  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{נִחְשָׁיו}$  in agreement with the Sing. Subj. (cf.  $\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{A}$  ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ).  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{חֶרֶץ}$  ||  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{יָדִיו}$  must be some kind of missile, e.g. *dart* or *javelin* > a *club* (RV). It may be a Hebraized form of the *tartāhu* of Assyrian historical texts, which probably means a sort of light spear or javelin (certainly a missile weapon: see Lehmann *Šamašsumukin*, p. 67, l. 22). Possibly, however,  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{חֶרֶץ}$  is a corruption of  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{רֶמַח}$  *spear*, incorrectly written  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{רֹמַח}$  plenē.  $\mathfrak{C}$  σφυρα ( $\mathfrak{K}^{\text{a}}$  σφυραν  $\mathfrak{K}^{\text{c}}$  σφυραι), i.e. σφῦρα, *hammer*, *mallet* (Ju 4<sup>21</sup>  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{מַכֶּתֶת}$  Is 41<sup>7</sup>  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{פַּטִּישׁ}$ ); cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Quasi stipulam aestimabit *mal-leum*;  $\mathfrak{A}$   $\text{נְרִימָה}$  *clubs* (but the Syr.  $\text{ܢܪܝܡܐ}$  is *axe*).  $\mathfrak{C}$  transposes the two stichi, and seems to read  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{חֶרֶץ}$  *the deep* pro  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{חֶרֶץ}$ : *He laughs at the spear* ( $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܡܠܚܬܐ}$ ) | *And the Deep is counted to him as the dry land*.

$\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{רָעַשׁ}$  *shaking* ( $\mathfrak{C}$  σεισμοῦ ut Am 1<sup>1</sup>); cf. 39<sup>24</sup>.  $\mathfrak{B}$  Et deridebit *vibrantem* hastam.  $\mathfrak{C}$  πυρφόρου (sc. ὄπισθοῦ or βέλεος) a *fire-bearing* shaft or bolt (=  $\mathfrak{M}$   $\text{בִּידִי}$ ); cf. Ar.  $\text{ܐܢܝܬ ܝܓܢܡ}$  *emisit ignem*, and  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܒܝܕܝܐ}$  v. 11.  $\mathfrak{A}$   $\text{ܪܝܢܐ ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  *noise of the spear*.

v. 22. Lit. *Under him (are) the sharpest of potsherds*; app. meaning the scales of his belly, which leave an impression on the mud where he lies, ( $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  =  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  *sharp* here only.) This agrees with st. ii: *He spreads* (17<sup>19</sup>) *a threshing-sledge* (Am 1<sup>3</sup>) *upon the mire*. The implement intended is still used in Syria; 'a board, about 7 ft. long by 3 ft. broad, set underneath crosswise with sharp pieces of hard stone or basalt, which, being drawn round the threshing-floor by a yoke of oxen, shells out the grain, and cuts up the straw into chaff' (Driver).  $\mathfrak{C}$  ἡ στρωμνὴ αὐτοῦ, *his bed* (17<sup>19</sup>) is a paraphr. of  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  *that which is under him*, and implies no different reading; and the same may be said of  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  *sharp spils* (or *obelisks*; cf.  $\mathfrak{B}$ ) =  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$ :  $\mathfrak{B}$  Sub ipso erunt *radii solis*. Both identify  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  with  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  *the sun* (9<sup>7</sup>).  $\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{A}$   $\text{δεντήρες}$  *sharpeners*,  $\mathfrak{C}$   $\text{σιδήρια}$  *iron tools* pro  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  are other unhappy guesses at the meaning of  $\mathfrak{L}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$ .  $\mathfrak{A}$   $\text{ܕܝܕܝܐ}$  *Under him are stones which are sharp as*

a *potsherd* = מ. (S om.) In st. ii B gives *Et secernet sibi aurum quasi lutum*, *And he will set apart for himself gold as it were mire*; app. reading יִפְרֹד pro יִרְפֹּד and taking חרוץ as χρυσός (Pr 8<sup>10,19</sup>), though the word does not occur elsewhere in Job. S is even more marvellous: πᾶς δὲ χρυσὸς θαλάσσης ὑπ' αὐτὸν ὥσπερ πηλὸς ἀμύθητος, *And all the gold of the sea is under him like untold clay*! = כמו מיט רב (cf. 27<sup>16</sup> 36<sup>28</sup> ἀμύθ.). S of the sea is evidently from the next line. I ימך דהבא ימך דהבא (סוף) *He spreads (?) the pure gold upon the mire*. (The emendation חרש חרודי החרש *He hath broken the sharp weapons of the smith* seems superfluous after vv. 26–29. The simile of the verse is surely apt and pictorial enough to satisfy us.)

v. 23. *maketh boil*: Hi. Cf. 30<sup>27</sup> Pu. צול, the Root of צולה, מצולה, *deep water, the deep*, is perhaps to be compared with צלל Assy. *ṣalḏlu, sink, be submerged* (מצולה = *place of sinking*?). The Nile may be meant both by this word מצולה and by ים *the sea* (Is 19<sup>5</sup> Na 3<sup>8</sup>). In st. ii מ ישים *he makes* is prob. right; cf. Gn 13<sup>16</sup> for the Constr. The suggested ישים *he wastes* is certainly no improvement, as it spoils the parallelism. Both stichi refer to the trail of froth and foam which marks the monster's movement through the water. כמרקחה *like an ointment-pan*; viz. when it bubbles and throws up white scum in boiling down the oil and spices to be compounded. S ἡγεται (יחשב) δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν ὥσπερ ἐξάλ(ε)ιπτρον (*as an unguent-box*); B paraphr. *Et ponet* (= ישים) *quasi cum unguenta bulliant* (B adds ים *mare* to st. i agst. metr. and sense). I יפא ישי הים יפא ישי *The sea he makes like a pan* = מ. S om. Possibly we should read כקלחת *like a cauldron* (|| to כפסיר: cf. Mi 3<sup>3</sup>).

v. 24. Further description of the appearance of the water as the long reptile swims through it. There seems no reason for changing a word in st. i, except that we might add the 3rd Pers. Suff. to נתיב *a path* and read נתיביו *his path* or *track*; the ו having perhaps fallen out before the following '. *Behind him shineth his track* (or, *Behind him he maketh his path shine*; יאיר may be either Trans. or Intrans.): i.e. he leaves a track of glistening spray behind him. Cf. B Post eum lucebit semita = מ; I בפתריו ינהר שבילא. To read יאיר *the Nile* pro יאיר is to substitute prose for poetry.

St. ii: *The Deep might be reckoned white-haired*; a beautiful simile for the 'hoary foam' of the troubled water. Point יחשב pro יחשב (v. 21; Is 29<sup>17</sup>). S סלך חבל סלך חבל *And as dry land the Deep is reckoned to him*; reading ליבשה pro לשיבה: i.e. he is equally at home in the water or on the land: a good sense, but not a good parallel to st. i. B aestimabit abyssum quasi senescentem = מ. So I יחשוב תהומא יחשוב תהומא (S om. st. i) app. gives a double version of st. ii: *And (he regards) the Tartarus (lowest depth?) of the abyss as a captive* (ὥσπερ αἰχμάλωτον = עשביה pro משיבה; cf. Is 52<sup>2</sup>); *He reckoned the abyss as*

a walk (εἰς περίπατον, cf. Ez 42<sup>11</sup>). In view of this we might perhaps hazard the conjectural verse :

אפיק יאור נתיבו  
: יחשב תהום לשבילו

*The bed of the Nile is his pathway ; | He regardeth the Deep as a road :* cf. Ps 77<sup>20</sup>. But מ suits the context better, and is far more poetical.

