Summer 6-2-1955

Studies in the Language of Job

Nahum M. Sarna

Recommended Citation

Studies in the Language of Job

Abstract

The Book of Job has long been a literary enigma. It is unique in the Hebrew Bible, not alone for the intellectual daring with which it elaborates upon a profound problem, but also because of its unusual and outstanding features of literary structure.

Degree Type
Dissertation

Degree Name
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

First Advisor
Joseph Reider

Second Advisor
Cyrus H. Gordon

Third Advisor
Meir H. Bravmann

Subject Categories
Biblical Studies | Jewish Studies | Language Interpretation and Translation | Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion | Translation Studies

Comments

STUDIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF JOB

by

NAHUM M. SARNA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The Dropsie College

for Hebrew and Cognate Learning

1955

APPROVAL

This dissertation, entitled

STUDIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF JOB.

by

Nahum M. Sarna

Candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

has been read and approved by

Joseph Reider

Cyrus H. Gordon

M. M. Brassman

Date   June 2, 1955

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

C O N T E N T S.

INTRODUCTION.

The Book of Job has long been a literary enigma. It is unique in the Hebrew Bible, not alone for the intellectual daring with which it elaborates upon a profound problem, but also because of its unusual and outstanding features of literary structure.

In the first place, we have a combination of prose and poetry, yet with the two elements separate.[1] We are confronted with a work which so obviously belongs to the Wisdom Literature, but which follows, in the main, the style of the Prophets and Psalms. In fact, there is more sustained poetry than in any other Biblical book. Moreover, the use of dialogue as a literary device, while not exclusive to Job, is developed to a degree unmatched in the classical Hebrew literature.

But it is principally in the peculiarities and difficulties of the language - morphological, syntactical and lexical - with their special problems of interpretation that the unique character of the Book of Job is exhibited. I.M. Casanowicz enumerated sixty absolute hapax legomena with a total of 145 unique forms.[2] Fried. Delitzsch[3]

---

1. The Massorah has noted the difference between the Prose and Poetry by two distinct systems of accentuation. For details see צבי הר-זהב, דקדוק הלשון העברית, II, ג, פרק תשיעי (תל-אביב, תשי"ב).

noted no less than 259 words, forms and usages not met
with elsewhere. In other words, Job displays the
greatest concentration of literary difficulties and the
largest vocabulary of any book of the Hebrew Bible. There
is hardly a line but that contains some perplexing word,
form or expression.

Any approach to these difficulties has to take
account of the text. The earlier scholars regarded the
text as excellent, although Houbigant in the 18th century
had already pointed out some textual errors and had
proposed emendations.[4] Even Justus Olshausen, who
generally showed a critical approach to the Massoretic
Text, favorably regarded Job as being one of the better
preserved texts.[5] It was not until 1871 with the appearance
of the metrical theories of Merx[6] that this favorable view
was challenged. From then on a general reaction set in
among scholars who expressed a profound suspicion of the
trustworthiness of our transmitted text and who proceeded

---

2.   Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol.VI, Article, "Hapax
Legomena". The number is equalled only by Isaiah with also
60 absolute cases and 201 unique forms.

3.   Das Buch Hiob, (Leipzig, 1902), p.125.

4.   C.F. Houbigant, Notae Criticae (1777).

5.   Cited by Karl Budde, Das Buch Hiob.
(Göttingen,1896),p.XLVI.

to the wholesale excision, emendation and rearrangement
of the book.[7]

Since the present study is restricted to the
linguistic problems of Job there is no need for more
than a passing reference to the numerous reconstructions
that have been proposed.[8] But a word must be said about
the emendation of the text. This may be of two types. It
may be purely hypothetical or it may rest upon the ancient
versions. The former is now being increasingly recognized
as an unsatisfactory basis for textual interpretation.
Recent research has more and more tended towards a growing
respect for the reliability of the MT, so that many of
the emendations proposed are now realized as being groundless.[9]
Even where emendation rests upon the readings of the versions
considerable caution has to be exercised. Comparative
Semitic philology no less than a study of the nature of the

---

6. A. Merx, Das Gedicht Hiob (1871).

7. For bibliographical details see Budde, op.cit.,
pp. XLVI -XLVII.

8. Detailed examples of such reconstructions are
to be found in R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament
(New York, 1948), p.671.

9. D. Winton Thomas, "The Textual Criticism of the Old
Testament", The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H.Rowley
(Oxford, 1951), pp. 238 - 263.

particular version from which the emendation is drawn shows

that many supposed divergencies of the versions from the MT

are "not in reality divergencies at all, but on the contrary,

reflect a text identical with the Massoretic text".[10]

In the case of Job the versions provide peculiarly little

support for the emendation of the MT.[11] In short, the

verdict of a recent writer[12] that "the reputation of the

MT stands deservedly high and that for the serious study

of the O.T. it must, in spite of its imperfections, con-

stitute the proper starting-point", applies with particular

force to the text of Job.

Quite a different line of approach to the linguistic

problems of the book is pursued by those who have recourse

to comparative Semitics. The result has been the uncovering

of an astonishing variety of linguistic influences. Scholars

---

10. Ibid., p.242. cf. H.M. Orlinsky, "The
Septuagint, its Use in Textual Criticism", BA, IX, (1946),
pp. 21 - 34.

11. S.R. Driver and G.B. Gray, The Book of Job
(International Critical Commentary, New York, 1921), Vol. 1.
pp. lxxi - lxxvi. P. Dhorme, Le Livre De Job (Paris, 1926),
pp. clii - clxxv. H.M. Orlinsky, "Some Corruptions in the
Greek Text of Job", JQR, xxvi, (1935), pp. 133 - 145.
cf. W.B. Stevenson, Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of
the Poem of Job (1951), p.3." ... sometimes variant Hebrew
readings have been wrongly inferred from phraseology that
is merely a paraphrase of MT".

12. D. Winton Thomas, The Recovery of the Ancient
Hebrew Language (1939), p.37.

have found, or have professed to find, affinities with
Arabic,[13] Aramaic,[14] Assyrian and Babylonian,[15] Edomite,[16]
Egyptian,[17] Mishnaic Hebrew[18] and Sumerian.[19] Some have
even gone so far as to maintain that our present work is

---

13. Alb. Schultens, Liber Jobi (1737), opened a new
epoch in Biblical studies by his philological approach,
explaining words largely on the basis of Arabic. He was
followed by J.J. Reiske, Conjecturae in Jobum et Proverbia
(Lips.,1779), and by Schnurrer, Animadversiones ad quaedam
loca Jobi (Tüb.,1781-2). B.Stade, Lehrbuch der Hebr.
Grammatik (1879), p.12ff., noted several Arabisms in Job.
See infra,note 22.

14. K.Budde, Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob
(1876), p.141;T.K. Cheyne, Job and Solomon (1887), pp.293-295;
E. Kautzsch, Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament (Halle, 1902).
Kautzsch, who dealt only with the lexicon and not with grammar,
counted 32 Aramaisms in the vocabulary. See further infra, note 21.

15. Dhorme, op. cit., pp.CXL -CXLI.

16. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.682: "... its thought and
language are characteristically Edomite." cf. ZAW, 44,
(1926), pp. 13-25, where Pfeiffer concludes that the book
is an Edomite production. Unfortunately, we do not possess
a single line of "Edomite" from any other source to
substantiate Pfeiffer's characterization of the language.

17. P. Humbert, Recherches sur les sources
égyptiennes de la littérature sapientiale d'Israël (Neuchâtel,
1929), p.75ff., pointed to many phrases and expressions
borrowed, in his view, from Egyptian literature and concluded
that the author lived in Egypt.

18. J. Barth, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Hiob
(1876), p.4; Stade, op.cit., cf. the instances noted by
M.H.Segal, Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (1927), Index "Job",
p.246. It is interesting,that while J. Meinhold,
Einführung in das Alte Testament (1926), p.39 claimed that
the language was post-exilic and similar to that of Ezra -

a translation. The first to do so was Abraham Ibn Ezra
in the 12th century, though he failed to specify what he
considered the original language to be.[20]   H. Torczyner[21]
regards the book as an inexact translation from an original
Aramaic, while F.H.Foster sees Arabic as the original.[22]

How are we to account for this unparalleled
diversity of linguistic affinities and for such a unique
concentration of literary perplexities within the compass
of a single book? No doubt, the very cosmopolitan
character of Hebrew Wisdom literature, its proven
indebtedness to extra-Israelite sources, incorporating
as it did the best of the accumulated Wisdom writings of
the ancient Near Eastern world, would of itself be
expected to produce dialectic variety in the literary form
in which it finally came to be expressed in Hebrew.[23]

Nehemiah, A. Dillman, Hirzel's Commentary 4th ed. (1891),
p.xxxv referred to its "classical elegance".

19.   C.J.Ball, Book of Job (1922).

20.   Commentary to 2:11.   " והקרוב אלי כי הוא ספר מתורגם על
כן הוא קשה בפרוש כדרך כל ספר מתורגם."
on 6:3, Ibn Ezra rejects an Aramaic origin of לעו . For
his comment cf. Ibn Janah, Sefer ha - Shorashim ed. Bacher
(Berlin,1897), s.v. בלע

21.   נ.ה. טורטוינר, ספר איוב (ירושלים, תש״א), [מהדורה שניה (תל-אביב, תש״ד)]

22.   "Is the Book of Job a Translation from an
Arabic Original?" AJSL, 49 (1932 - 33), pp.21-45.

In considering therefore, the literary problems of the
Biblical Wisdom books the possibility must always be
present that morphological, syntactical and lexical
peculiarities of any given work may as well exemplify
the literary influences of the source material as
characterize the style of the author or editor. Then
it must be remembered that Hebrew poetry in general
preserves linguistic strata that are not to be found
in prose. Since Job contains more poetic material than
other books we should not be surprised at a corresponding
growth in the number of rare forms; and the presentation
of Wisdom literature in poetic style provides a twin
source of difficulty. There is also some evidence that in
several instances dialectic variety is nothing more than a
mere literary device.[24]

The large number of hapax legomena may, moreover,
be partly accidental. The subject matter of Job is removed

---

23. W.O.E. Oesterley, The Book of Proverbs (1929),
pp.xxiv - lv. P.Humbert, op.cit.; Baumgartner, Israëlitische
und altorientalische Weisheit (1933), pp.20ff. W.O.E.
Oesterley and T.H.Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of
the Old Testament (1934), pp. 161-165; C.I.K Story,"The
Book of Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Literature", JBL, 64
(1945), pp. 319-39; H.L. Ginsberg, The Legend of King Keret
(1946), p.33; Pfeiffer, op.cit., pp.647-8,esp. p.648, note 1.

somewhat from the usual Biblical trend of thought and the wealth of ideas calls for a commensurate richness of language and variety of expression. The Hebrew Bible employs a very restricted vocabulary which certainly does not exhaust the ancientHebrew lexicon. The fact that many vocables can be explained by reference to the cognate Semitic languages does not necessarily mean that these same words were not in use in Hebrew.[25]

The wealth of inscriptional material that has been unearthed in the Near East during the past few decades has greatly enlarged the Semitic lexicon, has uncovered completely new features of Semitic grammar and syntax and, above all, has helped to place the Biblical literature in its appropriate cultural setting. The net result has been an elucidation of the written word to an extent not hitherto possible and this in turn has led to a positive re-evaluation of the scholarly attitude to the MT.

_____

24. This subject will be further discussed in the body of the dissertation.

25. cf. Dhorme, op.cit., p. cxli: La pénurie de notre documentation explique la disparition d'un certain nombre de mots ou d'expressions, qui étaient connus de la langue vulgaire ou littéraire, mais qui n'ont point été fixés dans la Bible".

reference to which has already been made.

The publication and interpretation of the Ugaritic material recalled several points of contact with Job.[26] But, as far as is known to the present writer, no attempt has as yet been made systematically and comprehensively to present, let alone evaluate, the numerous parallels between the Canaanite literature and the Book of Job.

Such a study will, it is contended, prove that while the book undoubtedly contains late features such as Aramaisms and Neo-Hebraisms, the greatest single literary influence is Canaanite and the language is saturated in all aspects with Canaanisms. The term "Canaanite" is here used in its most general sense to refer to the ancient dialects of Palestine and the Syrian (Phoenician) coast, including the language of the Amarna glosses from Palestine and of Ugarit.[27]

---

26. H.L. Ginsberg, _JBL_, 62 (1943), p.111 noted several Canaanisms in Job; W.F. Albright, "The O.T. and the Canaanite Language and Literature", _CBQ_, vii (1945), p.29, noted that "Proverbs and Job gain immensely from the new Ugaritic data which have already cleared up wholly or partially scores of obscure passages... Job contains scarcely any literary points of contact with the rest of the Bible, though its extraordinary poetic richness demands literary contacts somewhere". C.L. Feinberg, _BS_, 103(1946), pp.283-92, deals with:"the poetic structure of the Book of Job and the Ugaritic literature"; T.H. Gaster, _Thespis_ (1950), brings several references to parallels between Job and Canaanite mythological texts.

27. cf. Z.S. Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects (1939) pp.2-3; _A Grammar of the Phoenician Language_ (1936) pp.6-7.

It is hoped to reveal several hitherto unsuspected morphological and syntactical features and to demonstrate, incidentally, that the weight of evidence is in favor of our Hebrew as the original language of the book.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROLOGUE AND EPILOGUE.

The relationship of the Prologue to the Epilogue
and of both to the Dialogue has long been a subject of
scholarly dispute.[1] Wellhausen[2] maintained that the poet
borrowed from a folk-saga both the material and form for
his own work. Duhm[3] believed that the entire Prologue
and Epilogue were excerpted from a "Volksbuch" and that
these antedate the Dialogue. On the other hand, Kautzsch[@]
held that nothing more than the name of a righteous man
called Job was borrowed from tradition.

It is not possible to decide between these extreme
and contrary views with absolute certainty. However, the
evidence in recent years has been accumulating in favor
of an epic source for the prose sections.

Of greater significance since the discovery of the
Ugaritic epics is the mention of Job by Ezekiel.[5] Now
that the Daniel referred to in the same context can without
doubt be identified with the Daniel of the Legend of Aqht[6]

---

1. See K.Kautzsch, Das Sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob
(Leipzig, 1900), for the history of the problem.

2. J.Wellhausen, Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.(1871), p.555.

3. B.Duhm, Das Buch Hiob (1897), p.vii.

there is every reason to believe that Ezekiel in the case

of Job too refers to some well known and ancient story. This

impression is further strengthened by two important factors.

The Job of Ezekiel is described, not as a ḥaḵam, but as a

ṣaḏiq, an epithet exactly fitting the picture in the Prologue,

whereas Daniel alone is specifically mentioned by Ezekiel as

being a ḥaḵam.[7] This suggests that the prophet had in mind

a well-defined personality. Again, Job is mentioned in

Ezekiel in connection with intercession on behalf of others.

Is it mere accident that the Epilogue twice refers to Job

in his capacity of an intercessor?[8] This is not to say that

---

4.   op.cit., pp.18ff, 87.

5.   Ezek. 14: 14,20.

6.   S. Spiegel, "Noah, Daniel and Job", Louis Ginzberg
Jubilee Volume (1945), pp.305-356. For editions of the Legend
of Aqht, see J. Obermann, How Daniel was Blessed with a Son
(AOS offprint series No.20., New Haven, 1946); C. Gordon, Ugaritic
Literature (Rome, 1949), pp.84-103; T. Gaster, op.cit., pp.270-313.

7.   Ezek. 28:3.

8.   Job 42:8,10.

the prophet refers to our Book of Job, but it does argue

strongly for the existence of a common source to both.

The patriarchal setting of the story[9] has long been

noted but has generally been regarded as not being conclusive

in determining the antiquity of the story. However, there

is no satisfactory reason why the author should have

invented such a patriarchial background since it really

adds nothing to the understanding of the narrative. Moreover,

in conjunction with several features that can now be recog-

nized as characteristic of the Canaanite epic tradition, this

primitive setting must be freshly evaluated.

We shall now proceed to trace these epic elements

which we may enumerate as follows: -

---

9. The elements that go to make up the patriarchal
setting are as follows: -

(a) wealth is measured in terms of cattle and slaves (1:2)
עבודה רבה occurs elsewhere only in Gen 26:14.

(b) religion is very primitive, expressing itself in private
sacrifice without central shrine or priesthood. Incidentally,
the offerings in 42:8 correspond exactly to those of Balaam
(Num. 23:1).

(c) the mention of Sabeans and Chaldeans as marauding bands of
nomads.

(d). the mention of the קשׂיטה (42:11), only elsewhere in
Gen. 33:19 and Josh. 24:32.

(i) The Series of Misfortunes.

The unfolding of the miseries that beset Job in
successive stages is paralleled by the description of the
misfortunes that befall King Keret.[10]

(ii) Formulaic Repetition.

One of the universal characteristics of the epic is
verbal repetition, a feature particularly prominent in the
epics of Canaan.[11] The repetition of such formulae as

עוד זה מדבר וזה בא; ואמלטה רק אני is strongly reminiscent of
an epic prototype.

(iii) The Schematized Use of Numbers.

This is now recognized to be a Hebraic borrowing of
a typically Canaanite literary device.[12] Frequently,
something is repeated day after day for six days, the
seventh heralding a climax and inaugurating some new event.

(e) Job's longevity corresponds only to that of the
Patriarchal and pre-patriarchal period.

(f) The prose-style generally is that of the narrative
portions of the Pentateuch. Incidentally, the use of
קבל (2:10 bis) need no longer be necessarily an Aramaism in view
of its presence in the Amarna letters, v.BASOR,89 (1943),p.29ff.

10. Krt: 14ff.

11. This subject is fully discussed by U.Cassuto,
האלה ענת (ירושלים, תשי"ג) עמ' 34-36.

12. Ibid., pp.84, esp. notes 1-2.

Thus, for six days a fire rages in the temple of Baal and ceases abruptly on the seventh.[13] King Daniel wines and dines the gods for six days and on the seventh is visited by Baal.[14] The same King celebrates the birth of a son for six days and his guests depart on the seventh.[15] King Keret reaches his goal on the seventh day of his journey and invests Udm for seven days.[16]

In the same epic pattern is the seven day and night silent mourning of Job and his friends after which, Job opens his mouth to curse the day of his birth.[17]

Consistent, too, with classic Canaanite epic tradition, are the seven sons of Job[18] like the seven of King Keret[19] and of the god Môt.[20]

---

13. 51:VI:24-33.

14. 2Aqht: 1:6-16.

15. Ibid., II:30-40

16. Krt:105-109; 114-120; 194-211.

17. Job 2:13.

18. 1:2; 42:13.

19. 128:II:24.

20. 49:VI:7-9.

(iv) The Prominence of Daughters.

The striking naming and describing of Job's three daughters as against the anonymity of the sons[21] is in accord with the epic tradition. The Lady Ḥry bears Keret seven sons who remain anonymous but the one daughter is named.[22]

(v) Bnei Elohim.[23]

This is perhaps the oldest and most characteristically Canaanite element. Although the usage here probably implies nothing more than angels or heavenly host,[24] the monotheistic twist does not disguise its pagan origins. The identical term is found in the Ugaritic epics[25] and in the late 9th century Canaanite magical text from Arslan -Tash.[26] The same notion is also met with in the 10th century Phoenician Yḥmlk

---

21. Job 42:14-15.

22. 128:II:21-24; cf. Ruth 4:15.

23. Job 1:6; 2:1.

24. מ.ד.קאסוטו, "מעשה בני האלהים ובנות האדם",
Essays Presented to J.H.Hertz (London,1942),[Hebrew Section],
pp. 35-44,esp., pp.37-38. cf. Cassuto,5*%ע(תש״א). י״ב, תרביץ; ידיעות של
41-47 עמ׳) ת ש״ב), כרך ט׳. _____ התבר לחקירת א״י ועתיקותיה

25. 2:17, 33; 107:3; 51:III:14.

26. line 11, " וכל בן אלם ", v. T.Gaster, Orientalia
xi, (1942), pp.41-79.

inscription from Byblos?[27] We thus have here a reflex of the
Canaanite assembly of the gods.

(vi) ____קציעה____ and ____ימימה____

Of these two of the three names of Job's daughters,

____ימימה____ has generally been explained on the analogy

of the Arabic ____يمامة____ to mean "little dove", and ____קציעה____ is

taken to mean "fragrant bark". It is possible however, that

both these names are Canaanite. ____ימימה____ may correspond to

the Ugaritic ymmt limm,[28] an epithet of the goddess 'Anat.

____קציעה____ may represent the Ugaritic qs•t "a bow".[29]

(vii) ____בלע____[30]

This vocable is used metaphorically in the sense of

"killing", "destroying", a specialized meaning it has

undoubtedly acquired as a reflex of Canaanite mythology.

The reference is to the particular method by which the god

Môt disposes of his victims. In the Ugaritic texts we read:

---

27. Yḥmlk, 2:4 מפחרת אל גבל; cf. T. Gaster,
JQR, xxxvii, (1946), p.62, note 27; ibid. xxxviii, (1947), p.289;
Thespis, (1950), p.76, note 6; Albright, FSAC (1946), pp.199,226-7,
esp.331, note 26.

28. 'nt: III:9. Albright, BASOR, 70,p.19,n.6, suggests
that the more usual epithet ybmt is dissimilated from ymmt;
so Obermann, Ugaritic Mythology (1948), p.35.

29. UH, III, no. 1809.

30. Job 2:3.

<u>lyrt bnpš bn ilm mt bmh/mrt ydd il ǵzr</u> [31]

"Thou shalt indeed go down into the throat of the god
Môt/ Yea into the gullet of Il's Beloved, the Hero!"

<u>al tqrb lbn ilm mt/ al yᵉdbkm kimr bph/klli btbrnqnh tẖtan</u>[32]

"Do not draw near the god Môt lest he make you like
a lamb in his mouth, like a kid in his jaws ye be
crushed."

<u>yᵉrb bᵉl bkbdh bph yrd</u>[33]

"So that Baal may enter his inwards, yea descend into
his mouth."

From these passages and others[34] it is clear that
the Hebrew בלע acquired the meaning of "annihilating",
"destroying",[35] under the influence of the old Canaanite Môt
myth and its usage in the Job context which is also myth-
ological may well betray the original language of the folk-saga.

(viii) <u>שבענה</u> [36]

A recognition of the epic and Canaanite features may

---

31. 67:I: 6-18.

32. 51:VIII:15-20.

33. 67:II:3-4.

34. Text 51:VII:47-48, <u>yqra mt bnpšh</u>
"Môt calls from his throat", may be a double-entendre in the
light of 67:I:6-8, implying both the act of speech and a portent
of destruction.

35. As in Job 2:3; 8:18; 10:8; 37:20 cf. 2 Sam. 10:19
where להמית ‖ בלע. The celebrated Isa. 25:8 is very likely
intended to mean that Môt shall be hoisted by his own petard!

36. Job 42:13.

help to explain this morphologically difficult form. This hapax legomenon is generally regarded as a scribal error for שבעה and emended accordingly.[37] The Targum rendered it ארבסר "fourteen". All the other versions have "seven". Dhorme[38] explains the form as a dual in -ān to which has been attached the -āh termination for masculine numerals. He thus accepts the Targum's rendering.

The difficulty is that the number of daughters remained at three, so that we should expect the number of sons also to have remained constant. Dhorme attempts to overcome the discrepancy raised by his interpretation by attributing the non-increase in daughters to the fact that girls in the Orient were not considered important.

However, Dhorme failed to reckon with the different situation created by the epic treatment which, on the contrary, tends to exalt the female, as was previously pointed out in connection with the anonymity of the sons as opposed to the naming of the daughters and the explicit mention of their beauty. Further, as if to dispel any idea of the inferiority of the female we are expressly told that

---

37. GKC §97c

38. cf. BH: "forma mixta ex שבעין (=2x7) et שבעה ."

the girls received from their father an inheritance together
with their brothers, although apparently the custom was for
a daughter to inherit only in the absence of sons.[39] We
are thus left without any adequate explanation for the
disparity between the doubling of the number of sons and
the constancy in the number of daughters. The translation
of ‏שבענה‎ as "fourteen", must accordingly be rejected and
the form otherwise explained.

