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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. 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. Fried. Delitzsch

1. The Massorah has noted the difference between the Prose and Poetry by two distinct systems of accentuation. For details see (פֶּעַם, פֶּעַם-בֶּן יְם, פֶּעַם-בֶּן יְם).

2. Fried. Delitzsch
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, "\textit{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, \textit{Notae Criticae} (1777).

\(^5\) Cited by Karl Budde, Das Buch Hiob. (Göttingen, 1896), p.XLVI.
3.

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.

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, constitute 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


have found, or have professed to find, affinities with
Arabic,\(^\text{13}\) Aramaic,\(^\text{14}\) Assyrian and Babylonian,\(^\text{15}\) Edomite,\(^\text{16}\)
Egyptian,\(^\text{17}\) Mishnaic Hebrew\(^\text{18}\) and Sumerian.\(^\text{19}\) 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 quasdam
loca Jobi (Tübb., 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. הַכְּרֻבֶּל כְּהוֹ הַשַּׁעַר שֶׁמֶר מַעֲשָׂר עִנְיָן

on 6:3, Ibn Ezra rejects an Aramaic origin of יִצְבָּא מַעֲשָׂר דַּלּוּ המַעֲשָׂר for his comment cf. Ibn Janah, Sefer ha-Shorashim ed. Bacher (Berlin, 1897), s.v. יִצְבָּא

21. מַעֲשָׂרַן מַעֲשָׂר יִצְבָּא הַשַּׁעַר (חַבְּרֵי מַעֲשָׂר תַּמּוֹן)  "מַעֲשָׂרַן מַעֲשָׂר יִצְבָּא הַשַּׁעַר (חַבְּרֵי מַעֲשָׂר תַּמּוֹן)

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

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 ancient Hebrew 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 inscriptive 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". D.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.

10.

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. \(\text{Duhm}^3\) believed that the entire Prologue and Epilogue were excerpted from a "Volksbuch" and that these antedate the Dialogue. On the other hand, \(\text{Kautzsch}^4\) 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, \(\text{Das Sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob}\) (Leipzig, 1900), for the history of the problem.
3. B.\ Duhm, \(\text{Das Buch Hiob}\) (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 "rakam", but as a "sadig", an epithet exactly fitting the picture in the Prologue, whereas Daniel alone is specifically mentioned by Ezekiel as being a "rakam". 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? This is not to say that

4. op. cit., pp.18ff, 37.
7. Ezek. 28:3.
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 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 patriarchal background since it really adds nothing to the understanding of the narrative. Moreover, in conjunction with several features that can now be recognized 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) 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 (42:11), only elsewhere in Gen. 33:19 and Josh. 24:32.
14.

(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

\[ \text{unchecked Hebrew text} \]

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 (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.\(^{2}\)


11. This subject is fully discussed by U.Cassuto, 34-36 וענש תכשח (יונישה תכשח). \(^{1}\)

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.\textsuperscript{13} King Daniel wines and dines the gods for six days and on the seventh is visited by Baal.\textsuperscript{14} The same King celebrates the birth of a son for six days and his guests depart on the seventh.\textsuperscript{15} King Keret reaches his goal on the seventh day of his journey and invests Udm for seven days.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{17}

Consistent, too, with classic Canaanite epic tradition, are the seven sons of Job\textsuperscript{18} like the seven of King Keret\textsuperscript{19} and of the god Mōt.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} 51:VI:24-33.
\item \textsuperscript{14} 2Aght: 1:6-16.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid., II:30-40.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Krt:105-109; 114-120; 194-211.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Job 2:13.
\item \textsuperscript{18} 1:2; 42:13.
\item \textsuperscript{19} 128:II:24.
\item \textsuperscript{20} 49:VI:7-9.
\end{itemize}
(iv) The Prominence of Daughters.

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

(v) Bnei Elohim.

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

24. ERsays Presented to J.H.Hertz (London,1942),cf. Cassuto,5XY(תשמך),  
inscription from Byblos. We thus have here a reflex of the Canaanite assembly of the gods.

(vi) and

Of these two of the three names of Job's daughters, has generally been explained on the analogy of the Arabic to mean "little dove", and is taken to mean "fragrant bark". It is possible however, that both these names are Canaanite. may correspond to the Ugaritic ymmn, an epithet of the goddess Anat. may represent the Ugaritic as't, "a bow".

(vii)

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:


28. Albright, BASOR, 70, p.19, n.6, suggests that the more usual epithet ybm is dissimilated from ymm; so Obermann, Ugaritic Mythology (1948), p.35.

29. UH, III, no. 1809.

lyrt bnpš bn ilm mt bmh/mrt ydd il ġzr

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

al tqrblbn ilm mt/ al y·dbkm kimr bph/klli btbrmqnh thtan

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

y·rb b·l bkbdbh bph yrd

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

From these passages and others it is clear that the Hebrew מות acquired the meaning of "annihilating", "destroying", under the influence of the old Canaanite Mōt myth and its usage in the Job context which is also mythological may well betray the original language of the folk-saga.

(viii) מות

A recognition of the epic and Canaanite features may

32. 51:VIII:15-20.
33. 67:II:3-4.
34. Text 51:VII:47-48, ygrat bnpšh "Mōt 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 2:5; 8:16; 10:8; 37:20 cf. 2 Sam. 10:19 where מות. The celebrated Isa.25:8 is very likely intended to mean that Mōt shall be hoisted by his own petard!
help to explain this morphologically difficult form. This hapax legomenon is generally regarded as a scribal error for ≤כע and emended accordingly. The Targum rendered it דריי "fourteen". All the other versions have "seven". Dhorme explains the form as a dual in -ăn to which has been attached the -äh 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 יעק (=2×7) et יער"
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. 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 as "fourteen", must accordingly be rejected and the form otherwise explained.

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

\[ \text{wld šb·ny att itrḥ} \]

"the wives I have wed have born seven"

For the pattern -ny > -na we may compare the dual lany>lana (Aramaic šlb) and ṅnv > ṃnv, so šb·ny > . This -ny is probably to be explained as an old adverbial ending which most likely has also persisted in (Gen. 42:36) which has no feminine antecedent.

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

39. Num. 27:8
40. 52:64
21.

וְלַעֲשֶׂה אָחָיתֵהוּ

This unusual construction may well represent an archaic and original usage in which was a collective and abstract term meaning 'group of three', 'triad', and could still be used with either gender.

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.
CHAPTER TWO

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:3</td>
<td>14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:19</td>
<td>19:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:16</td>
<td>21:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:9</td>
<td>30:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:15</td>
<td>30:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:29</td>
<td>31:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:21</td>
<td>32:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:4</td>
<td>33:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:28</td>
<td>36:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:25</td>
<td>38:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ibn Ezra acutely observed this situation:

"ובא מה שמעה 세 ביאווב זרואה י.chain עמרד וראוי י.א. ו" (יאב.א.ל.)

22.
Even more unusual is the effect of the so-called Waw consecutive. To be sure, the traditional construction of perfect followed by consecutive imperfect is fairly common. 

---

2. e.g. 3:10, 23, 25, 26; 5:3; 6:20; 7:5b; 8:4; 10:8; 16:12; 19:9; 24:2; 28:11,14; 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.

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.
5. cf. v.26
6. cf. preceding and following simple imperfects.
7. cf. following simple imperfects.
8. cf.
9. cf. Driver, Tenses §80; GKC §111t.
10. Budde emends to אָזָה.

11. Dhorné maintains that the consecutive expresses Job's mood as a consequence of events summarized by תְבַּע הִצְלֹע הֶנְתַּנָּה. However, elsewhere seems to precede contingent assertions (3:13; 6:3; 7:21; 13:19; 14:16). Torcyner therefore, takes as a condition with הֶנְתַּנָּה as the apodosis and emends to conjunctive וַא. Perles, Analekten (Neue Folge), p.9, emends to מקְּצֶה "dem sur Zeit, da es dich trifft, ermattest du", pointing to a similar corruption in Judg.15:12. 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 חִנָּה is found in I.Sam.2:16, following Q, which is to be preferred. v. Driver, Notes, ad loc; E. 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 חִנָּה fit in.

12. cf. preceding participles.

13. For a similar word play of following by אָזָה 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, פְּרָת הַיַּדְלֵדָה

15. cf. וְתָּקָם עַל

16. Gray-Driver, Dillmann, Bickell, Budde, Ehrlich, Kittel all emend both וְתָּקָם and to conjunctive Waw, taking the sentence as an interrogative.
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 עֹד יָרֵא!; G.R. Driver, Problems, p. 68, takes וַחַל = Acc. ḫašalu, "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.


20. cf. יַעֲנָא and v. 27, יָרֵא! Budde emends every consecutive Waw to a conjunctive.

21. Budde emends to יָרֵא! ֽוַקְבָּשׁ

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

23. Budde emends to יָרֵא! ֽוַקְבָּשׁ

24. cf. v. 14, בָּרֵא וַקְבָּשׁ, v. 15, יָרֵא 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.
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 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. This phenomenon, while outstandingly characteristic of Job is not peculiar to it, as may be seen from comparisons with early Hebrew poetry.

Ps. 18 v. 7 יִרְשָׁעָה = II Sam. 22. יִרְשָׁעָה
12 יִרְשָׁה = יִרְשָׁה
14 יְרִיאָה = יְרִיאָה
16 יְֽיִשְׁתָּמַר = יְֽיִשְׁתָּמַר
39 יְֽאָמָ almacen = יְֽאָמָ almacen
44 יְֽרֵכֶה = יְֽרֵכֶה

25. Driver, ibid., explains יְֽרֵכֶה 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.
Similarly, the construction of perfect followed by simple imperfect with past tense signification is found in Exod. 15 v. 12; v. 14; v. 15

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 $^\text{a}^\text{i}l$ and $^\text{a}_\text{q}^\text{t}l$.