[The √ שיב, ساب, Assyr. šābu, was originally a colour-term, denoting bright, white, whitish, grey, esp. of the hair ; cf. 3 R 65, 7<sup>b</sup> : *If his head be full of grey hairs*, &c. (SAG . DU-su šīdāti malī), said of a newborn child (Omen-text). The analysis may perhaps be the Factitive ש, ש, + אב bright, white, &c., which we see in אבב Assyr. abābu, ebbu : cf. also perhaps שבב, šabābu, 'blaze', שָׁבֵב flame 18<sup>5</sup>.]

v. 25. earth : עפר as 19<sup>25</sup>. his like or likeness : מִשְׁלֵּי ἄπ. ὁ ὁμοιον αὐτῷ ; Ὡ potestas quae comparetur ei. Ὡ hardly suggests מִשְׁלֵּי (KB). Perhaps we should point מִשְׁלֵּי (Is 52<sup>5</sup> Je 30<sup>21</sup>) : *There is not on earth one that ruleth him* = his master. Ὡ And his power on the dust walketh (reading אֵין wrongly for אֵין and app. מִשְׁלֵּי). Ἧ his ruler (cf. Mi 5<sup>1</sup>) ; cf. st. i.

St. ii is very dubious. מ seems to mean *He who was made for* or *into* (Ju 8<sup>27</sup>) a lack-fear or fearlessness (חַת fear Gn 9<sup>2</sup>) ; but both metre and parallelism are defective. Ὡ ut מ : qui factus est ut nullum timeret. Ἧ (whom He made that he might not be broken, scil. with fear : cf. 1 Sa 17<sup>11</sup>) = paraphr. of מ. Ὡ πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαύεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων μου = Ὡ 40<sup>19b</sup> ; see the notes there. The angels are introduced because it seemed irreverent to speak of the Creator as 'sporting' with His creature. The anomalous הָעֵשׂוּ (it should at least be הָעֵשִׂי Ex 3<sup>16</sup> 38<sup>24</sup>) cannot be accepted ; and לְבַעַל חַיִּית pro מִן חַיִּית (why not לְבַלְהוֹת ? cf. note 26<sup>20</sup>), is hardly convincing. *He who was made a lord of beasts* is a phrase without parallel in the OT, and coheres but awkwardly with st. i. Ὡ seems to have read הָעֵשֶׂה (הָעֵשֶׂה) לְשַׁחֲתָבֵל Who hath made for the Pit of Destruction every high one that he seeth ; connecting the words with v. 26<sup>a</sup> (cf. Is 38<sup>17</sup>), and perhaps omitting חַת. Upon the whole we incline to prefer : אֵלֶּה עָשָׂה לְשַׁחֲתָבוֹ : (There is nothing like him on earth ; ) *Eloah made him to play with*. The poet is utterly at a loss to account for the existence of such a strange outlandish creature, and can only suppose it to be a kind of freak or sport of the Creative Power.

v. 26. מ lit. *Every high one he seeth* = Ὡ Omne sublime videt = Ἧ כָּל גִּבְהָא יִהְיִי (cf. Ὡ supr. cit.) = Ὡ πᾶν ὑψηλὸν ὁρᾷ. But this is manifestly an unsuitable sense, not to mention the suspicious אֶת־ and the metrical shortness of the stichus. We might accept the corrections אֶת־ and יִירָא (cf. Ec 12<sup>5</sup>) : *Him every high (or haughty) one feareth*. But perhaps we should read וְרָם עַל-כָּל-גִּבְהָ וְיִירָא *Above all that is high and lofty*

he is exalted; or בָּאָרֶץ on the earth may have fallen out after נִבְחָה, or even the emphatic Adv. Infin. נָאָה (*He is supremely exalted*; cf. Ex 15<sup>1</sup>).

The phrase שָׁחַן בְּנִי recurs from 28<sup>6</sup>; see the note there. Levy CHWB cites from Sifri a saying about Rome: מְלִכּוּת זוֹ מִשְׁתַּחֲצֶצֶת וּמִתְנַאֶה וְגו' *This kingdom was proud and haughty, &c.* The Prim. Root may perhaps be recognized in Sum. 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 ĠA-ZA, ĠAZ, *bear, lift*, e.g. SAG-ĠUL ĠAZA, *mukîl rêš limutti*, 'lifting a head of enmity', i.e. *hostile*; said of the Seven Evil Spirits. The Ar. شَخَص *to rise* (of a star) may be a loan-word. Or, since Heb. שָׁחַן, in the only other place where it occurs, denotes beasts of prey, such as the lion, we might compare ĠAZ, ĠAŠ, *to smash, break in pieces, kill* (=GAZ; cf. SA-GAZ, *robber, bandit*). The ש is, as usual, Factive.

It should be noticed that st. ii has four stresses, while st. i has only two. Possibly the verse is an interpolation. The statement that an amphibious and ungainly reptile like the crocodile is monarch of all the wild beasts seems very improbable (cf. Pr 30<sup>30</sup> Dan 4<sup>7ff.17</sup> Pr 19<sup>12</sup> 20<sup>2</sup> Ju 14<sup>18</sup> 2 Sa 1<sup>23</sup>). If, however, we make the slight change of אֵל for אֶת־מֶלֶךְ in st. i (as elsewhere), and read וְיִמְלֹךְ pro מֶלֶךְ, st. ii, we arrive at a verse which is metrically correct and forms a passable conclusion to the whole: *El seeth every high one* (cf. 28<sup>24</sup>); | *And is sovereign over all the sons of pride* (including the crocodile). 𐤔𐤕𐤕 super universos filios superbiae. 𐤔𐤕𐤕 And he (the crocodile) hath become king over every creeping thing (𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕) suggests שָׁחַן pro שָׁחַן; cf. Gn 1<sup>20.21</sup> Le 10<sup>41</sup>. Cf. also 𐤔𐤕𐤕 And he is king over all sons of fishes (𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕); cf. Gn 1<sup>26</sup>); and 𐤔𐤕𐤕 αὐτὸς δὲ βασιλεὺς πάντων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι. But 𐤔𐤕𐤕 βρομῶδους, *stinking thing* = שָׁחַן (Le 11<sup>10.41</sup>).

Chapter 42. Realizing his own ignorance and impotence, in view of the inexhaustible wonders of the natural world, Eyob now makes humble submission to the absolute Lord of All.

v. 2. Clearly we must read יִדְעֵתִי 𐤔𐤕𐤕 c 𐤔𐤕𐤕 ὁδᾶ, 𐤔𐤕𐤕 Scio, 𐤔𐤕𐤕 יִדְעֵתִי, Qerf and numerous codd. pro Ketfb יִדְעֵת. Eyob confesses God's omnipotence: *Scio quia omnia potes*; so 𐤔𐤕𐤕. In st. ii leg. מְאֻמָּה c 𐤔𐤕 ἀδυνατέῖ δέ σοι οὐθέν > 𐤔𐤕𐤕 𐤔𐤕𐤕 מְאֻמָּה *device or purpose* (21<sup>27</sup>). The former suits the parallelism better. In any case, 𐤔𐤕𐤕 יִבְצֵר (Gn 11<sup>6</sup>) should be 𐤔𐤕𐤕. *Nothing is cut off or shut off from Thee*; i.e. unattainable by Thee. (𐤔𐤕𐤕 looks like a labialized form of קָצַר.) If the meaning were *No thought* (or *purpose*) *is hidden* (cf. Je 33<sup>3</sup>) or *withheld from Thee* we should expect כְּלִימוּמָה: cf. 𐤔𐤕𐤕 (et nulla te latet cogitatio) and 𐤔𐤕𐤕.

v. 3. The non-metrical interpolation מִיּוֹמָה מַעֲלִים עֲצָה בְּלִי־דַעַת (remembrance of 38<sup>2</sup> with מַעֲלִים pro מַחֲשִׁיךְ and om. מִיּוֹמָה ante בְּלִי; cf. 𐤔𐤕𐤕) must, of course, be rejected, as making the verse an incoherent tristich and interrupting the connexion of thought: *That being so* (Thou being what Thou hast now shown Thyself to be in Knowledge and Power), *in*

my ignorance I have spoken too boldly on things beyond my grasp. Cf. Pr 30<sup>18</sup> Ps 131<sup>1</sup>. ☞ Therefore hast Thou shown me what I have not understood | And I have not known what things were too great for me. ☞ τίς δὲ ἀναγγελεῖ μοι ἃ οὐκ ᾔδειν | μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά ἃ οὐκ ᾔπιστάμην; Possibly the verse should be restored as follows:

לֹכַן הִגַּדְתִּי לִי לֹא־אֲבִין  
נִפְלְאוֹת מִמֶּנִּי לֹא־אֲדַע:

*Therefore thou hast shown me what I discerned not,  
Wonders beyond me that I knew not.*

v. 4. Another interpolation. St. ii (metr. short) occurred 38<sup>3b</sup> 40<sup>7</sup>. For st. i see 33<sup>31</sup>. It is perfectly irrelevant, and greatly weakens the effect of the emphatic statement which follows (v. 5), if 'Job repeats, in line 1, the substance, and in line 2 the actual words, of God's challenge to him in xxxviii. 3, prior to confessing (v. 5) his inability to meet it, and retracting (v. 6) his former presumptuous utterances' (Driver). If the verse were genuine, it would naturally be taken to mean a demand for further discussion; but such a demand would absolutely contradict the spirit of the context (vv. 2, 5, 6).

v. 5. *By mere hearsay*: לִשְׁמָע אֵין according to ear-hearing: cf. Is 11<sup>3</sup> לִשְׁמָע אֵין. The verse obviously contrasts mere hearing about God with personal vision, viz. the Theophany of 38<sup>1</sup> in which Eyob recognizes the fulfilment of his confident hope that he would one day 'see God', Who would 'stand up on the earth' and openly vindicate His servant's innocence (19<sup>26-27</sup>).

*mine own eye hath seen Thee*: וַעֲיֵן רָאָהְךָ: cf. 19<sup>27</sup> וַעֲיֵן רָאָהְךָ.

v. 6. The effect upon Eyob of the vision of God. מִן cannot mean either AV or RV. The text is evidently corrupt, and st. ii is metrically short. מִן cannot mean *I abhor myself*, nor yet *I reject (it)*, viz. what I have spoken (Driver; cf. RV marg. *loathe my words*). An Object is certainly required if מִן here is to *reject* (5<sup>17</sup> 8<sup>20</sup> 9<sup>21</sup> 19<sup>18</sup> 30<sup>1</sup> 31<sup>13</sup> al.); and מִן usually means *to repent of* some action (Am 7<sup>3,6</sup> Je 8<sup>6</sup>), and can hardly express *repent (sitting) on dust*, &c. Cf. Jon 3<sup>6</sup> וַיֵּשֶׁב עַל־אֲפֶר; Lk 10<sup>13</sup>. We have, however, already had an instance of another מִן (Aram.), meaning *to run, flow, melt away* (7<sup>6</sup> Ps 58<sup>8</sup> Ni.; cf. Tg. Ps 38<sup>8</sup> מִן). We might therefore point מִן *I dissolve*; cf. ☞ διὸ ἐφάλμισα (= מִן 31<sup>13</sup>) ἐμαυτὸν καὶ ἐτάκην, *Wherefore I slighted myself and melted*—a conflate rendering. Then, with the further change תַּחְתִּי *in my stead* or *place* (cf. 36<sup>20</sup> 40<sup>12</sup> notes; Hab 3<sup>16</sup>), or possibly תַּחְתִּיךְ *under Thee* (Mi 1<sup>4</sup>) *pro nihilo*, we have a good line: *Therefore I begin to melt on the spot*. According to ancient belief, the sight of God must cause instant dissolution (Gn 16<sup>13</sup> Ex 3<sup>6</sup> 1 K 19<sup>13</sup> Is 6<sup>5</sup> also Gn 32<sup>30</sup> Ju 13<sup>22</sup> al.). Even the mountains 'melted at the Presence of God' (Mi 1<sup>4</sup> Ps 97<sup>4,5</sup>, cf. Is 64<sup>1</sup>):

much more might flesh and blood, the unstable substance of poor humanity, be expected to do so.

Ⲯ's form of st. ii is ἡγημαι δὲ ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν γῆν καὶ σποδόν. This might represent וָנִי לַעֲפָר וְנִחְשְׁבִי *And take myself for dust, &c.* (ἡγέομαι = חָשַׁב five times in Job, 13<sup>24</sup> 19<sup>11</sup> 33<sup>10</sup> 41<sup>19</sup> 35<sup>2</sup>); or perhaps וְנִחְשְׁבִי or וְנִחְשְׁבִי *And I become like* Is 14<sup>14</sup> (which would account for Ⲯ וְנִחְשְׁבִי = וְנִחְשְׁבִי or וְנִחְשְׁבִי *and am still*). But if our restoration of st. i is right, we may suppose that st. ii was originally a reminiscence of 30<sup>19</sup>: וְנִחְשְׁבִי (or וְנִחְשְׁבִי Is 14<sup>10</sup>) כַּעֲפָר וְאֵפֶר *And I (am) become like dust and ashes*; a natural result of dissolution. (Ⲯ *Therefore I will be still | And shall be raised to life—*ⲗⲓⲥⲙⲓⲁⲓ *—on the dust, &c.* Ⲱ *Therefore I despised—*ⲙⲁⲓⲥⲓⲧⲓⲁⲓ *—my riches | And was comforted for my sons who are dust and ashes!*) The idea that Eyob needed repentance for his presumptuous language, and that he expressly admits it in this final utterance, finds explicit statement in Ⲙ: *Idcirco ipse me reprehendo | et ago poenitentiam in favilla et cinere.* That idea is, however, wanting in ⲮⲰⲱ; while, as we have seen, the text of Ⲙ is questionable on grounds both of grammar and metre. That the hero of the poem, for whose moral excellence Iahvah Himself vouches in the Prologue (1<sup>8</sup> 2<sup>3</sup>), and whose language about God, which so greatly shocked the three Friends, actually receives the stamp of Iahvah's approbation in the very next verse (v. 7), should here fall into an agony of penitence, is extremely improbable. It would, in fact, stultify the main argument of the book, which hinges on the assumption of Eyob's perfect integrity and piety.

#### THE PROSE EPILOGUE.

Iahvah declares Eyob to have been right in his contentions as against the Friends, and bids them seek his intercession on their own behalf, lest punishment befall them (vv. 7-9). Eyob is restored to twice his former prosperity, and dies in a good old age (vv. 10-17).

v. 7. *Iahvah*: Ⲯ ὁ Κύριος. Ⲙ om. bis. The prose-narrative relating the happy conclusion of the trial of Eyob naturally reverts to the Divine Name used in the Prologue.

*these words*: Ⲯ prefixes *all* (πάντα = כל), which may well be right. Instead of *Mine anger is hot against thee and against thy two friends* Ⲯ gives ἡμάρτες σὺ καὶ οἱ φίλοι σου = רַעֲיָךְ וְשְׁנֵי רַעֲיָךְ. Cf. 1<sup>21</sup> 2<sup>10</sup>. (A remarkable substitution; perhaps preserving a real v. l.) *of Me*: ⲙⲉ = אֲנִי; cf. Je 27<sup>13</sup>. For אֲנִי used in different senses in the same verse, cf. 1 Sa 3<sup>12</sup>. But Ⲯ ἐνώπιόν μου, Ⲙ coram me (so Ⲯⲱ) = אֲנִי: cf. 1 K 3<sup>22b</sup>, Ju 11<sup>11</sup>. The variant makes little or no difference to the general sense. Eyob had spoken quite honestly of God's dealings with man; the three Friends, in their anxiety to maintain the doctrine that all calamities are penal visitations, had ignored notorious facts of human



experience. (The omission of all reference to Elihu would seem to indicate that he played no part in the original drama: see *Introd.*) נִכְיָה *what is fixed, certain, right or correct*; a syn. of נִמְנָם: Ps 51<sup>7</sup>. ἁληθές; Ὡ rectum; 𐤒 𐤍𐤊𐤏𐤍𐤕 justice. Cf. 𐤍 right, true, Gn 42<sup>11</sup> Nu 27<sup>7</sup> al. (The Sem. 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 *kānu* 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 *be fixed, established*, and so to *be*, is probably identical in origin with Sum. 𐎶𐎵 GIN or GEN, *kānu, kunnu*, 'stand firm', 'establish', *kēllu*, 'right', 'truth', 'justice'; also *alāku* 'to walk', as involving the *upright* position. The primitive form of the character is a human *foot*, which naturally symbolizes either standing fast or motion.)