As a matter of fact, ‏שבענה‎ has its counterpart
in the Ugaritic šb⁽ny, in a similar context and in which
there is no doubt of the meaning as "seven":

wld šb⁽ny att itrḫ[40]

"the wives I have wed have born seven"
For the pattern -ny > -na we may compare the dual lany>lana
(Aramaic ‏לנא‎) and ‏שתה > שרי‎, so šb⁽ny > ‏שבענה‎. This -ny is
probably to be explained as an old adverbial ending which
most likely has also persisted in ‏שכלתי‎ (Gen. 42:36)
which has no feminine antecedent.

Accordingly, ‏שבענה‎, meaning "sevenfold", is in all
probability a fossilized literary survival from the epic original.

_____

39.   Num. 27:8

40.   52:64

(ix) <u>שלשת אחיתיהם</u>[41]

This unusual construction may well represent an
archaic and original usage[42] in which <u>שלשת</u> was a collective
and abstract term meaning 'group of three', 'triad', and
could still be used with either gender.[43]

The cumulative effect of the evidence here presented
is to show that the Prologue and the Epilogue are extracted
from an ancient epic source, the characteristics of which
are those of the Canaanite epic. Some traces of the
original language are still recognizable in our present
version.

---

41. Job 1:4

42. Contra GKC, op. cit.

43. G.R. Driver, "Gender in Hebrew Numbers", JJS
1(1948), pp.90-104.

STUDIES IN THE GRAMMAR

I. THE TENSES.

The sequence and function of the tenses constitute one of the most vexing problems presented by the poetry of Job. Not only is there a bewildering variety of sequence, but the combinations are not inherently functional.[1]

A. Perfect and Simple Imperfect.

The two forms commonly interchange without any apparent difference in tense signification, while the order of sequence is not important.

1. Perfect followed by simple Imperfect.

4:3	יסרת	תחזק	; 6:15	בגדו	יעברו
14:3	פקחת	תביא	; 14:11	אצלו	יחרב
14:19	אחקו	תשטף	; 19:8	גדר	ישים
19:16	קראתי	אתחנן	; 21:10	עבר	יגעל
29:9	עצרו	ישימו	; 30:13	נסתו	יצילו
30:15	ההפך	תרדף	; 30:17	נקר	ישכבון
30:29	קמתי הלכתי	אשוע	; 31:20	ברכוני	יתחמט
31:21	הנפתי	אראה	; 32:11	הוכלתי	אדין
33:4	עשתני	תחיני	; 33:25	רפש	ישוב
33:28	פדה	תראה	; 36:17	מלאת	יתמכו
36:25	חזו	יביט	; 38:17	נגלו	תראה

---

1. Ibn Ezra acutely observed this situation:
"וכל מה שתמצא באיוב שהוא לשון עתיד הוא בינוני או לשון עבר " (איוב א':א')

38:22   תראה באת ; 39:29   חפר   יבידו

41:5   יבוא גלה ; 42:3   הגדתי   אדע , אבין

2. Imperfect followed by simple Perfect

9:13   צחח/ ישיב ; 10:3   תמאס , תעשק   הופעת

11.20   אבד תבלינה ; 15:7   תולד   תולדת

15:15   זכו יאמין ; 15:18   יאידו   כחדו

19:15   הייתי תחשבני ; 19:27   אחזה   ראו כלו

21:7   גברו,עתקו, יחין ; 21:25   ימות   אכל

23:12   צפנתי אמיש ; 24:2   ישיאו   גדלו

24:4   תבאו ירו ; 24:8   ירחצו   חבקו

24:11   דרכו יצהירו ; 24:19   יגזלו   חטאו

24:20   מתקו ישכחהו ; 25:6   יאהיל   זכו

27:19   פקח יאסף, ישכב ; 27:20   תשיאהו   גנבתו

28:5   נהפך יצא ; 30:12   יקומו   שלחו

30:20   עמדתי אשוע ; 31:7   תצלה   דבק,הלך

31:25   מצא אצמח ; 33:21   יכל   ראו שפו

41:20   נהפכו יבריחו;

B. Waw Consecutive.

Even more unusual is the effect of the so-called <u>Waw</u>
consecutive. To be sure, the traditional construction of
perfect followed by consecutive imperfect is fairly common[2].

---

2.   e.g. 3:10,23,25,26;   5:3;   6:20;   7:5b;   8:4;
10:8;   16:12;   19:9;   24:2;   29:11,14;   30:11,19,26;
31:5,15;   32:6;   37:21.

But the presence of the Waw can in no sense be regarded as a necessary part of the construction in any way influencing the tense meaning. This is clear from the numerous examples cited above in which the perfect is followed by the simple imperfect, yet with past tense signification. Even more decisive is the use of a consecutive imperfect following a perfect as a frequentative or present tense, exactly as though it were punctuated as a conjunctive Waw.

7:6	וַיִכְלו	קלו	7:9	וַילך	כלה
7:20	וָאהיה	שמתני	11:11	וַירא	ירע
12:18	וַיאסר	פתח [3]	14:2	וַימל וַיזבח	יצא [4]
15:27-28	וַיצא וַישכן	כסה [5]	19:20	וָאתפללה	רבקה [7]
20:15	וַיקיאנו	בלע [6]	24:2	וַירעו	גדלו
so 24:11	וַימצאו	דרכו	30:20	וַתתבנן	עמדתי [8]

The consecutive imperfect often has a frequentative or present tense meaning after a simple imperfect.[9]

---

3. cf. the preceding and following simple imperfects and participles.

4. cf. ולא יעמד

5. cf. v.26 ירוץ

6. cf. preceding and following simple imperfects.

7. cf. following simple imperfects.

8. cf. תעננו

9. cf. Driver, Tenses §80; GKC §111t.

3:24	וַיֵּחַתּוּ[10]		תָּבוֹא	4:5	וַתֵּלֶא. וַתִּבָּהֵל	תָּבוֹא[11]
5:15	יְמֹשֵׁשׁ, יְפַגְּשׁוּ /י.ע/ וַיֵּדַע			6:21	תִּרְאוּ[13] וַתִּירָאוּ
7:15	וַתִּבְחַר		תְּבַעֲתַנִּי /הי/	7:18	תִּבְחָנֶנּוּ וַתִּפְקְדֶנּוּ[14]
		15			
9:20	וַיַּעְקְשֵׁנִי	יִרְשִׁיעֵנִי	11:3	יַחֲרִישׁוּ וַתִּלְעַג[16]
12:25	וַיִּתְעֵם	יְמַשְׁשׁוּ	14:10	יָמוּת וַיֶּחֱלָשׁ וַיִּגְוַע[17]
14:20	וַיַּהֲלֹךְ	17:7	יִתְקַפְּהוּ	אֶהְיֶה /ע.ל/ וַתֻּכָּה[18]
19:10	יֵצֵא וָאֵלַךְ so following	וַיֶּסַע. וַיֶּחַר, וַיַּחְשֹׁב

---

10. Budde emends to וַיֵּחַתּוּ

11. Dhorme maintains that the consecutive expresses Job's mood as a consequence of events summarized by תָּבֹא, תִּגַּע. However, elsewhere כִּי עַתָּה seems to precede contingent assertions (3:13; 6:3; 7:21; 13:19; 14:16). Torcyner therefore, takes כִּי עַתָּה as a condition with וַתֵּלֶא as the apodosis and emends to conjunctive Waw. Perles, Analekten (Neue Folge), p.9, emends to כִּי עֵת תָּבֹא "denn zur Zeit, da es dich trifft, ermattest du", pointing to a similar corruption in Judg.13:12. However, the context clearly requires v.5 to be in contrast with vv.3,4, and is so understood by LXX, Vulg. An identical contrasting use of כִּי עַתָּה is found in I.Sam.2:16, following Q, which is to be preferred. v. Driver, Notes, ad loc; B. Jacob, ZAW, 18(1898), p.295-298, ignores both this instance in Job and that in I.Sam.2:16, in neither of which would his explanation of כָּעֵתָּה = כִּי עַתָּה fit in.

12. cf. preceding participles.

13. For a similar word play of יָרֵא followed by רָאָה cf. Zech.9:5; Ps.40:4; 52:8, in each, with Waw conjunctive - another example of the erratic punctuation of the Waw.

14. cf. v.17, תָּשִׁית, תִּגְדְּלֶנּוּ

15. cf. אֶצְדָּק, תָּבֹא אָז

16. Gray-Driver, Dillmann, Bickell, Budde, Ehrlich, Kittel all emend both וַתִּלְעַג and וַתֹּאמַר to conjunctive Waw, taking the sentence as an interrogative.

cf. v.12   יבא| 33:22   [19] יבל וַתִקְרַב

[20]

33:26   וישב וירא ויראה| 34:24   [21] ירע ויעמד

[22]

36:9   ויגל v.10 ויאמר, ויגל   37:8   [23] תשכן ותבא

[24]

39:15   ותשכח|

In these examples it cannot be the sequence that determines the tense meaning since the consecutive imperfect can have the same present or frequentative meaning when following a participle.

---

17. Kittel emends to אֵיגוע, יחלף ;G.R. Driver, *Problems*, p.68, takes חלש = Acc. ḥašalu, "to crush", (metathesis); *ibid.*, p.137, he explains the consecutive Waw as expressing preterite tense in future condition = 'When a man has died/dies, then he will have become/will become prostrate.'

18. In the preceding chapter Job has described his sufferings. In vv.6,7, he describes his present state.

19. See Driver, *Tenses*, §138, II.a.

20. cf. יעתר and v.27, ישר יאמר, Budde emends every consecutive Waw to a conjunctive.

21. Budde emends to וְיַעֲמֹד|

22. cf. v.8, ילכדון|;Budde emends every Waw in vv. 9,10 to conjunctive.

23. Budde emends to ותבוא|

24. cf. v.14, תדושה ,v.15, תרחם, תעזב Driver, *Problems*, p.137,: "the general passes into the particular and back again". This seems rather a desperate attempt at explaining away the consecutive imperfect.

25

3:21	וַיַחְפְּרֵהוּ הַמַחְכִּים	12:22	וַיֵצֵא מְגַלֶה
12:23	וַיַנְחֵם לַשְׁגִיא	12:24	וַיַתְעֵם מֵסִיר
14:17	וַתִטְפֹּל חָתֻם	14:20	וַתְשַׁלְחֵהוּ מְשַׁנֶה

The cumulative effect of the evidence here presented
is to establish beyond doubt that the presence of the so-called
consecutive Waw does not determine the tense. There is no
difference in signification between the conjunctive and
26
consecutive Waw, a fact that has misled many of the commentators
into emending the punctuation where the consecutive Waw
has a frequentative or present meaning.[27] This phenomenon,
while outstandingly characteristic of Job is not peculiar
to it, as may be seen from comparisons with early Hebrew
poetry.[28]

Ps.18	v.7	יִשְׁמַע	=	II Sam. 22.	וַיִשְׁמַע
	12	יָשֶׁת	=		וַיָשֶׁת
	14	וַיִרְעֵם	=		יִרְעֵם
	16	וַיִגָלוּ	=		יִגָלוּ
	39	אֲמַחֲצֵם	=		וָאֲמַחֲצֵם
	44	תְפַלְטֵנִי	=		וַתְפַלְטֵנִי

---

25. Driver, ibid., explains וַיַחְפְּרוּ as a
preterite referring to a particular case known to the
speaker. However, this is unnecessary in view of the
parallel verse 22 which is certainly a generalized statement,
the verbs being frequentative. In the same construction
in 12:22-24, it would require a long stretch of the
imagination to maintain a preterite meaning for the finite
verbs.

so, I. Sam. 2:6 מֵמִית , מְחַיֶה , מוֹרִיד ‖ וַיַּעַל

Similarly, the construction of perfect followed by simple

imperfect with past tense signification is found in Exod. 15.

v.12 תִּבְלָעֵמוֹ , נָטִיתָ ;v.14 יֹרְגָּזוּן ‖ שָׁמְעוּ ;v.15 יֹאחֲזֵמוֹ . נִבְהֲלוּ

The insertion of consecutive Waw here would not in

any way affect the tense meaning. In fact, in the earliest

poetry the Waw is used most sparingly, showing that it is

not the tense determinant.

In order to be able satisfactorily to explain the

apparent irregularities of the sequences of the tense forms,

the time aspects involved in their usage have to be considered.

To avoid an incongruence of function with nomenclature,

the traditional "perfect" and imperfect" is henceforth

replaced by the morphologically descriptive qtl and yqtl.

C. The preference for the Yqtl

One of the major characteristics of the verbal system

of the poetry is the use of the yqtl as the regular and

common verbal form. Its preference over the qtl is over-

whelming. How far this tendency has gone may be gauged

---

26. See further below, for examples of conjunctive
Waw with preterite connotation.

27. So Budde and others.

28. Cross & Freedman, JBL, LXXII (1953), p.17f.

from a comparison with the tense forms employed in passages
parallelled in other books.[29]

3:3   אוּלָד [30] Jer. 20:14   יֻלַּדְתִּי

5:18   ימחץ, תרפינה Deut. 32:39 מחצתי ארפא cf. Hos.6:1 וירפאנו טרף

9:18   ישביענ מ' Lam. 3:15   השביעני מ'

12:4   שחק...אהיה Jer. 20:7; Lam. 3:14   הייתי...שחק

19:7   אשוע Hab. 1:2   שועתי

24:21   לא תלד Isa. 54:1   לא ילדה

cf. also 12:6 ישליו with Jer. 12:1   שלו

      22:19b ילעג with the perfect in Ps. 107:42b.

      In each case, be it observed, there is no distinction
in time aspect between the parallel verbs although Job
consistently preferred the yqtl while other writers used
the qtl.

      Gesenius[31] failed to include this preference for the

---

      29. In this connection it is of no consequence on
which side the literary dependence lies.

      30. cf. 15:7; 38:21 תלד Is. 51:2 תחוללכם
The yqtl can only be a pure preterite cf. Driver, Problems,
p.95. It is impossible to see how, with GKC §107k, אולד
can express an action "which from some point in the past is
to be represented as future".

      31. GKC,§2q-s.

yqtl among the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry. Driver[32]
attempted to explain the phenomenon as being due to the
livelier image which the yqtl form presents. He vigorously
denies that the yqtl can ever stand for the qtl or assume
its meaning.

The evidence from Job contradicts Driver's assertions.
The frequent and promiscuous interchange and "irregular"
sequence of the two forms qtl and yqtl show that their
functions are secondary. The yqtl represents a variety
of tense meanings which have to be inferred from the context
and which, as has been shown above, are not all dependent
upon the presence or absence, or punctuation of the Waw.

This situation is not restricted to Job but is
characteristic of the earliest Hebrew poetry[33] and is exactly
parallelled in Canaanite poetry.[34] The preference for the

---

32. Tenses, §85.

33. See Cross & Freedman, op. cit.

34. See Goetze, JAOS,58(1938), p.289f., esp. p.309;
UH,I,9:2; 13:32; Harris, Development, p.48;
JAOS, 57 (1937), p.152, n.11.

yqtl therefore can only be regarded as a poetic archaism,
a stylistic device developed in Job to its highest form
of expression.

D. Yqtl expressing past time

The author of Job not only followed the old
Canaanite poetic tradition in the overwhelming preference
for the yqtl form but also, as in Canaanite, used it to
express past time even without the Waw.[34] In other words,
a very anomolous situtation exists. On the one hand, the
yqtl with the consecutive Waw may express present tense,
while on the other, the simple yqtl can express not only
a past frequentative but even completed action.[35]

Examples of a past frequentative abound.

3:12	אינק	4:3	תחזק
4:4	תאמץ . יקימון	4:12	יגנב
4:15	יעמד, תסמר, יחלף	15:5	ותבחר , יאלף
15:6	יען , ירשיעך	15:18	יגידו
19:3	תכלימוני	19:8	ישים
19:10	יתצני	19:12	יבא
22:6	תפשט , תחבל	22:7	תמנע , תשקה
22:9	ידכא	29:12	אמלט
29:13	ארנן , תבא	29:16	אחקרהו
29:17	אשליך	29:22	תטף , ישנו
29:23	ויחלו	29:24	אשחק , יאמינו , יפילון
29:25	ואשכן , ואשב , אבחר	30:12	יקימו

30:13	יציל ו	31:7	תתה ה
31:13	אמאס	31:16	אמנע
31:19	אראה	31:20	יתחמם
31:21	אראה	31:25	אשמח
31:26	אראה	31:29	אשמח
31:32	אפתח . ילין	31:34	אצא , יחתני , אערוץ אתבונן , יתחקרון
31:38	יבכין . תזעק	32:12	אבין . אדין
33:8	אשמע		

In all these cases the element of past time is
undeniable, while in many the factor of continuity or
repetition is not at all certain.

Thus in 4:12,15, Eliphaz may well be describing
individual actions that occurred but once, in which case
the yqtl forms would all express completed action in the
past. The same difficulty in differentiation between
a continuous and a completed action exists in 6:15;
7:12; 19:11; 31:7,13,16,17,19,20,25,26,32; 32:12;
33:8; 42:3.

Undoubtedly expressing completed action are
3:3 אולד so 15:7; 38:21 תולד ;3:11 אמות , ואגוע
3:13 ואשקט! 25, יבא ;10:18 אגוע , אובל
The element of completed action is not affected by the
fact that it may be merely hypothetical. The past time

---

35. So regularly in Accadian.

is undoubted and the verbal form is the <u>yqtl</u>.

3:11	אמות	וְאָגוֹעַ ,13	וְאֶשְׁקוֹט . יָנוּחַ
3:16	אֶהְיֶה [36]	10:18	אֶגְוַע תִּרְאֵנִי
10:19	אֶהְיֶה , אוּבַל		

It is to be noted that the past time element is
maintained even with the conjunctive <u>Waw</u>.

3:11	וְאָגוֹעַ	,13	וְאֶשְׁקוֹט
29:21	וְיִדְּמוּ , וְיָחֵלּוּ	,23	וְיִחֲלוּ
29:25	וְאֵשֵׁב	30:26	וָאֲיַחֲלָה
31:17	וָאֹכַל		

There can no longer be the slightest doubt that
the <u>yqtl</u> is the usual narrative tense in Job and that
while it may accurately be described as "omnitemporal"[37]
it is predominantly used as a preterite,[38] just as in
Canaanite and East Semitic.[34]

---

36. Hitzig, Beer emend to לֹא אֶהְיֶה "which existed not".
But the sentence would then lack a predicate. Wright,
Budde omit לֹא. Gratz, Torczyner emend לֹא to לוֹ. LXX
does not translate the phrase. The reading לֹא is attested
by the Targum לֵית אֶפְשַׁר דְּאֱהֵי . Dhorme places
the verse after v.12 with לֹא אֶהְיֶה dependent on מַה , מַדּוּעַ
That the v. is connected with vv.11-12 is undeniable. The
preterite signification of אֶהְיֶה is also beyond doubt. A
satisfactory solution to the difficulty could be obtained
if we read אֹז for אוֹ, the confusion arising out of an
original abbreviation אֹ , and construe לֹא as the emphatic
לֹא/לֻ. The translation would be:"verily would I then have been...".

37. F.R.Blake, <u>JBL</u>, 63 (1944), p.276; cf. p.294.

E. The Jussive Form

Another peculiar feature of the verbal forms used in Job is the frequent employment of the jussive in place of the imperfect where the context could not possibly support a jussive meaning. Of sixty instances of this kind adduced by Driver,[39] no less than twenty-five are drawn from Job which exhibits a higher percentage of these forms than any other book.[40]

These forms are of three types:

1. with the Waw conjunctive.[41]

2. with no conjunctive.[42]

In both cases the jussives arise out of the vocalization.

3. The shortened form of the ל״ה verb.[43]

_____

38. For the question of yqtl as the original tense, see the full discussion in Driver, Problems, pp. 9-31.

39. Tenses, §171.

40. The percentage is 3:1 over Psalms, the next highest frequency.

41. 13:23; 15:33; 20:23b; 24:25; 27:22; 34:29

42. 17:2; 18:9; 33:11; 36:14; 37:4-5; 38:24; 39:26; 40:9; 40:19.

43. 18:12; 20:23;26,28; 23:9,11; 24:14; 33:21,27; 34:37.

In this type the jussive form is consonantal and independent
of the punctuation.

The phenomenon has been variously explained and treated.

a). Böttcher regards such forms as genuine, with
the jussive expressing "the resented compulsion of an
alien will".[44] This explanation is so forced and gives the
jussive such a reversal of its ordinary meaning as to
raise more difficulties than it attempts to solve.[45]

b). Ewald[46] and Dillmann[47] followed by many comment-
aries[48], assume that in most, if not all, cases the
consecutive Waw should replace the conjunctive and should
be added where the jussive form is without a Waw. In other
words, these apparent jussives are due to mistakes of the
punctuators. This view is followed by Driver,[49] but with

-----

44. Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebr. Spr. (1866),
II,p.183,ref. to 13:27, 24:14; 34:37; "das Übel
empfundene Muss des fremden Eigenwillens".

45. cf. Driver, op.cit., §172.

46. Lehrbuch der Hebr. Spr. (ed.8, 1870),233a,343b.

47. Hiob, ed. 2. (1891), to 31:21.

48. e.g. Gray-Driver, who more or less consistently
emend the text.

49. Tenses, §§172-174.

certain modifications. According to him, since the majority
of the forms stands at the beginning of a clause they have
been influenced by the normally expected form with Waw-
consecutive, while the desire to preserve a connection
with the preceding, which the fuller form with ן gave,
further influenced the imitated vocalization of the jussive
(i.e. consecutive) form.

c). Hitzig[50] assumes that the Waw consecutive
construction may be broken up and still retain consecutive
sense. According to this view

$$ \text{ל\ ויהי} \ldots \text{ן} \qquad = \qquad \text{ל\ ויהי} $$

d). Gesenius[51] explains this jussive form on
rhythmical grounds. Since the majority of cases occur at
the beginning of a clause, the shortening is due to the
distance of the imperfect-form from the principal tone.

None of these explanations is fully satisfactory.
To assume a mistaken vocalization in the seven instances
of Waw conjunctive is possible, but the same explanation
is unlikely in the much more frequent examples without
a Waw and especially where the jussive form is consonantal.

---

50. v. Driver, ibid., §172; cf. §85 obs; Davidson,
Syntax, §55R.5.

51. GKC, §109k.

Even Driver's theory does not adequately explain why
the writer, or scribe, did not use the full consecutive
form. As a matter of fact it is highly doubtful
whether the form with the Waw consecutive at the beginning
of a clause is indeed the norm which is said to have
influenced the use of the jussive form.

Cross and Freedman[52] in a careful study of the use
of the Waw at the beginning of cola in Biblical Hebrew
poetry came to the conclusion that, as in Ugaritic, the
conjunction follows no determinable set of rules but
seems to be distributed at random. It is, moreover,
used most sparingly in the earlier poetry,[53] not appearing
once in Psalm 68 which is full of Ugaritic parallels.[54]

Hitzig's theory, apart from being very doubtful
in itself[55] does not explain the examples with the conjunctive

---

52. op.cit., note 28.

53. ibid., p.19f note v.

54. UH,I, 14:2.

55. Thus, if the prefixion of the Waw is not the
tense determinant then there is no need to assume a
"disintegration" of the consecutive-imperfect construction
at all.

Waw, for which resort must be had to emendation. Nor does
it explain over a dozen cases where the jussive form cannot
possibly be regarded as due to disintegration of the Waw-
consecutive construction.[56]

In the circumstances, the explanation of Gesenius
presents the least difficulties. However, a different,
less mechanical, approach is possible.

It has previously been observed that the use of
the conjunction at the beginning of a clause is
capricious and that the time aspect is determined by the
context, not by the presence or absence of the Waw.[57] Bauer-
Leander[58] noted the possibility of the jussive expressing the
same meaning as the full imperfect form. Since this is

------

56. 18:9,12; 20:23,26,28; 33:11,21,27. 36:14;
38:24; 37:4,5; 39:26.