C. The preference for the $^\text{a}_\text{q}^\text{t}l$

One of the major characteristics of the verbal system of the poetry is the use of the $^\text{a}_\text{q}^\text{t}l$ as the regular and common verbal form. Its preference over the $^\text{a}^\text{i}l$ is overwhelming. 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.

from a comparison with the tense forms employed in passages paralleled in other books. 29

3:3  הָפַת 30 Jer. 20:14

5:18 יִשָּׁקֵל תְּרוּפֶּה Deut. 32:39 cf. Hos. 6:1
9:18 יָשִׁבץ וְזָכַר Lam. 3:15
12:4 אֲשֶׁר יָשֶׁר Jer. 20:7; Lam. 3:14
19:7 נִשָּׁמַע Hab. 1:2
24:21 לְהַעֲזֹבְךָ Isa. 54:1

cf. also 12:6 עֲזֹבְךָ with Jer. 12:1

22:19b נִשָּׁמַע 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 vatl 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 יָשָׁמִיר Isa. 51:2 The vatl can only be a pure preterite cf. Driver, Problems, p.95. It is impossible to see how, with GKC §107k, תַּעְלָה can express an action "which from some point in the past is to be represented as future".

31. GKC, §2q-s.
vqtl among the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry. Driver attempted to explain the phenomenon as being due to the livelier image which the vqtl form presents. He vigorously denies that the vqtl 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 vqtl show that their functions are secondary. The vqtl 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 and is exactly paralleled in Canaanite poetry. The preference for the

30.

32. Tenses, §85.

33. See Cross & Freedman, op. cit.

31.

\( \text{yatl} \) therefore can only be regarded as a poetic archaism, a stylistic device developed in Job to its highest form of expression.

D. \( \text{yatl} \) expressing past time

The author of Job not only followed the old Canaanite poetic tradition in the overwhelming preference for the \( \text{yatl} \) form but also, as in Canaanite, used it to express past time even without the \( \text{Waw}. \)\(^{34} \) In other words, a very anomalous situation exists. On the one hand, the \( \text{yatl} \) with the consecutive \( \text{Waw} \) may express present tense, while on the other, the simple \( \text{yatl} \) can express not only a past frequentative but even completed action.\(^{35} \)

Examples of a past frequentative abound.

3:12  יִאָכֵל
4:3  יִתֵּשֵׁר
4:4  יַנְמָן , יְרִמָּה
4:12  יִנְשֵׁב
4:15  יִקָּמֶה , יְרִמָּה יִרְדַּתָּה
15:5  יִתַּכְּנֵי רֹאָבָם
15:18  יִרְדַּתָּה
19:3  יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב
19:8  יִשָּׁב
19:10  יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב יִשָּׁב
19:12  יִשָּׁב
22:6  יַפְסִל הַחֲכָל
22:7  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
22:9  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:12  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:13  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:16  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:17  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:22  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:23  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:24  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
29:25  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
30:12  יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל יִבְשָׁל
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 yatil 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 יִנָּא so 15:7; 38:21 יָּתִה; 3:11 יִנָּא יִנָּא
3:13 יִנָּא יֵעָנָי; 25 לַעֲנָי; 10:18 יָנָא יָנָא

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 yiqtol.

3:11 נָוהי אָזְרוֹ נָוהי 13
3:16 הַכַּהֵרָה אָזְרוֹ 10:18
10:19 אָזְרוֹ הַכַּהֵרָה

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

3:11 יָאַרְוֹ 13
29:21 יָרֹרְוֹ יָרֹרְוֹ 23
29:25 יָאַרְוֹ 30:26
31:17 יָאַרְוֹ

There can no longer be the slightest doubt that the yiqtol is the usual narrative tense in Job and that while it may accurately be described as "omniternal" it is predominantly used as a preterite, just as in Canaanite and East Semitic.

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

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, no less than twenty-five are drawn from Job which exhibits a higher percentage of these forms than any other book.

These forms are of three types:
1. with the Waw conjunctive.
2. with no conjunctive.
In both cases the jussives arise out of the vocalization.
3. The shortened form of the  נב verb.

38. For the question of yatal 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
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". 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.

b). Ewald and Dillmann, followed by many commentaries, 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, 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".


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.

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 ı 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
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{I}} \\
\text{\textit{I}} \\
\text{\textit{I}}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{I}} \\
\text{\textit{I}} \\
\text{\textit{I}}
\end{array} \]

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 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 not appearing once in Psalm 68 which is full of Ugaritic parallels.

Hitzig's theory, apart from being very doubtful in itself 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

57. cf. e.g. II Sam. 22:14 מָלֵא with Ps.18:14 מָלֵא and many other examples cited by Cross & Freedman, op. cit.
58. HG p.274L citing Gen.49:17 מָלֵא; Deut. 28:21 מָלֵא; 32:18 מָלֵא; Ps. 11:6 מָלֵא.
precisely the usage in Ugaritic where the jussive with or without Waw may even indicate past time, 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 yagam; its jussive use is only an offshoot of its universal function".

F. The Tense Sequence in Verb Repetition.

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

8:3 יָעָה ... יָעָה
13:7 תָּבַר ... תָּבַר
27:16-17 יָעָה ... יָעָה
37:4-5 יָעָה ... יָעָה
41:16 יָעָה ... יָעָה

In these cases it has been usual to regard the

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. ysg/ksp yšl/h brš ysg ksp/lalpm brš ysg/m
irbbt/ysq hym wtbth

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

špq ilm krm y[n] špq ilht bprt [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, 41:15. The versions
differ in their degree of faithfulness to the MT. An excellent
case in point is 8:3.

LXX ἀδικήσει ... ῥεκέσει
Vulg. supplantat ... subvertit
Targ. (a) ʾbšy (b) ʾbšy

On the basis of these differences and the supposed unlikelihood of the repetition, moderns generally emend the text. Kittel gives four possibilities for the first ʾbšy - viz.

ʾbšy, ʾbšy, ʾbšy, ʾbšy?

Apart from the fact that Symmachus and Syriac agree with MT, this mode of reasoning involves a methodological error.

ʾbšy ʾbšy v.3a is confirmed by 34:12. Targum to 3a renders ʾbšy by ʾbšy but in 34:12 the same word is rendered Moreover, an examination of the Targum renderings to ʾbšy shows wide variety - Job 19:6 ʾbšy; 32:12 ʾbšy; Ps. 119:78 ʾbšy; 146:9 ʾbšy; Amos 8:5. ʾbšy The variations in the versions must therefore be regarded simply as attempts at stylistic improvements and not as evidence of the corruption of MT.
"Kîr 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.

63. 51:I:26-30
64. 51:VI:47-54
65. 2 Aqht: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 _v_- 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. יִקְרֶהַ יָאָרְבָּה מֵעָלָיו מֵעָלָיו יִקְרֶה יָאָרְבָּה

2. 15. יִקְרֶה הָאֶרֶץ מֵעָלָיו מֵעָלָיו יִקְרֶה הָאֶרֶץ

The difficulty of finding the subject of יִקְרֶה יָאָרְבָּה and יִקְרֶה הָאֶרֶץ 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 "όριος ως χρόνος", Theod. & Symm. translated the phrase as "ναβαείως ως χρόνος", Vulg. has "primogenita mors".
The mention of הַנִּיאֵת (v.14) confirms a literal rendering for בֵּנוֹת הָאָרֶץ, 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 מֵי has acquired a specialized personified meaning analogous to its usage as a proper name in the Ugaritic epics. 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. 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 בָּדָק in connection with Môt's activities (v.13) again harks back to mythology. The

---

4. Ibid., p.49.
special characteristic of this Canaanite god is that he devours his victims. In a typical passage Môt boasts of his prowess and describes to Anath his methods, saying:

\[\text{bklel ydy ilhm ...}\\ \text{"with both my hands I shall devour" ...}\]

It is more than likely that the difficult \[\text{ydy} \] may mean "with his hands", thus giving an exact phraseological correspondence with the Ugaritic passage cited above. There is no need to emend \[\text{ydy} \] to \[\text{ydy} \], as the uniconsonantal \[\text{ydy} \], "hand", appears fossilized in the combination \[\text{bd} \], "in the hands of", in Ugaritic, as \[\text{ba-di-u} \] in a Canaanite gloss of the Amarna letters and in Phoenician inscriptions.

\[\text{mbh} \] 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 \[\text{mbh} \] is an epithet for the netherworld is clear from Ezek. 26:20-21 where it is used synonymously with \[\text{bl} \] and \[\text{mr} \] and antithetically

5. For references and texts see the note on \[\text{ydy} \] on p.17 of this dissertation.


7. \[\text{UH},1,3:20\].
The "king of the netherworld" can be none other than Môt himself. Several Ugaritic passages refer explicitly to Môt's throne in the underworld. 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 _דבעיר_. This, indeed, was recognized by Duhm and Gray who, however, emended the verb to _ברreira_, in the masculine.

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 _ברreira_ may be compared several instances of its employment in a figure of destruction:

Isa. 13:21
34:11
Ezek. 31:13
32:4

Thus _ברreira_ is a figure of destruction and the architect of the destruction, or the subject of _ברreira_ 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 Mōt's first-born, in the same way that Namtar, his Mesopotamian counterpart, is the agent of pestilence and destruction.\textsuperscript{11} The Idea is that the entire household disintegrates with the death of the wicked master.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{A visual representation of the section of the text.}
\end{figure}

\textit{בכר שמעת}, on the analogy of 39:16 מ"ה and Hab 2:6 מ"ב, 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. \textit{בכר שמעת} is to be taken literally and is the subject of \textit{ת"ירוה} and \textit{ס"ר}. We have here two examples of a \textit{ט} preformative referring to a masculine antecedent in 3rd. s.

3. 20:9

\textit{אלו רעוי תשרר לא מצוה} This construction is unique.\textsuperscript{13} The obvious incom-

\textsuperscript{11} Here too, EM emends to

\textsuperscript{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 Eshmun•a•zir Inscription line 11; in Ugaritic in 1 Qaht: 159-160; and in a Hittite text, for which see Gaster, Thespis. p.304 n.