v. 8. *seven bullocks and seven rams*: Nu 23<sup>1.29</sup> Ez 45<sup>29</sup>. Eyob was to act as priest: cf. Gn 12<sup>7.8</sup> 22<sup>2-13</sup>. If Iahvah was originally a designation of Šin, the moon-god, and identical with El-sheba', *the god Seven*, under which title he may be supposed to have been worshipped at Be'er-sheba' (see Burney *Judges*, pp. 43 f. 249-53 ff.), we may see a reason for the number of the sacrificial victims required by traditional use for His burnt-offering. Such ideas were, however, remote from our author's mind and age. To him sun, moon, and stars are alike subordinate to Iahvah (see 9<sup>7-9</sup> 25<sup>5</sup> 31<sup>26</sup>); sacred numbers were probably a matter of ritual tradition about the original significance of which he felt no curiosity; and he appears to use the various Divine Names transmitted from the past as mere poetical variants of each other. But as in the Prologue he traces the misfortunes of his hero to the initiative of Iahvah, so he ascribes to Him (the God of prophetic revelation) the personal intervention which satisfies Eyob (38<sup>1</sup>; cf. Gn 22<sup>1.11.14</sup>), and his subsequent restoration to health and wealth.

*for his intercession I will accept*: lit. *for his face I will lift up* (Gn 19<sup>21</sup> 1 Sa 25<sup>36</sup>). Pro 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 *leg. כי את־פניו* (at ὁ ὤτι εἰ μὴ κατλ. = 𐤍). *that I may not wreak destruction upon you*: reading 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 (Le 26<sup>16</sup>) or 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 (Is 17<sup>14</sup>; plur. five times in Job, 18<sup>11</sup> al.) pro 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 *folly* (2<sup>10</sup>), which seems too strong a term for the inconsiderateness of anger. Ὡ paraphr. *For, save on his account, I would have destroyed you*; but Ὡ ut non vobis imputetur stultitia = 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 *לבלתי יחשב לכם נבלה*. I *that I may not do to you* 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 *a shameful act* (Dt 22<sup>21</sup>). Ὡ *that I put you not to shame* (𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕). Regarded as a mere *façon de parler* or popular phrase, 𐤍 may be right: *that I may do you no fool-mischief*, play no fool's trick with you, do you no foul wrong, by dealing with you like a 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕. (Or cf. Ps 18<sup>27b</sup>.)

The closing sentence of the verse is repeated, perhaps accidentally, from v. 7. Ὡ varies it thus: *for ye spoke not against my servant Eyob a true thing*; Ὡ has *ad me* = 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤕 instead of *coram me* this time.

v. 9. and Zophar: 𐤏𐤕𐤕 c codd. mult. and Ὡ𐤏𐤕 (exc. 1 post 1). 𐤏𐤕𐤕.

v. 10. The Trans. use of שׁוּב in the phrase שׁוּב שְׁבוּת *to turn the captivity* of a nation or individual (Ps 126<sup>1-4</sup>) and fig. *to restore their fortunes or prosperity* (cf. also Is 52<sup>8</sup> Ez 16<sup>53</sup> Ho 6<sup>11</sup> Am 9<sup>14</sup> Na 2<sup>3</sup>) seems an inexplicable divergence from the ordinary intrans. use of the verb. We should have expected Hi. (cf. the Aram. Aph.). It may be an isolated survival of the vaguer or more comprehensive use of the Root in the primitive stage of the language. (The bilit. √ שׁוּב is possibly identical with Sum. TAB *double, repeat, add, &c.* Cf. the use of שׁוּב to denote the repetition of an action, and the Syr. *ܠܫܬܐ* *again*. To do a thing again may be to reverse it. But perhaps we should rather compare Sum. DUB *go round, surround*; ŠUB *bend, a bow*; ŠUB *turn, turn round* (*lapátu*) = ŠEB *id.*<sup>1</sup>) Q שְׁבוּת, K שְׁבִית *captivity*, Coll. *a body of captives*, or prisoners-of-war, from שָׁבָה (Aram. שָׁבָא, Ar. سَبَا) *to take captive men or cattle as booty of war*, may be compared with Sum. DAB, DIB, *kamû*, 'to take prisoner', šabātu 'to seize', 'take', &c. (√ שׁוּב = tab, dab). *his friends*: וְרֵעֵהוּ ut 1 Sa 30<sup>26</sup>. An רֵעֵהוּ? The uncontracted form here only in Job; 32<sup>9</sup> has רֵעֵי. In 12<sup>4</sup> 16<sup>21</sup> רֵעֵהוּ is Sing. as in Gn 11<sup>9</sup> et saep. al.

*increased all that was Eyob's to double*. Read prob. אֶת-וְרֵעֵהוּ pro אֶת-אֱלֹהֵי (cf. Ez 23<sup>14</sup>) = עָלַ (Dt 1<sup>11</sup>). His possessions were doubled, but not the number of his children (cf. 1<sup>2.3</sup>).

v. 11. *His brothers, or kinsmen*, members of his tribe, and his acquaintance are mentioned 6<sup>16</sup> 19<sup>13</sup>, but his sisters nowhere else; cf. 1<sup>4</sup> 17<sup>14</sup>. *feasted*: lit. *eat bread*: Lk 14<sup>15</sup>. *condoled . . . and comforted*: 2<sup>11</sup>. *an ingot*; scil. of silver? The קִשְׁיָה Gn 33<sup>19</sup> Jos 24<sup>32</sup> (cf. Gn 23<sup>16</sup>) was prob. a definite weight of unstamped metal, used as money. *ἑκαμνᾶδὰ μίαν*, one *ewe-lamb* = *ovem unam*, *חֶדְרָא חֶדְרָא* *one lamb*, *סֵבָל יֶמֶס*. The Midrash Gen. Rab. 79 gives a triple explanation of קִשְׁיָה; viz. *ounces, lambs* (טַלְאִים) and *shekels* (סַלְעִים). In Gn 31<sup>14</sup> *ἑκαμνᾶσις* = עֶשְׂרֵת מָנִים. Was the translator thinking of *manehs* or *minas*, or was he merely misled by the assonance of the two words? In the case before us, a shekel seems too little, and a maneh (50 or 60 shekels) would hardly be too much for a congratulatory present. Perhaps קִשְׁיָה was an old Canaanite equivalent of the Bab. and Aram. מִנָּה; and, like מִנָּה, the word might etymologically denote a definite or specific *portion* of metal (cf. Ar. *قَسَطَ* *divide up or distribute property, apportion a tax, &c.*). Or should we rather compare Aram. קִשְׁיָה (קִשְׁיָה) *just, right, true*, and Ar. *قَسَطَ* *just and a balance for weighing*?

Ⲭ expands the verse thus: *Now all his brothers and his sisters heard*

<sup>1</sup> שׁוּב has lost the initial sound in Ar. *أَب* *return*. If the primary notion was *bent, rounded*, we might comp. אֹב *skin-bottle*, as a round thing, and אָפַף *surround*, and אָפַן *wheel* (AP=AB); also גֹּב, גֹּב, etc.



stibii, refers to the practice of darkening the eyebrows and eyelashes with powdered antimony, as Oriental women still do, to make the eyes appear more brilliant by contrast. Cf. 2 K 9<sup>30</sup> Je 4<sup>30</sup>. G's 'Αμαλθείας κέρας, 'Amaltheia's Horn', is more curious than illuminating. The Greek phrase was used proverbially in the sense of 'horn of plenty' (Anacr. 8 al.); and G, not recognizing the word פֶּה, and misreading 'הַפֶּה for הַפֶּה, may have supposed that the name was *Horn overturned*; scil. in order to pour out the contents, as in the case of the fabled goat or nymph that suckled Zeus, according to the well-known Greek legend. It is doubtful scholarship and mere indulgence of unbridled fancy to interpret the three names as 'Lengthener of Days', 'Shortener of the Thread of Life', and 'Horn of Plenty' ('an astral-mythological allusion; Amaltheia is a constellation'); and to suppose that they 'contain a play upon the Oriental prototype of the three Greek Fates' (Jeremias, *OTLAE*, II. 253 ET.).—These names were evidently intended to suggest that Eyob's daughters were beauties of the first rank (cf. v. 15).