57. cf. e.g. II Sam. 22:14 וַּרְעֵם with Ps.18:14
וַיִּרְעֵם and many other examples cited by Cross & Freedman,
op.cit.

58. HG p.274L citing Gen.49:17 וִיהִי; Deut. 28:21
יַדְבֵּק;32:18 תֶּשִׁי ; Ps. 11:6 יַמְטֵר

precisely the usage in Ugaritic where the jussive with
or without Waw may even indicate past time,[59] there seems
not to be the slightest doubt that a similar situation
obtains in Biblical Hebrew poetry.

Accordingly, these verbs, jussive in form but not
in meaning, are to be explained as archaisms after the
pattern of early Canaanite poetry and there is no need
to treat them as textual corruptions. As G.R. Driver
has expressed it; "it is------- wrong to see a jussive in
every yaqtul; its jussive use is only an offshoot of its
universal function".[60]

F. The Tense Sequence in Verb Repetition.

In several instances the same verb is repeated in
both stichoi of a sentence.

8:3　　יצות　... יצות

13:7　תדברו ...תדברן

27:16-17　　　　יכין　...　יכין

37: 4-5　　　ירעם　...　ירעם

41:16　יצוק ...!יצוק:

In these cases it has been usual to regard the

59. UH,I, 9:7; 13:32; cf. Harris, Development, p.85.
60. Problems, p.10.

text as corrupt.[61] Torczyner explains the repetitions as
being due to the limitations of the "translator". Neither
of these explanations can any longer be maintained in view
of the frequent use of the identical construction in
Ugaritic poetry.[62]

e.g. yṣq/ksp yšl/h ḫrṣ yṣq ksp/lalpm ḫrṣ yṣq/m
lrbbt/yṣq ḥym wtbtḫ[63]

"He casts silver, He smelts gold, He casts silver by
thousands (of shekels), Gold he casts by myriads, He
casts hym and tbtḥ!"

špq ilm krm y[n] špq ilht ḫprt [yn]..[64]

"He satisfied the sheep gods with wi ne, He satisfied the
ewe goddesses with wine..."

špq is repeated no less than eight times.

---

61. See the commentaries to 8:3,   41:16.   The versions
differ in their degree of faithfulness to the MT.   An excellent
case in point is 8:3.

LXX   ἀδικήσει   ... ταράξει
Vulg. supplantat   ...   subvertit
Targ. (a)   יעקם   (b)   יקלקל
On the basis of these differences and the supposed unlikeli-
hood of the repetition, moderns generally emend the text.
Kittel gives four possibilities for the first יעות - viz.
יֶעֱקַל , יעקש , יצוה , יַ.עֲוֶה
Apart from the fact that Symmachus and Syriac agree with MT,
this mode of reasoning involves a methodological error.
יעות מעקם v.3a is confirmed by 34:12. Targum to 3a renders
יעות by יעקם but in 34:12 the same word is rendered
Moreover, an examination of the Targum renderings to יעות
shows wide variety - Job 19:6 תתפכני ; 34:12 יקלקל
Ps. 119:78 יעותני : 146:9 יסלסל ; Amos8:5. לשקרא The variations
in the versions must therefore be regarded simply as attempts
at stylistic improvements and not as evidence of the corruption
of MT.

<u>tbʿ kṯr/lahlh hyn tbʿ lmš/knth[65]</u>

"Kṯr departs to his tent(s), Hyn departs to his tabernacles."

Accordingly, the five cases cited above of the repetition of the same verb in parallel clauses must be regarded as another example of the influence of Canaanite poetic style on the language of Job.

---

62.   Cassuto, <u>Tarbiṣ</u>, 14 (1942), p. 9f.

63.   51:I:26-30

64.   51:VI:47-54

65.   2 ʾAqht:V:31-33.

II SOME VERBAL FORMS.

A. t- preformative with 3rd m.s. imperfect.

A peculiarity of the language of Job, hitherto
unrecognized, is the use of a t- preformative with the
imperfect in parallelism with the normal 3rd m.s. in y-,
or under the government of a masculine subject. This
phenomenon has caused great confusion to the commentators.
The following examples demonstrate the point:

1.   18:14.   יֻתַּק מֵאָהֳלוֹ מִבְטַחוֹ תַצְעִדֵהוּ לְמֶלֶךְ בַּלָּהוֹת
2.   :15.   תִּשְׁכּוֹן בְּאָהֳלוֹ מִבְּלִי־לוֹ יְזֹרֶה עַל־נָוֵהוּ גָפְרִית

The difficulty of finding the subject of תַצְעִדֵהוּ
and תִּשְׁכּוֹן has given way to various emendations and much
forced exegesis.[1] What has not been sufficiently appreciated,
however, is the mythological background of the entire
section which alone can explain these verses.

The "first-born of Death" (v.13) is usually
interpreted figuratively as "fatal disease". "the terrors
of death", "one doomed to death". The Targum, followed
by Rashi, took the phrase to mean "the Angel of Death".[2]

---

1. For details, see Gray & Driver, op.cit., ad loc.
2. The other versions give no help. LXX has simply
θάνατος , Theod. & Symm. translated the phrase as πρώϊμος θάνατος ,
Vulg. has primogenita mors.

The mention of ‎מלך בלהות (v.14) confirms a literal rendering for ‎בכור מות , but with a mythological implication. Môt, as is well known, is the Canaanite god of Death associated with disease, destruction and aridity. Cassuto has pointed to several passages in Scripture in which the Hebrew ‎מות has acquired a specialized personified meaning analogous to its usage as a proper name in the Ugaritic epics.[3] Specific mention of Môt's first-born has not yet turned up, but reference may be made to Ugaritic Text 49:VI:7-9, which speaks of the "seven sons of the god Môt". Moreover, in Mesopotamian mythology Namtar, the god of pestilence, is the first-born and grim messenger of Ereshkigal, mistress of the netherworld.[4] Môt too is king of the netherworld and it would be quite in keeping with the Near Eastern motif for his first born son too, to be his grim messenger.

The use of the verb ‎אכל in connection with Môt's activities (v.13) again harks back to mythology. The

---

3. U. Cassuto, The Goddess Anath (Jerusalem, 1951), pp.48-49, cf. p.22.

4. Ibid., p.49.

special characteristic of this Canaanite god is that he
devours his victims.[5] In a typical passage Môt boasts
of his prowess and describes to Anath his methods, saying:[6]

> bklat ydy ilḥm ...
> "with both my hands I shall devour" ...

It is more than likely that the difficult בדרו may mean
"with his hands", thus giving an exact phraseological
correspondence with the Ugaritic passage cited above. There
is no need to emend בדרו to בידרו, as the uniconsonantal
ḏ, "hand", appears fossilized in the combination bd, "in the
hands of", in Ugaritic, as ba-di-u in a Canaanite gloss
of the Amarna letters and in Phoenician inscriptions.[7]
מלך בלהות is to be rendered "king of the netherworld". The
description of the fate of the wicked leaves no doubt that
death is here intended. That בלהות is an epithet for the
netherworld is clear from Ezek. 26:20-21 where it is used
synonymously with בור and ארץ תחתיות and antithetically

---

5. For references and texts see the note on בגלע on
p.17 of this dissertation.

6. 67:I:19-20.

7. UH,I,8:20.

with ‏ארץ חיים‏ [8] The "king of the netherworld" can be
none other than Môt himself. Several Ugaritic passages
refer explicitly to Môt's throne in the underworld. [9]
If "the firstborn of Môt" is the grim messenger who
brings victims to Môt in the netherworld, then it is most
reasonable to assume that he is the subject of ‏תצעידה‏ .
This, indeed, was recognized by Duhm and Gray who, however,
emended the verb to ‏יצעידה‏ , in the masculine. [10]

The second clause of v.15 and the following verses
show that utter ruination follows the action of someone who
inhabits the house of the wicked. With this use of ‏שכן‏
may be compared several instances of its employment in
a figure of destruction:

Isa. 13:21	‏ושכנו שם בנות יענה‏
34:11	‏וינשוף וערב ישכנו בה‏
Ezek. 31:13	‏על מפלתו ישכנו כל עוף השמים‏
32:4	‏והשכנתי עליך כל עוף השמים‏

Thus ‏תשכון באהלו‏ is a figure of destruction and the
architect of the destruction, or the subject of ‏תשכון‏ would,

---

8. cf. also Ezek. 27:36; 28:19.

9. e.g. 51:VIII:7-14; 67:II:14-16.

10. cf. BH ad loc.

most consistently with the mythological picture, be Môt's
first-born, in the same way that Namtar, his Mesopotamian
counterpart, is the agent of pestilence and destruction.[11]
The Idea is that the entire household disintegrates with
the death of the wicked master.[12]

מבלי-לו, on the analogy of 39:16 ללא-לה and
Hab 2:6 לא-לו, requires no emendation, the phrase
meaning "without him", i.e. he, the owner, being gone.

To sum up: Bildad describes the ineluctable fate
of the wicked in terms borrowed from the language of myth.

בכור מות is to be taken literally and is the
subject of תצעידהו and תשכון. We have here two
examples of a t- preformative referring to a masculine antecedent
in 3rd. s.

3.   20:9   ולא עוד תשורנו מקומו

This construction is unique.[13] The obvious incom-

---

11. Here too, BH emends to ישכון

12. v.16 is a stereo-typed curse formula, being found
with variation in the Bible in Isa.37:31, Amos 2:9; and
Mal.3:19; in the Phoenician Eshmunazar Inscription line 11;
in Ugaritic in 1 'Aqht: 159-160; and in a Hittite text, for
which see Gaster, Thespis. p.304 n.

13. Gen.18:24 בקרבה refers, not to מקום but to
עיר. In II Sam.17:12 אחת has been corrected by Q.

patibility of the undoubtedly masculine **מקום** with a verb in the feminine has either led to the emendation of the verb to **ישורנו** [14] or been explained by taking **מקומו** as the object of the verb with **עין** in 9a as the subject. [15] Against this is the pronominal suffix of **תשורנו** which, as in the parallel **צדפתו** and **ימצאהו**, must refer to the wicked. This is the tradition of Theodotion and the Vulgate and is supported by the equivalent **ולא יכירנו עוד מקומו** (7:10 = Ps.103:16). Accordingly, **מקומו** must be the subject of **תשורנו**. In fact, were it not for the feminine form of the verb none would question the predicate-subject construction. We are thus faced with another instance of a <u>t</u>- preformative with a masculine connotation in the 3rd s.

4.   22:29   <u>כי השפילו ותאמר גוה ושח עינים יושיע</u>

The two clauses are obviously intended to be parallel. The second clause is perfectly clear: He (God) saves the lowly. **שח עינים**, while a <u>hapax legomenon</u>, is the opposite of **גבה עינים** [16] . **שח** is derived from **שחח**, "to

---

14.   So Gray and Driver, <u>BH</u>.

15.   So Torczyner, <u>op.cit</u>.

16.   Ps. 101:5.

be humble, abased". It is used in the same sense in 9:13.
Significantly, it is found together with שָׁפֵל in Isa. 25:12;
26:5. It may therefore be safely assumed that הִשְׁפִּילוּ in
clause 'a' corresponds in meaning to שָׁח עֵנַיִם in 'b', It is
to be understood as an "internal" Hiphil[17] as used in Isa. 57:9;
Jer. 13:18; Ps.113:6, and with an indefinite subject in the
plural,[18] meaning: "when men are brought low". גֵּוָה is a
contraction of גֵּאֶוָה [גַּאֲוָה] "pride",[19] which is by no means
always used in a bad sense.[20]

Whether וַתֹּאמֶר be taken in the sense of "proclaim"
or, with Torczyner, as the Acc., amâru, "to be high", "exalted",
the clause is parallel to יוֹשִׁיעַ and the subject must
therefore be God. The meaning of the clause is then, that
when men are brought low, He (God) restores their pride –
an exact parallel to clause 'a'. This conclusion may be
confirmed by a striking equivalent of our verse, though in the
exact opposite sense, in the Aramaic (Dan. 4:34) וְדִי מַהְלְכִין בְּגֵוָה
יָכִל לְהַשְׁפָּלָה. The use of שָׁפֵל with גֵּוָה, as in our verse, nullifies

---

17. GKC §53d.

18. A.B. Davidson, _Hebrew Syntax_ (3rd ed.1901), 108.
For a similar usage in Job cf. 6:2 יִשָּׂא .

19. GKC §23f. cf. Jer. 13:17.

20. cf. Deut. 33:26,29, Ps. 68:35.

all attempts at emending the latter word. Both the Daniel
and Job verses may be grounded in a popular proverb, a fact
which would also help account for the terseness of language
as well as for the use of what will later be shown to
be an archaism in the Hebrew. At any rate, ‏ותאמר גוה‏ is
parallel to ‏יוריע‏ and represents a t- preformative
used as 3 m.s. [21]

Two further, though uncertain, examples of this
phenomenon may be cited:

5.   5:17   ‏הנה אשרי אנוש יוכיחנו אלוה ומוסר שדי אל תמאס‏

Since ‏אל‏ is frequently used in place of ‏לא‏ in
Job,[22] and since ‏ימאס‏ would be more natural in the context,
‏תמאס‏ may well be 3 m.s. However, two other explanations
are also possible for the sudden change of person. The
speaker may be quoting a general maxim which he then applies
directly to Job and since the phrase is found in almost
identical form in Prov. 3:12 and may here be a direct quotation.

6.   16:8   ‏ותקמטני לעד היה‏

‏הלאני‏ in v.7 refers to God as do the following verbs
in 3rd. m.s. The only other usage of ‏קמט‏ in Job (22:16)
also has God as the subject.

-----

21. Vulg. and Syr. overcome the difficulty by reading ‏יוריעו‏
22. cf. 5:22; 9:34; 20:17; 32:21.

It would thus be tempting to explain ‏וַתְּקִמֵנִי‎ too, as a
3rd. m.s. and so obviate the incongruence of 2nd person
with ‏הִיה‎ . However, the impossible ‏הִשַׁמֵּתַ‎ in v.7. and the
general obscurity of the verses must render this suggestion
tentative.

Having established at least four, and possibly six,
instances of a 3rd. m.s. imperfect with t- in Job, we now
turn to the cognate languages where, as a matter of fact,
the same phenomenon can be found in Phoenician and the
Canaanite glosses of the Armarna tablets.

The 10th cent. Aḥiram Sarcophagus Inscription has
the following:

line 10   ‏תחתסף חטר משפטה תהתפך כסא מלכה‎

Now it is true that ‏כסא‎ might be a feminine noun as in
Ugaritic,[23] but there is no evidence for ‏חטר‎ as other than
masculine. We have here a case of t- preformative for
3rd. m.s. imperfect.[24]

Similarly, Ebeling in his study of the verbal forms
of the Amarna letters pointed out several undoubted instances
of the same phenomenon there, e.g. tirâm "he loves", tiqbi

23. 51:V:108, tᶜdb ksu.

24. So Harris, Grammar, p.65. cf. L.H. Vincent, "Les
Fouilles de Byblos", RB, 34 (1925), p.186.

"he says", tidin "he gives".[25]

Dhorme[26] has commented on the evidence as follows: -
"On ne doit pas s'étonner de trouver ce préfixe ta ou ti
au plur. masc. puisqu'il apparaît même au masc. sing......
La conclusion qui s'impose, cest qu'on employait l'une pour
l'autre les 3es pers masc. et fem., tant au sing. qu'au plural".

The evidence cited here shows conclusively that a
3rd. m.s. form with a t- preformative existed in the
Canaanite dialects[27] and the examples of the same phenomenon
in Job cited above fall into the same pattern and should be
so explained, no emendation from fem. to masc. being required.

B. t- preformative with 3rd. m.pl. imperfect.

That such a form existed among the Canaanite dialects
is no longer in dispute[28] Equally certain it is that vestigial

---

25.   E. Ebeling, Das Verbum der El-Amarna Briefe, (Berlin, 1909),
p.12, cf. paradigms p.10,15.

26.   "La Langue de Canaan", RB, X (1913), p.379.

27.   It is interesting to note that the promiscuous
interchange of masc. and fem. verbal forms is to be found in
the Nuzu dialect where it is Hurrian substratum.

28.   For the literature up to 1951 see W.L. Moran,
JCS,V (1951),pp.33-35. Previously, Moran (with Albright) had
expressed doubt on the existence of such a 3rd.pl. t-
preformative on the grounds that (a) such forms may be f.s.
verbs employed with m.pl. subjects as collectives as in Arabic
and Hebrew, (b) they may be conflate Canaanite-Accadian formations
(JCS, II (1948), pp.243-244, esp. Comm. No.6). Subsequently,
Moran (op.cit.)withdrew his objection because of new evidence
provided by the syntax of purpose clauses in the Amarna letters
from Byblos. As to the explanation of this taqtulu form, Moran
was inclined to accept the suggestion of Cross and Freedman
(JBL, 67 (1948), p.201,fn.16) that it arose by the analogical

usages of this form are to be found in Biblical Hebrew.[29]

Job 19:15 תחשבני may be another such example.[30] Most

scholars re-arrange vv.14-15 so that גרי ביתי is attached

to the previous verb. While this has the merit of improving

the metrical arrangement, it is not without objection:

(1) גרי ביתי goes better with אמהתי.

(2) שכחוני is more appropriate to יידעי than to

גלביתי (3) irregular metrical division is fairly common[31].

(4) the m. suffix of בעיניהם, while not entirely

anomalous,[32] goes better with גרי ביתי attached to אמהתי

than to the previous verse.[33]

(5) The form תחשבני still remains morphologically

difficult even if it refers to אמהתי alone. Accordingly,

it would be best to leave the text as it is and to explain

תחשבני as a Canaanism, an instance of t- 3rd m.pl. imperfect form.

---

change of prefix y->t- on the basis of the idiomatic use of the
3rd. f.s. indicative taqtulu with a plural subject. For another
explanation, see that of Dhorme cited above, note 26.

29. See UH,I,p.63, for examples. A survival of this
Canaanism is to be found in a late Aramaic magical text:J.Montgomery,
Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur (1913), Texts No.21-23,line 2:
ומן כל נזקין דלא תקרבון

30. GKC §60 a merely records, but does not explain,the form.

31. cf. Job 4:8; 14:13; 26:5.

32. GKC § 135 o.

33. GKC § 132 d;46d.

C. The Qatlâti Perfect.

The usual perfect Qal form of רִיב in the 2nd m.s.

is רַבְתָּ. Job, however, in one instance, has the unusual

form רִיבוֹתָ (33:13). Ebeling[34] has pointed out that this

corresponds to the well-attested Qatlâti[35] perfect form,

used side by side with the Qatalti form in the Canaanite

glosses to the Amarna tablets. Accordingly, רִיבוֹתָ is to be

classified as a Canaanism.

_____

34. E. Ebeling, Das Verbum Der El-Amarna Briefe,

(Berlin, 1909), p. 21; Dhorme, RB, X, (1913), p. 391, n. 3.

35. The use of -â- as a binding vowel is regularly
found in the Accadian status indeterminatus and the permansive
forms. It has survived in Hebrew regularly in such forms
as הֲקִימוֹתִי   סַבּוֹתִי. where it gives biconsonantal verbs
triconsonantal appearance. That it once was used more widely
in Hebrew may be conjectured from the K. and sometimes even
from the Q of many irregular forms e.g. II Kings 4:23 אַתְּ
הוֹלֶכֶת K, Jer. 8:18 מַבְלִיגִיתִי , for the î vowel of which
cf. Acc. belêta; 10:17 יוֹשַׁבְתְּ k; 15:10 מְקֻלָלוּ = מְקַלְלוּנִי ;
22:23 מְקֻנַנְתִּי k; יֹשַׁבְתְּ k; 51:13 שָׁכַנְתְּ k. All these cases
may be explained as having the verbal suffixes attached to
the nominal (participle) form just as in the Accadian status
indeterminatus.

III The Relative Pronoun ‎ְשׁ

The relative pronoun ‎ְשׁ occurs but once, in k. ‎שֶׁדִּין
(Q ‎שֶׁדּוּ) 19:29, and is so understood by Aqu. Theod. Symm.
Targ. Syr. Vulg. as well as in Rabbinic literature.[1] The
Jewish commentators Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Ralbag, similarly
construed the form.

Some moderns[2] prefer to emend ‎שׁ to ‎שׁן. This, however,
is highly objectionable, for while the omission of the
relative pronoun is frequent in Job nowhere is ‎שֶׁן used in the
direct object of the verb. On the analogy of 11:18 a
preceding ‎כִּי would be required. No-one familiar with Biblical
Hebrew idiom could tolerate a construction ... ‎לְפִי תְּרִיוּן שׁי

The use of the relative ‎שׁ is characteristic of Moabite[3]
and is mainly confined in the Hebrew Bible to those books
that have Northern origins or affinities[4]. It is undoubtedly
connected with Phoenician ‎אשׁ [5] The vocalization ‎שׁ is that

---

1. Minḥath Shai, ad loc.

2. Budde, Klostermann, BH, Gray-Driver.

3. v. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the
Old Testament (9th ed. 1913), p.449, n.

4. HG, p.29 maintains that š in Hebrew is original to
Northern Israel. cf. Dahood, Biblica, 33 (1952), p.44f. esp.,
p.45, n.1.

5. W. Wright, Comparative Grammar (1890), p.119.

of the proto-Semitic ša which is the regular form of the
Canaanite relative pronoun as found in the Amarna letters.[6]
As a matter of fact the latter yields a construction
identical with that of Job in the use of ša in the sense of
"that" after the verb idu.[7]

---

6.   Dhorme, "La Langue de Canaan", RB, XI (1914),
p.360.
7.   EA, 149:82, pointed out by Dhorme, ad loc.

IV <u>THE DEFINITE ARTICLE</u>.

One of the characteristics of Hebrew poetry is the
tendency to omit the definite article where it would be
expected in prose.[1] This phenomenon is explained by the
fact that poetry, consciously or otherwise, imitates the
older forms of the language, and since Ethiopic, Accadian
and Ugaritic have no definite article it may be assumed that
there was none in proto-Semitic. The peculiarity of Job
lies, not in the rarity of the article, but in the inconsistency
and erraticism in its use.

The definite article has a dual function - as
a relative pronoun in a participial sentence, and as a noun
determinant.

A. <u>The Article as a Relative</u>.

There is a complete lack of consistency in this type
of construction. The article is present in 9:5,6,7; but
absent in vv.8,9,10. The participle is defined in5:10 but
not in vv.9,13. With the following instances which have
the article:- 3:8,14,15,21,22; 6:16; 22:17; 30:3-4;
may be contrasted the ommission in the series 12:17,19-24 and
26:7-8.

The conclusion is unavoidable that the presence or

1.<u>GKC</u> §126h; Wilson,<u>Hebraica</u>, VI (1889-90),p.214
Lambert, <u>REJ</u>, 37 (1898), p.203.

absence of the article with a participle is entirely

capricious, a mere stylistic device for which no controlling

conditions can be determined.

B. Determination of the Noun.

The most frequent use of the article[2] is in cliches

especially of the kind composed of two nouns in construct

relationship. Here again there is a most haphazard and

inconsistent determination. The following contrasts

illustrate the point:

5:22 חית הארץ	but	14:19 עפר ארץ
5:25 עשב הארץ		24:4,18 עני ארץ
12:24 עם הארץ		35:11 בהמות ארץ
28:24 קצות הארץ		
37:3,38:13 כנפות הארץ		
12:8 דגי הים	but	6:3 חול ימים
36:30 שרשי הים		9:8 במתי ים
		38:16 נבכי ים

11:8 גבהי שמים   but   12:7,28:21;35:11 עוף השמים

22:12 גבה שמים

22:14 חוג שמים

26:11 עמודי שמים

38:29 כפר שמים

38:33 חקות שמים

38:37 נבלי שמים

---

2. The use of the full form of the definite article with the
noun must be distinguished from the apparently elided form with the

Similarly difficult to understand are the inconsistencies

in the following cases:

a) In clichés we find לילה consistently without the

article 4:13 חזיונות לילה

20:8; 33:15 חזון לילה

34:20 חצות לילה

Yet in 3:3, the undefined יום is parallel to הלילה .