\textsuperscript{13} Gen.18:24 \textit{ברקן} refers, not to \textit{חקים} but to \textit{לוה}. In II Sam.17:18 \textit{כדר} has been corrected by Q.
14. So Gray and Driver, BH.
15. So Torczyner, op. cit.
16. Ps. 101:5.
be humble, abased". It is used in the same sense in 9:13. Significantly, it is found together with בחר in Isa. 25:12; 26:5. It may therefore be safely assumed that בחר in clause 'a' corresponds in meaning to יִהְיוּ לָהֶם "in 'b', It is to be understood as an "internal" Hiphil as used in Isa. 57:9; Jer. 13:18; Ps. 113:6, and with an indefinite subject in the plural, meaning: "when men are brought low". יִהְיוּ אֲלֵי is a contraction of יִהְיוּ לָהֶם יִהְיוּ לָהֶם "pride", which is by no means always used in a bad sense.

Whether יִהְיוּ אֲלֵי be taken in the sense of "proclaim" or, with Torczyner, as the Acc., עָמָרמ, "to be high", "exalted", the clause is parallel to יִהְיוּ אֲלֵי 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) יִהְיוּ אֲלֵי יִהְיוּ אֲלֵי. The use of בחר with יִהְיוּ אֲלֵי, as in our verse, nullifies

17. GKC §53d.

18. A.B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax (3rd ed. 1901), 103. For a similar usage in Job cf. 5:2 בחר.


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, לָאָדָה is parallel to יָדָר 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 גָּדוֹל אַבָּדָה יִנְסָה יִנְסָה יֵאָז הָוֵה אָגָרָה עָלָי בְּדַעְתָּן בְּדַעְתָּן

Since לָאָדָה is frequently used in place of לָאָדָה in Job, 22 and since לָאָדָה would be more natural in the context, לָאָדָה 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 הַתְּאָשִׁיאָה לֹא־זֶכֶר הָיָה

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

21. Vulg. and Syr. overcome the difficulty by reading לָאָדָה.

It would thus be tempting to explain \( \text{לֹאָפְתָּן} \) too, as a 3rd. m.s. and so obviate the incongruence of 2nd person with \( \text{נָבַל} \). However, the impossible \( \\text{נָבַל} \) 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 Amarna tablets.

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

line 10 \( \text{כִּיָּאָהוֹלְךָ וּרְאָתיָא וְהָאָלָאָהַיָּא רַבֵּהַ יָאָחַן} \)

Now it is true that \( \text{כִּיָּאָהוֹלְךָ} \) might be a feminine noun as in Ugaritic,\(^{23}\) but there is no evidence for \( \text{רַבֵּהַ יָאָחַן} \) 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. \( \text{tirām} \) "he loves", \( \text{tigbi} \)

---

\(^{23}\) See 51:V:108, \( t \cdot \text{db ks} \).

"he says", tidin "he gives".  

Dhorme 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, c'est 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 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. Equally certain it is that vestigial


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 tagtulu 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 עשתנוה may be another such example.30 Most scholars re-arrange vv.14-15 so that על נה is attached to the previous verb. While this has the merit of improving the metrical arrangement, it is not without objection:

(1) פֶּלֶטָה goes better with עשתנוה.

(2) נֹעַל is more appropriate to מָדַע than to על נה.

(3) irregular metrical division is fairly common31.

(4) the m. suffix of בְּצַיִל, while not entirely anomalous,32 goes better with עשתנוה attached to עָקַד than to the previous verse.33

(5) The form עשתנוה still remains morphologically difficult even if it refers to עשתנוה alone. Accordingly, it would be best to leave the text as it is and to explain עשתנוה as a Canaanism, an instance of ת_ 3rd m.pl. imperfect form.

change of prefix ת_ on the basis of the idiomatic use of the 3rd. f.s. indicative tagtulu 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:

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


32. GKC §135 o.

33. GKC §132 d§46d.
C. The Qatlati Perfect.

The usual perfect Qal form of בָּרָב in the 2nd m.s. is בָּרָב. Job, however, in one instance, has the unusual form בָּרָב (33:13). Ebeling has pointed out that this corresponds to the well-attested Qatlati perfect form, used side by side with the Qatalti form in the Canaanite glosses to the Amarna tablets. Accordingly, בָּרָב is to be classified as a Canaanism.


35. The use of -א- 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 יִרְדָּב 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 יִרְדָּב K, Jer. 8:18 יַרְדַּבְתֶּם, for the 1 vowel of which cf. Acc. beleta; 10:17 יִרְדָּבְתֶּם k; 15:10 יֵרְדַּבְנִים יָבְנִים = יִרְדַּבְנִים יִרְדַּבְנִים, 22:23 יִרְדַּבְנִים יָבְנִים K; 51:13 יִרְדַּבְנִים יָבְנִים 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.
The relative pronoun ı occurs but once, in k. ı
(Q ı ı) 19:29, and is so understood by Aqu. Theod. Symm.
Targ. Syr. Vulg. as well as in Rabbinic literature. The
Jewish commentators Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Ralbag, similarly
construed the form.

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

The use of the relative ı is characteristic of Moabite
and is mainly confined in the Hebrew Bible to those books
that have Northern origins or affinities. It is undoubtedly
connected with Phoenician ı. The vocalization ı is that

1. Minhath Shai, ad loc.
2. Budde, Klostermann, BH, Gray-Driver.
3. V. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the
4. HG, p. 29 maintains that ı in Hebrew is original to
p. 45, n. 1.
of the proto-Semitic ša which is the regular form of the Canaanite relative pronoun as found in the Amarna letters.\footnote{Dhorme, "La Langue de Canaan", RB, XI (1914), p.360.} 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.\footnote{EA, 149:82, pointed out by Dhorme, ad loc.}
IV THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

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. The Article as a Relative.

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 in 5:10 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 omission in the series 12:17, 19-24 and 26:7-8.

The conclusion is unavoidable that the presence or

¹ GKC §126h; Wilson, Hebraica, VI (1889-90), p. 214
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 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:

| הירש המץ | 5:22 | but | עיני זכר | 14:19 |
| עצי המץ | 5:25 | עיני זכר | 24:4,18 |
| עמי המץ | 12:24 | הבמות זכר | 35:11 |
| קוזי המץ | 28:24 | הבמות זכר | 37:3,38:13 |
| הבמות המץ | 12:23 | but | חוטי זכר | 6:3 |
| טרשיים | 36:30 | בטיה זכר | 9:8 |
|.ToBoolean Color | 36:16 | but | יתלבש | 12:7,28:21,35:11 |
| אגדת שבירה svensk | 22:12 | but | שמיר | 22:14 |
| חוח אמירה | 22:14 | אימורי זכר | 26:11 |
| בצירם | 38:33 | but | זכר | 38:33 |
| צוקות זכר | 38:33 | but | לבלי זכר | 38:37 |

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 consistently without the article

Yet in 3:3, the undefined is parallel to הנצללה.

We find yet in 30:3; 37:9, but 30:5.

b) The poetic preposition usually goes with an undefined noun:

yet the exception of the cliché always undefined.

c) The particle too, never takes the article,

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

d) The interrogative 58:19, 24 takes the article but not 38:2; 42:3 or 4:7.

e) We find and otherwise always simply 28:12, 20, otherwise always simply 33:29 and 6:16; 37:10;

Finally, comparison between Job and other books is instructive.

prepositions . 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; 33:30.

4. cf. Ps. 25:12
59.

On the other hand, אֲדֹנָי מִּי Job 28:13, but אֲדֹנָי חֲרוֹם Isa 53:8

How is this erraticism in the use of the article to be explained? König⁶ 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.

_voltage 28:12 (¬20)
מל תורן - אַסְרֵדָה 37:9
נַרְקַח - כֵּפֶר הָעִבְרִים 38:29

7. Among the examples he cites is Job 5:10 נַגְּנוּ.
On the other hand, the reverse situation occurs nine times.

In fact, since the article is actually present in both members of the parallelism only four times,

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

---

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 ידנוגם, v.23 ידנוגם v.14:24 ידנוגם, but v.30 ידנוגם; v.19 ידנוגם v.22 ידנוגם v.25 ידנוגם Ecclesiastes too, shows the same inconsistent insertion of the article: - 2:8 גלעדו מתכרכו וסערון; 10:20 עזרו ... הָעָלָהוּ ... 12:6 ... הָעָלָהוּ ... 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

that in the case of Ecclesiastes the phenomenon is the result of Phoenician syntactical influence.\textsuperscript{11} The following examples of the inconsistent Phoenician use of the article may be compared with those of Job cited above:

\textit{y̏mlk} \hspace{1cm} \text{line 4, } פִּתְחָה חַרָע \hspace{1cm} \text{5, } נָפְתַּה חָרָע \hspace{1cm} \text{6, } רֹכֵ֣ב נַחֲנָ֣א \hspace{1cm} \text{11, } יִרְכְסַ֣נְתָא רֹכֵ֣ב.}

\text{Sidon, Tabnith} \hspace{1cm} \text{3, } מִנְבַּע ; \hspace{1cm} \text{Eshmunazar; 4, } מִנְבַּע \hspace{1cm} \text{Eshmunazar} \hspace{1cm} \text{9, } אֵלָלָם הִרְצַּו, נַעֲלֵי הָיְמָן}

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 \textit{nota accusativi} \textit{ןָּא} occurs without a following definite article:

1. 13:25

2. 36:7

3. 41:26

In each of these instances the commentators have seen fit to emend the text so as to eliminate the syntactical

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.  

b) that every *nota accusativi* must be followed by the definite article.

a) The *nota accusativi* in Job

The restricted use of *ן* is characteristic of Hebrew poetry in general and of Job in particular. However, the particle is to be found several times with suffixes and even with a noun as the direct accusative of a verb. There can


be no objection therefore, to the use of the nota accusativi as such.

b) The nota accusativi without the article.
This construction is not uncommon in Hebrew poetry as may be shown by such examples as Isa. 33:19

41:7 
Ezek. 26:19
Ps. 146:9;
Prov. 3:12
Eccles. 3:15
4:4
Eccles. 7:7
12:14
Eccles. 3:15

This looseness in the combination or omission of the article with דְּנַח 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 nota accusativi or for its use with a defined noun.