v. 15. Leg. מִצְנָה c 2 codd. and GCB pro מִצְנָה.

in all the land: or earth, as G ἐν τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανόν, B in universa terra. מִצְנָה, אֲבִיהֶם, אֲחֵיהֶם, neglecting the gender of the Pron. Suff. Several codd. correct, reading לָהֶן, &c.

an estate among their brothers: cf. Nu 27<sup>47</sup>.

v. 16. after this: i.e. after giving his daughters their portions; or more prob. after all the events of his restoration. Cf. B post haec. But G μετὰ τὴν πληγὴν, after the stroke (πληγή. ἀπ. in Job = מַכָּה or נֶגֶף).

a hundred and forty years: i.e. twice the period of the usual term of life (Ps 90<sup>10</sup>); so that in this respect also he was doubly compensated for all his sufferings, and might be considered to have attained to a truly patriarchal age. (Cf. Gn 11<sup>26.32</sup>. If Eyob was about 65 at the time when his troubles began, he reached the same age as Terah, viz. 205.) G Now Eyob lived after the Stroke an hundred (and) seventy years, and all the years he lived (were) two hundred (and) forty (and eight: G<sup>acc.</sup> AC). According to this, he was 70 or 78 at the time of the catastrophe.

and saw: K וַיֵּרָא rectè; Q וַיֵּרָא. four generations: but as only three generations are mentioned, including himself, we must either take בני בני in the wider sense of his sons' descendants or posterity, or suppose that וַיֵּרָא אֶת־בְּנֵיהֶם and their sons has fallen out of the text. This last statement was not in the original LXX.

v. 17. sated with life: lit. satisfied with days (Gn 35<sup>29</sup> P).

G adds: But it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raiseth. Is this a reference to 19<sup>26ff.</sup>, or to some Midrash? G adds further: He is explained out of the Syriac book as dwelling in the Ausitic

land on the borders of Idumaea and Arabia. Formerly he had the name of Jobab (see Gn 36<sup>33†</sup>). And taking an Arabian wife, he begets a son named Ennōn; but he himself was of a father Zerah, a son of the Sons of Esau, and a mother Bozrah (Gn 36<sup>39</sup>), so that he was fifth from Abraham. And these are the kings that reigned in Edom, which country he also ruled: first Balak the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba, and after Balak Jobab who is called Job; and after him, Husham who was a Duke from the Temanite country; and after him, Hadad the son of Barad (Heb. Bedad) who smote Midian in the plain of Moab, the name of whose city was Geththaim (Heb. גֵּתְתַיִם).

Now the Friends who came to him (were) Eliphaz of the Sons of Esau (Gn 36<sup>10</sup>), Baldad the Tyrant (or Prince Pr 8<sup>16</sup> Hab 1<sup>10</sup>) of the Sauchaeans, Sophar the king of the Minaeans (G<sup>A</sup> + Teman son of Eliphaz Duke of Idumaea. He is explained out of the Syriac book as dwelling in the Ausitic land on the borders of the Euphrates. Formerly he had the name of Jobab. And his father was Zareth from the sunrising). Ζάρε or Ζάρεθ = זָרַח, which means sunrise. These attempts to fix the place of Eyob in history obviously depend upon the fanciful identification of the patriarch with Jobab (Gn 36 l.c.); but it is hardly necessary to state that the resemblance of the two names is merely one of sound, and that no etymological relation is traceable between them. See *Introd.*

## APPENDIX.—ALTERNATIVE VERSION OF CHAP. 3.

CHAPTER 3.—*1 Afterwards Eyob opened his mouth and  
cursed his day.*

*2 And Eyob answered and said:*

*3 Perish the day I was born,  
And the Night that said, 'A man is conceived!'*

*4 [That Day become Darkness!]  
Eloah above heed it not,  
And no Radiance shine upon it!*

*5 Darkness and Deathshade befoul it!  
Clouds settle upon it!*

*[Benightings(?) of Day affright it!  
6 That Night—utter gloom seize it!]  
Be it not one among the Days of the Year—  
Into the tale of the Months let it come not!*

*7 That Night become stone-barren!  
No joyous birth-shout enter it!*

*8 Ban it they who curse the Day (?)—  
Adept in rousing the Dragon!*

*9 Darkened be its twilight Stars!  
[Let it wait for the Light and there be none!]  
Let it not look on the Eyelids of Dawn!*

*10 Because it shut not my womb-doors,  
And hid not sorrow from mine eyes.*

*11 Why began I not to die from the womb—  
From the belly came not forth to expire?*

*12 Wherefore did knees receive me,  
And breasts when I began to suck?*

*13 For now I had lain down, and were still—  
I had slept; then rest were mine!*

*14 With Kings and Councillors of State,  
Who rebuild ruins for their pleasure.<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> Or *builded themselves memorials* (cf. Eg. *hrp*, stela).

- 15 Or with Princes who had much gold,—  
 Who filled their houses with silver;  
 16 Or like a buried abortion I should be,—  
 Like babes which never saw Light.
- 17 [*There the wicked cease from troubling;  
 And there the weary rest.*]
- 18 Together the prisoners repose;  
 They hear not the taskmaster's voice:  
 19 High and low are there;  
 And the slave is free from his lord.
- 20 Why is Light given to the suffering,  
 And Life to the bitter in soul—  
 23 To the man whose way is hidden,  
 And Eloah hath 'hedged him about'—
- 21 Who wait for Death in vain,  
 And dig for it as buried treasure;  
 22 Who rejoice to see She'ol,—  
 Are glad when they find the Grave?
- 24 [*For before my bread my sighing cometh,  
 And I pour out my groans like water.*]
- 25 If I dread a thing, it cometh upon me,  
 And what I fear befalleth me:  
 26 I have neither ease nor quiet,—  
 No rest, and Wrath cometh.

NOTE.—*Perhaps the last three quatrains should rather be read  
 as follows:*

- 20 Why is Light given to the sufferer,  
 And Life to them that are sorrowful,  
 21 Who wait for Death, and there is none,  
 And who dig for it like buried treasure—
- 23 To the man whose way is hidden,  
 And Eloah hath 'hedged him about',  
 22 Who rejoiceth when he seeth She'ol,—  
 Is glad when he findeth the Grave?
- 25 For a dread I had, and it reached me,  
 And what I feared came upon me:  
 26 I was neither secure nor quiet;  
 I rested not, and yet came Trouble.

## GENERAL INDEX

INTRODUCTION to the Book, pp. 1-34.

Author's argument and its limitations, 1-4.

Analysis of the interpolated Elihu-section, 4-7.

The Praise of Wisdom, chap. 28, another interpolation, 7-8.

Originality of the book, 8.

The name Job, or rather Eyob, identified in Babylonian, 9.

The so-called 'Babylonian Job', 9-11.

Text and Translation of 'The Babylonian Job', 12-30.

Story of Nebuchadnezzar's Fall and Restoration, Dan 4, compared with the older legend, 30-31.

Date of the Book of Job uncertain. Apparent implications of the internal evidence, 31-34.

Note on the prosody of the poem, 34.

A revised translation of the book, 35-94.

Commentary on the traditional Hebrew text and the ancient versions, 95-466.

Appendix.—Alternate Version of Chap. 3, 467-8.

Index Rerum, 470.

Index to Notes on Hebrew Words (mainly philological), 471-5.

Sumerian with Semitic Glosses, 476-9.