We find 30:8; מן הארץ 37:9, but מן גו 30:5. מן החדר

b) The poetic preposition מני usually goes with an

undefined noun: -

12:22; מני חשך 41:11; מני ים 18:17,[3] מני ארץ but

31:7 מני הדרך occurs. שמים, with the exception of

the cliché עוף השמים , is always undefined.

c) The particle כל too, never takes the article,

Yet we find the combination 28:24;37:3;41:3. כל השמים

d) The interrogative אי־זה 38:19,24 takes the

article but not מי זה[4] 38:2; 42:3 or מי הוא 4:7.

e) We find הקרח 38:29 and קרח 6:16; 37:10;

החכמה 28:12,20, otherwise always simply חכמה[5].

Finally, comparison between Job and other books is

instructive.

---

prepositions בב"ל . In such cases, as will be shown later, the
vocalization is not necessarily a guide to the presence of the
article.

3. so 16:16; מני בכי מני שחת 33:30.

4. cf. Ps.25:12 מזה האיש

ארור היום Jer. 20:14   ארור הים Job 3:3

עפר הארץ Isa. 40:12   עפר ארץ 14:19

חוג הארץ Isa. 40:22   חוג שמים 22:14

On the other hand, ארץ החיים Job 28:13, but ארץ חיים Isa 53:8

How is this erraticism in the use of the article
to be explained? König[6] maintains that in two parallel
clauses, the presence of the article in the first clause
also determines thereby the second.[7] The evidence however,
is against such an interpretation of the omission of the
article, for in the majority of cases in Job the article is
present in the second clause but omitted in the first. We
should have to assume retrogressive functioning of the
article - an impossible situation.

Thus, the article is present in the first clause, but
absent in the second, only three times.

והחכמה - בינך   28:12 (=20)

מן החדר - ממזרים   37:9

הקרח - כפר השמים   38:29

---

5. 11:6; 12:2; 15:8; 26:3; 28:28; 32:7,13;
33:33; 38:36; 39:17.

6. Syntax §292n cf. Lambert, op.cit., p.206f.

7. Among the examples he cites is Job 5:10 הנתן - ושלח

On the other hand, the reverse situation occurs nine

times.

3:3	יום - והלילה	
5:22	לצד ולכפן - חית הארץ	
12:7	בהמות - עוף השמים	
28:21	כל חי - עוף השמים	
33:30	מני שחת - באור החיים	
35:11	בהמות ארץ - עוף השמים	
38:12 (Q)	בקר - השחר	
39:15	רגל - חית השדה	
40:20	בול הרים - חית השדה	

In fact, since the article is actually present

in both members of the parallelism only four times,

3:4	הלילה ההוא v.6 והיום ההוא	
5:23	אבני השדה - חית השדה	
28:24	קצות הארץ - כל השמים	
37:3	כל השמים - כנפות הארץ	

the evidence unmistakably demonstrates that the absence or

presence of the article is capricious and that König's

rule cannot be substantiated.

Tur-Sinai[8] suggests that the article may have

---

8.   ספר איוב (2nd. ed., 1954), p.362.

been later inserted with nouns on the analogy of the prose
style. However, we should still be without explanation
for the capriciousness of the editors in inserting the
article. Furthermore, Psalm 104 and Isaiah 40ff share
with Job the peculiarity of the participial sentences
used indiscriminately, with or without the article.[9]
Psalm 104, moreover, exhibits a large number of Canaanite
forms and has numerous phraseological correspondences with
Job. It exhibits the same erraticism in its use of the
article with the noun, e.g. v.14 האדם, v.23 אדם
v.14:24 הארץ, but v.30 אדמה; v.19 שמש, v.22 השמש.
v.23 זה הים גדול

Ecclesiastes too, shows the same inconsistent insertion
of the article: - 2:8 סגלות מלכים והמדינות; 10:20 דבר...הקול
12:6 הגלגל... כד etc. Thus, the inconsistency and
erraticism in the placement of the article must have some
explanation other than the whim of the redactor, especially
since it occurs in precisely those texts which otherwise
exhibit strong Canaanite influence.

No help can be obtained from Ugaritic since it lacks
the article entirely. But Dahood[10] has effectively demonstrated

---

9. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p.468.

10. M.J.Dahood, op.cit,, 33 (1952), pp.197f.

that in the case of Ecclesiastes the phenomenon is the result

of Phoenician syntactical influence.[11]. The following

examples of the inconsistent Phoenician use of the article

may be compared with those of Job cited above: -

yḥmlk   line 4,   פתח חרץ זן ;5, הפתח חרץ זן

" 6,   ערפת זא ,12; והערפת זא

Sidon,Tabnith" 3, ר האין;Eshmunaazar; 4,   משכב ז

Eshmunaazar   " 9,   אלנם קדשם ,22 ;האלנם הקדשם

The evidence would seem to decide in favor of the

variability in the use of the article as a genuine feature

of the language of Job and against the assumption of late

editorial addition. Rather is it to be considered another

proof of its archaic character and a point of contact with

Phoenician and Northern Hebrew.

C. Omission of the Article with the Nota Accusativi

Three times in Job the nota accusativi את occurs

without a following definite article:

1.   13:25   ואת קש יבש תרדף
2.   36:7   ואת מלכים לכסא
3.   41:26   את כל גבה יראה

In each of these instances the commentators have

seen fit to emend the text so as to eliminate the syntactical

---

11.   Friedrich, Grammatik, §300 "Im Phönizischen
scheint keine Regel über Setzung oder Nichtsetzung des
Artikels beim Substantive erkennbar". cf. Schröder, Die
phönizishe Sprache (Halle,1869) p.161. Harris, Grammar,
p.66; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions (1903), p.21.

difficulty. Before considering the merits of the emendations
we have to examine the suppositions upon which they rest.
These are two-fold:

   a)   that the nota accusativi is alien to the language
of Job.[12]

   b)   that every nota accusativi must be followed by
the definite article.[13]

   a)   The nota accusativi in Job

The restricted use of את is characteristic of Hebrew
poetry in general[14] and of Job in particular[15]. However, the
particle is to be found several times with suffixes[16] and
even with a noun as the direct accusative of a verb.[17] There can

---

12.   W.B.Stevenson, Notes on the Poem of Job (1951),p.55:
"The accus. particle is not used before a noun elsewhere in
the poem". Tur-Sinai, op.cit., to 13:25.   cf. on 5:2;

13.   Ibid. p.176,   "אין את אלא לפני ה̇א הידיעה בכלל̇
Gray-Driver, op.cit.,II,p.86: "את before an indeterm. noun is very
anomalous".

14.   GKC §117a; A.M.Wilson, op.cit., pp.139-150, 212-224.

15.   Ibid. p.140, Wilson points out that Job proportion-
ately uses את less than any other Biblical book, with the
exception of Lamentations, Proverbs and Nahum.

16.   אֹתִי 14:3; אתכם 13:9,10,11;27:5;11; cf. אִתָּי19:4,
אִתָּך 14:5.

17.   7:21 עֹנוּ ותצבור את;26:4 את⸳מי הגדת. For הגיד את
cf. 32:6   חוה את;28:23 ידע את מקומה 35:4, ואת רעך⸱⸱⸱ אשיבך

be no objection therefore, to the use of the <u>nota accusativi</u>
as such.

b) The <u>nota accusativi</u> without the article.
This construction is not uncommon in Hebrew poetry[18] as may be
shown by such examples as Isa.33:19 את עם נועז
41:7 את צרף ; Ezek. 26:19 את תהם ; Ps.146:9; את גרים
Prov.3:12 את בן ; Eccles.3:15 את נרדף ; 4:4 את כל עמל ואת כל כשרון
Eccles.7:7 את לב ; 8:9 את כל זה ;12:14 את כל מעשה

This looseness in the combination or omission of the
article with את corresponds exactly to the general erraticism
in the use of the article itself. Here too, the explanation
lies within the sphere of Phoenician syntactical influence.
As with the article, there are no fixed rules in Phoenician for
the insertion of the <u>nota accusativi</u> or for its use with
a defined noun.[19]

Kilamuwa II:15: ישחת ראש בעל צמד [20]
Karatepe I:21-11: דננם ישבת שם [21]
Esmun‑azar 4f: אל יפתח אית משכב ז
Karatepe,III:14-15: יחמד אית הקרת ז

---

18. Wilson, <u>op.cit.</u>, p.214

19. Friedrich, <u>op.cit.</u>,pp.274-278 cf. Schröder, <u>op.cit.</u>, p. 213

20. = השחית את ראש ׳

21. = את הד׳ הושבתי שם

All the afore-going evidence points to the following
conclusions: the use of את with a noun in Job is attested
firmly; the omission of the article after את is not
anomalous in poetry and is common Phoenician usage. These
facts should warrant a cautious approach to the emendation
of the text in the three Job passages cited at the outset,
a detailed consideration of each of which is now called for.

1. העלה נדף תערוץ ואת קש יבש תרדף

It is usual to emend ואת to ואם[22]. However, the
pattern אם... ה is by no means invariable. The conjunction
ו may frequently replace אם in the coordinate clause of an
interrogative sentence, e.g. 4:2; 6:26; 15:7;8,11; 18:4
38:16,17,22,38. Again, in two or more parallel or coordinate
clauses one may take the nota accusativi and the other omit
it. This construction is common in Biblical Hebrew: -

Isa. 49:21	אלה - את אלה	
Ezek. 4:5	עון - את שני[23] עונם - את עון	
Prov. 22:23	את קבעיהם ריבם	
II Chron. 32:14	עמו 15, את עמו	
cf. Zech. 2:1	עיני 5, את עיני	

In Job itself if is found three times: -

7:21	פשעי - את עוני
26:4	נשמת מי - את מי
28:23	דרכה - את מקומה

---

22. so Gray-Driver,Beer,Budde,Duhm,Kittel.

23. cf. Prov. 23:11 את ריבם

Accordingly, there can be no objection to the presence of אֵת and since, as has been shown, the omission of a following article occasions no difficulty, the emendation to וְאֵם is entirely unnecessary.

2.   36:7   וְאֵת מְלָכִים לַכִּסֵא וַיֹשִיבֵם לָנֶצַח וּכו׳

The exegetical difficulty occasioned by the inappropriate mention of מְלָכִים is independent of the syntactical problems of the sentence, which alone engage our attention. Duhm's suggested emendation to וְאֵם in no wise improves the text.[24] Perles[25] proposed the reading וְיֵשֶׁת. However the Targum and Theod. καὶ μεττὰ ,testify to the antiquity of MT וְאֵת. It has already been shown that there can be no objections as such to the combination וְאֵת מְלָכִים It remains to point out that וְאֵת introducing casus pendens followed by the imperfect with Waw is a legitimate construction.[26] Three such examples will suffice for our purpose, each being syntactically equivalent to our Job passage:

I Kings 15:13   וְגַם אֵת מַעֲכָה אִמּוֹ וַיְסִרֶהָ מִגְּבִירָה
II Kings 16:14   וְאֵת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַנְּחֹשֶׁת ... וַיַּקְרֵב ...
Isa.   57:12   וְאֵת מַעֲשַׂיִךְ וְלֹא יוֹעִילוּךְ

---

24.   cf. the remarks of Dhorme, ad loc.

25.   F. Perles, Analekten (1922), p.41.

26.   GCK §111h.

Thus, in Job 36:7, as in the previously cited case, the emendation וְאֶת is unnecessary.

    3. 41:26   אֵת כָּל גָּבֹהַּ יִרְאֶה

It is common to emend אֵת to אֹתוֹ and יִרְאֶה to יֵרֶא

The MT however, is supported by 40:11,[27] 12a   רְאֵה כָל גֵּאֶה

We have here another instance of אֵת without a following article.

    The three cases of the <u>nota accusativi</u> with an **undetermined** noun are consistent with the erratic placement of the article generally, and the archaic phenomenon is another point of contact with the area of Phoenician and Northern Hebraic syntactical influence.

---

    27. So Budde, Duhme, Beer.

V   THE PREPOSITIONS

A. The Vocalization of the Prepositions, בכ״ל

There are no non-syncopated forms of the article with the prepositions, the determination of which is indicated solely by the vocalization.   There are excellent reasons for doubting whether the Massoretic vocalization really indicates the presence of the article.[1]

1.   The Massorah would indicate a prodigious use of the elided article with the prepositions in inexplicable contrast to the very sparse use of the article otherwise.

2.   The shortened preposition מִ with which the article does not elide, never appears with the article.

3.   Many nouns have the defined form of the prefix although they are never otherwise determined by the definite article in Job, e.g. חשך , בינה , אל , אור , אביון
מִשְפט , שחת, שחקים , צל , עב , מים , מות .

4.   There are numerous inconsistencies in the punctuation of the prefix with the same noun: -

בָאור 33:28	לָאור 12:22 etc.,	לְאור 30:26
לְאל 13:8;	לְאל 13:7	
לְעב 20:6;	כְּעָב 30:15	
לִקבר 10:19;	לִקברות 21:32	

---

1.   cf. GKC, §126n, note 2,

37:21 בַּשְׂחקים	37:18 לְשִׂחקים	
9:32 בְּמשׁפט	14:3 בַּמשׁפט	9:19 לְמשׁפט
6:18 בְּתֻהו	12:24 בְּתֹהו	

5. There is a large number of inconsistences within a single context: —

3:21	קֶבֶר , v.22 לָמוּת ;	
5:22	לְצֵיד וּלְכפן - חיַּת הָאָרץ ;	
9:6	כוכבים , לַחֹס v.7 , ארץ ;	

בהמות - עוף השמים 12:7; מצהרים - כַּבקר 11:17

בְּצֵים - כַּצֵל 14:2; חשׁך - לָאור 12:22

בֶּחשׁך - אוֹר 24:16; לְטוֹרף - לחם 24:5; בָּארץ - נתיב 18:9

שׂאוֹל - לָאֲבדון 26:6; כַּכֹל - כְּרֹאשׁ שׁבֹּלת 24:24

לֵאמֹר - חֶרֶד קֹלוֹת v.26; לְרוּח - מים 28:25

כַּמֹּר - לְמלקוֹשׁ 29:23; שׂער - בָּרחוֹב 29:7

כֶּעפר - וָעֵפר 30:19; כָּרוֹת - כְּעָב 30:15

זהב - לֻכתם 31:24; אוֹבד - כָּאֲבדון 31:19

שׂחֹת - בַּשׁלח 33:18; גר - לָאֹרח 31:32

בֶּעמק - בֹּכֹח 37:18; החֹדר - מִמצֹרים 37:9

בֶּעמק - בֹּכֹח 39:21 חכמה - בַּבִּינה 39:17

For all these reasons, the vocalization of the preposition cannot possibly represent the presence of the article. Several explanations have been offered for this state of affairs. König's phonetic theory[2] was criticized by

---

2. <u>Syntax</u>, §292n, note 1.

Lambert[3] and the evidence from Job completely refutes it,
for we find the indefinite preposition extensively prefixed
to nouns in the pre-tone and before gutturals. Lambert[4]
himself thought that the traditional pronunciation of the
prefixes with sheva was altered by the punctuators, probably
to accord with the prose style in which the article was much
more frequently used. However attractive, this theory does
not explain the numerous inconsistences, why the punctuators
should have altered some forms but not others, even within
the same verse.

An alternative explanation may lie in the nature of
the original vowel of the prepositions which in each case
was patah, later shortened to sheva. The original vowel
remained frequently in the pre-tone lengthened to qametz.
It is probable that there was a transition period in the
shift from $a > \breve{e}$ in which both forms existed side by side.
Poetry, in its tendency to use archaism, may well have
frequently preserved the older pronunciation of the
prepositions with patah.

---

3. REJ, 37, p.209 note 2.

4. Ibid. p.208, cf. BDB, 208b.

B. The Preposition בּ "from"

The recovery of the Ugaritic language, in which the
preposition <u>ba</u> has the meaning "from"[5] in addition to the
significations well known from Hebrew, drew the attention
of scholars to the fact that the same phenomenon is to be
found in Phoenician[6] and Old South Arabic.[7] In Biblical
Hebrew too, the use of בּ as "from" has been increasingly
recognized.[8] Several cases of this phenomenon are to be

---

5.   Gordon, <u>UH</u>,10:1, p.81ff. מִן is not attested
in Ugaritic.

6.   This was first observed by H.Winckler,
<u>Altorientalische Forschungen</u>,I, pp.63-67; cf. Harris,
<u>Grammar</u>, p.120,s.v. מִן ; J.Friedrich, <u>Grammatik</u>, 251. For
a criticism of Friedrich's "dissimilation" theory, see Gordon,
<u>Orientalia</u> XXI (1952),p.121. The observation of Cooke,
<u>North Semitic Inscriptions</u> (1903), p.35, that "the preposition
itself cannot denote 'from' is, of course,invalidated. On
the other hand, the remark of Albright, <u>JAOS</u>,LXVII (1947),p.158
n.42, that מִן "from" is not attested in Phoenician, is not
to be taken too literally in view of such forms as למפּעורר
and the suffixed מִנם.

7.   See Maria Höfner, <u>Altsüdarabische Grammatik</u>
(1943),§123k.

8.   cf. Gordon, <u>op.cit.</u>,J.Reider, <u>JJS</u>,III (1952),
p.78; Cross & Freedman,<u>JBL</u>,LXXII (1953),pp.17,24,n.20,
25,n.35,26 n.42; S.R.Driver, <u>Notes on...Samuel</u> (2nd. ed.1913)
p.LXVII, cites a variety of instances of "orthographic
confusion" of the prepositions בּ and מ between <u>MT</u> and <u>LXX</u>.
Many such can now be explained on the basis of <u>MT</u> בּ = "from".
The same applies to several of the examples cited by Fried.
Delitzsch, <u>Die Lese - und Schreibfehler</u> im Alten Testament
(1920), pp.113f. For a case in Biblical Aramaic cf. שתי בּ
Dan.5:2,3. It is interesting to note that Ibn Janâḥh, <u>Sefer
Harikmah</u> 33, already observed that the preposition in Lev.8:32,
and elsewhere,has the function "from".

found in Job.

    1. 4:21   הלא נסע יתרם בם

The preposition was understood by Vulg. (<u>auferentur</u> <u>ex eis</u>) and Targ. (אנטל סעיד מנהון) in the sense of "from".

נסע in the Niphal is elsewhere only found in Isa. 38:12 where significantly, the preposition is מני. In the sense of deprivation, the verb has the same meaning in Ugaritic -ns', "to remove".[9]

    For יתרם cf. Ps.17:14 והניחו יתרם לעולליהם Job 22:20. ויתרם אכלה אש

Fried. Delitzsch,[10] even before the days of Ugaritic studies, pointed out that the preposition here is equivalent to the Accad. <u>ina</u> = "in", "from". There can be no doubt that the correct rendering of the passage is:

    "Their substance is removed from them".

    2. 5:19   בשש צרות יצילך

Elsewhere in Hebrew ב after נצל always indicates the agent[11]. Following the LXX most moderns emend

---

    9. e.g. 49:VI:27 = 129:17 ; cf. Job 19:10 Hiph. ויסע
‖ v.9 ויסר.

    10. <u>Das Buch Hiob</u> (1902), p.145.

    11. e.g. Ps. 33:16; 71:2; Ezek.14:14,20. The only exception, Isa. 57:13, is more apparent than real since the preposition there introduces an initial circumstantial verbal clause.

שׁוׄבׄ to מׄשׁוׄבׄ, an emendation now rendered unnecessary
by the recognition of the true function of the preposition.
An excellent Ugaritic parallel[12] is provided by 3 'Aqht: rev.14:

wy‹śrk byd btlt [ʿnt]
"and may he save thee from the hand of "Anat".

3. 5:21 בׄאׄתׄהׄ לׄגׄיׄן שׁׄוׄבׄ

בׄ in connection with הׄבׄא always elsewhere indicates
place-where. LXX, Syr. and Vulg. all render the preposition
"from", on the basis of which, moderns emend to מׄשׁׄוׄבׄ. Here,
again, the MT has preserved a vestigial meaning of the
preposition.

4. 7:13 וׄהׄתׄנׄגׄ בׄחׄלׄוׄמׄוׄת וׄמׄחׄזׄיׄוׄנׄוׄת תׄבׄעׄתׄנׄיׄ

This verse affords an excellent example of the
interchange of the functions of the prepositions מׄ and בׄ[13].

5. 20:20 בׄחׄמׄוׄדׄוׄ לׄאׄ יׄמׄלׄטׄ

Despite the textual difficulties of 20a and 21b,

---

12. Incidentally, the passage has other Canaanite
affinities in the climactic use of numbers, on which see further,
above, p.14.

13. Otherwise, חׄתׄת takes מׄ,Isa.31:4,9; 51:7;
Jer.1:17; 10:2 bis.

the general sense is abundantly clear. The emphasis is
on the fact that in the end the wicked are forced to
relinquish their ill-gotten gains. מפלט in the Piel is
always transitive and means to "save, deliver". Wherever
the verb in this form is without an object one has to be
understood.[14] It is possible so to take יפלט here with
נפשו understood, but it would then shift the emphasis from
the miscreant's treasure to his life - a thought which is
not natural to the context. Moreover, in vv. 20, 21 we have
chiastic parallelism, אין שריד לאכלו = בחמודו לא ימלט
It is simplest to take בחמודו as the object of the verb
and to regard the preposition as another instance of ב = "from".
The rendering then is: "He shall save (nought) from his goods".

6. 21:25 ולא אכל בטובה
The phrase אכל ב is equivalent to אכל מן.[15]
7. 35:16, 36:12 בבלי דעת
בבלי is equivalent to מבלי

---

14. Ps. 33:17 ברב חילו לא ימלט in which the ב
is instrumenti. Amos 2:15a is not really a case in point since
נפשו in b is the object of both clauses. In Isa. 46:4 an
object is clearly understood.

15. For the interchangeable use of מ and ב after
אכל, cf. Exod. 12:43, 44, 45 אכל ב', with Lev. 7:21 אכל מ.

8.   36:15   <u>יחלץ עני בעניו</u>

That ב here means "from", may be shown by such

parallel phrases as:

    Prov.11:8   <u>צדיק מצרה נחלץ</u>
    Ps. 116:8   <u>כי חלצת נפשי ממות</u>

C. The Preposition ל = "from"

Like the preposition <u>ba</u>, <u>la</u> too in Ugaritic

and Hebrew, has the meaning "from".[16] Several examples are

attested:

    1.   8:8   <u>כי שאל-נא לדר רישון</u>

It is possible to treat the preposition as ל <u>rei</u>

and translate, "concerning the former generation". Such

a construction however, is precluded by v.10. which shows

that asking for information <u>from</u> some-one is presupposed.

The usual idiom for this is <u>שאל מן</u>, but the use of ל

with the same function is not unknown elsewhere[17] With

this vestigial use of Canaanite ל cf. the phrase <u>שאל ב</u>

Judg. 20:18; I Sam.28:6; 30:8.

    2.   12:6   <u>ישלין אהלים לשודדים ובטחות למרגיזי אל לאשר...</u>

---

16.   Gordon, <u>UH</u>, 10:1. For additional examples in
Hebrew, cf. Judg.3:28; 7:24, and Patton, <u>Canaanite Parallels
in the Book of Psalms</u> (1944),p.41.

17.   e.g. II Kings 8:6. Both functions of ל are to
be found in I Sam.30:21. Our phrase <u>שאל ל</u> in 8:8 is thus to be
compared not with Deut.4:32, but rather with Deut.32:7.

The preposition in each clause has generally been taken as expressing the periphrastic genitive[18]. Such an interpretation is unwarranted. In the first place, robbers do not usually possess tents but ravage those of others[19]. Secondly, the reference here is to the state of the righteous, not of the wicked[20]. Zophar in the previous chapter has taken the fact of Job's suffering as evidence of his guilt, for, he implies, the righteous do not suffer. (11:13 -19). Job counters this by sarcastically agreeing with Zophar on the blissful state of the righteous and then exposing the falsity of the idea by citing the bitter facts of reality. The close connection between the two speeches is seen by the mention of לבטח , ובטחת in 11:18 and of בטוחות in 12:6. ואולם v.7, shows that what follows is meant to contradict the preceding. Understanding the passage in this manner, the repeated preposition ל means "from":

---

18. GKC. § 129 a-f.

19. cf. Jer.4:20. שדד אהלי

20. This was correctly noted by Tur-Sinai, but he did not recognize either the sarcastic nature of the speech or the true function of the preposition.