18. Wilson, op. cit., p. 214
20. = עַשֵׁה
21. = וְהָבָה תָּמָצָה
All the afore-going evidence points to the following conclusions: the use of לְ� with a noun in Job is attested firmly; the omission of the article after לְ� 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. הנִּ֣בַע֙ תּוּרְוָה֙ את֙ הָֽעֲשָׁרָ֔ה

It is usual to emend לְ〜 to לְ〜. However, the pattern לְ〜 is by no means invariable. The conjunction מ may frequently replace לְ〜 in the coordinate clause of an interrogative sentence, e.g. 4:2; 6:26; 15:7; 31:1; 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 לְ〜 גָּאֹלָה
ezek. 4:5 לְ〜 הָנֹאות עַל-וֹ
prov. 22:23 לְ〜 בַּעֲרָתָה
II Chron. 32:14 לְ〜 אֵלֵי יִשָּׁעְיָ֔, הָאָ֖בִ֣י הַקּוֹדֶ֑סִי

In Job itself if is found three times: -

7:21 לְ〜 אֵלֵי
26:4 לְ〜 אֵלֵי
28:23 לְ〜 אֵלֵי

22. so gray-driver, Beer, Budde, Duhm, Kittel.
23. cf. prov. 23:11 לְ〜
Accordingly, there can be no objection to the presence of \( \text{and since, as has been shown, the omission of a} \) following article occasions no difficulty, the emendation to \( \text{is entirely unnecessary.} \)

2. 36:7 66

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I Kings 15:13} & \quad \text{לָאֹנָם הַעֲלֵהֻהָ אֶתְיוֹנָה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם} \\
\text{II Kings 16:14} & \quad \text{לָאֹנָם מְאֹצִרְתָּה} \\
\text{Isa. 57:12} & \quad \text{לָאֹנָם יְרַעָלָה}
\end{align*}
\]

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


26. GCK §111h.
Thus, in Job 36:7, as in the previously cited case, the emendation ֵיָא is unnecessary.

3. 41:26 אֵילִיםְבַּעֲשָׁנָה יִרְכָּן

It is common to emend יָס to לַיִּסְי and יָסָי to לַיִּסְי. The MT however, is supported by 40:11,27 12אֵילִיםְבַּעֲשָׁנָה יִרְכָּן

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

The three cases of the nota accusativi 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, בּוּרָה

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 ב 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. צַלָּה, בֵּית, אַלְיוֹ, אֲבִי, מַעַשֶּׁה, מַעַמַּה, מַעַיִן, מַעַד, מַעְדַּה.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>שֶׁלֶג</th>
<th>33:28</th>
<th>צֵל</th>
<th>12:22 etc.,</th>
<th>צֵל</th>
<th>30:26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58:13:8;</td>
<td>58:13:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֵלָה</td>
<td>20:6;</td>
<td>לֵלָה</td>
<td>30:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֵלָה</td>
<td>10:19;</td>
<td>לֵלָה</td>
<td>21:32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ cf. GKC, §120n, note 2,
5. There is a large number of inconsistencies within a single context:

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 was criticized by

2. Syntax, §292n, note 1.
Lambert\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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 inconsistencies, 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 gemetz. It is probable that there was a transition period in the shift from $\mathcal{a} > \dot{\mathcal{e}}$ 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.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{3} REJ, 37, p.209 note 2.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid. p.208, cf. EDE, 208b.
\end{itemize}
B. The Preposition "from"

The recovery of the Ugaritic language, in which the preposition ba has the meaning "from" 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 and Old South Arabic. In Biblical Hebrew too, the use of as "from" has been increasingly recognized. Several cases of this phenomenon are to be

5. Gordon, UH, 10:1, p. 81ff. is not attested in Ugaritic.

6. This was first observed by H. Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, I, pp. 63-67; cf. Harris, Grammar, p. 120, s.v. ; J. Friedrich, Grammatik, 251. For a criticism of Friedrich's "dissimilation" theory, see Gordon, Orientalia XXI (1952), p. 121. The observation of Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions (1903), p. 55, that "the preposition itself cannot denote 'from' is, of course, invalidated. On the other hand, the remark of Albright, JAOS, LXVII (1947), p. 158 n. 42, that "from" is not attested in Phoenician, is not to be taken too literally in view of such forms as and the suffixed.

7. See Maria Höffner, Altsüdarabische Grammatik (1943), §123k.

8. cf. Gordon, op. cit., J. Reider, JJS, III (1952), p. 73; Cross & Freedman, JB, LXXII (1953), pp. 17, 24, n. 20, 25, n. 35, 26 n. 42; S. E. Driver, Notes on... Samuel (2nd. ed. 1913) p. LXVII, cites a variety of instances of "orthographic confusion" of the prepositions and between MT and LXX. Many such can now be explained on the basis of MT = "from". The same applies to several of the examples cited by Fried. Delitzsch, Die Leseverfehler im Alten Testament (1920), pp. 115f. For a case in Biblical Aramaic cf. Dan. 5:2, 3. It is interesting to note that Ibn Janah, Sefer Harikmah 33, already observed that the preposition in Lev. 3:32, and elsewhere, has the function "from".
found in Job.

1. 4:21

The preposition was understood by Vulg. (auferentur ex eis) and Targ. (אַלָּשׁ תָּעִיד מַעַּה) in the sense of "from".

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

For Job 22:20. יִתְמוּ אֲכַלָּם אַשּׁ For cf. Ps.17:14 וְיִתְמוּ אֲכַלָּם אֵשֶׁת

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

"Their substance is removed from them".

2. 5:19

Elsewhere in Hebrew אֲשֶׁר always indicates the agent. 11 Following the LXX most moderns emend

9. e.g. 49:VI:27 = 129:17 ; cf. Job 19:10 Hiph. חֶבֶל


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.
an emendation now rendered unnecessary
by the recognition of the true function of the preposition.
An excellent Ugaritic parallel\(^\text{12}\) is provided by 3'\,Aqht: rev.14:

\[\text{wy·šrk byd btl} \text{ [nt]}\]
"and may he save thee from the hand of "Anat".

3. 5:21 "\text{ba·ha·n} \text{ an·nah}"

in connection with \text{ba·n} always elsewhere indicates place-where. LXX, Syr. and Vulg. all render the preposition "from", on the basis of which, moderns emend to \text{ba·n} \text{ an·nah}. Here, again, the MT has preserved a vestigial meaning of the preposition.

4. 7:13 "\text{ba·n} \text{ an·nah} \text{ an·nah} \text{ an·nah}"

This verse affords an excellent example of the interchange of the functions of the prepositions \text{ba} and \text{ba} \(^\text{13}\).

5. 20:20 "\text{ba·n} \text{ an·nah} \text{ an·nah}"

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, \text{ba·n} takes \text{ba}, 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. לֹאַבְדַּךְ 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. It is possible so to take לֹאַבְדַּךְ here with לֹא 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, לֹאַבְדַּךְ קְרִיְתָךְ לָבַל = לֹאַבְדַּךְ קְרִיְתָךְ לָבַל. It is simplest to take קְרִיְתָךְ 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 לֹאַבְדַּךְ קְרִיְתָךְ לָבַל
The phrase בְּלֹא קְרִיְתָךְ is equivalent to בְּלַא קְרִיְתָךְ. 18

7. 35:16, 36:12 לֹאַבְדַּךְ קְרִיְתָךְ לָבַל is equivalent to קְרִיְתָךְ מִלְּבֹאָךְ.

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

15. For the interchangeable use of ב and ב after בְּלַא, cf. Exod.12:43,44,45 בְּלַא בֹאָךְ, with Lev.7:21 בְּלַא בֹאָךְ.
That  ה  here means "from", may be shown by such parallel phrases as:

Prov. 11:8  יָֽה  מִצְרָא יָֽהָֽמִּי
Ps. 116:8  וּלְמַחְמָא רַחַֽשְׁנִי מַעֵֽקָּב

C. The Preposition י = "from"

Like the preposition ba, la too in Ugaritic and Hebrew, has the meaning "from". Several examples are attested:

1. 8:8  יְסֹֽדָּנִּיְּרָנִּי מָֽרָנִּי

It is possible to treat the preposition as י rei and translate, "concerning the former generation". Such a construction however, is precluded by v.10. which shows that asking for information from someone is presupposed. The usual idiom for this is י, but the use of י with the same function is not unknown elsewhere. With this vestigial use of Canaanite י cf. the phrase יָֽה הָֽמִּי
Judg. 20:18; I Sam. 28:6; 30:3.

2. 12:6  יָֽה הָֽמִּי לָֽשָׁר יָֽה הָֽלָֽשָׁר הָֽנֶֽסֶנִּי הָֽמָֽרָנִּי יָֽה הָֽמִּי


17. e.g. II Kings 8:6. Both functions of י are to be found in I Sam. 30:21. Our phrase יָֽה הָֽלָֽשָׁר in 8:3 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\textsuperscript{18}. Such an interpretation is unwarranted. In the first place, robbers do not usually possess tents but ravage those of others\textsuperscript{19}. Secondly, the reference here is to the state of the righteous, not of the wicked\textsuperscript{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 \textsuperscript{18.} \textsuperscript{19.} \textsuperscript{20.} in 11:13 and of in 12:6. \textsuperscript{18.} \textsuperscript{19.} \textsuperscript{20.} shows that what follows is meant to contradict the preceding. Understanding the passage in this manner, the repeated preposition \textsuperscript{18.} \textsuperscript{19.} \textsuperscript{20.} means "from":

\textsuperscript{18.} \textsuperscript{19.} \textsuperscript{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 מֵאוֹרָר תִּרְפְּתָה לְרֵעִי

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

4. 20:26 מֵאָרַע מֵאָרַע מְדֹנִים

The difficulty here lies in the preposition מ nowhere else means "reserved for". Furthermore, the context requires precisely the opposite expression since darkness suggests security rather than peril for treasures. If the מ 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 מִבָּב

The dictionaries22 take the מ 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 מִיָּדָן. Nowhere is the interchange of functions of מִיָּדָן, better illustrated than in the equation מִיָּדָן = מִיָּדָן.

D. The Combination of Prepositions.

A characteristic of Phoenician is the accretion of different prepositions before a substantive, giving rise to such forms as: מִיָּדָן, מִיָּדָן. Biblical Hebrew shows traces of this phenomenon in the combination מִיָּדָן. A pure Phoenician form appears in I Chron. 15:13 מִיָּדָן, which should undoubtedly be vocalized מִיָּדָן. The same tendency is present in Mishnaic Hebrew in a form like מִיָּדָן (Aboth 2:4).