## INDEX RERUM

- 'Amaltheia's Horn', p. 465.  
 Angels, 140 f.; 'The Host of Heaven', 145; Invocation of, 145;  
     'Sons of God', 101 f., 140; Messengers of Gods, 33 note, cf. 181;  
     evil, 123, cf. Ps 78<sup>49</sup>; demons (Babylonian), ubiquity of, 103, 105 f.  
 Antiochus Epiphanes, possible reference to, 388.  
 Apocalyptic or Eschatological element wanting in Job, 233, 399.  
 Babylonian cosmogony, allusions to:  
     Man made from clay by the goddess Aruru, 142, 373; created before  
         the beasts, rivers, mountains, vegetation, &c., 239.  
     Division of Primeval Waters, 166; a boundary fixed for the Sea, 416,  
         and paths for the Heavenly Bodies, 181.  
     Primeval War between the Powers of Light and Darkness, 318;  
         'Helpers of Rahab' (*Tiāmat*), 184; Rahab or *Tiāmat* subdued,  
         323 f.  
     Light, as daily creating the world anew, 417 f.  
     The North and the Mountain of the Gods, 321, 413.  
 Belly as the seat of intelligence, 370 f., and the kidneys associated with  
     mind, 425.  
*Benē Kēdem*, 98.  
 Chaldeans, 108.  
 Confusion of *ḥ* and *š* in old script, 305.  
 Creation of Man, 142, 194.  
 'Day of Iahvah', no reference in Job, 309, 399.  
 Earth as the Great Mother, 110.  
 Father as family priest, 99.  
 'Fire of God', 108.  
 Horus, an Egyptian sun-god, 181.  
 Laws of Hammurabi quoted, 362.  
 Mythical conceptions of physical phenomena (Snow, Light, Darkness, &c.),  
     420; Father of Rain and Dew, 421; Constellations, 422 f.  
 Necromancy, 137.  
 Numbers seven and three, 97.  
 Oath, formula of the sacred, 326.  
 'Pillars of Heaven', 323.  
 Play on the name Eyob, 373.  
 Prayer in healing sick (Bab.), 319.  
 Rebuilding ruins brings a curse, 245.  
 Sabeans, 107.  
 Satan, The, 102-104; cf. 123 f. (Evil Spirits).  
 Shaving the head a sign of mourning, 109.  
 She'ol, conceptions of, 198; its locality, 321; the dead ignorant of  
     events on earth, 236; pains of decay(?) 237; porter of She'ol,  
     419.

# INDEX TO NOTES ON HEBREW WORDS (MAINLY PHILOLOGICAL)

אָבָה	188 f.	בִּהִיר	413
אָבָה	170	בִּהַל	290
אֲבִדוֹן	321	בְּחִמוֹת	439 f.
אֲבִיר	316	בּוֹל	442
אֲבִר	232	בּוֹז	168
אֲנַל	421	בּוֹם	168
אֲנִר	33, 173	בּוֹר	266
אוֹה	170	בּוֹה	168
אוֹיִל	145	בַּחַן	307
אָחוֹז	443	בַּחַר	307
אִיּוֹב	9, 95	בִּלְגָּ	189
אִיתָנִים	216	בְּלִימָה	321 f.
אֵל	145	בִּלְם	322
אֵל	158, 212	בְּמוֹת	182
אֱלֹהִים	212	בְּצִר	302, 398
אֱלֹהִים	97, 101, 138, 339	בְּצִיר	202
אֱלֹהִים	241	בֵּר	190
אֱלִיל	220	בְּרִית	190
אֱלִילִי	195	בְּרַח	229
אֱלִף	381	בַּת יַעֲנָה	430
אֱלִף	381		
אֱלִיף	381	גִּב	296
אֱמֵל	145	גִּבֵּר	232
אֱפִיק	441, 451	גִּוֵּעַ	197
אֲרֵגֶב	296	גִּיר	440
אֲרִי	135	גִּיחַ	415, 444
אֲרִיָּה		גִּלָּר	252
אֲשֶׁשׁ	232	גִּנֵּב	256, 292
אֲתָמוֹל	176	גִּרָם	407
		גִּשָּׁם	407
בִּגְד	245		
בְּרִיָּה	265, 449	רֵאבָה	453

דִּי	287	חמד	286
דָּגַל	350	חמס	247
דניאל	9	חמין	247
דקק	412	הנף	177, 244
דרום	412	חנק	167
		חף	373
האביר	435	חצה	149
הוא	407	חצין	149, 293
הור	414	חקר	202
הוות	165	חרב	232
הלך	248	חרה	232
הלל	340	חרנפר	181
הרם	213	חרם	181, 232, 456
התחטא	455	חרף	200
התל	221	חרר	232
זהב	337, 362	טחות	425 f.
זהם	376	טחן	358
זור	272	טפל	220
זך	190	טרח	409
זכה	190		
זכוכית	337	יאל	145
זלעפה	246	יאל	158
זמם	358	ידע	415
		יהוה	211, 406, 462
חבל	388 f.	יין	371
חדה	231	יבח	220
חדור	456	ילעלעו	436
חוג	299	יפע	192
חול	344	יקוט	177
חויץ	149	ירח	319
חור	279	ירט	252
חוש	357	ירק	169
חזיו	339	ישן	294
חין	450	ישש	368
חף	372		
חלָה	207	כאב	237
חלילה	326	כבר	232
חלף	234	כחד	245
חלד	194, 197 f., 206	כחש	250, 353

בידור	452	מענדות	422
בירון	456	מקום	316
בימה	182 f.	מרץ	163
כלה	208	משטר	425
כלם	200	משל	325 f.
כָּנָה	371	מתים	199
כָּסָא	322	מתלעות	343
בסיל	182 f.		
כפיר	283	נאף	170
כפר	190	נבל	229
כרר	202	נְבִלָה	229
כָּתָם	337	נְבִלָה	116, 462
		נבכי	419
לאה	250	נגן	349
לאם	381	נוה	185
לבב	203	נוח	185
לביא	283	נוף	362
לויחן	124, 445	נום	464
לילית	266	נחושה	160
ליץ	378	נחשת	160
ליש	283	נחשתון	124
לפיד	452	גין ונכד	267
לפת	162	נכונה	462
		נכח	220
מאם	168, 460	נכר	385
מבול	289	נמלה	145
מום	205	נפל	229
מורש	259 f.	נפש	453
מזיח	218	נשב	170
מזרות	423	נשם	170
מלאך	377	נשף	170
מלאכי	32 f.	נתך	194
מליץ	377 f.		
מלל	229	סבל	410
מסה	168, 172	סנור	336 f.
מָסָה	187	סד	227
מסם	168	סור	239
מסכן	301	סור	232
מָסַע	455	סחיפה	236
מעון	427	סכן	237 f., 383

סלף	217	קמל	145
ספח	236	קנה	443
סרס	213	קרח	421
		קש	226
עויל	273	קשה	226
עון	225	קשת	226
עיש	182 f.	קשיטה	463
עמישה	452		
עלים	297	ראם	429
עלמין	350	ראש	229
ענר	366	רבב	371
ענק	167	רגב	296
עצב	193	רגל	172
ערל	157	רגן	172
ערין	226	רגע	172
		רהב	374
פז	338	רוח	138, 255
פח	298	רוח	371
פיד	209	רוח	452
פימה	244	רחב	371
פלא	196	רחץ	341
פלט	307	ריב	374
פלל	360	ריר	157
		רפה	319
צאלים	442	רמח	433
צבא	170	רנן	282
צול	457	רסס	213
צחנה	273	רעמה	429 f.
צלצל	448	רענן	247
צפים	147, 264	רפאים	189, 320
צמת	161	רצה	231
צנים	444	רצח	213
צפור	446	רצין	213
צרר	235	רקע	412
		רק	169
קדוש	145	רקק	169
קדקר	229		
קטל	224	שאנן	294
קיר	202	שאף	170
קלתי	437	שבה	463

שביב	263, 458	שלה, שלו	210, 294
שננ	214	שלח	248
שנה	214	שלך	248, 264
שנע	214	שלל	210
שדר	210, 242	שמר	173
שדי	212, 291	שמץ	324
שהם	337	שנה	437
שוא	171	שנים	437
שואה	351	שפח	236
שוב	463	שפע	298
שׁוה	185, 201	שקה	214
שור	173	שקל	155
שורות	312	שרר	440
שזף	283	תאם	437
שחר	248, 398	תבל	409
שחח	185	תהום	184
שחל	283	תולעה	319
שחץ	459	תועפות	303
שחק	235, 391	תור	173
שחת	185	תורה	302
שטח	219	תוי"זיה	214, 354
שׁטם	250	תותח	456
שמן	250	תלע	343
שיב	458	חם	96
שיח	238	חמה	323
שכב	426	חמול	176
שכוי	425	תעב	190
שפוח	447	תפת	257
שכם	216, 362		

# SUMERIAN WITH SEMITIC GLOSSES

A *mú, mé, banú*, water, beget, 131, 421.