"The tents (of the righteous) are at ease from
robbers, and secure from those who provoke God, from etc."

3.   12:20   מסיר שפה לנאמנים

The difficulty of ל after a verb of removing has
been explained away either as " ל of respect", or as a
periphrastic genitive. The Targum renders the preposition
by "from" - ממהימנין, and there can be no doubt that
this is the simplest and most natural solution. A
similar use of ל after a verb of deprivation is to
be found in Ps. 84:12   לא ימנע טוב להולכים

4.   20:26   כל חשך טמון לצפונין

The difficulty here lies in the preposition. טמון ל'
nowhere else means "reserved for". Furthermore, the
context requires precisely the opposite expression since
darkness suggests security rather than peril for treasures.
If the ל be taken as "from", the difficulty disappears.
The meaning is: the security is removed, the treasures
of the wicked are exposed to plunderers. [21]

5.   38:41;   41:25   לבלי

The dictionaries[22] take the ל as designating a

---

21. cf. Isa. 45:3 for the same figure of darkness
protecting treasures.

22. cf. BDB, p. 516b.

condition or state. Rather we have here an interchange

with מִבְּלִי . Nowhere is the interchange of functions

of לְ, בְּ, מִ, better illustrated than in the equation

מִבְּלִי = בְּבְלִי = לְבְלִי .

D. The Combination of Prepositions.

A characteristic of Phoenician is the accretion

of different prepositions before a substantive, giving

rise to such forms as: לְ-מִ-נֶעֱרִי , לְ-מִ-מֹצָא שֶׁמֶשׁ ,

לְ-מִ-בְּ-יֶרַח , לְ-מִ-בְּ-חַיֵּי [23]. Biblical Hebrew shows

traces of this phenomenon in the combination לְמִ-,

לְמִן . A pure Phoenician form appears in I Chron. 15:13

לְמַבָּרִאשׁוֹנָה, which should undoubtedly be vocalized לְמִבְּ-.

The same tendency is present in Mishnaic Hebrew in a

form like לְכַשֶׁאפְנֶה (Aboth 2:4).

This phenomenon may be recognized in several

passages in Job.

    1. 36:3; 39:29 לְמֵרָחוֹק [24]

    2. 5:5 אֶל מִצִּנִּים

This phrase has been variously emended, principally

---

23. J. Friedrich, Grammatik, § 253.

24. Elsewhere only II Sam. 17:19 (=1 Chron. 17:17);
II Kings 19:25 (=Isa. 37:26); II Chron. 26:15; Ezra 3:13.

because of the difficulty of combining אל with מ. Since

however, אל and ל are interchangeable, the combination

should not be inherently impossible. As a matter of

fact, it is actually to be found in:

Lev. 16:15   אל מבית לפרכת

II Kings 11:15 (= II Chron. 23:14)   אל מבית לשדרות

However, the phrase מצנים יקחהו is perfectly

intelligible. If אל be taken pleonastically, as one or

other of the prepositions must be in these combinations,

the verse may be translated:

"Whose harvest the hungry devour, yea they take

it out of the (very) thorns", i.e. even that which is

overgrown with thorns, and usually escapes the reapers

attention, is not spared.

3.   9:15   לְמִשְׁפָּטִי

As the text stands this is an unusual Poel form[25]

Hitzig and Budde prefer לְמִשְׁפָּטִי , while Gratz emends to

לְמִן שׁפטי. There can be no doubt that the verb חנן

goes much better with an active noun שׁ פט. It would be

simplest to read לְמִשׁ פּטִי, i.e. a combination of מ + ל

with שׁ פט.

---

25.   GKC. §55b,c.

4. 20:23 בלחומו

We have here a description of the ineluctable fate
of the wicked. This word is parallel to חרון אף, but
so far, has defied all the efforts of the lexicographers
to find a satisfactory etymology within the context. The
various emendations suggested - חבלים[26], בבלהמו[27]
בלהות[28], חמתו[29], פחם[30], are either too difficult
to explain as the original of בלחומו, or do not suit
the context. On the critical principle, 'lectio difficilior
praeferenda est', it is best to treat בלחומו as ב-ל-חומו
i.e. as a combination of prepositions with the noun חום,[31]
"heat", "anger", equivalent to חמה and synonymous with חרון אפו .
For its use in Job, cf. 6:17 בחמו. In Ugaritic literature,
in a not dissimilar context in which a curse is put on the
land, we find the same word ḥm with the same denominative
verb mṭr used in the parallel clause:

---

26. LXX.

27. Dillmann, Budde.

28. Bickell.

29. Duhm.

30. Beer.

31. cf. Arab. ﻗَﻴْﺢ, "poison, venom."

ʿrpt bḥm un yr ʿrpt tmṭr bqz[32]
"Clouds in the heat of evil; the early rains; clouds that rain on the summer fruit".

Accordingly, we should translate: "he raineth upon him in/ with his venom".

5.   33:22   לְמְמִתִים

The contrast of שׁחַת with חַיִּים in v.30 suggests that our word here means "death" or "the dead" rather than "killers". Syr., Targ., both so understood it. Perles emends to לְמוֹ מֵתִים while Dhorme prefers לִמְקוֹם מֵתִים . The original reading may well have been לִמְמִתִים with the מ pleonastic, another instance of an accretion of prepositions obscured by the Massoretic vocalization.

---

32. I 'Aqht, 39-41 on which see Gaster, Thespis, p.12, n.62.

VI THE LAMEDH OF REINFORCEMENT.

The deictic element la as an adverbial emphasizing
particle, used proclitically, is a well known feature of
the Semitic languages.[1] It appears regularly in Accadian,[2]
Arabic[3] and Ugaritic[4] and is attested in Phoenician.[5]

In 1894, P. Haupt[6] drew attention to ten instances of
this particle in Biblical Hebrew and still others were noted

---

1. See I. Eitan, AJSL, XLV (1929), p.202; Albright,
CBQ, VII (1945), p.24.

2. W. von Soden, Grundriss, §81. The usual form is lu.
but la is also frequent. For an example of the asseverative
la in the Nuzu dialect cf. la inandinu, "we shall give",
- E. Chiera, Excavations at Nuzi, vol. 1. (Harvard Semitic Series
vol. v.(1929), 9:12.

3. Wright, Arabic Grammar (1951), II, p.41D.

4. Gordon, UH, 9:12; A Goetze, JOAS, 58 (1938), p.291,
n.132.

5. Friedrich, Grammatik, §257e; Albright, JBL, 69
(1950), p.389, has drawn attention to the fact that the
emphatic la is present in the Amorite pr.n. Sidqu-la-nasi
and in the pr.n. Adon-la-ram found on a graffito at Hamath.

6. Johns Hopkins University Circulars, XIII (1894),
No.114.

by Casanowicz[7] and Smith.[8] While not all of these proposed
examples have been accepted there is not the slightest
doubt that this usage of the Lamedh is a feature of Biblical
Hebrew.[9] I. Eitan,[10] in an exhaustive study, showed that
since it appears in the MT as לא, it was often mistaken for
the negative particle.[11] He pointed to no less than seven
instances of the emphatic Lamedh in Job, viz.

8:12	יבש ‖ עודנו באבו לא יקטף
11:11	ידע ,וירא ‖ ולא יתבונן
13:12	לגבי חמר לביכם
14:16	תספר ‖ לא תשמר
23:17	ומפני כסה אפל ‖ לא נצמתי מפני חשך
30:6	בערוץ נחלים לשכן
33:14	לא ישורה

Further examples of the particle, not hitherto recognized, may
be cited as follows: -

1. 3:16 או כנפל טמון לא אהיה

7. JAOS, XVI (1896) pp. clxvi-clxxi.

8. JBL, 24(1905) p.30.

9. cf. GKC §143e; Brockelmann, Grundriss,2.p.110;
Albright, CBQ, op.cit., points out that the most frequent
usage, as indicated by Ugaritic, appears to be with the
imperfect.

10. "La particule emphatique la dans la Bible",
REJ, 74 (1922), pp.1-16. M.J. Dahood, Biblica, 33 (1952),
p.192,n.1, points out that "it is important to note that
the majority of examples of this particle cited by Eitan
come from passages which are now known to contain Canaanite
influence".

11. For the confusion of לו and לא cf. e.g. LXX to
Ps.55:13; Job 9:33.

The difficulty of the negative particle has been universally
felt and variously treated. Gray-Driver render: "I had not
been", meaning I would have had no existence at all. Tur-
Sinai[13] likewise interprets the last two words as equivalent
to ‏ללא אהיה‎ i.e., I would have been as nothing. However,
all the cases cited for the existence of such a construction
without the preposition are themselves difficult and
problematical. Hitzig and Beer read ‏לא היה‎, but the
sentence is then/a predicate. Wright and Budde merely
                without
omit ‏לא‎. It is simplest to take ‏לא‎ as the emphatic, and
translate:

> "I would indeed have been".

2.   9:35   ‏כי לא כן אנכי עמדי‎

The negative clearly gives a sense contrary to that
expected. v. 35a emphasises Job's fearlessness in protesting
his innocence and the justice of his case. It would be
unthinkable to suppose that in 35b he suddenly declares
that he is not correct. Moreover, the phrase was obviously
designed to be a repetition of the first line of the
argument, v.2.   ‏אמנם ידעתי כי כ|‎. If ‏לא‎ be recognized
as the emphatic, the difficulty disappears and we have the

---

12.   On the interpretation of this crux,v. AJSL
op.cit. note 1. For the asseverative ‏ל‎ attached to nouns in
Ugaritic, v.J.Obermann, Ugaritic Mythology, (1948), p.85, n.75.

13. ‏ספר איוב‎ (2nd. ed.) ad loc.

very definite statement:

"I am certainly correct".

3. 21:16 הן לא בידם טובם

Here again, the whole tenor of the chapter demands a positive statement that the wealth of the wicked is secure. The commentators accordingly either take לא as an interrogative negative or, with LXX, omit the offending particle. It is best to take לא as emphatic and render as a strongly affirmative statement.

4. 27:19 עשיר ישכב ולא יאסף

The parallel clause, עיניו פקח ואיננו, and the subsequent verses, make it clear that a negative with יאסף is out of place. Most moderns accept the emendation of Houbigant - ולא יוסיף, although the Niphal of אסף in the sense of death is well attested.[14] No emendation is required if לא be recognized, not as a negative, but as an emphatic particle.

---

14. e.g. Jer. 8:2.

VII   THE ENCLITIC -m.

The enclitic particle -m(a) is familiar to students of Akkadian and Ugaritic,[1] although its origin is obscure.[2] Syntactically it may be added to a finite verb, it may interpose between the infinite absolute and the verb,[3] it is appended to nouns and may even intervene between the construct and its genitive.[4] Its function with verbs and nouns alike is emphasis and/or stylistic variation.[5]

The enclitic -m has been recognized in recent times as existing in Biblical Hebrew in numerous passages, having been mistaken by the Massoretes for the possessive or pronominal suffix or for the preposition מ[6].

Further Biblical examples would seem to be presented by the following passages in the book of Job:

---

1.   For a case in Phoenician see CIS. 119.2

2.   For a comprehensive review of the literature. see M.Pope, "Ugaritic Enclitic -m", JCS V (1951) pp.123-128.

3.   For an example in Accad. cf. Mari Tablets,III:8:16-17 šu-ta-aṣ-bu-tum-ma uš-ta-ṣa-ab-ba-at, "I caused to be undertaken." Similarly,in Ugaritic, 75:I:38,, bʿl hmdm yhmdm "Baal verily covets."

4.   cf. Gordon, UH pp.44,90.

5.   Pope,op.cit., p.128.

6.   Ginsberg, JRAS (1935), p.47; JBL,LXII (1943), p.115; LXIX (1950), p.54; Kithbei Ugarith, p.130; Albright, JBL,LXIII (1944), p.215,n.45,p.219,n.83; CBQ,VII (1945), p.23; Gordon, UH, p,115,n.4; Gaster, JQR. XXXVII (1946),p.65,n.32; p.58,n.9; Patton, Canaanite Parallels, p.12. Dahood, Biblica, 33 (1952), p.194 Cross & Freedman, JBL, LXXII (1953),p.26,n.41,p.28,n.63; Reider,

1.   5:15 **ויצא מחרב מפיהם ומיד חזק אביון**

The imbalance of the parallelism is obvious. The
sequence **מחרב מפיהם** is extraordinary. Syr., Targ., and
Vulg., all omit the preposition and read **מחרב פיהם**,[7]
"from the sword of their mouth", figurative for calumny.[8]

Ewald, Fried, Delitzsch, Dhorme, emend to **מֵחָרֵב**.
However, this root is no-where else used of persons and
would be an unlikely parallel to **אביון**.[9]

It is here suggested that the translation of the Syr.,
Targ., and Vulg., be adopted in respect of this phrase
without resort to textual emendation. The preposition
in **מפיהם** is the enclitic –m to be attached to the
preceding word to read **מחרב(מ) פיהם** . **אביון**
is the object of **ויצא** and the Waw of **ומיד** is epexegetical.
The meaning is that God protects the needy from slanderous

JJS, III (1952), 78-79; HUCA, XXIV (1952-53), p.97. Another
example is most likely to be found in Judg. 5:13 **לאדירם עם** =
בגבורים ‖ לאדירי (מ) עם

7.   So the reading in 20 Mss. v. G. Beer, Text des
Buches Hiob, (1895). But these probably represent scribal
attempts at removing the difficulty.

8.   For the connexion of "sword" with "mouth", cf. Ps. 57:5
שננו כחרב לשונם 64:4; **חרבות בשפתותיהם** 59:8; **ולשונם כחרב חדה**

9.   For other, more radical, emendations see the
commentaries.

accusation and physical violence. The translation is:

"He delivers the needy from the sword of their mouth,yea
from the hand of the strong".

2. 7:15 וַתִּבְחַר מַחֲנָק נַפְשִׁי מָוֶת מֵעַצְמוֹתַי

The preposition with the final word has either yielded
the awkward translation"... death rather than these my bones",
or misled the trnaslators into emending מֵעַצְמוֹתַי to
מֵעַצְבוֹתַי "... death rather than my pains". If however,
the preposition be taken as the enclitic of the preceding
מָוֶת (מ) the perfect balance of the two parallel clauses
is restored. מָוֶת becomes the object of וַתִּבְחַר. The
correct translation is then: "So that my soul (= I)
chooseth strangulation, my bones (= I) death".[10]

3. 8:8 כִּי שְׁאַל־נָא לְדֹר רִישׁוֹן וְכוֹנֵן לְחֵקֶר אֲבוֹתָם

The possessive suffix with אֲבוֹת is inconsistent with
the parallel clause and unlikely within the context. Both
the LXX and Vulg. omit the suffix, while Syr. and Targ.
translate it. The difficulty may be satisfactorily overcome
by regarding it as the enclitic -m.[11]

The translation is:

"For inquire, I pray thee, of the former generation,
and apply thyself to that which the fathers have searched out".

---

10. For the combination עַצְמוֹת ‖ נֶפֶשׁ cf. Ps.6:3-4; 35:9-10;
Prov.16:24. cf. also Isa.66:14 לֵב ‖ עַצְמוֹת ;Prov.15:30 לֵב ‖ עֶצֶם.

11. cf. Torczyner, ad loc.

4. 8:18   אם יבלענו ממקומו וכחש בו לא ראיתיך

As the text stands the subject of יבלענו must either

be "He", i.e. God, or "one". It is true God is mentioned in

v.20, but the two verses do not form a contextual unity. In

fact, God as the subject would be very strange in view of

the particular verbs used. The translation "one" adds nothing

to the interpretation of the verse. The difficulty lies in

the preposition in ממקומו. If this be taken as the

enclitic -m belonging to the preceding יבלענו the difficulty

disappears. מקומו is the subject of both verbs and the

translation is:

"If his place devour him and then deny him (saying),

'I have not seen thee!'"12

5. 15:18   אשר חכמים יגידו ולא כחדו מאבותם

To avoid the obviously impossible translation "and have

not hid from their fathers", the translations resort to a

tour-de-force and take ולא כחדו parenthetically, with

מאבותם meaning "having received it from their fathers".

Clearly the second clause exactly expresses the first negatively

and אבותם must be the subject of כחדו. LXX and Vulg.

both omit the preposition from מאבותם. If this be taken as

_____

12. For the idiom of a "place devouring", cf. Exod.15:12;
Num.16:32, 34.

the enclitic of the preceding verb (כחדו(מ ‎) , the perfect
balance of the parallelism is restored. The translation
then is:

"Which wise men tell and their fathers did not conceal".[13]

6. 17:7 _ותכה מכעש עיני ויצרי כצל כלם_

The line would be considerably improved by the
presence of a verb in clause 'b' parallel to **ותכה**. Houbigant
suggested _כלים_. However, a perfect would be more natural
after the imperfect consecutive _ותכה_. The difficulty lies
in the final -m. If this be taken as the enclitic we have
the superior reading _כָּל (מ)_.

---

13. i.e. litotes for, "their father plainly declared".

VIII THE PARTICLE AY

22:30 ‏ימלט אי-נקי‎

The crux here is the word ‏אי‎. Elsewhere in Biblical
Hebrew it is found only in the combination ‏אי-כבוד‎ (I Sam. 4:21),
usually taken as the negative, common in post-Biblical Hebrew
and in Phoenician and Ethiopic. However, the etymology of
‏אי-כבוד‎ is very doubtful.[1] ‏אי‎ as a negative in our passage,
although attested by the LXX *ῥύσεται ἀθῷον* and the
Targ. ‏גבר דליתוי זכאי‎ gives precisely the opposite
meaning to that required by the context. Notwithstanding the
great textual difficulties in the third cycle of speeches
(chapters 22-31), the theme is clear, viz, that Job's
sufferings must be caused by great wickedness and that the
wicked must in the end be punished. To declare that the
guilty (‏אי-נקי‎) can escape is to vitiate the force of
Eliphaz' entire argument. Moreover, v.30 is obviously
intended to be parallel to v.29 ‏ימלט אי-נקי ‖ ואח עינים יושיע‎
Without doubt, therefore, the MT, as it stands, is corrupt.

The Medieval Jewish commentators, Ibn Ezra and
Ralbag, tried to overcome the difficulty by taking ‏אי‎, not as
a negative, but as "island". (cf. A.V. "the island of the
innocent") and this has been followed in modern times by
Torcyzner who regards the phrase as a popular proverb with

---

1. See Driver, Notes on Samuel, ad lóc.

"island" in the sense of "land" and ‎נקי‎ as the subject of the sentence, i.e. "the innocent deliver a land".

Ibn Parḥon suggested the emendation ‎את‎ or ‎איש‎, a reading which has been followed by nearly all commentaries and which is certainly preferable to the complete deletion of ‎אי‎.[2] The require-ments of parallelism are in favor of some word before ‎נקי‎. However, it is difficult to see how ‎את‎ or ‎איש‎ could have been corrupted into the nonsensical negative ‎אי‎, especially in view of the LXX and Targ. readings supporting the MT and it is best to look for a different explanation of the MT.

Fortunately, this may be supplied by reference to the well known Semitic particle 'ay,[3] used frequently as an indefinite pronoun or exclamation.

In Accadian,[4] we find ayyû (masc.), ayyitummā (fem):

"ilu ayyummā" "some god or other"
"šarru(m) ayyummā" "some king or other"

and as a generalized indefinite relative pronoun, ayyummā ša (ayyū ša) "who-ever".

Similarly in Arabic[5] we find,

أَيِّي 'ayyun, "he who", 'whoever'.

أَيِّي وُأَيْكَ كَانَ شَرًّا فَأَخْزَاهُ ٱللَّهُ

---

2. cf. Vulg. "salvabitur innocens."

3. Wright, Comparative Grammar, pp.120f. I. Eitan, in his study of the Hebrew and Semitic Particles in AJSL, XLIV, No.3.(1928), p.191, deals with the demonstrative 'iy but not with 'ay.

"Whichever of us (two) be the bad one may God bring him to shame".

وَمَا تَدْرِي نَفْسٌ بِأَيِّ أَرْضٍ تَمُوتُ

"and no soul knows in what land it shall die".

That this particle existed within the Canaanite dialects is clear from Ugaritic where it is found in the exclamatory

'ayaḫ[7], "O what a brother",

as well as in the indefinite,

lḥm. blḥm 'ay wšty bḥmr yn 'ay[8]
"eat of some bread and drink some liquor of wine"

With this latter should be compared the almost identical phrase in

Prov. 31:4 אֵי שֵׁכָר (Kthib אוֹ)

which should accordingly be translated:

"... it is not for kings to drink wine or for princes (to drink) any liquor".

Turning now to the usages of this particle in Job, we find the exact parallel to אֵי שֵׁכָר in a phrase identical with the Ugaritic lḥm 'ay in 15:23 לֶחֶם אַיֵּה which should be translated: "he wanders about for some food", i.e. for anything at all to eat.[9]

---

4.   A. Ungnad, Grammatik des Akkadischen, §15d.
w. Von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, §48h, §49b.

5.   W. Wright, Arabic Grammar, II,220B, 315B.

6.   UH:III:No.101.

7.   Ibid., Text 333:6.

8.   Ibid, Text 52:6.

9.   This identification was tentatively put forward by H.L. Ginsberg, Kithbei Ugarith, p.78.

The final ‏הַ‎ may be due to a scribal misunderstanding and hence
expansion of the original particle ‏אִי‎ to ‏אַיֵּה‎ or may well represent
an original final vowel as in the Arabic 'ayya.

We may now proceed to a consideration of the crux

22:30 ‏יְמַלֵּט אִי־נָקִי‎

in which we should recognize, not the meaningless negative,
but the indefinite particle, reading:

‏אִי נָקִי‎

and translating:

"He delivers whomsoever is innocent".

This explanation has the merit of preserving the Massoretic
consonantal text, restoring the meaning to the passage and
exactly fitting the parallel clause in the preceding verse.
In short, all the textual difficulties disappear if we
recognize the existence here of the Semitic particle 'ay.

IX THE"PLEONASTIC" Waw.

Attention has recently been called to the striking use of the "pleonastic" Waw in Ugaritic and to a similar phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew.[1] In these cases the text would be perfectly clear if not for the disturbing Waw. Thus, in Ugaritic text 51:V:107-8:

> št alp qdmh mr(i)a wtk pnh.
> "An ox was placed before her, a fatling right
> in her face".

so also text 52:51:

> bm nšq whr
> "together with kissing there is conception".

In Hebrew the same obtrusive Waw, as pointed out by Pope, appears in:

II Sam.13:20 ... ותשב תמר ושוממה
"And Tamar remained desolate ..."

II Sam.15:34 עבד אביך ואני מאז ועתה ואני עבדך
"Your father's servant I was previously, but now I
am your servant."

Hos.8:6 כי מישראל והוא
"Surely it is (only a product) of Israel".

Amos 3:11 צר וסביב הארץ
"An enemy is around the land".

Amos 4:10 ואעלה באש מחניכם ובאפכם
"And I caused the stench of your camp to rise to

---

1. M. Pope, "Pleonastic Waw before Nouns in Ugaritic and Hebrew", JAOS,73 (1953),pp.95-98.

your nostrils", (literally, "so that it is ...   .")

In all these examples the disturbing Waw seems to be used as an auxiliary verb, "to be". Indeed, G.D. Young has drawn attention to the Egyptian auxiliary verb ꞽw "to be", which he regards as the base of the Waw consective as well as of this "pleonastic" Waw.[2]

In Job, one such case has **hitherto** been identified:[3]

1. 4:6   הלא יראתך כסלתך תקותך ותם דרכיך
"Is not your piety your confidence, Your hope your perfect conduct?"