This phenomenon may be recognized in several passages in Job.

1. 36:3; 39:29 מִיָּדָן
2. 5:5 מִיָּדָן

This phrase has been variously emended, principally


24. Elsewhere only II Sam. 17:19 (=I Chron. 17:17); II Kings 19:25 (=Isa. 37:26); II Chron. 26:15; Ezra 3:13.
because of the difficulty of combining לְהַפְּקָדָה with מָזַר. Since however, לְהַפְּקָדָה and מָזַר are interchangeable, the combination should not be inherently impossible. As a matter of fact, it is actually to be found in:

Lev. 16:15  יָקָם כָּלִית לְפֹקְדָה
II Kings 11:15 (= II Chron. 23:14) יָקָם כָּלִית לְפֹקְדָה

However, the phrase מְזַרְיָה is perfectly intelligible. If מְזַרְיָה 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 מָזַר יִשְׂרָאֵל

As the text stands this is an unusual Poel form. Hitzig and Budde prefer נָשַׁמֵּה, while Gratz emends to נָשַׁמֵּה. There can be no doubt that the verb נָשַׁמֵּה goes much better with an active noun נָשָׁמָה. It would be simplest to read נָשַׁמֵּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. a combination of מָזַר + מָזַר with מָזַר, 25

25. GKC. §55b, c.
We have here a description of the ineluctable fate of the wicked. This word is parallel to אָרָרָה, but so far has defied all the efforts of the lexicographers to find a satisfactory etymology within the context. The various emendations suggested - לָרָה 26, מְרָה 27 לֶ国有资产 28, מָ氛 29, מְו 30, are either too difficult to explain as the original of מְרָה, or do not suit the context. On the critical principle, 'lectio difficilior praeferenda est', it is best to treat מְרָה as מְרוֹן, i.e. as a combination of prepositions with the noun מַיר, "heat", "anger", equivalent to מַי and synonymous with מַי. For its use in Job, cf. 6:17 מַי. In Ugaritic literature, in a not dissimilar context in which a curse is put on the land, we find the same word מַי with the same denominative verb מַי used in the parallel clause:

26. LXX.
27. Dillmann, Budde.
29. Duhm.
31. cf. Arab. "poison, venom."
81.

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 מַעַת

The contrast of מַעַת with מַעַת 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 מַעַת מַעַת, while Dhorme prefers מַעַת מַעַת. The original reading may well have been מַעַת מַעַת with the 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. It appears regularly in Accadian, Arabic and Ugaritic and is attested in Phoenician.

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


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.

by Casanowicz⁷ 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 ה, it was often mistaken for the negative particle.¹¹ He pointed to no less than seven instances of the emphatic Lamedh in Job, viz.

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

1. 3:16 לא ודמעי עבורי הuve כדי


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 ה and ה 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 renders: "I had not been", meaning I would have had no existence at all. Tur-Sinai\textsuperscript{13} likewise interprets the last two words as equivalent to \textit{מִיָּהַל} \textit{מָלָא}, 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 \textit{מִיָּהַל}, but the sentence is then a predicate. Wright and Budde merely omit \textit{מָלָא}. It is simplest to take \textit{מָלָא} as the emphatic, and translate:

"I would indeed have been".

2. 9:35 ꞌיָהַל אֲרֵבִיָּה מְלָא

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. ꞌיָהַל אֲרֵבִיָּה מְלָא. If \textit{מָלָא} be recognized as the emphatic, the difficulty disappears and we have the

\textit{אֲרֵבִיָּה מְלָא}.


13. לִיָּהַל (2nd. ed.) \textit{ad loc.}
very definite statement:

"I am certainly correct".

3. 21:16 מַעְלָה הַיָּרוֹד בַּתּוֹ וָניִּיר

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 מַעְלָה as an interrogative negative or, with LXX, omit the offending particle. It is best to take מַעְלָה as emphatic and render as a strongly affirmative statement.

4. 27:19 יִשְׁרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יָזֵכָּה יָסָר

The parallel clause, יָזֵכָּה יָסָר, and the subsequent verses, make it clear that a negative with יָזֵכָּה is out of place. Most moderns accept the emendation of Houbigant — יָזֵכָּה, although the Niphal of יָזֵכָּה in the sense of death is well attested. No emendation is required if מַעְלָה be recognized, not as a negative, but as an emphatic particle.

14. e.g. Jer. 3:2.
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 \(\text{-t}\).\(^6\)

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


3. For an example in Accad. cf. Mari Tablets, III:3:16-17 \(\text{su-ta-as-bu-tum-ma uš-ta-ša-ab-ba-ati}\), "I caused to be undertaken." Similarly, in Ugaritic, 75:1:33, \(\text{b'il hašm yḥadm}\) "Baal verily covets."


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

The imbalance of the parallelism is obvious. The sequence **זַפְרֵנָה סִירָא** is extraordinary. Syr., Targ., and Vulg., all omit the preposition and read **מַרְפֵּא לְפִי יָם**, "from the sword of their mouth", figurative for calumny.  

Ewald, Fried, Delitzsch, Dhomme, emend to **מַרְפֵּא**. However, this root is nowhere else used of persons and would be an unlikely parallel to **מַרְפֵּא**.

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 **זַפְרֵנָה סִירָא** is the enclitic **מ** to be attached to the preceding word to read **מַרְפֵּא לְפִי יָם**. **זַפְרֵנָה סִירָא** is the object of **יָם** and the Waw of **יָם** is epexegetical. The meaning is that God protects the needy from slanderous

---

JJS, III (1952), 73-79; HUCA, XXIV (1952-53), p.97. Another example is most likely to be found in Judg.5:13 **לָדֶידַרְיָה יָבַעְיָה**. But these probably represent scribal attempts at removing the difficulty.  

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 **חֲדָד הָאָמָר וַעֲשָׂרָה יָבַעְיָה**; 59:3 **שְׁלַשְׁתֵּי נַפְעַת הָאָמָר**; 64:4 **חֲדָד וְאָמָר יָבַעְיָה**.  

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

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

3. 8:8

The possessive suffix with 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 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 cf. Ps.6:3-4; 35:9-10; Prov.16:24. cf. also Isa.66:14 ; Prov.15:30.

11. cf. Torczyner, ad loc.
4. 3:13

As the text stands the subject of הָלַךְ 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 לְךַמַּה. If this be taken as the enclitic מ belonging to the preceding הָלַךְ the difficulty disappears. מָה 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'"

5. 15:18

To avoid the obviously impossible translation "and have not hid from their fathers", the translations resort to a tour-de-force and take הָדַע parenthetically, with חָכָם meaning "having received it from their fathers". Clearly the second clause exactly expresses the first negatively and חָכָם must be the subject ofוֹדֵעַ. LXX and Vulg. both omit the preposition from חָכָם. 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 (וַיִּירָדֶנָה), the perfect balance of the parallelism is restored. The translation then is:

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

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

13. i.e. litotes for, "their father plainly declared".
VII THE PARTICLE **AY**

22:30 | **איה**

The crux here is the word **איה**. Elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew it is found only in the combination **איה** (I Sam. 4:21), usually taken as the negative, common in post-Biblical Hebrew and in Phoenician and Ethiopic. However, the etymology of **איה** is very doubtful. As a negative in our passage, although attested by the LXX and the Targ. 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 (**איה** ) can escape is to vitiate the force of Eliphaz' entire argument. Moreover, v.30 is obviously intended to be parallel to v.29 **איה**. 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 **איה**, not as a negative, but as "island". (cf. A.V. "the island of the innocent") and this has been followed in modern times by Torczyner who regards the phrase as a popular proverb with

---

1. See Driver, Notes on Samuel, *ad loc.*
"island" in the sense of "land" and үн as the subject of the sentence, i.e. "the innocent deliver a land".

Ibn Parhon suggested the emendation үй or үй, a reading which has been followed by nearly all commentaries and which is certainly preferable to the complete deletion of үй. The requirements of parallelism are in favor of some word before үй. However, it is difficult to see how үй or үй could have been corrupted into the nonsensical negative үй, 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, used frequently as an indefinite pronoun or exclamation.

In Accadian, we find үү (masc.), үү (fem):

"iṣu үү" "some god or other"
"үү (m) үү" "some king or other"

and as a generalized indefinite relative pronoun, үү (үү) "who-ever".

Similarly in Arabic we find,

"a'yun, "he who", "whoever":

2. cf. Vulg. "salvabitur innocens."

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

"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 'ayah, "O what a brother", as well as in the indefinite:

\[ 	ext{lbm. bhm 'ay wšty bmar yn 'ay} \]

"eat of some bread and drink some liquor of wine"

With this latter should be compared the almost identical phrase in Prov. 31:4 (Kthib VI)

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 כְּפָרְכַּף in a phrase identical with the Ugaritic lbm 'ay in 15:23 כָּפָרְכַּף which should be translated: "he wanders about for some food", i.e. for anything at all to eat.

4. A. Ungnad, Grammatik des Akkadischen, §15d.
5. W. Wright, Arabic Grammar, II, 320B, 315B.
9. This identification was tentatively put forward by H.L. Ginsberg, Kithbei Ugarith, p.78.
The final ה may be due to a scribal misunderstanding and hence expansion of the original particle ק to ע or may well represent an original final vowel as in the Arabic ʿayya.

We may now proceed to a consideration of the crux 22:30 שָׁבַעַת מִשְׁפַּטֵּי ה in which we should recognize, not the meaningless negative, but the indefinite particle, reading:

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 ʿay.
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. In these cases the text would be perfectly clear if not for the disturbing Waw.

Thus, in Ugaritic text 51:V:107-8:

\[\text{št alp qdmh mr(1)a wtk pnḥ.} \]
"An ox was placed before her, a fatling right in her face".

so also text 52:51:

\[\text{bm nšq whr} \]
"together with kissing there is conception".

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

II Sam. 13:20

\[\text{יהב חור יאשה ותתקנוה} \]
"And Tamar remained desolate ..."