AG (AGA, AGU) *agú*, crown, 299.

ANSHU *iméru*, ass, 216.

EDIN *šéru, edinú*, plain, wilderness, desert, 142.

EL *ellu*, bright, pure (cf. UL *nabádu*, glitter), 212.

ELALU *zamméru*, singer, *lallaráté*, outcries, wailing (cf. ILU); ELLU *id.*, 195.

ER *dímtu, bikílu, bakú*, tears, weeping, to weep, 131.

EME *lišánu*, tongue, speech; EME-KUKU *ákil qarçi*, slanderer (Sum. *tongue + cal*), 274.

EME-SIG *qarçu*, calumny, slander (Sum. *tongue + base*), 220.

EN *enu*, priest, *bélu*, lord, *šarru*, king.

EN, ENE, *ittu*, time, 176.

ENEM *amātu*, word (see INIM), 358.

EN-ZUNA (? ZU-ENNA) *Sín*, the Moon-god, 123.

ESIR *sulá, sáqu, šulá*, road, street, 232.

ID, I, *náru*, river, canal, 402.

ID, ITU, ITI, *arhu*, moon, month, 319.

IDÉ, *inu, énu*, eye (also IGI), 415.

ILU *nubá*, wailing, 195, 378.

IM, EN, *šáru*, wind, storm, 289.

IM, IN, *ulluğu, šaná*, dye, stain, taint, 241.

IM-BAL *nabbaltu*, tornado, 289.

IM-GAL *šáttu, méhu*, south, south-wind, 123.

IM-ĞUL *imhullu*, hurricane, 123.

IM-SUB *kémašši*, melting-pot (from IM *íštu*, clay), 160.

INIM *amātu*, word, 358.

UD, U, *ánu, urru*, day, (*ilu*) *Šamaš*, the Sun, 414.

U, UA, *šammu*, vegetation, plants, greens, *rílu*, pasture, *mákalu*, food, 131.

UG (GUG? MUG?) *mítu*, dead, *mātu*, death, 197.

UG = ĞUG = RUG, 169.

UG *ru'tu, rátu*, spittle, UĞ-RIA *rusá, ruhá*, bewitching (*spittle + let flow*), 157.

UG, UĞU, general name for various kinds of insects, grubs, and other vermin (*kalmatu, mánu, sásu, paršu'u*, &c.); UĞ-TUR (DUR), *tultu*, worm, maggot, *ákilu*, moth-grub, 319.

UL *ullu, ulçu*, joy, 158.

UR *kalbu, labbu, néšu*, dog, lion, 135.

UR-KU *kalbu*, dog, 424.

URIG *urğılu*, greens, 247.

UZU *šíru*, flesh, 302.

UZU UR-UŠ, (*šíru*) *tértum ša šíri*, omen from inspection of the flesh, 302.

USAN, USA, *šittum*, sleep, 294.

USHUM-GAL *ušumgallu* ('Great Worm'), *bašmu*, a serpent (mythical?), 123.

BAD *pitá*, open, 146, 152.

BAD *nisá*, far, depart, 209.

BAL *nabalkutu, pilaggu*, break through, axe, 183, 196, 360.

BAL *ebéru*, get over, 410.

BAL *tabáku*, pour out, 156.

BAL *dabábu, tamá*, speak, say, 229.

BA-LAG *balaggu*, harp, 349.  
 BIL *qalá*, *šarāpu*, BI-BI *šahānu*, burn, 114.  
 BUL *nāšu*, quake, 290.  
 BAR *aḥātu*, side, 183.  
 BAR, BA, *parāsu*, *zāzu*, *pitú*, *mišlu*, split, divide, open, half, 183.  
 BAR *namāru*, *nīru*, *šamšu*, shine, light, sun; cf. PAR *namru*, bright, 190.  
 BUR *bāru*, *hurru*, *šuplu*, pit, hole, bottom, 184.  
 PA . . . Ê *šūpá*, shine forth, 192.  
 PAG *esirum ša iṣṣuri*, auceps, cavea avium? 298.  
 PAR *namru*, bright, shining, 190.  
 PESH, PI, *napāšu*, *rapāšu*, breathe, blow, expand, *erá*, become pregnant, 245, 453.  
 GAB *irtu*, breast, 296.  
 GABA-TINU 'hill of life'?, 348.  
 GABI-RI *šadú*, mountain, 348.  
 GAB-RI *maḥāru*, to 'breast', confront, 232.  
 ĠAB *bi'šnu* *bīšnu*, stinking, foul, bad, 171, 190, 241.  
 GIB, GIG, *marṣu*, *murṣu*, *ikkibu*, sick, sickness, pain, 237.  
 GU *šasú*, *apálu*, *qibú*, speak, 241.  
 ĠU BUR, *huburu*, abyss?, 184.  
 GUG *samtú*, sparkling? (cf. GUB *ellu*), 337.  
 GUN *kisádu*, neck, 167.  
 GAD *kitú*, clothing stuff of some kind, 245.  
 GAD *qātu*?, hand, 248.  
 ĠAD *ellu*, *ebbu*, *namru*, bright, pure, 231.  
 GID *aráku*, be long, 296.  
 GAL *našú*, *šaḡálu*, lift, 155.  
 ĠAL *garáru*, flow, run, 357, 369.  
 ĠAL *zāzu*, split, halve, 183.  
 GUL *abātu*, *ubbutu*, perish, destroy, 208.  
 ĠUL *limnu*, bad, hostile, 290; *zāru*, hate, 273.  
 ĠUL *šulputu*, destroy, 208.  
 ĠUL *ḥidílu*, rejoicing, 195.

GAM, GAN, *kamāsu*, *kanāšu*, *ga-dādu*, bend, bow, 177.  
 GEME, GEM, *sinništu*, *amtú*, *ardatu*, woman, maid; GEME-DUG *kunnú*, greet (or treat) tenderly, 371. (Cf. GEN, GÊ, *amtú*.)  
 GEN, GÊ, *šerru*, *la'á*, *ṣiḥru*, little, weak, 301.  
 GUM, ĠUM, *ḥamāšu*, *ḥašálu*, grind, pound, 247.  
 ĠIN *šalmu*, dark, 146.  
 ĠIN, GI, *qanā*, reed, 146.  
 ĠIN *šadú*, mountain?, 182.  
 GAR *šakānu*, *šarāqu*, make, put, give (cf. MUN-GAR *makkūru*, goods), 447.  
 GAR *uḥḥuzu*, *eséru*, *abbuttu*, *lānu* (= INGAR), enclose, bind, fetter, wall, 202.  
 ĠAR, GISH-ĠAR, *eṣéru*, *uṣurtu*, enclose, bounds, 202.  
 ĠÍR *birqu*, lightning, 232.  
 GI-RIM *ellu*, *samtú*, clear, pure, a gem (cf. RIN *ellu*), 337.  
 GISH *išádu*, fire, 232.  
 GISH, GESH, *iṣu*, tree; GESH-TIN *inu*, *karanu*, vine, wine ('Tree of Life'), 371.  
 GUSH-KIN *ḥurāṣu*, gold, 337.  
 KA *pām*, *pá*, *appu*, mouth, face, 220.  
 KA-GÁL (*píl pí*), 'Open-mouth', 123.  
 KASH *lasmu*, fiery, impatient?, 146.  
 KESH *riksu*, bond, 226.  
 KA-ZAL *tašiltu*, pleasure ('ace-bright'), 231.  
 KA-SHU-MAR, KA-SHU-GAL, *appa labānu*, to cast down the face (in prayer), 229.  
 KIN *šite'ú*, seek, look for, attend to, 383.  
 KU(N), KUKKU, KU-KU, *lābu*, *dašpu*, good, sweet; KU *matqu*, mead or metheglin: cf. ĠIN *lābu*, 273.  
 KU, KUÊ, *akálu*, to eat, 131.  
 KU-BABBAR, *kaspu*, *šarpu*, silver, 337.