The perfect chiastic parallelism which results from a recognition of the true function of the Waw here, leaves no doubt as to the soundness of the identification.

Other instances of this "pleonastic" Waw in Job, not previously recognized, are as follows:

2. 3:19   קטן וגדול שם הוא

No satisfactory rendering has so far been proposed to explain the anomalous reference of the pronoun   הוא to two persons. The suggestion of Gesenius,[4] followed by Budde and Dhorme, to take הוא in the sense of "the same",

---

2. G. Douglas Young, "The Origin of the Waw Conversive", JNES, XII (1953), pp.248-252.

3. Pope, op.cit., p.97.

4. GKC §135a n.1.

is not supported elsewhere, but does not remove
the syntactical difficulty. The latter applies also to
the proposal of Gray-Driver to take שָׁם as the predicate and
הוא in the sense of "to be". The emendation of Gratz
צוה הוא is open to the same objection. If we recognize
the Waw as having the function of the verb "to be", the
syntactical difficulty disappears. גדול שם הוא becomes
the predicate of קָטֹן, yielding the excellent sense, "there
the small becomes (as) the great, and the slave is free from
his master".[5]

3. 20:2 ובעבור חושיבי

The Waw has occasioned considerable difficulty since
it seems to detach the second clause from the first and leave
it incomplete. Hence, it is usual to read or understand
בעבור זאת or בעבור כ. However, the difficulty disappears
if the Waw be translated, "it is (because of) ..."

4. 26:5 הרפאים יחוללו מתחת מים ושכניהם

The mention of water in connection with רפאים and
the antecedent of the plural suffix of שכניהם have
given rise to numerous emendations and much strained exegesis.

------

5. D.Yellin, חקרי-מקרא - איוב (1927), sensed
this meaning but proposed the deletion of the Waw.

It is here proposed to read ‏וּעֶכְנֵיהֶם‏, from a noun ‏עֶכֶן‏, "dwelling-place", found in Deut.12:5 ‏לְשִׁכְנוֹ‏ and now confirmed by the Genizah Ben Sira 14:25 where ‏עֶכֶן‏ is synonymous with ‏אהל‏[6]. As another example of "pleonastic" Waw the rendering is:"The shades tremble, whose dwelling-place is beneath the waters", or, "The shades tremble; Their etc."

In several Ugaritic passages the rpim are mentioned in parallelism with ilnym[7] which in one text are said to reside "two layers beneath the springs of the earth..." (tḥt ʿnt arṣ).[8] The mention of ‏תחת מים‏ in our Job passage in reference to ‏רפאים‏ may well be connected with this notion.

All the afore-mentioned examples have been cases of the "pleonastic" Waw with nouns. The same phenomenon with verbs, though more complex, is well attested in Semitic. Goetze[9] pointed out several instances in Ugaritic as did König[10] in regard to Phoenician and Hebrew. In the following

---

6. M. D. Segal, ‏ספר בן־סירא השלם‏ (1953), p.92.

7. 62:45-46; 122: 2-4, 9-12 etc.

8. ʿAnat:IV:79.

9. A. Goetze, "The Nikkal Poem from Ras Shamra", JBL, 60 (1941), p.355-6.

cases the understanding of the text is considerably improved
if the Waw be accepted as "pleonastic".

5. 10:8   יחד סביב ותבלעני

It has been usual to accept the Greek reading

אחר תסוב / סבות - μετὰ ταυτα μεταβαλών με ἔπαυσας

as superior to the Hebrew.[11] However, both יחד and סביב
are frequently used as adverbs determining verbs of
destruction.

יחד		
	II Sam. 14:16	להשמיד ... יחד
	Ps. 49:11	יחד ... יאבדו
	Ps. 74:8	נינם יחד
	Isa. 27:4	אציתנה יחד
סביב	Zech. 12:6	ואכלו ... את כל העמים סביב
	Ps. 97:3	ותלהט סביב צריו
	Job 19:10	יתצני סביב ואלך
	Lam. 2:3	ויבער ... אכלה סביב

In some of the cases it is clear that סביב and
יחד may be used interchangeably. The combination of the two
adverbs in our passages conveys the idea of intensity.

Taking the Waw of ותבלעני as "pleonastic", we
get the excellent translation:

"Thou wouldst utterly destroy me".

6. 15:17   וזה חדיתי ואספרה

The conjunction with the imperfect is usually taken
to introduce the predicate of a casus pendens and has been
termed Waw apodosis.[12] This is the only instance of such a

---

10. E. König, Lehrgebäude, II, 2, §§341, m-r cf.
Brockelmann, Grundriss, II, p. 442f.

case with cohortative. It is far simpler to ignore
the conjunctive <u>Waw</u> as being "pleonastic" and render:

"That which I have seen I shall relate".

7.   23:12   מצות שפתי ולא אמיש

This verse too, is treated as <u>casus pendens</u> and the
verb taken as "internal Hiphil". Rather we should accept
the verb as transitive, as in Mic.2:3, with מצות ע׳ as the
object. This fits in better with the two clauses of v.11
and the parallel clause inv.12 in each of which the verb is
transitive and takes a direct object.

The translation then is: -

"I did not put away the commandment of His lips".

---

11.   v. Gray-Driver, <u>ad loc</u>.

12.   <u>GKC</u>, §143d;   Driver, <u>Tenses</u>,§125.

X INTERJECTIONS.

הֵן

This interjection, in place of ‏הִנֵּה‎ , is used
22 times in Job,[1] it being confined elsewhere in poetry
mainly to Deutero-Isaiah.[2] The predominence of the shorter
form[3] may be explained as a Canaanism or at least an
archaism, for Ugaritic has $\underline{hn}$[4], Phoenician attests ‏הֵן‎ [5]
instead of Hebrew ‏הִנֵּי‎ , pointing to an original ‏הֵן‎ , and
the 8th cent. archaising Zenjirli dialect has ‏הֵנוּ‎ .[6]

---

1. v. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p.467

2. v. BDB, p.243c; cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., for other
correspondences between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.

3. For the origin of the particle hn, v.l. Eitan,
AJSL, XLV (1928), p.142.

4. UH, 12:7.

5. Friedrich, op. cit., §259.

6. Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p.161, lines
30,31.

XI THE NEGATIVE WITH וֹ

The combination וֹ. לֹא (9:33) is unique. LXX
and Pesh. read לֹא = לֹו, a reading adopted by many
scholars.[1] Targ. and Vulg. support MT. There are good
reasons for prefering the MT reading.[2]

Job asserts (v.32a) that God and man are not
equal contestants. This inherent inequality itself makes
litigation not feasible (v.32b), a situation aggravated by
the impossibility, for the same reason, of finding an
umpire (v.33). If the reading לֹו be adopted we should
have to assume that Job knowingly expresses an idle wish.
Moreover, the following verse (34) rests on the assumption
that no such umpire exists. The reading לֹא וֹ thus
fits the context better. It is also supported by the
assonance with לֹא אֵין in the preceding verse.

Apart from the exegetical and technical considerations
the MT can be supported by comparitive Semitic idiom.

Reference to the cognate languages reveals a diffused
and variegated negation of וֹ. In Accadian we find laššū
= lâ-išū as well as ul iši[3]; Arabic has لَيْسَ = لَ with the

---

1. v.W.B. Stevenson, Notes on the Poem of Job (1951),p.37.
2. So Gray-Driver and Dhorme.

103.

unused أَنَسَ [4] The eighth century Zenjirli dialect

of Aramaic, which has affinities with the Canaanite group,

Hebrew, Moabite and Phoenician, as well as with Arabic,[5]

yields the form לִישָׁה = לֹא יֵשׁ + 3 f.s. suffix[6] The

Biblical Aramaic לָא אִיתוֹהִי (Dn.2:11) and the later

Aramaic לָא יֵת . לָא אִית = כֹּמָא ,לֵית is certainly

an analogic formation, whatever the etymology.[7]

   Because of the cognate Aramaic forms, Tur-Sinai[8]

regards לֹא יֵשׁ as an example of the poor Hebrew

translation from the Aramaic original. But against this

is the Ugaritic construction bl it, while Hebrew itself

---

3.   Ungnad, Grammatik, §55; Von Soden, Grundriss, §111a.

4.   Wright, Arabic Grammar, 1,96c, Rem.a.

5.   Cooke, op.cit., p.181,184; Eitan "Hebrew and Semitic Particles", AJSL,XLIV,3, (1928), pp.187-189; Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects (1939), p.17; Cross and Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography,p.23, and especially, Appendix, p.61-64.

6.   Zenjirli Bar Rekub inscription, line 16.

7.   v. Eitan, op.cit., p.188, who doubts the etymological identity of Aramaic אִית with Hebrew יֵשׁ,

8.   סֵפֶר אִיוֹב, (2nd ed.) p.369.

has a significant parallel to לא יﬞ in the form of אﬞ ין (Ps.135:17).

In short, the evidence points to the conclusion that our לא יﬞ is a well established Semitic idiom, that no emendation of the MT is necessary and that it is more likely a Canaanite archaism rather than late Aramaism.

---

9. 2 'Aqht:I:21.

XII THE SCHEMATIZATION OF THE NUMERALS.

The schematized, or climactic use of numbers as a literary device, common to Job and Canaanite literature, has been dealt with previously in connection with the Prologue.[1] An extension of this usage as a purely technical and poetic contrivance, likewise common to Canaanite literature, is found several times in the Dialogue. Outside of Ugaritic literature, the Arslan Tash inscription provides a good example of this Canaanite device:

line 17-18   צבא צרתי ושמנה אשת בעל
"seven-fold co-wives and eight-fold consorts of Baal",

In Job itself, the following numerical series are attested:

1. one-two

With Job 33:14, 40:5, may be compared Ugaritic išt ištm "a fire, two fires".[2]

2. two-three

33:29   פעמים-שלש is paralleled by

tn dbḥm šna bᶜl tlt rkb ᶜrpt
"Baal hates two sacrifices, three the Rider of the Clouds",[3]

---

1. see above 14f.
2. 137:32

<u>tn   mtpdm ... tlt   mth   ǵyrm</u>
"two stages ... three marches in the hills"[4]

3.   <u>six-seven</u>

With the several examples from Ugaritic cited previously[5]
may be compared Job 5:19.

---

3.   51:III:17-18.

4.   ʿAnt:IV:79-80.

5.   page 15,notes 13-15.

CHAPTER THREE

STUDIES IN THE LEXICON.

The literary dependence of the Book of Job upon
the ancient Canaanite literature is nowhere better illustrated
than in the large number of points of contact of a lexical,
phraseological, mythological and stylistic nature. Such
correspondence, it is true, may be found in good measure in
any one of the books that make up Biblical literature and maybe
explained by the fact that the Hebrews inherited from the Canaan-
ites a polished literary tradition.[1] To appreciate therefore,
the full, direct and unusual extent of the dependence of Job
upon Canaanite source material we shall, in the main, ignore
the more common stylistic parallels such as fixed pairs of
synonyms, stereotyped epithets and clichés and confine our
present study to those that are unusual and outstanding
and that throw light upon the problems of the language and
interpretation of the Book.

אֲגְמוֹן 41:12. The usual meaning "reed" does not fit in here

with עָשָׁן , דּוּד נָפוּחַ which rather suggests a connection

with fire. Hence, the final ן is generally regarded

as a dittograph and the resultant אֲגַם is associated

---

1. The literature on the subject is now too vast
to be listed. The most comprehensive treatment is that of
Cassuto, conveniently summarized in The Goddess Anath (Hebrew,
Jerusalem, 1951), pp.19-41.

with Arabic اجم and Assyrian agâmu, "to be hot, boil".
In Ugaritic this vocable appears as agn, "fire".[2] It is
possible that אגמן is a conflation of two forms אגם, אגן.
אהל with משכנות, 21:28, is a distinctly Canaanite collocation.[3]
אזן parallel to בין. 32:11-12, v. infra s.v. בין
אי in 15:23, לחם איה corresponds exactly to Ugaritic, lḥm ay
(52:6). אי-נקי 22:30 should be vocalized אי נקי,
"whomsoever is innocent he delivers". v. supra pp.91ff.

איתנים 12:19. From the parallel "priests" and the connection
with "counsellors", "judges", "kings", "elders" and "nobles"
in the preceding and following verses, this word has been
recognized as referring likewise to a class of persons.
Duhm identifies them with "permanent and powerful families,
primarily descendants of David". Most scholars, without
accepting Duhm's fanciful and precise identification, agree
that this word is the usual Biblical איתן derived from
the Arabic[5] وَتَن, "strong", "permanent", "existing ceaselessly"

---

2. 52:15, parallel to išt.

3. 2Aqht,V:31-33; 128:III:18-19. cf. Cassuto, op.cit., p.26.

4. Duhm, Das Buch Hiob (1897), p.69.

5. I.Eitan, A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography (N.Y.1924),
pp.50-53, who deals only with the verbal form in Hebrew. The first
to suggest the Arabic cognate was Schultens, Origg. Hebrae ae (1724),i.8

The difficulty is however, that אירתן is nowhere else used
of persons and the nexus of thought would suggest some
precise class, rather than a vague and general definition.[6]
Ugaritic suggests another possibility. We find there
the ytnm as a certain guild of temple servitors,[7] now
accepted as being connected linguistically with the
Nethinim mentioned in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.[8]
Consonantally, the equation אירתנים = ytnm = נתינים
presents no difficulties. The root ytn early displaced
ntn in Phoenician and Ugaritic[9] and even spread to Southern
Palestine as is evidenced by the Amarna preterite form
ya-di-in.[10] In Hebrew a further shift from yitn'it took
place,[11] giving rise to the nominal forms אתנן and אתנה
(Hos. 2:14) = Ugaritic ytnt "gift".[12] As to the vocalization of
our passage, it is probably a Massoretic confusion with the
usual Hebrew אירתנים.

---

6. Budde, op.cit.,p.63, noting the difficulty, suggested
the reading גוֹיא' or מתי-א.

7. 301:I:1; 52:3, which should now be read: ytnm qrt lʿly,
and translated, "the ytnm of the city on high".

8. UH,I,8:28, p.51; For the 10th cent. Canaanite origin
of the Temple guilds in Chronicles, v.Albright, Archaeology and
the Religion of Israel (1942), pp.126-9; CBQ. VII (1945), p.26;
Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume (1950), p.66. cf. B. Maisler,
‏ידיעות החברה לחקירת א"י (שנה יא) עמ' ,‏ 105.

9. Z.S.Harris, Grammar, op.cit.,p.44; Development of
the Canaanite Dialects (1939), p.37.

10. EA,337:13.

11. J.A. Montgomery, JAOS, 58 (1938), p.135. For the shift
yitn'it cf. also the Aramaic proper name בלאתן "Bel gives (a son)",

This identification of our אֵיתָנִים = ytnm fits in excellently with the parallel "priests" and the other officers of government mentioned in the passage. That the Nethinim were closely connected with the Priests is evident from several passages[13] and they were also numbered among the rulers of the State.[14] The use of ytnm instead of the Judean Nethinim would be another point of contact with Canaanite source material, suggesting Northern origins.[15]

אֵל as the personal name of God is one of the peculiarities of Job in which it appears no less than 55 times,[16] never with the definite article. This strongly suggests literary dependence on El, the head of the Canaanite Pantheon.[17]

---

cited by S.A.Cook, A Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions (1898),p.30.

12. Krt. 135:258.

13. Neh. 11:3; I Chron.9:2 etc.

14. רָאשֵׁי הַמְּדִינָה Neh.11:3 with which cf. רָאשֵׁי עַם הָאָרֶץ in Job 12:24.

15. cf. mention of קְדֵשִׁים and נַעַר in 36:14. Incidentally, the medieval Jewish commentators, Kimchi, Ralbag, and the Mezudoth took נֶאֱמָנִים, parallel to זְקֵנִים, v.20, as a fiʿlan formation from נאם, "orators" (cf.Je23:31),on the analogy of פֶּתֶן,כַּבֶשׂ,בִּנְיָן, an explanation accepted by Har-Zahav,op.cit.,III:i:12 (p.157).

16. 4. הערה 18. עַל (ירושלים, תרצ"י) ספר דנבורג, ע.צ. מלמד Memaled failed to recognize the implications of this phenomenon, attributing it to Arabic and Aramaic influences.

17. v. Cassuto, op.cit., p.45.

אֲנִי is used twenty four times in the Poem while the variant אָנֹכִי occurs fourteen times. However, if it be taken into account that Elihu alone uses אֲנִי nine times as opposed to אָנֹכִי twice, it will be seen that the numerical disparity between the usages of the variants in the body of the Poem is negligible. The relative frequency of אֲנִי-אָנֹכִי as a criterion for the deter- mination of date, source and linguistic influence[18] has lost much of its validity since the discovery of Ugaritic in which, like Hebrew, both forms of the pronoun occur in the same text.[19] As Z.Harris has pointed out,[20] while 'anâku is characteristic of E. Semitic and Canaanite, as 'ana is of S. Semitic and Aramaic, both are reflexes of Proto-Semitic forms and early Canaanite also used 'ani, though infrequently. Harris, therefore, describes as "unnecessary" the view[21] that 'ani was an Aramaic form belonging to the hypothetical younger (Aramaic) stratum in Hebrew. The use of ani may as well be an archaism as an Aramaism.

---

18. F. Giesebrecht, "Zur Hexateuchkritik", ZAW,1(1881),p.251ff, more or less accepted by Driver, Introduction,(9th ed.),p.155n.,and GCK, §32c, n.l.

19. UH:I:6:3.

20. op.cit., pp.10, 74-75.

21. HG, 248-9.

אפיק נחלים 6:15 With this is to be compared Ugaritic apq thmtm

(49:I:6; 51:IV:22). Ugaritic orthography does not permit

a decision on MT use of the singular as against the

usual emendation אפיקי.

אף אם 36:29 is unique in the Bible.[22] The locution is a purely

Phoenician conjunction. [23]

ארץ in the unusual sense of the netherworld, is found in

10:21,22, corresponding exactly to this usage of Ugaritic

arṣ.

אתה 3:25 (and so four times) is one of the supposed Aramaisms.[24]

The observation of Kautzsch[25] that the root had not yet

appeared in Canaanite is now nullified by its presence

in Ugaritic ʾtw.

ב meaning "from", used regularly in Ugaritic and Phoenician

is to be found in several passages. v. supra, p.71f.

---

22. cf. the semantic parallel גם אם, Eccles. 8:17, on
which v. Dahood, Biblica, 33 (1952), p.48.

23. CIS, 3:6; cf. Friedrich, op.cit., §257b.

24. cf. Dhorme, to 3:25.

25. Die Aramaismen Im Alten Testament (1902), p.8.

בד I. This vocable, in some instances, seems to be a fossilized combination of the preposition ב with the uniconsonantal ד "hand", exactly as found in a Canaanite gloss of the Amarna letters ba-di-u,[26] in Ugaritic bd "in the hands of",[27] and in later Phoenician inscriptions,[28]This meaning of בד is to be found twice in Job. בדי יאול 29(17:16), and יאכל בדיו = "the first-born of Death (Môt) will devour with his hands," (18;13). In both these cases the association of "hand" with "Death" or "Sheol" is appropriate in view of Môt's own description of the method by which he disposes of his victims:

bklat ydy ilhm[30].. "with both my hands I shall devour...".

בד II. 11:3; 41:4. In both instances something like "word" is required by the context. In the Eshmun‛azar inscription בד is used with exactly this meaning.[31]

---

26. EA, 245:35.

27. 51:I:25 etc.

28. UH, 8:20, p.48.

29. I.Eitan, "Hebrew & Semitic Particles", AJSL, 44 (1928), p.260, n.1. suggested reading בְּדֵי but this now seems unnecessary.

30. 67:I:19-20.

31. line 6, אל תשמע בדנם "do not listen to their words", v. Slouschz, ... אוצר הכתבות p.21; לב (תרצ"ה), ספר היובל לפרו׳ ע. קמינס

בוא 6:8, used in the sense of granting a request has its exact
semantic equivalent in the Amarna usage:[32] ù la-a ka-ši-id
i-re-šu, "as soon as the request is granted". Accadian
kašadu = Heb. בוא in the mind of the scribe who was
giving contemporary usage of בוא to the Acc. Our Job passage
is thus a very early idiom.

בין || שמע (13:1; 26:14) corresponds exactly to Ugaritic[33]

šmᶜ laliyn bᶜl/bn lrkb ᶜrpt
"Hear, O abyn Baal! Perceive, O Rider of the Clouds!"

Semantically equivalent is אזן || בין, 32:11-12.

בלע in the specialized metaphorical sense of "killing","annihil-
ating" (2:3; 8:18; 10:8; 37:20;) is a reflex of the old
Canaanite Môt myth. v. supra, p.17f.

בני אלהים is found three times (1:6; 2:1; 38:7;) always within a
mythological context. The phrase is found in Ugaritic, in
Phoenician and in the Canaanite inscription from Arslan Tash.[34]
As parallel to כוכבי בקר (38:7) we find the equivalent
in Ugaritic[35]

bn il ‖ pḫr kkbm,
"The sons of El" ‖ "the assembly of the stars".

---

32. EA, 82:16-17.

33. 51:V:121-22.

34. For sources, v.supra chap.1, notes 24-27.

35. 76:I:3-4. Cassuto, Essays Presented to J.H.Hertz,
(Hebrew Section), p.39, n.25. Albright, FASC (1946), p.331, note 26.

גלה ‖ בוא 41:5. This unusual parallelism corresponds exactly
to the common Ugaritic locution gly ‖ bw'.[36] In one
Ugaritic text[37] bw' is followed by pnm, just as here we
have גלה פני. The phrase should therefore be translated,
"who can penetrate?".

גער 26:11. This word, used of God's rebuke to the Sea, is
the same used when Baal rebukes the gods[38] and Astarte
censures Baal.[39] Both instances, like our Job passage,
refer to the combat with the Dragon.

דאבה 41:14. This hapax legomenon is generally connected
with the Aramaic root דוב, "to flow", "melt", "waste away".
However, the parallel עז suggests a meaning "strength".
Almost certainly[40] we have here metathesis for דאבה
as in Deut. 33:25, which corresponds to Ugaritic, dbat
"strength".[41]

----

36. 49:I:6-7; 51:IV:23; 127:4, etc.

37. 127:4.

38. 137:24.

39. 68:28.

40. F.M.Cross Jr., VT (1952), p.162f.

41. 76:II:21,22. UH,I,p.40, note 5.

ידין 36:31. The difficulty of accepting the usual meaning of ידין here in view of the parallel יתן אכל has long been noted and Houbigant's emendation of the MT to יזּין has been widely accepted.[42] However, it is also possible that this word is a denominative of the Semitic dn, a jar for the storing of food and drink. This word twice appears in Ugaritic[43] and is common to Accadian, Arabic, Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew.[44] The verb would therefore mean "to distribute food (or drink)" parallel to יתן אכל.

דרך 26:14 40:19 In both cases the meaning "rule", "dominion", fits the context more appropriately than the usual connotation. This would correspond exactly to the Ugaritic usage of drkt.

הלך 14:20, has the meaning of "perish". This signification, as in Arabic هلك, appears in Ugaritic in the šafel.[45]

המר 17:2. בהמרותם; This difficult word, following קברים v.1, and ארח לא אשוב 16:22, may well be connected with Ugaritic hmr –mhmrt,[46] throat, or gorge, of Môt.

---

42. so Graetz, Bear, Dhorme, Kittel.

43. 126:III:14; ʿnt 1:12, so the reading of Cassuto, Anat, pp.63, 75.

44. ẅ.E.L. Sukenik, PEQ (1940), p.59-60.

45. ʿnt: v:10-11; 3 ʾAqht,Rev.11-12; Cassuto, op.cit., p.86.

46. 67:I:7-8.

תלן עיני, on the analogy of the figurative use of

לון in 19:4; 29:19; 41:14, would mean "my eye is ever

fixed upon their throats", i.e. 'I am ever aware of the

constant peril I am in from my enemies who would devour

me". ותכה מכעס עיני v.7. would then follow naturally

this verse. In Ps. 140:11 בהמירת is used similarly

and may be a metaphor of Sheol, especially in view

of the Talmudic מהמורות "burial places"[47] תמורתו

20:18, in view of the parallel בלע, עלס, may also be

connected with the same root.

ו The "pleonastic" Waw as found in Ugaritic[48] explains several

passages in Job v. supra, pp.95ff.

זמר 35:10. It has long been felt that זמרות here cannot be

appropriately translated "songs". LXX φυλακκας is

usually taken to reflect an alternative reading (א)שְמִרות

It is now recognized that Ugaritic s̆mr = Arabic ذَمَرَ

"to be strong, brave," is sometimes behind the Hebrew

זמר[49]. This applies to זמרות here and we should translate:

---

47. v.Jastrow, s.v. המר; Ben Yehuda, Thesaurus, VI, p. 2832,
s.v. מהמירה.

48. 51:V:107-108; 52:51.

49. v.Koehler & Baumgartner, Lexicon, s.v. זמר;
Cassuto, Commentary on the Book of Exodus (1954), Hebrew, p.120; so
Ex.15:2 עזי וזמרת; Gen.43:11 זמרת הארץ; Isa.25:5 where read
תכריע ו יעצה "he humbles the power of the terrible"; Ps.119:54.

118.

"who giveth strength in the night",[50]LXX reading could

well have arisen from MT, and no emendation is required.[51]

חדה 3:6 אל יחד MT points to חדה "to rejoice", which

Kautzsch[52]regards as a pure Aramaism. But the exact

phrase is found in Ugaritic al thd ‖ altšmḫ.[53]

חלק 21:17 is to be understood as the Ugaritic ḫlq

"to destroy". Accepting Dhorme's identification of

תבל with Acc. ḫabâlu[54]the phrase is to be translated

"Does he destroy the wicked in his anger?"

חנף This adjective to describe the wicked is characteristic

of Job. The locution חנפי לב,36:13, is unique.

8:13 defines the חנף as one who "forgets God". That

this sin is really an act of presumption is clear from

17:25 and 20:6. Now the identical phrase ḥnp lb is

to be found as a characterisation of 'Aqht by El because

---

50.   For ־ות as abstract ending as a variant of ־ות
v.GKC §861.

51.   זמר in this sense is also to be found in the pr.n.
זמרי, זמריהו, in Phoenician pr.n. דמר and in Old S. Arabic מדמר
"strong", and pr.ns. דמראל, דמרכרב.

52.   op.cit., p.29.

53.   3 'Aqht : rev.9; ʿnt:V:30.

54.   Dhorme, ad loc.

119.

he was guilty of an act of presumption against the gods,
in this case against Anat.[55]There can be no doubt that our
חנפי לב and the use of חנף is borrowed from
Canaanite usage.[56]

חפש 3:19 חפשי as used here is a double enténdre based
on the specialized Canaanite usage. Firstly, in the
servant-master relationship חפשי corresponds to ḫpt
"a freeman"; then in the particular context referring to
the netherworld it is undoubtedly connected with bthptt,
a synonym for Sheol.[57]

ים 7:12; 26:12; 38:8 used in the sense of Sea Dragon in the
context of the fight between God and this mythical monster,
figures so prominently in the Baal Epic.

ירד used with שאול 7:9 etc. and שחת 33:24 corresponds to
the Ugaritic expression yrd arṣ with identical meaning.[54]

יﬠ The unique negation with לא 9:33, is paralleled by
Ugaritic bl it.[59]

---

55 3Aqht rev:17.

56 v.Gaster, Thespis, p.261, n.10, who refers to the use
of the cognate verb, ḫanapu, "to insult," in Amarna letter 288:8.
Incidentally, BDB derivation of חנף from حنف has to be revised
since the Ugaritic is ḫ not ḥ.

57 cf. בית החפשית II Kings 15:5 = II Chron.26:21, cf. Ps.
88:6.

58 51:VIII:7-9.

59. 2Aqht 1:21, v. supra, p.102f.

רַבָּה is thrice employed as an unusual parallel to יוֹם or לַיְלָה,[60]

a usage intelligible only in a Ugaritic context.

ym ymn yʿtqn lymm lyrḫm.[61]

"a day, two days pass, from days to months,"

l [ymm] lyrḫm lyrḫm lšnt[62]

"From [days] to months, from months to years".

כוכבי בקר 38:7 v. supra, s. בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים.

לְ in the sense of "from" occurs in several passages v.

supra p.75ff.

For "Lamedh of reinforcement" v. supra, pp.82ff.

לויתן 3:8; 40:25 is ltn, the sea Dragon of Canaanite mythology.

מ enclitic occurs several times. v. supra, pp.86ff.

מות as the genius of destruction and aridity as in Canaanite

literature is clearly indicated in 18:13. The reference

to בכור מות, "first born of Môt", must be connected

with the "seven sons of the god Môt" of Ugaritic.[63] מות

in the sense of the netherworld 27:15; 28:22; 30:24;

38:17 is a reflex of Canaanite mythology.

---

60. Job 3:6; 7:3; 29:2.

61. 49:II:26-27.

62. Ibid., v:7 = I 'Aqht 175-6.

63. 49:VI:7-9.

מחץ 26:12 <u>מחץ רהב</u>. The usage here in connection with
the victory of God over the Sea Dragon is significant
since מחץ is the common Ugaritic verb for the gods
smiting their enemies. Significantly, the only other
usage of מחץ in Job (5:18) also refers to God.

מנה 7:3 <u>מני</u> in the sense of "fated" corresponds to Ugaritic
<u>mnt</u> "lot", "fate". [64]

מכך 24:24 is regarded as a pure Aramaism. [65] However, it may
well be connected with Ugaritic <u>lymk</u>, [66] "he is not vanquished".

מלל used over thirty times either as a verb or noun is
generally taken as a sign of Aramaic influence. [67] The
verbal form has now turned up in the Karatepe [68]
inscription suggesting that the early usage of this
vocable in Canaan was more widespread than is commonly
supposed.

נבך 38:16 <u>נבכי ים</u>; 28:11 <u>מבכי נהרות</u> are phraseologically
equivalent to Ugaritic <u>mbk nhrm</u>, "sources of the rivers",

---

64. 49:II:36.

65. E. Kautzsch, <u>op. cit.</u>, p.57.

66. 68:7.

67. E. Kautzsch, <u>op. cit.</u>, p.60, disputed by Nöldeke, <u>ZDMG</u>
LVII, p.413.

68. Gordon, <u>JQR</u>, 39 (1948), p.47, n.18; p.48, n.21.
Friedrich, <u>op. cit.</u>, §149.

cf. Ug. nbk "a well", MT מִבְּכִי should now be emended
to מַבְּכִי.[69]

נוּח 36:16 נַחַת is an exceptional nominal formation in
Hebrew[70] but perfectly usual in Phoenician. The word
occurs several times in Phoenician inscriptions.[71]

נחת is clearly the root of תֵּחַת 21:13 despite the
anomolous vocalization, and was so understood by Symm.
Vulg. Targ. Syr. It need not be an Aramaism[72] since
nḥt "to go down" appears in Ugaritic and Phoenician.

נסע 4:21; 19:10, in the sense of "remove" corresponds
exactly to Ugaritic, ns⁽ "to remove". To be noted also
is the Canaanite usage of the preposition נסע ב' 4:21,
"remove from!"

נעים parallel to טוב 36:11; The same pair of synonyms
occurs in Ugaritic n⁽m ‖ ṭb.[73] In Phoenician likewise
נעם means "good".[74]

---

69. Ginsberg, JRAS (1935), p.53; כתבי אוגרית p.29;
Albright, AJSL, 35 (1919), 161-195

70. GKC, §95k.

71. Harris, Grammar, p.123; JAOS, 67 (1947), p.156, n.26.

72. Kautzsch, op.cit, p.64.

73. ⁽nt:I:19-20.

74. cf. yḥmlk, line 8 ופעל לי נעם .

נער 36:14. v. <u>infra</u>, s.v. **קדשים**.

נפש 33:20 is parallel to **חיה** which means "appetite, as established from 38:39; so Ugaritic npš, "appetite".[75]

סכה 36:29 used of the abode of God. The term is semantically equivalent to the Ugaritic, mẓll (cf. Aramaic **מטללתא** = **סכה**) used of the abode of the children of El.[76]

ספר The "counting of months" in Ugaritic has two significations, implying either the months of pregnancy[77] or the passage of time.[78] Both usages are found in Job, the former in 39:2 and the latter in 3:6; 14:5; 21:21. - another example of a phrase intelligible only in a Ugaritic context.[79]

עבד 40:28 **עבד עולם**. This phrase, found only three times in the Bible, signifies here total subjugation and abject surrender. The identical phrase, used in the same figurative sense, is employed by Baal in

---

75.   127:11 etc.

76.   ᶜnt, pl.VI:IV:1;   51:I:13,18;:IV:52:56, always parallel to <u>mṯb il</u>,abode.

77.   2Aqht, II:43-44.

78.   <u>Ibid</u>, VI:28-29.

79.   Cassuto, <u>Anath</u>, pp.21-22.

124.

his message of surrender to Môt:

     ʿbdk an wd ʿlmk
     "Thy slave am I, yea thine for ever."[80]

עזב 39:14 is more likely to be connected with Ug. ʿdb
"to prepare, arrange, set", than with עזב "to forsake".
The nexus of thought with v.15, shows that the
emphasis is clearly on לארץ, על עפר rather
than on the verb. The sense is therefore: she
places her eggs on the ground, yea hatches them
in the dust, where they get crushed.

עיפתה 10:22. This form is generally taken as an old
locative of עיפה.[81] However, the word occurs as
עיפתא in the Arslan Tash inscription lines 1,19,
where it is the name of a demoness. It must have
the same connotation in Job since עיפתה parallels
צלמות, אפל. In the afore-mentioned inscription
we read line 19, לעיפתא בחדר חשך. There can
be no doubt that Job is referring to this demoness
that haunts the dark places. Our עיפתה is thus
a Hebraized orthography for the Aramaic f.pl.

---

80. 67:II:12.

81. GKC §90g.

emphatic form עיפתא. Such an Aramaic form is no
more an indication necessarily of late influence
in Job than it is the Arslan Tash inscription
which belongs at least to the 7th century and which
is "pure Canaanite".[82]

עלם This vocable is used in two distinct senses,
although subsumed in the dictionaries under one
root. נעלמה 28:21, has the usual signification
"hidden", parallel to נסתרה. On the other hand,
42:3 מי זה מעלים עצה corresponds exactly to 38:2
מי זה מחשיך עצה, i.e. עלם means "to
be dark". This applies to 6:16 where the parallel
קדר means, "to be dark". Now it is true that
there is a semantic relationship between "to conceal"
and "to be dark", but the equation קדר = חשך = עלם
is very precise. Philological evidence also points
to two unrelated Semitic stems. עלם "to conceal"
corresponds to Arabic علم. But in Ugaritic we
also find ẓlmt parallel to ǵlmt, meaning "darkness".[83]

_____

82. Gaster, _Orientalia_, XI (1942), pp.41-79, esp. p.43.

83. 51:VII:55; frag:8; cf. Ginsberg, _Ancient Near
Eastern Texts_, (ed. J.B.Pritchard, 1950), p.131, n.11.

It is this root ǵlm that must lie behind the Job
passages cited above. Since Ugaritic ǵ = Hebrew
‍ע only when ǵ is proto-Semitic,[84] we are accordingly
dealing here with an ancient Canaanite root ǵlm
"to be dark", distinct from ʿlm "to conceal". The
translations of עלם in Job should be revised as follows:

6:16   יתעלם שלג "snow becomes dark".[85]

42:3   מעלים "who darkens ...?"

In all probability the nominal form תעלמה 11:6;
28:11, should be rendered "dark places".[86]

עמק 39:21 is here used in its Ugaritic signification
of "strength", parallel to כוח.[87]

---

84. Otherwise the equation is Arabic ẓ = Hebrew ṣ
= Ugaritic ǵ or ẓ.

85. See the description in Gray-Driver,I, ad loc.

86. In 28:11 תעלמה is contrasted with יוציא אור

87. J. Reider, <u>VT</u>,II,(1942), p.129.

עַפְעַף 3:7; 41:10. In Ugaritic[88] ᶜpᶜp means "eyes". This

signification rather than "eye-lids" better fits the phrase

עפעפי שחר and is supported by עיניו in 41:10.

עשה 23:9. Eitan identified בעשותו with Arabic غِشَا "to

go to", "approach"[89] ‖ יעטף = عطف "to turn".

As early as the Targum it was recognized that "left" and

"right" here stand for "North" and "South". The root غِشَا

has now been attested in Ugaritic, used too in connection

with direction.[90] The North is the abode of the gods in Can-

aanite mythology.[91] The entire chapter expresses Job's intense,

but unsuccessful search for God. The verse may therefore be

interpreted: I behold Him not when He approaches His

Heavenly abode in the North, nor do I see Him when He turns

Southward, i.e. emerges from the North. No emendation of

בעשותו to בקראתי or of יעטף to אעטף is

required.

---

88. Krt: 147, 295.

89. I. Eitan, A contribution to Biblical Lexicography, (N.Y., 1924), p.56.

90. Cassuto, אמל' 67 (תש"ב ירושלים) ספר דינבורג; Ugaritic Text 51:VII:41.

91. Isa. 14:13; Ps.48:3 and Job itself 37:22.

עתק 21:7 is generally taken as "grow old", in which sense it is an Aramaism. [92] עתק as a verb occurs nine times in the Bible, five of which occur in Job and four of these latter have the primary meaning "to pass". This would correspond to Ugaritic ʿtq. In one Ugaritic text[93] we find this verb together with ymm denoting the passage of time. We may therefore have here, Job 21:7, an elliptical usage of ʿtq in the same sense: "They pass (their days) in amassing wealth." cf. v.13. יבלו ימיהם

צמת 6:17; 23:17, corresponds to Ugaritic ṣmt, "to destroy".

צפון 26:7 in a cosmoganic context; 37:22 referring to the appearance of God in His splendor. This term reflects the Canaanite conception of the North as the Heavenly abode. [94]

קבל 2:10 bis, is usually regarded as an Aramaism. However, the vocable has now been attested in the Amarna texts. [95]

---

92.   E. Kautzsch, op.cit., p.73.

93.   49:II:26-27; :V:7.

94.   v. Morgenstern, HUCA, 16 (1941), p.65.

95.   BASOR, 89 (1943), p.29ff.

קרץ 33:6. The phrase, equivalent to the Accadian expression _garâṣu ṭiṭa_, now has its counterpart in Ugaritic _qrṣ rt_ "to shape clay into an effigy".[96]

קדישם 5:1; 15:15. This term is found in the Arslan Tash inscription, line 11-12, where כל קדשים is parallel to כל בן אלם, leaving no doubt that the קדישם are gods. Similarly, Ugaritic _bn qdš_ means "the gods".[97] Our Job passage thus uses another term directly borrowed from Canaanite mythology.

קדשים 36:14. As temple (male) prostitutes, this term is well known from other passages. The parallel בנער is very strange and moreover presents a syntactical difficulty. As an abstract noun with the force of an adverb it is not exactly parallel to בקדשים. Dhorme takes קדשים as an abstract noun meaning "adolescence". But from the analogies he quotes we should expect a form קדישם, while there is no evidence for the use of קדש in this sense. Others[98] have argued that the קדשים probably died at an early age worn out by their excesses and so became proverbial as victims of

---

96. 126:V:29.

97. 137:21,38; 2 'Aqht:I:4,9,14.

98. Gray-Driver, _ad loc._

an untimely death. This explanation does not remove

the syntactical difficulty. In Ugaritic we find

a class of priests known as qdšm. A list of temple

functionaries mentions nᶜrm together with qdšm and

khnm.[100] It is here suggested therefore, that our נֻעֲר

refers to a guild of temple servitors (cf. supra, s.v.

אִיתֻנֻם). The reference here maybe to some historic

event. The Book of Kings mentions repeated persecutions

of the ____ קֽדֵשִׁים beginning with Asa (I Kings 15:12)

and continuing through the days of Jehoshaphat (22:47),

until the thorough-going reformation of Josiah

(II Kings 23:7). Certainly these guilds did not

survive the Judean Exile. The plausibility of a

historic explanation is increased by 12:17ff., which seems

likewise to have a historic background. Both passages

may well refer to the same event.

רֲחֻם The locution ____ יֵצֵא מֵרֲחֻם 3:11; 10:18; 38:8

is phraseologically equivalent to the Ugaritic yṣi lpit.[101]

---

100. 113:60.

101. 2 'Aqht:II:9, according to J. Obermann, How Daniel
was Blessed with a Son, (A.O.S. Offprint Series, No.20), p.4. line 93.

רפאים 26:5 "shades", are mentioned in the Phoenician inscriptions[102]
and in the Ugaritic texts. It is noteworthy that in
several passages in the latter, rpim parallels ilnym,[103]
In one passage[104] the ilnym are said to reside "two layers
beneath the springs of the earth... "(tht ʿnt arṣ). The
reference to תחת מים in our Job passage may well be
connected with this.

רשף 5:7 Reshef was one of the gods of the Canaanite Pantheon,
being found in Ugarit[105] and Phoenician.[106] He was even
adopted by the Egyptians of the New Empire into their
Pantheon.[107]

שחק is used eleven times in Job, but צחק never appears. From
Judg.16:25 it may be inferred that שחק belongs to the
spoken language, צחק to the literary dialect. The
exclusive use of שחק in Job is another indication that
the answer to many of the linguistic difficulties lies in
the direction of dialectic variation.

---

102. Sidon, Tabnith, line 8,

103. 62:45-46; 122:2-4, 9-12 etc.

104. ʿnt:IV:79.

105. Text 17:5.

106. v.Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p.56f., and
more recently R.O!Callaghan, "An Approach to Some Religious
Problems of Karatepe", Archiv Orientalni XVII, 360).

107. Albright, Stone Age, (2nd ed., 1946), p.160.

שׁאול 26:6; שׁחת 17:14. Both these synonyms for the
netherworld are masculine only here in Job. It is
quite possible that the gender has been influenced
by the identification of the netherworld with
Môt who ruled it, so 27:15, 28:22; 30:23; 38:17. The
employment of the masculine for these terms shows the
strong mythological strain underlying their usage.[108]

שׁבעוׁנו 42:13; This hapax legomenon corresponds to Ugaritic
sbʿny[109] (v. supra, pp.18ff).

שׁוע 36:19 may be connected with צוׁעת, "sacrifice" as
in Phoenician.[110] This fits in well with רב כפר v.18

שׁחת v. supra, s.v. שׁאול

שׁלח 33:18; 36:12 עבר בשׁלח. This unique phrase
has been variously explained. Duhm went so far as
to emend to בשׁאׁלה.[111] Those who retain שׁלח regard

---

108. v. supra. s.v. מות

109. 52:64.

110. Marseilles Tariff, lines 3,4.v. Slouschz, op.cit., p.143.

111. cf. BH, ad loc.

it as a late word.[112] In each case the context leaves
no doubt that the phrase is synonymous with death.

עבר in Job is frequently used in the sense of
"passing away", "disappearing". (6:15; 11:16; 30:15;
34:20; cf. 17:11). The integrity of the reading בשלח
is now attested by the Ugaritic equivalent

> mšbᶜt hn bšlḥ ttpl[113]
> "A seventh, lo, he fell by the sword;"

שרה 37:3; This hapax legomenon is regarded as a pure
Aramaism[114] cognate to שרא "to lossen". However,
Ugaritic

> šrh larṣ brqm[115]
> "he flashes lightning to the earth";

suggests rather that the final ה is radical and
original and that we have here a Canaanite root šrh
"to flash" (lightning).[116]

---

112. cf. Gray-Driver II ad loc.

113. Krt, 20-21, cf. Joel 2:8. On שלח v. Ginsberg
The Legend of King Keret, p.14. S. Yeivin, לשוננו ט״ז, p.139.

114. Kautzsch, Aramaismen, p.90.

115. 51:V:71.

116. On this word v. Ginsberg כתבי אוגרית p.31;
JBL, LXII (1943), p.109f; BA., VIII (1945), p.57.

שרש is frequently used figuratively for offspring (5:3;

18:16; 29:19). This usage is typically Canaanite,

Thus, in Ugaritic we find $\check{s}r\check{s}$ parallel to bn.[117] With

18:16   במתחת שרשיו יבשו וממעל ימל קצירו

cf. Phoenician,[118] אל יכן לם שרש למטנ ופר למעל

and Ugaritic, $\check{s}r\check{s}k$ bar$\d{s}$ al yp'/ri$\check{s}$ $\acute{g}$ly bd ns'k.[120]

תהום is thrice synonymous with ים (28:14; 38:16; 41:23-24)

The identical parallel occurs in Ugaritic ym - thm.[121]

תנין 7:12 as the mythological sea-monster corresponds

exactly to Canaanite tnn.

---

117. 2 'Aqht:I:19-20 etc.

118. Eshmun'azar Inscription, lines 11-12.

119. I 'Aqht, 159-160.

120. For the translation of this line, v. Gaster,
Thespis, p.303, and cf. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature (Rome,1949),
p.99.

121. 52:30 etc.

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing studies have been mainly confined to the points of contact between the Canaanite material and the language of Job. While there is no claim to exhaustiveness, the material presented is regarded as being sufficiently comprehensive and weighty as to/ certain conclusions.

justify

I   The Prologue and Epilogue

These contain several important characteristic features of the classical Canaanite epic tradition. Certain morphological, syntactical and linguistic peculiarities have been shown to be archaisms paralleled in Ugaritic. The probability is that the Prologue and Epilogue have been extracted from an ancient epic source (referred to by Ezekiel), traces of the original language of which are still to be found in our version.

II   The Date of the Poem

The problem of the age of the Poem, controversy over which has raged since Talmudic times, is nearer a solution.

With no other Biblical work has there been such great diversity of opinion and such a wide gap between the extremes of dating. Already in the Talmud, practically every possible viewpoint was expressed, covering the patriarchal age, the Mosaic

135

era, the times of the Judges, even the exilic and Persian periods.[1] Almost every one of these views has found a protagonist among modern scholars who have done little more than enlarge the range of possibilities. Thus, Ébrard and Rawlinson supported Mosaic authorship. Luther and Franz Delitzsch argued for the Solomonic age. Nöldeke and Hitzig assigned the book to the times of Isaiah, whilst Ewald looked to the seventh century and Cheyne, Duhm and Budde to the fifth, for the time of composition.[2] C. Siegfried[3] has even argued for a Maccabean dating - a claim obviously absurd, since Ben Sira was certainly influenced by Job.[4]

A mere listing of such widely differing views is sufficient to show that they can rest only upon evidence of the most uncertain nature. It is appropriate to consider, therefore, whether the foregoing studies shed any fresh light upon this problem and whether they provide additional evidence for a more precise formulation. In the opinion of the present writer, the material assembled in this

------

1. **B. Baba Bathra** 15a; J. Soṭah v.8.

2. For details, see Karl Budde, Das Buch Hiob, (1896) pp. XL ff.

3. Jewish Encyclopedia, VII, art., "Job".

4. M. H. Segal, op.cit., pp. 3ff., 16ff.

dissertation must inevitably favor an early dating.

(i) Morphologically, the poetry exhibits a striking phenomenon in the use of t- preformative for 3rd m.s. This corresponds exactly to the use of the identical form in a tenth century Phoenician inscription and, frequently, in the much earlier Canaanite glosses to the Amarna letters.

(ii) Another specific point of contact with the Amarna Canaanite glosses is to be found in the Qatlâti perfect form, used once in Job.

(iii) The Canaanite poetic tradition is followed in the employment of the yqtl as the predominently characteristic tense-form, mainly expressing past time.

(iv). Similarly, the poetry contains an extraordinary high percentage of jussive forms expressing past time, a usage characteristic of Ugaritic poetry.

(v) The repetition of the same verb in the same tense form in parallel clauses is likewise to be regarded as evidence of the syntactical influence of Canaanite poetry and not of poor style or textual corruption.

(vi) The inconsistent and erratic use of the article can be satisfactorily explained only on the assumption of Phoenician or Northern Hebraic influence. The same applies to the use of the nota accusativi without the definite article.

(vii)   The schematized or climactic use of numbers,
attested several times in the poetry, is a typical Canaanite
literary device.

(viii)   A study of the prepositions is particularly
revealing.

The vocalization most frequently betrays the older
pronunciation with a patah.

Both ב and ל are employed in the sense of "from",
exactly as in Ugaritic.

The accretion of prepositions represents a significant
point of contact with Phoenician.

The Lamedh of Reinforcement" is frequently attested.

Recognition of the true function of the prepositions
removes many exegetical obscurities and obviates the need for
textual emendation.

(ix)   Textual and exegetical clarification likewise
results from recognizing the presence of the archaic enclitic
particle -m in several passages and of the indefinite particle
'ay twice.

(x)   The Waw in a number of difficult passages is
seen to be employed "pleonastically", as is the case in
Ugaritic, and the understanding of the text in such cases is
considerably improved.

(xi) The studies in the lexicon reveal a considerable number of points of contact with the ancient Canaanite literature of a lexical, phraseological, mythological and stylistic nature.

Several common Hebrew vocables have specialized meanings or usages, specifically Canaanite, viz., בלע, בוא, ארץ, אל, מנה, מחץ, מות, לויתן, ים, חפש, חנף, הלך, דרך, גער, אפון, עתק, עפעף, עלם, עזב, ספר, סכה, נעים, נטע, תנין, תהום, שרש, שחת, שאול, רשף, רפאים, קדושים.

Many rare or difficult words can be explained by reference to the Canaanite dialects, viz.,

זמר, המרות, דין, דאבה, גלה, בד, איתנא, אגמן, צרה, צוע, קרץ, צמת, עשה, עמק, נכר, חלף.

Several unusual word-combinations, pairs of synonyms, clichés and stylistic peculiarites are seen to belong to the Canaanite literary heritage, viz., אפ-אם, אפיק נחלים, אל יחד ,הן; בוכבי בקר || בני אלהים, שחק ||בן, גלה ||בוא, נבכי ים, ספר ירחים, לילה||יום||ירח, לא יצ, נעים ||טוב, חנפי לב, עבד עולם, ירח שאול, מבכי ים.

Some previously believed Aramaisms can now be shown to be, on the contrary, early Canaanisms, viz.,

צרה, קבל, עיפתה, נחת, מלל, מכך, דאבה, אתה.

(xii) The Book of Job is extraordinarily rich in mythological references, note of which has been constantly taken

in these studies as a background for the proper under-
standing of the text. Practically all of the mythological
terminology and motifs used have their parallels in the
Canaanite literature. These correspondences may be summarized
as follows:

 EL as the personal name of God; קְדוֹשִׁים (5:1; 15:15)
and בני אלהים (38:7) to designate the pantheon; the council
of God (15:8); the gods quarrelling on high (25:2); the
north as the heavenly abode (26:7; 37:22); the סכה as the
appellation of the Divine throne (36:29); חנפי לב to
describe those guilty of acts of presumption against God
(36:13); God as a lightning-slinger (36:32; 37:3; 38:35); the
mention of the god Reshef (5:7); Môt as the king of the
netherworld and the genius of destruction and aridity, and
the reference to his "first born son" (18:13-14); מות, by
metonomy, used of the netherworld (27:15 etc); the method by
which Môt disposes of his victims (17:16; 18:13); רפאים as
the shades of the dead residing beneath the waters (26:5); the
specialized use of ארץ in the sense of the netherworld
(10:21:22); the exceptional employment of שאול and שחת
in the masculine as a hypostasization of the god Môt
(17:4; 26:6); the frequent reference to the combat of God
and the Dragon with its stereotyped terminology:

גער (26:11); ים (7:12; 26:12; 38:8); לויתן (3:8; 40:25); מחץ (26:12); נחש בריח (26:13); תהום (28:14; 38:16; 41:23-24); תנין (7:12).

Such a vast array of mythological correspondences sharing a common technical terminology with the Canaanite epics, taken in conjunction with the numerous morphological, syntactical, lexical and general stylistic evidence, leads to one **conclusion** - that the language of the Book of Job is saturated with Canaanisms and archaisms, and that the Canaanite literature is probably the greatest single literary influence upon it. The book may, in fact, be said to represent the high water-mark of Canaanite literary **influence** upon Hebrew.

To what period then, is Job to be assigned? It has been frequently claimed in recent years that a "revival" of Canaanite influence took place in Israel between the seventh and the third centuries B.C.E. "which brought with it not only a renaissance of the early epic literature but also an unexampled diffusion of Phoenician writings".[5] It should be pointed out,

---

5. Albright, FSAC., (1946) p.243; cf. BASOR 46 (1932), pp.15-20. Gaster, Thespis, pp.145, assigns an exilic or post-exilic date to Biblical passages containing pagan mythological influence. He explains them as an attempt to recapture the allegiance of the returning and assimilated Jewish exiles by representing their ancestral religion in terms of the heathen mythologies with which they had become acquainted. Dahood, op.cit., p.34, explains the Canaanite influence by a supposed movement of Jews from South to North after the Babylonian destruction where they came into close contact with Phoenicians. Gordon, "North Israelite Influence on Postexilic Hebrew", (Hebrew), Eretz-Israel,

however, that while Canaanite literary influence in the Prophetic and Wisdom literature is undeniable, both the use of the term "revival"[6] and the period to which it is ascribed are very arbitrary. In the first place, since literary prophecy began relatively late we have no means of knowing exactly how early is the Canaanite influence and whether, in fact, the sources at our disposal represent a revival, i.e., an innovation in Israel, or the continuance of a literary tradition. Secondly, it is arguing in a circle to assume that all "heathen" influence must be exilic or postexilic and then to assign all passages exhibiting such influence to the exilic or postexilic periods. This is particularly true of such references in the first Isaiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and the Psalms.[7]

As far as Job is concerned, the evidence all points, in the opinion of the present writer, to an early, ie., pre-exilic

---

III (Jerusalem, 1954), pp.104-105, attributes the Canaanite forms in exilic and postexilic prose to the contacts and intermingling of the Judeans with the Northern tribes during the Babylonian exile. The numerical superiority of the Northerners affected the language of those who returned from the Exile.

6. Albright op. cit.

7. cf. especially, Gaster, op. cit.

dating for the great mass of material that goes to make up the
book.[8] It is not only a question of numerous mythological
and lexical correspondences for, as a matter of fact, unlike
in the Prophets and Psalms, the mythology is completely devoid
of any national element and there is no attempt at reinterpret-
ation in terms of Israel's history and religious experiences.
This alone would argue for an early dating. But even more
decisive is the presence of a large number of morphological
and syntactical peculiarities characteristic of the Canaanite
dialects. This is supplemented by a point of historical
interest. The supposed references in 12:16 ff. are far too
vague to be of value. But the mention of אֶזְרָחִים, קְדֵשִׁים
and נֹצֵר, identified as temple functionaries, points again to
the pre-exilic period.[9]

---

8.   This conclusion is not affected by the fact that
there are many parallels between Job and other Biblical books.
All those who claim literary dependence on the part of Job
do so on the assumption that the book is late. In fact, there
need be no interdependence at all since a large number of the
so-called borrowings comprises clichés. See above page 29
for some evidence that Job represents an older version in
many of these instances.

9.   For identification of these terms see the
Lexicon under their respective headings.

III The Language of the Book.

The conclusion arrived at as to the period in which
the book was written inevitably affects the problem of the
original language. If the work be a translation we have
to assume that the translator deliberately introduced a vast
number of Canaanite archaisms into his work - a most unlikely
situation. At the same time, we should have to explain why the
translator chose to give many common Hebrew vocables a
specialized meaning, intelligible only in a Canaanite context.
The problem is further complicated if Aramaic be assumed to
have been the original language. In the first place, the
number of so-called Aramaisms has been greatly reduced by
reference to the Canaanite dialects, Accadian and Arabic.
Secondly, the very presence of Aramaic words - if, indeed,
they be exclusively Aramaic would tend to argue against an
Aramaic original, for several occur in conjunction with a Hebrew
synonym: e.g., אתה - בוא (3:25); צד - אהד (16:19);
חזה - ראה (19:27); מלה - דבר (29:22); פרא - ערוד (39:5);
גרם - עצם (40:18).

In all these instances we must ask ourselves what the
original of the Hebrew term was, or are we to assume that the
Aramaic prototype contained Hebraisms? The presence of
Aramaisms in the vocabulary is nothing more than an idiosyncrasy
of the Hebrew writer. In any case it has no bearing on the

problem of dating since the Arslan Tash, Kilamu and Zakir
inscriptions all show that Aramaic had penetrated the
Canaanite linguistic sphere as early as the eighth century B.C.E.

Nevertheless, there are two aspects of the language
which still have to be taken into consideration. The first
is the striking absence or extreme sparsity of some archaisms
otherwise characteristic of Hebrew poetry. The relative זו
and the feminine demonstrative pronoun זֹה never occur. Totally
absent too is the Hireq compaginis - very remarkably, in view
of the relatively large number of participial forms. The
Holem compaginis likewise does not appear - again surprising
since the frequently used cliché חית ארץ appears elsewhere
as חיתו ארץ, In general, there are practically no remains
of the early case-endings.[10]

The second striking feature is the presence of certain
late Hebrew forms.[11]

These two elements, in contrast to the otherwise early
characterization of the language lead to the conclusion that
the book in its final form has undergone some later revision.

---

10. Only the accusative is attested: ארצה 34:13 is a
genuine object, on which see Wright, Comparative Grammar p.141;
ארצה 37:12 and עלתה 5:16, are fossilized accusatives used
nominatively. On ציפתה 10:22, see above p.124, contra
GKC §90 g.

11. See p.5, n.18, for the literature.

The final conclusions are, therefore, that the weight of evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of our Hebrew as the original language, that the book is saturated with Canaanisms and archaisms, that the text is in a far better state than is supposed, and that the book , as such, is pre-exilic but that, in its present form, it is the result of later revision.

****

ABBREVIATIONS

(* indicates that the item is fully listed in the Bibliography)

AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages & Literatures.
Aqu.	Aquila
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BDB	Brown, Driver & Briggs*
BH	Biblia Hebraica*
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CIS	Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum
EA	Knudzton*
FSAC	Albright*
GKC	Gesenius*
HG	Bauer-Leander*
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature & Exegesis
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JJJ	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland.
K	Kethib

LXX	Septuagint
MT	Massoretic text
PEQ	Palestine Exporation Quarterly
Q	Qere
RB	Revue Biblique
REJ	Revue des Etudes Juives
Symm.	Symmachus
Syr.	Syriac
Targ.	Targum
Theod.	Theodotion
UH	Ugaritic Handbook*
VT	Vetus Testamentum
Vulg.	Vulgate
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Albright, W.F., "The Mouth of the Rivers,"<u>AJSL</u> XXXV (1919), pp.161-195.

_____,"Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research," <u>BASOR</u>, 70 (1938), pp.18-24.

_____,<u>Archaeology and the Religion of Israel</u>, (1942).

_____,"An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine," <u>BASOR</u>, 89 (1943), pp.29-32.

_____, "The O.T. and the Canaanite Language and Literature"<u>CBQ</u>,VII (1945), pp.5-31.

_____, <u>From the Stone Age to Christianity</u> (1946).

_____, "The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblus," <u>JAOS</u>, LXVII (1947), pp.153-160.

_____, and Moran W.L., "A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos," <u>JCS</u>, II (1948), pp.239-248.

_____, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphet", <u>Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume</u>, (1950), pp.61-82.

Ball C.J., <u>The Book of Job</u>, (1922).

Barth J., <u>Beiträge zur Eklarung des Buches Hiob</u>, (Leipzig, 1876).

Baumgartner W., <u>Israëlitische und altorientalische Weisheit</u>, (1933).

Bauer H. and Leander P., <u>Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache</u>, (1922).

Ben Yehuda E., <u>מלון הלשון העברית</u>, (1908-46).

Blake F.R. "The Hebrew Waw Conversive", <u>JBL</u>, LXIII (1944), pp.271-295.

_____, "Studies in Semitic Grammar", <u>JAOS</u>, LXXIII (1953),pp.7-15.

Böttcher F., <u>Ausfürhliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache,</u> (1866-7).

Brockelmann C., Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprache, (Berlin, 1908-13).

Brown F, Driver S.R. & Briggs L.A., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, (Oxford, 1906).

Budde K., Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob, (1876).

_____, Das Buch Hiob, (Göttingen, 1896).

Callaghan R.O., "An Approach to Some Religious Problems of Karatepe," Archiv Orientalni, XVII, p.360.

Casanowicz I.M., Paranomasia in the Old Testament, (1894).

_____, "The Emphatic Particle ל in the Old Testament," JAOS ,XVI (1896), pp.clxvi-clxxi.

_____, Jewish Encyclopedia, vol.vi. Article, "Hapax Legomena".

Cassuto V., ידיעות החברה העברית לחקירת "בעל ומות בכתבי אוגרית" א"י ועתיקותרה (תש"ב) , נ' , עמ' גא 5-51

_____, "מעשה בני האלהים ובנות האדם"in Essays Présented to J.H.Hertz, [Hebrew Section,] pp.35-44 (Lond.1942).

_____, "ספרות מקראית וספרות כנענית" , תרביץ , (תש"ב) , גא' , עמ' 197-213; 10-1 , עמ' , (תש"ג) , ר"ד.

_____, האלה ענת ,(ירושלים. תש"א) ,

_____, פרוש על ספר שמות(ירושלים תש"ג) ,

Cheyne T.K. Job and Solomon (1887).

Chiera E. Excavations at Nuzi ,vol.I, (Harvard Semitic Series vol.v., 1929)

Cooke S.A., A Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions, (1898).

Cooke G.A., A Text Book of North Semitic Inscriptions, (Oxford, 1903).

Cross F.M. Jr., "Ugaritic db'at and Hebrew Cognates" VT,II (1952),
    pp.162-164

_____ and Freedman D.N.., "The Blessing of Moses",JBL,LXVII (1948),
    pp.191-210.

_____, Early Hebrew Orthography, (AOS 1952)

_____, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving",II Samuel =Psalm18" JBL,
    LXXII (1953), pp.15-34.

Dahood M.J., "Canaanite - Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth",
    Biblica, 33 (1952), pp.30-52, 191-221.

Davidson A.B., Hebrew Syntax, (3rd. ed., 1901)

Delitzsch Franz, Das BuchIob, (Leipzig, 1876)

Delitzsch Fried., Das Buch Hiob, (Leipzig, 1902)

_____, Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament, (1920)

Dhorme P., "La Langue de Canaan", RB, X(1913), pp.369-393, X (1914),
    pp. 37-59, 345-372.

_____, Le Livre De Job, (Paris, 1926)

Dillmann A, Hiob (Hirzel's Commentary, 4th ed. 1891).

Driver G.R., Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System, 1936

_____, "Gender in Hebrew Numbers" JJS, 1 (1948), pp.90-104.

Driver S.R., A Treatise on the Use of The Tenses in Hebrew,(3rd ed
                                 Oxford,1892)
_____, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel(2nd ed.,
                                 Oxford, 1913)
_____, and Gray G.B., The Book of Job (International Critical
    Commentary, 1921)

Duhm B., Das Buch Hiob,(1897)

Ebeling E., Das Verbum der El-Amarna Briefe, (Berlin, 1909)

Ehrlich A.B., Ranglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel, vol vi (1913).

Eitan J., "La Particule emphatique la dans la Bible", REJ, 74 (1922), pp.1-16.

_____, A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography, (New York,1924)

_____, "Hebrew and Semitic Particles", AJSL, XLIV (1928),pp.177-205, 254-260, XLV (1928-29), pp.48-63,130-145,197-211,XLVI (1929) pp.22-51.

Ewald H., Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, (8th ed.1870)

Feinberg C.L., "The Poetic Structure of the Book of Job and the Ugaritic Literature", BS, 103 (1946), pp.283-92.

Foster F.H., "Is the Book of Job a Translation from an Arabic Original?", AJSL, XLIX (1932), pp.21-45.

Friedrich J., Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik, (Rome, 1951)

Gard D.H.., The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job, (1952).

Gaster T.H., "Psalm 29",JQR., XXXVII (1946), pp.55-65.

_____, "The Canaanite Epic of Keret",JQR, XXXVII (1947),pp.285-293.

_____, "The Book of Habakkuk", JQR, XXXVIII (1948), pp.347-348.

_____, Thespis (1950).

Giesebrecht F., "Zur Hexateuchkritik",ZAW, I (1881),pp.177-276.

Ginsberg H.L., "Notes on 'The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods,' JRAS (1935), pp.45-72.

_____, (תרצ"ו)   כתבי אוגרית

_____, "The Ugaritic Texts and Textual Criticism", JBL , 62 (1943), pp.109-115.

_____, "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible" BA, VIII (1945), pp.41-58

_____, The Legend of King Keret, (1946).

_____, "Some Emendations In Isaiah",JBL, LXIX (1950),pp51-60.

153.

Goetze A., "The Tenses of Ugaritic", <u>JAOS</u>, LVIII (1938),pp.266-309.

_____, "The Nikkal Poem from Ras Shamra",<u>JBL</u>, LX (1941),pp.353-374.

Gordon C.H., <u>Ugaritic Handbook</u> (Rome, 1947),

_____, "Phoenician Inscriptions from Karatepe", <u>JQR</u> XXXIX (1948),
pp.41-50.

_____, <u>Ugaritic Literature</u>, (Rome, 1949)

_____, [Review of Friedrich's Phonizisch-Punische Grammatik],
<u>Orientalia</u>, XXI (1952), pp.119-123.

Harris Z.S., <u>A Grammar of the Phoenician Language</u>, (1936)

_____,"A Conditioned Sound Change in Ras Shamra",<u>JAOS</u>,57 (1937),
pp.151-157.

_____, <u>The Development of the Canaanite Dialects</u>, (1939).

Har-Zahav A., (תל-אביב, תשי"ב) _____ דקדוק הלשון העברית

Haupt P, "A new Hebrew Particle",<u>Johns Hopkins University Circulars</u>
XIII (1894), No.114, pp.107f.

Hitzig Ferd., <u>Das Buch Hiob</u>, (1874).

Höfner Maria, <u>Altsüdarabische Grammatik</u> (Leipzig, 1943).

Houbigant C.F., <u>Notae Criticae</u> (1777).

Humbert P., (<u>Recherches sur les sources égyptiennes de la littérature
sapientiale d'Israël</u> (Neuchatel, 1929).

Ibn Ezra Abraham, <u>Commentary On Job</u>.

Ibn Janaḥ Abu Al-Walid Merwan, <u>Sefer Ha-Shorashim</u> (ed. Bacher, 1897).

Jacob B., "Ex.9,14f., über כי עתה (כי אז), <u>ZAW</u>, 18 (1898)pp295-298.

Jastrow M., <u>A Dictionary of the Talmud</u>, (1926).

Kautzsch E., <u>Die Aramaismen Im Alten Testament</u>, (Halle, 1902).

_____, <u>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</u>, (ed. Cowley, 1910).

Kautzsch K., Das Sogenannte Volksbuch Von Hiob, (Leipzig, 1900),

Kimchi David, Commentary on Job.

Kittel Rud., Biblia Hebraica, (1945)

Knudzton J.A., Die El-Amarna Tafeln, (Leipzig, 1915)

Koehler L. and Baumgartner W.,Lexicon In Veteris Testamenti Libros
                                          (Leiden, 1953)

König E.,Historisch Kritisches Lehrgebäude Der Hebräischen Sprache,
                                          (1881).

_____, Historisch - Comparative Syntax Der Hebräischen Sprache.
                                          (1897).

Lambert M., "L'Article Dans La Poesie Hebraique", REJ, 37 (1898),
                                          pp.203-209.

Merx A., Das Gedicht Hiob, (1871)

Montgomery J.A., Aramaic Incantation Texts From Nippur,(1913).

_____, "Hebraica", JAOS LVIII (1938), pp.130-139.

Moran W.L., "New Evidence on Canaanite taqtulū (-na), JCS, v(1951),
                                          pp.33-35.

Morgenstern J., "Psalm 48", HUCA, 16 (1941) pp.1-95.

Nöldeke T, [Review of Kautzsch's Aramaismen], ZDMG, LVII, pp.412-420.

Norzi,Jedidiah.Solomon b. Abraham, Minhat Shai.

Obermann J., How Daniel Was Blessed With A Son, (New Haven, 1946)

_____, Ugaritic Mythology, (1948).

Oesterley W.O.E., The Book of Proverbs, (1929).

_____, and Robinson T.H. An Introduction to the Books of the Old
          Testament, (1934).

Orlinsky H.M. "Some Corruptions in the Greek Text of Job", JQR, XXVI (1935),pp.133-145.

_____, The Septuagint, its Use in Textual Criticism", BA IX (1946), pp.21-34.

Patton J.H., Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms, (1944).

Perles F., Analekten zur Textkritik Des Alten Testaments, (München, 1895),(Neue Folge, Leipzig, 1922).

Pfeiffer R.H., "Edomitic Wisdom", ZAW, 44 (1926), pp.13-25.

_____, "The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism",JBL, (1927) XLVI,pp.193-206.

_____, Introduction to the Old Testament,(N.Y., 1948)

Pope M., "Ugaritic Enclitic -m", JCS, V (1951), pp.123-128.

_____, "Pleonastic Waw Before Nouns In Ugaritic and Hebrew", JAOS, 73 (1953), pp.95-98.

Pritchard J.B., Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, (Princeton, 1950).

Ralbag [Rabbi Levi b. Gerson] , Commentary on Job.

Rashi [Rabbi Solomon b. Isaac] , Commentary on Job.

Reider J., "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew", VI,II (1952), pp.113-130.

_____, "Miscellanea Hebraica", JJS,III (1952), pp.78-86.

_____, "Contributions to the Biblical Text", HUCA, XXIV (1952-53) pp. 85-106.

Reiske J.J., Conjecturae in Jobum et Proverbia, (1779).

Schnurrer C.F., Animadversiones ad quaedam loca Job, (1781-2).

Schröder P., Die Phönizische Sprache, (Halle, 1869)

Schultens Alb., Liber Jobi, (1737)

Segal M.H., _A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew_, (Oxford, 1927)

_____, ספר בן-סירא השלם (תש״ג)

Slouschz N., (תל-אביב, תש״ב) אוצר הכתבות הפניקיות

Smith H.P., "Old Testament Notes", _JBL_ XXIV. (1905), pp.27-30.

Spiegel S. "Noah, Daniel and Job", _Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume_,
        (1945), pp.305-356.

Stade B., _Lehrbuch der Hebr. Grammatik_, (1879)

Stevenson W.B., _Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Poem of Job_,
                                                                (1951).

Story C.I.K., "The Book of Proverbs and North West Semitic Literature",
        JBL, LXIV (1945). pp.319-39.

Szold B., _Das Buch Hiob_, (1866).

Torczyner H., ספר איוב . (ירושלים, תש״א) : (תש״ד) (תל-אביב.

Vincent L. H., "Les Fouilles de Byblos," _RB_, 34 (1926), pp.161-193.

Von Soden W., _Grundriss Der Akkadischen Grammatik,_ (Rome, 1952).

Welhausen J., _Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol._, (1871)

Wilson A.M., "The Particle את in Hebrew", Hebraica, VI (1889-90),
                                        pp.139-150,212-224.

Winckler H., _Altorientalische Forschungen_ I (1893ff)

Winton Thomas D., _The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language_, (1939).

_____, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament", _The Old
        Testament and Modern Study_, (ed. H.H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951).

Wright W., <u>Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages</u>, (Cambridge 1890).

_____, <u>A Grammar of the Arabic Language</u>, (3rd. ed., 1951).

Yeivin S.,   <u>לשוננו, בא. עמ׳ 139.</u>

Yellin D., (1927)   <u>הקדמי מקרא : איוב</u>

Young Douglas G., "The Origin of the Waw Conversive", <u>JNES,</u> XII (1953), pp.248-252.