II Sam. 15:54

\[\text{כ לארשי ולארשי ויהי יאשה ולארשי ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ולארשי} \]
"Your father's servant I was previously, but now I am your servant."

Hos. 3:6

\[\text{שה יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה ויהי יאשה} \]
"Surely it is (only a product) of Israel".

Amos 3:11

\[\text{אככ ערב לארשי} \]
"An enemy is around the land".

Amos 4:10

\[\text{ומלך יהודא נ붉כים ולארשי} \]
"And I caused the stench of your camp to rise to

---

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 1iw "to be", which he regards as the base of the Waw consecutive as well as of this "pleonastic" Waw.  

In Job, one such case has hitherto been identified:  

1. 4:6  

"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  

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

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 סָמָה as the predicate and
כְּנִי in the sense of "to be". The emendation of Gratz
קְנַי is open to the same objection. If we recognize
the Waw as having the function of the verb "to be", the
syntactical difficulty disappears. יִמָּ֖לֹק becomes
the predicate of יַ֖מְלָה, yielding the excellent sense, "there
the small becomes (as) the great, and the slave is free from
his master". 5

3. 20:2  לְעָבַד יָרָאִים

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
רֵעֵב or רֵעֶב. However, the difficulty disappears
if the Waw be translated, "it is (because of) ...

4. 26:5  מִבְּחַר חָיֶם לְעָבִ֖ד אַלֹ֔הִים

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

5. D. Yellin,  וְהָיָ֖ה (1927), sensed
this meaning but proposed the deletion of the Waw.
98.

It is here proposed to read יָרָכִים, from a noun יָרָכ, "dwelling-place", found in Deut. 12:5 יָרָכַת and now confirmed by the Genizah Ben Sira 14:25 where יָרָכ is synonymous with יָרָכָה. 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 rpm are mentioned in parallelism with ilnym7 which in one text are said to reside "two layers beneath the springs of the earth..." (ṯḥt ʿnt ṣrg).8 The mention of יְרָכָה in our Job passage in reference to יְרָכָה 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. Goetze9 pointed out several instances in Ugaritic as did König10 in regard to Phoenician and Hebrew. In the following

7. 62:45-46; 122: 2-4, 9-12 etc.
cases the understanding of the text is considerably improved if the Waw be accepted as "pleonastic".

5. 10:8 יַרְדִּיָּה יֶבֶרֶג

It has been usual to accept the Greek reading as superior to the Hebrew. However, both יַרְדִּיָּה and יֶבֶרֶג are frequently used as adverbs determining verbs of destruction.

| יַרְדִּיָּה | II Sam. 14:16 | Lev. xxiii. 38 | Ps. 49:11 |  |  |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| יֶבֶרֶג    | Ps. 74:8       | נָטָא כִּמָּת |  |  |  |
|           | Isa. 27:4      | אֶלְקָתָה יִדְרִי |  |  |  |
|           | Zech. 12:6     | יָאַרְאָה ... חָטֵאתוֹ לְמֵיתָה |  |  |  |
|           | Ps. 97:3       |  |  |  |  |
|           | Job 19:10      |  |  |  |  |
|           | Lam. 2:3       |  |  |  |  |

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

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

"Thou wouldst utterly destroy me".

6. 15:17 יַדְתָּא תָּדַא יֶבֶרֶג

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

case with cohortative. It is far simpler to ignore the conjunctive Waw as being "pleonastic" and render: "That which I have seen I shall relate".

7. 23:12

This verse too, is treated as casus pendens and the verb taken as "internal Hiphil". Rather we should accept the verb as transitive, as in Mic.2:3, with מָצַו 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, ad loc.

12. GKC, §143d; Driver, Tenses, §125.
This interjection, in place of הֶנָּה, is used 22 times in Job, and is confined mainly to Deutero-Isaiah. The predominence of the shorter form may be explained as a Canaanism or at least an archaism, for Ugaritic has ḫn, Phoenician attests ḫnn, instead of Hebrew יְנָה, pointing to an original יְנָה, and the 8th cent. archaising Zenjirli dialect has יְנָה.

1. v. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p.467
2. v. BDB, p.243c; cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit., for other correspondences between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.
4. UH, 12:7.
5. Friedrich, op.cit., §259.
XI THE NEGATIVE WITH \( \psi \)

The combination \( \psi \) (9:33) is unique. LXX and Pesh. read \( x^b = r^b \), a reading adopted by many scholars.\(^1\) Targ. and Vulg. support MT. There are good reasons for preferring 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 \( \frac{1}{2} \) 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 \( \psi \) thus fits the context better. It is also supported by the assonance with \( \psi \) in the preceding verse.

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

Reference to the cognate languages reveals a diffuseness and variegated negation of \( \psi \). In Accadian we find \( \text{laššū} = \text{lā-îšu} \) as well as \( \text{ul ūšī} \); Arabic has \( \text{yišū} = \dot{y} \) with the

---

2. So Gray-Driver and Dhorme.
The eighth century Zenjirli dialect of Aramaic, which has affinities with the Canaanite group, Hebrew, Moabite and Phoenician, as well as with Arabic, yields the form \( \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} = \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} + 3 \text{f.s. suffix}\). The Biblical Aramaic \( \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} \) (Dn. 2:11) and the later Aramaic \( \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} \), which is certainly an analogic formation, whatever the etymology.

Because of the cognate Aramaic forms, Tur-Sinai regards \( \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} \) as an example of the poor Hebrew translation from the Aramaic original. But against this is the Ugaritic construction \( \text{bl it} \), while Hebrew itself

---

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

4. Wright, Arabic Grammar, 1.96c, Rem.a.


7. v. Eitan, op.cit., p.188, who doubts the etymological identity of Aramaic \( \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} \) with Hebrew \( \text{נָחַת חֲצָה} \).

8. מַעֲבַד, (2nd ed.) p.369.
has a significant parallel to \( \mathfrak{v} \mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{x} \mathfrak{b} \) in the form of \( \mathfrak{v} \mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{j} \mathfrak{x} \) (Ps. 135:17).

In short, the evidence points to the conclusion that our \( \mathfrak{v} \mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{x} \mathfrak{b} \) 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.

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. 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:

\[ \text{line 17-18} \]

\[ \text{seven-fold co-wives and eight-fold consorts of Baal}, \]

In Job itself, the following numerical series are attested:

1. one-two

With Job 33:14, 40:5, may be compared Ugaritic \( išt \) \( išt\text{in} \) "a fire, two fires". 2

2. two-three

33:29 \( \text{baal-kp}\) is paralleled by

\[ \text{tn dbbm ſna bc\text{lt} rkb spt} \]
"Baal hates two sacrifices, three the Rider of the Clouds".3

1. see above 14f.
2. 137:32
in mipdm ... ṭḥ ṭḥ ḫyrm
"two stages ... three marches in the hills"\(^4\)

3. six-seven

With the several examples from Ugaritic cited previously\(^5\) may be compared Job 5:19.

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 Canaanites 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.

¹ 41:12. The usual meaning "reed" does not fit in here with which rather suggests a connection with fire. Hence, the final is generally regarded as a dittograph and the resultant 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 جل and Assyrian agānu, "to be hot, boil". In Ugaritic this vocable appears as agn, "fire". It is possible that راجح is a conflation of two forms حن, حن. Parallel to حن, 21:28, is a distinctly Canaanite collocation. In 15:23, حن corresponds exactly to Ugaritic, 1bm ay (52:6). حن 22:30 should be vocalized حن, "whomsoever is innocent he delivers". v. supra pp.91ff.

108.

2. 52:15, parallel to 15t.
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, Orig. Hebraeae (1724), 1.8.
The difficulty is however, that מִן is nowhere else used of persons and the nexus of thought would suggest some precise class, rather than a vague and general definition. Ugaritic suggests another possibility. We find there the yttnm as a certain guild of temple servitors, now accepted as being connected linguistically with the Nethinim mentioned in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

Consonantally, the equation מִן = yttnm = יִתְנֵה presents no difficulties. The root yttn early displaced ntn in Phoenician and Ugaritic and even spread to Southern Palestine as is evidenced by the Amarna preterite form ya-di-in. In Hebrew a further shift from vît took place giving rise to the nominal forms יָתֵנ and יִתְנֵה (Hos.2:14) = Ugaritic ytnt "gift". As to the vocalization of our passage, it is probably a Massoretic confusion with the usual Hebrew יָתֵנ.

6. Budde, op. cit., p.63, noting the difficulty, suggested the reading כַּנָּא or כַּנָּא.

7. 301:1:1; 52:3, which should now be read: yttnm qrt l-ly, and translated, "the yttnm of the city on high".

This identification of our דָּמִי = yētmān 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 and they were also numbered among the rulers of the State. The use of דָּמִי instead of the Judean Nethinim would be another point of contact with Canaanite source material, suggesting Northern origins.

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


13. Neh. 11:3; I Chron. 9:2 etc.
14. נַעַרְפָּר הָאֵזְרִים Neh. 11:3 with which cf. לָדָד

in Job 12:24.


16. מֵאָלֶרֶד וְיָכַת מַלְאַךְ Memael failed to recognize the implications of this phenomenon, attributing it to Arabic and Aramaic influences.

17. v. Cassuto, op.cit., p.45.
is used twenty four times in the Poem while the variant occurs fourteen times. However, if it be taken into account that Elihu alone uses nine times as opposed to 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 as a criterion for the determination of date, source and linguistic influence 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. As Z. Harris has pointed out, while is characteristic of E. Semitic and Canaanite, as is of S. Semitic and Aramaic, both are reflexes of Proto-Semitic forms and early Canaanite also used, though infrequently. Harris, therefore, describes as "unnecessary" the view that was an Aramaic form belonging to the hypothetical younger (Aramaic) stratum in Hebrew. The use of may as well be an archaism as an Aramaism.

20. op. cit., pp. 10, 74-75.
With this is to be compared Ugaritic špå thntm (49:I:6; 51:IV:22). Ugaritic orthography does not permit a decision on MT use of the singular as against the usual emendation ḫpzn.

36:29 is unique in the Bible. The locution is a purely Phoenician conjunction.

in the unusual sense of the netherworld, is found in 10:21, 22, corresponding exactly to this usage of Ugaritic arg.

3:25 (and so four times) is one of the supposed Aramaisms. The observation of Kautzsch that the root had not yet appeared in Canaanite is now nullified by its presence in Ugaritic ṭw.

meaning "from", used regularly in Ugaritic and Phoenician is to be found in several passages. v. supra, p.71f.

I. This vocable, in some instances, seems to be a fossilized combination of the preposition еч with the uniconsonantal י hand", exactly as found in a Canaanite gloss of the Amarna letters ba-di-ע,26 in Ugaritic bd "in the hands of",27 and in later Phoenician inscriptions.28 This meaning of י is to be found twice in Job. יכוננ,29(17:16), and יכוננ = "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:

bkalת יד ילמנה יכוננ" "with both my hands I shall devour...".

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

26. EA, 245:35.
27. 51:I:25 etc.
28. UH, 8:20, p.48.
31. line 6, יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ "do not listen to their words", v. Slouschz, ... יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ p.21; יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ יכוננ.
6:8, used in the sense of granting a request has its exact semantic equivalent in the Amarna usage: \( 32 \). \( \text{la-a ka-ši-id i-re-su} \), "as soon as the request is granted". Accadian \( \text{kašadu} = \text{Heb. xi2} \) in the mind of the scribe who was giving contemporary usage of \( \text{xi2} \) to the Acc. Our Job passage is thus a very early idiom.

\( \text{p2} \) \( \| \text{p3} \) (13:1; 26:14) corresponds exactly to Ugaritic

\[ \text{šm} \text{ lalyn bēl/bn lrkb cprt} \]

"Hear, O abyn Baal! Perceive, O Rider of the Clouds!"

Semantically equivalent is \( \text{p2} \) \( \| \text{p3} \), 32:11-12.

\( \text{y12} \) in the specialized metaphorical sense of "killing", "annihilating" (2:5; 8:18; 10:8; 37:20) is a reflex of the old Canaanite Mōt myth. v. supra, p.17f.

\( \text{bōn x, x, x} \) is found three times (1:6; 2:1; 38:7) always within a mythological context. The phrase is found in Ugaritic, in Phoenican and in the Canaanite inscription from Arslan Tash. 34 As parallel to \( \text{p2} \) \( \| \text{p3} \) (38:7) we find the equivalent in Ugaritic

\[ \text{bn il} \| \text{phr kkbm} \]

"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.
This unusual parallelism corresponds exactly to the common Ugaritic locution גלת 奭 奭. In one Ugaritic text[bw] is followed by °ם, just as here we have  ISSUE. The phrase should therefore be translated, "who can penetrate?".

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

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

36. 49:1:6-7; 51:IV:23; 127:4, etc.
38. 137:24.
41. 76:II:21,22. UH,1,p.40, note 5.
The difficulty of accepting the usual meaning of here in view of the parallel has long been noted and Houbigant's emendation of the MT to has been widely accepted. However, it is also possible that this word is a denominative of the Semitic , a jar for the storing of food and drink. This word twice appears in Ugaritic and is common to Accadian, Arabic, Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew. The verb would therefore mean "to distribute food (or drink)" parallel to.

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 .

, has the meaning of "perish". This signification, as in Arabic , appears in Ugaritic in the šafel.

This difficult word, following v.1, and , may well be connected with Ugaritic , throat, or gorge, of Mšt.

42. so Graetz, Bear, Dhomme, Kittel.
43. 126:III:14; nt 1:12, so the reading of Cassuto, Anat, pp.63, 75.
45. nt: v:10-11; 3 Aqht,Rev.11-12; Cassuto, op.cit., p.86.
46. 67:1:7-8.
on the analogy of the figurative use of כְּחָלִל 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". This verse, in view of the parallel 20:18, may also be connected with the same root.

The "pleonastic" Waw as found in Ugaritic explains several passages in Job. It has long been felt that here cannot be appropriately translated "songs". LXX is usually taken to reflect an alternative reading It is now recognized that Ugaritic = Arabic "to be strong, brave," is sometimes behind the Hebrew 49. This applies to here and we should translate:

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


49. v. Koehler & Baumgartner, Lexicon, s.v. ציר; Cassuto, Commentary on the Book of Exodus (1954), Hebrew, p. 120; so Ex. 15:2; Gen. 43:11; Isa. 25:5 where read "he humbles the power of the terrible"; Ps. 119:54.
"who giveth strength in the night", \textsuperscript{50} LXX reading could well have arisen from MT, and no emendation is required. \textsuperscript{51} 

\textsuperscript{50} For \textsuperscript{דִּי} as abstract ending as a variant of \textsuperscript{דִּי} v. GKC §861. 

\textsuperscript{51} \textsuperscript{דִּי} in this sense is also to be found in the pr. n. \textsuperscript{תָּמִד}, \textsuperscript{תָּמִדָּה}, in Phoenician pr. n. \textsuperscript{תָּמִד} and in Old S. Arabic \textsuperscript{תָּמִדָּה} "strong", and pr. ns. \textsuperscript{תָּמִדְתָּה}, \textsuperscript{תָּמִדְתָּה}.

21:17 is to be understood as the Ugaritic \textsuperscript{בָּדַע} "to destroy". Accepting Dhorme's identification of \textsuperscript{בָּדַע} with Acc. \textsuperscript{בָּדַע} the phrase is to be translated "Does he destroy the wicked in his anger?"

This adjective to describe the wicked is characteristic of Job. The locution \textsuperscript{בָּדַע}, 36:13, is unique. 8:13 defines the \textsuperscript{בָּדַע} 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 \textsuperscript{בָּדַע} is to be found as a characterisation of 'Aqht by El because

\textsuperscript{52} op. cit., p.29. 

\textsuperscript{53} 3 'Aqht : rev.9; nt:V:30. 

\textsuperscript{54} Dhorme, \textit{ad loc}. 
he was guilty of an act of presumption against the gods, in this case against Anat. 55 There can be no doubt that our and the use of is borrowed from Canaanite usage. 56

as used here is a double entendre based on the specialized Canaanite usage. Firstly, in the servant-master relationship corresponds to hpt "a freeman"; then in the particular context referring to the netherworld it is undoubtedly connected with bhtpptt, a synonym for Sheol. 57

7:12; 26:12; 38:3 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.

used with 7:9 etc. and 33:24 corresponds to the Ugaritic expression 'rd arg with identical meaning.

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

55 3Aght rev:17.
56 v.Gaster, Thespis, p.261, n.10, who refers to the use of the cognate verb,anapu, "to insult," in Amarna letter 288:8. Incidentally, BDB derivation of from has to be revised since the Ugaritic is h not h.
59. 3Aght 1:21, v. supra, p.102f.
is thrice employed as an unusual parallel to בְּנֵי or בְּנֵי, 60
a usage intelligible only in a Ugaritic context.

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

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

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

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

as the genius of destruction and aridity as in Canaanite
literature is clearly indicated in 18:13. The reference
to הָעָלֶה, "first born of Môt", must be connected
with the "seven sons of the god Môt" of Ugaritic. 63

in the sense of the netherworld 27:15; 28:22; 30:24;
38:17 is a reflex of Canaanite mythology.

62. Ibid., v:7 = I 'Aqht 175-6.
The usage here in connection with the victory of God over the Sea Dragon is significant since יִדְרַי is the common Ugaritic verb for the gods smiting their enemies. Significantly, the only other usage of יִדְרַי in Job (5:18) also refers to God.

7:3 יִדְּרָנָה in the sense of "fated" corresponds to Ugaritic mant "lot", "fate". 64

7:24 is regarded as a pure Aramaism. 65 However, it may well be connected with Ugaritic lynk, "he is not vanquished". 66

The verbal form has now turned up in the Karatepe inscription suggesting that the early usage of this vocable in Canaan was more widespread than is commonly supposed.

38:16 בְּרִיעַת; 28:11 נִיבֵי נַחֲרִים are phraseologically equivalent to Ugaritic mbk nhrm, "sources of the rivers", 67

64. 49:II:36.

65. E. Kautzsch, op.cit., p.57.

66. 68:7.


cf. Ug. nbk "a well", MT יֶבֶן should now be emended to יֶבֶן. 69

לָה 36:16 הָנָה is an exceptional nominal formation in Hebrew 70 but perfectly usual in Phoenician. The word occurs several times in Phoenician inscriptions. 71

לָה is clearly the root of לְהָנָה 21:13 despite the anomalous vocalization, and was so understood by Symm. Vulg. Targ. Syr. It need not be an Aramaism 72 since nht "to go down" appears in Ugaritic and Phoenician.

לָה 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 לְו 4:21, "remove from"

לָה parallel to לָל 36:11; The same pair of synonyms occurs in Ugaritic נ מ. In Phoenician likewise מִי means "good". 74

69. Ginsberg, JRAS (1935), p.53; חֲבֵרוֹ לְו לָל p.29; Albright, AJSL, 35 (1919), 161-195
70. GKC, §95k.
72. Kautzsch, op.cit, p.64.
73. 'nt:1:19-20.
74. cf. yhmlk, line 8 לָלֵי יֶבֶן. 
36:14. v. infra, s.v. הָנַש יָשַׁנְתּ.

33:20 is parallel to נְנָח which means "appetite," as established from 38:39; so Ugaritic נָס, "appetite." 75

36:29 used of the abode of God. The term is semantically equivalent to the Ugaritic, מַצֶּל (cf. Aramaic מִזְצָל = מַצֶּל) used of the abode of the children of El. 76

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

40:28 אָרְבָּעָה יָמִים. 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. "nt, pl.VI:IV:1; 51:I:13,18;IV:52:56, always parallel to מִצָּל, abode.
77. §Aqht, II:43-44.
78. Ibid, VI:28-29.
his message of surrender to Mšt:

‘bdk an wd *lmk
"Thy slave am I, yea thine for ever."\(^{30}\)

39:14 is more likely to be connected with Ug. ‘db
"to prepare, arrange, set", than with 35\(\text{h} \)
"to forsake". The nexus of thought with v.15, shows that the
emphasis is clearly on 35\(\text{h} \), 35\(\text{h} \) 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.

10:22. This form is generally taken as an old
locative of אֵלִיָּה. \(^{31}\) However, the word occurs as
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 אֵלִיָּה parallels
אֵלִיָּה. In the afore-mentioned inscription
we read line 19, אֵלִיָּה אַבּוֹט. There can
be no doubt that Job is referring to this demoness
that haunts the dark places. Our אֵלִיָּה is thus
a Hebraized orthography for the Aramaic f.pl.

---

\(^{30}\) 67:II:12.

\(^{31}\) *GKC* \$90g.
emphatic form םֵיתא. 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

This vocable is used in two distinct senses, although subsumed in the dictionaries under one root. לִבְּךָ 23:21, has the usual signification "hidden", parallel to הָנָר. On the other hand, מֵי דֵּרֶךְ שֲׁמַיָּהּ 42:3 corresponds exactly to 33:2 מִי דֵּרֶךְ שֲׁמַיָּהּ, i.e. יִבְיָה means "to be dark". This applies to 6:16 where the parallel מַרְדֹּק means, "to be dark". Now it is true that there is a semantic relationship between "to conceal" and "to be dark", but the equation יִבְיָה = מַרְדֹּק is very precise. Philological evidence also points to two unrelated Semitic stems. יִבְיָה "to conceal" corresponds to Arabic يَبُي. But in Ugaritic we also find שָּׁמַיְת parallel to שָּׁמַיְת, meaning "darkness". 83

It is this root $\text{GLM}$ that must lie behind the Job passages cited above. Since Ugaritic $\text{G} = \text{Hebrew} \quad \text{Y}$ only when $\text{G}$ is proto-Semitic, we are accordingly dealing here with an ancient Canaanite root $\text{GLM}$ "to be dark", distinct from "$\text{LM} $ "to conceal". The translations of $\text{M?Y}$ in Job should be revised as follows:

6:16 $\text{M?Y} \text{?X?} \text{?Y?} $ "snow becomes dark". 

42:3 $\text{M?Y} \text{?X?} $ "who darkens ...?"

In all probability the nominal form $\text{M?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} $ 11:6; 28:11, should be rendered "dark places". 

$\text{M?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} $ 39:21 is here used in its Ugaritic signification of "strength", parallel to $\text{M?X?} $ 87.

---

84. Otherwise the equation is Arabic $\text{G} = \text{Hebrew} \quad \text{Y}$ = Ugaritic $\text{G}$ or $\text{Z}$.

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

86. In 28:11 $\text{M?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} $ is contrasted with $\text{M?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} \text{?X?} $ 11:6.

3:7; 41:10. In Ugaritic\(^{88}\) מָזַע means "eyes". This signification rather than "eye-lids" better fits the phrase מָזַע מְזַע and is supported by מָזַע in 41:10.

25:9. Eitan identified מָזַע with Arabic مَاشَا "to go to", "approach"\(^{89}\) מָזַע = מָזַע "to turn". As early as the Targum it was recognized that "left" and "right" here stand for "North" and "South". The root מָזַע has now been attested in Ugaritic, used too in connection with direction.\(^{90}\) The North is the abode of the gods in Canaanite 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 מָזַע to מְזַע or of מָזַע to מָזַע is required.

\(^{88}\) Krt: 147, 295.

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

\(^{90}\) Cassuto, מָזַע (ירוחליס טֵזֵרוּת) קָרֵי, Ugaritic Text 51:VII:41.

\(^{91}\) Isa. 14:13; Ps.43:3 and Job itself 37:22.
21:7 is generally taken as "grow old", in which sense it is an Aramaism.\(^{92}\) נָחָל 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 טq. In one Ugaritic text\(^{93}\) we find this verb together withヤム denoting the passage of time. We may therefore have here, Job 21:7, an elliptical usage of טq in the same sense: "They pass (their days) in amassing wealth." cf. v.13. פָּסַל יָמִים

6:17; 23:17, corresponds to Ugaritic smt, "to destroy". 26:7 in a cosmogonic 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.\(^{94}\)

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.
95. BASOR, 89 (1943), p.29ff.
33:6. The phrase, equivalent to the Accadian expression garasu tita, now has its counterpart in Ugaritic arg rt, "to shape clay into an effigy".96

5:1; 15:15. This term is found in the Arslan Tash inscription, line 11-12, where рrрр is parallel to ррррррррр, leaving no doubt that the are gods. Similarly, Ugaritic bn gods means "the gods".97 Our Job passage thus uses another term directly borrowed from Canaanite mythology.

36:14. As temple (male) prostitutes, this term is well known from other passages. The parallel 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 . Dhorme takes as an abstract noun meaning "adolescence". But from the analogies he quotes we should expect a form , while there is no evidence for the use of вррр in this sense. Others98 have argued that the 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:Ι: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 \textit{qdsym}. A list of temple functionaries mentions \textit{n-rm} together with \textit{qdsym} and \textit{khnh}. It is here suggested therefore, that our \textit{\ldots} refers to a guild of temple servants (cf. supra, s.v. \textit{\ldots}). The reference here maybe to some historic event. The Book of Kings mentions repeated persecutions of the \textit{\ldots} 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.

\textit{\ldots} The locution \textit{\ldots} is phraseologically equivalent to the Ugaritic \textit{\ldots}.\textsuperscript{101}

\textbf{100.} 113:60.

\textbf{101.} 2'Aght:II:9, according to J. Obermann, \textit{How Daniel was Blessed with a Son}, (A.C.S. Offprint Series, No.20), p.4. line 93.
"shades", are mentioned in the Phoenician inscriptions and in the Ugaritic texts. It is noteworthy that in several passages in the latter, rophe parallels ilnym. In one passage, the ilnym are said to reside "two layers beneath the springs of the earth... "(tht\nt arg). The reference to ropy nshn in our Job passage may well be connected with this.

Reshef was one of the gods of the Canaanite Pantheon, being found in Ugarit and Phoenician. He was even adopted by the Egyptians of the New Empire into their Pantheon.

is used eleven times in Job, but npx never appears. From Judg. 16:25 it may be inferred that npx belongs to the spoken language, npx to the literary dialect. The exclusive use of npxy 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.
105. Text 17:5.
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; 33:17. The employment of the masculine for these terms shows the strong mythological strain underlying their usage.\textsuperscript{108}

This hapax legomenon corresponds to Ugaritic \textit{sb'ay} \textsuperscript{109} (v. supra, pp.18ff).

\textit{nyx} 36:19 may be connected with \textit{nyx}, "sacrifice" as in Phoenician. This fits in well with \textit{ydp zr} v.18

This unique phrase has been variously explained. Duhm went so far as to emend to \textit{h'xwV}.\textsuperscript{111} Those who retain \textit{h'xw} regard

\textsuperscript{108} v. supra. s.v. \textit{nipp}
\textsuperscript{109} 52:64.
\textsuperscript{110} Marseilles Tariff, lines 3,4.v. Slouschz, \textit{opcit.}, p.143.
\textsuperscript{111} cf. BH, \textit{ad loc.}
it as a late word. In each case the context leaves no doubt that the phrase is synonymous with death.

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 is now attested by the Ugaritic equivalent:

msbt ḫn bšl ttp
"A seventh, lo, he fell by the sword;"

37:3; This hapax legomenon is regarded as a pure Aramaism cognate to יָרָץ "to loosen". However, Ugaritic

šrh lars brgm
"he flashes lightning to the earth";
suggests rather that the final of is radical and original and that we have here a Canaanite root šrh "to flash" (lightning).116

112. cf. Gray-Driver II ad loc.
114. Kautzsch, Aramaismen, p.90.
115. 51:V:71.
134.

is frequently used figuratively for offspring (5:3; 18:16; 29:19). This usage is typically Canaanite. Thus, in Ugaritic we find šrē parallel to bn.117 With 18:16 cf. Phoenician,118 and Ugaritic, šrēk bars al yrh rish gely bd ns k.120

is thrice synonymous with bn (28:14; 38:16; 41:23-24) The identical parallel occurs in Ugaritic yrh-thum.121

7:12 as the mythological sea-monster corresponds exactly to Canaanite tnm.

117. 2'Aqht:1:19-20 etc.
118. Eshmun'azar Inscription, lines 11-12.
119. I'Aqht, 159-160.
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 justify certain conclusions.

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
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, Ebrard 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, Duhr 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. Sotah V.3.
2. For details, see Karl Budde, Das Bueh Hiob, (1896) pp. XL ff.
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 Qatlāti perfect form, used once in Job.

(iii) The Canaanite poetic tradition is followed in the employment of the yātā as the predominantly 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 accusatiivi 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 מ 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 מ in several passages and of the indefinite particle מ 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.
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., יִבְעָר, בֵּית, מְדִינָה, שְׁכֵן, מְאֹד, בָּטֵן, אַלָּת, מִשְׁמַר, מַעַל, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָגַד, מְבָɡ
in these studies as a background for the proper understanding 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; הֶלְדָּשׁ (5:1; 15:15) and הַלְדוֹת (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 הַלְדוֹת as the appellation of the Divine throne (36:29); הַלְדוֹת 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); הַלְדוֹת, by metonomy, used of the netherworld (27:15 etc); the method by which Môt disposes of his victims (17:16; 18:13); הַלְדוֹת as the shades of the dead residing beneath the waters (26:5); the specialized use of הַלְדוֹת in the sense of the netherworld (10:21:22); the exceptional employment of הַלְדוֹת and הַלְדוֹת 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:
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" 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, i.e., 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. 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 reinterpretation 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 מִי, מָכָה and יְנָּה, identified as temple functionaries, points again to the pre-exilic period.

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., נון - נון (3:25); דוע - דוע (16:19); תנן - תנן (19:27); רה - רה (29:22); דוע - דוע (39:5); עשה - עשה (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 מ and the feminine demonstrative pronoun מ never occur. Totally absent too is the הירוג compaginis – very remarkably, in view of the relatively large number of participial forms. The נעלום compaginis likewise does not appear – again surprising since the frequently used cliche נעלום appears elsewhere as נעלום. 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: נחקק 34:13 is a genuine object, on which see Wright, Comparative Grammar p.141; ה거나 37:12 and ה거나 5:16, are fossilized accusatives used nominatively. On נחקק 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.
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