KAR, *kāru*, wall, 202.

KAR-KAR *nabātu ša ūme*, shine of day, 421.

KUR *šadū*, mountain, 239; KUR-GAL *šadū rabū* (title of a god), 291.

KUR, KURUM (i. e. KURU), *paqādu*, look after, entrust, &c., 385.

KUR *nakru*, enemy, 385.

DA(G), DA; cf. DA-GAL *rapšu*, broad, 412.

DAB, *lamū*, *saḥāru*, surround = DUB, 381.

DIB *aḥāzu*, *kaḥū*, *ṣabātu*, *taḥāhu*, seize, catch, take, 463.

DAG *ebbu*, *ellu*, *namru*, bright, shining; cf. DI, DE, *nabātu*, *nummuru*, glitter, brighten, &c., 415.

DAG *naparkū*, give way, cease, 161.

DAL *naprušu*, fly away, 222.

DIM *sanāqu*, bind, fasten; *riksu*, bond, rope, 323.

DIM *kīma*, like, 337.

DUMU, DAMU, *māru*, child, son (also daughter, *mārtu*), 424.

DI *dēnu*, judgement, 415.

DIM-MER, DI-MER, DIN-GIR, DI-GIR, *ilu*, *iltu*, god, goddess, 144.

DUN *palānu*, eat, swallow, 147.

DA-RI *zāqu*, blow hard, 412.

DAR-LUGAL *tarlugallu*, Aram. *tarnegōlā*, cock, 123.

DUR *labāku*, *raḥbu*, to flow?, watered, moist, fresh, 419.

TA *ina*, *kīma*, in, with, like = DA *idu*, *illu*, side, 160, 410.

TAM *talīmu*, brother; TAN *ḥawīru*, spouse; TAB *tappū*, companion (cf. DAM *mātu*, *aššatu*, spouse), 437.

LAL, LA, *enšu*, weak, *mašū*, to minish, 250.

LAB *šūtuqu*, vast, huge, immense, 381.

LAG = NAG (*šaqū*, *šatū*, irrigate, drink), swallow, eat?, 343.

LAG *nāru*, *namāru*, light, shine (cf. LAG in ZA-LAG), 181, 189. Cf. RA (RAG?) *illu*, *ebbu*, *namru*, bright, pure.

LI in LI-DU, *zamāru*, sing, 378.

LI-LIZ *līlisu*, guitar-playing (Chinese *li*), 378.

LI *šamnu*, oil, fat (Ch. *nī*, *li*, fat), 341.

LI-NUN *ḥimētu*, butter, 341.

LÜ *amēlu*, man; LÜ KINGA *mār šipri*, messenger, 123. (Cf. NU *amēlu*, *zikaru*; Ch. *nu*, *lu*, slave.)

LUḠ *palāhu*, be afraid, 181.

RAḠ, RA, *raḥāqu*, to flood, wash, 341 (cf. LAG, LUḠ *mišā*, to wash, str. make bright or pure).

RAḠ, RA, *rapāsu*, to strike, thresh, 412. (Cf. LAG *mašādu*, to smite.)

RI, (RIḠ), *zāqu*, to blow hard; *ziqqu*, blast, 138, 374.

RIG in U-RIG, green (Ch. *luk*, Jap. *ryoku*, green), 169.

RÜ *banā*, build, make, 142 (= DU).

RUZ (RAZ) in SHU-RUZ, *ka-bābu*, *šabābu*, *šamā*, burn, sparkle, shine, 231.

MAL = BAL = GAL, *nabālu*, *labānu*, throw down, 229.

MUL *kakkabu*, star; *nabālu*, *namāru*, shine, 212, 423.

MULU BABBAR Μολοβοβαρ, 184.

MIM, NIG (ning), NIN, *mamma*, *mimma*, *mumma*, any one, any thing, 205.

MUN *šikaru ša KASH*, *šābtu*, must, 371.

MU-TIN (= GESH-TIN) *inu*, vine, wine, 371.

MUN-GAR *makkūru*, goods, 447.

MU(N) SUB *šimetan*, *lilātum*, evening, 125.

MASH *mašū*, *tuāmu*, twin, 181 (= MAN *mašā*).

MASH *ellu*, *ebbu*, bright, pure; *ššipū*, purifying priest, exorcist (also *mašmašu*).

MUSH *çiru*, serpent (cf. Jap. *mushi*, worms, *ma-mushi*, viper), 125.

MEZ, *edlu*, ME, MU, (MISH, MESH, MUSH) *zikaru*, male, man, 199.

NA, NU, *rabāçu*, lie down, *utūlu*, *çalālu*, &c., 146.

NAG = SHAG 195. NAG *šatū*, to drink, 131.

NAM-LÜGAL, *amélūtu*, mankind, 142. (With LÜGAL cf. Arab. *rag'ol*, man.)

NIG, LIG, *kalbatu*, bitch; *nēštu*, lioness, 135.

NU, LA, *lā*, not, 131.

NUM, LUM, *unnubu*, *uššubu*, to grow luxuriantly, to plant, 287.

NUMUN, NU, *zēru*, seed, 142, 287.

NUN *rabū*, great; *rubū*, prince, 287.

ZAG flame? cf. ZA in ZA-LAG *nūrum ša išdli* (= 𒌦𒌦), 190.

ZA-BAR *ebbu*, *ellu*, *namru*, bright, gleaming; *šiparru*, copper, 362.

ZEB *šābu*, good, beautiful, 362 (cf. DUG and ZAG *šābu*).

ZIB, (ZIG), *šimlan*, twilight, evening (cf. SUB in MU-SUB), 125.

ZAG *lamētu*, address to a god, 238.

ZUR *kunnū*, treat tenderly, 371.

ZUR *ikribé*, prayers, 349.

SHAB *baqāmu*, *ḥarāçu*, *šarāmu*, split, &c., 136; *barū ša širi*, inspect flesh of victims, 283.

SHIB (in I-SHIB *išibbu*, diviner, sorcerer) divination, 356.

SHAG, SHA, *damāqu*, *dummuqu*,

to be bright, pure; to purify metals, 190, 194, 337.

SHUB *lapātu*, to bend, bow, turn round (also SEB), 463.

(SHAD,) SAD, SATI, *bāmātu*, mountains (cf. *satum* = *šadū*; Assy. loanword), 212.

SHID *atmā*, speech, 239.

SHA-KAN *imēru*, ass, 216.

SHEN *ebbu*, *ellu*, bright, pure, 194.

SHER *rakāsu*, *riksu*, *qaçāru*, bind, bond.

SHER *šarāru*, splendour; SIR, SI, *nūru*, *namāru*, light, to shine, 173.

SHUG, SHUKU, *kurummatu*, sustenance, bread, 131.

SHU-RIN *tínūru*, clay oven, fire-pot, 356.

SUB (GEN-TA-) *limmašiš*, *limlessi*, let him be purified! 160.

SAG *mūmītu*, charm (cf. ZAG *lamētu*), 238.

SAG-DU *qaqqādu*, head, 458.

SA-ĠAR *epru*, dust, earth, 235.

SIG *damāqu*, *dummuqu*, *çurruqu*, to be bright, pure, to purify, smelt or refine metals, 194, 337 (cf. SHAG).

SIG *argu*, green, yellow, 337.

SIG *šipātu*, *šupātu*, fleece, woollen stuff, 177.

SIL, SUL, *sāqu*, *sulū*, road or street, 232. (Cf. SIR in E-SIR.)

SIR, SUR, *zamāru*, sing; *çarāhu*, shriek, scream, 355.

SIR BALAGGA *zamār balaggi*, harp-music, 349.

SIR *šerū*, depart (cf. SUD and E-SIR), 232.

SIM in IR-SIM, *armanmu*, *erēšu*, smell, fragrance, 376.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND  
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS