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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 (sect. regarding the Massorah).
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. Even Justus Olshausen, who generally showed a critical approach to the Massoretic Text, favorably regarded Job as being one of the better preserved texts. It was not until 1871 with the appearance of the metrical theories of Merx that this favorable view was challenged. From then on a general reaction set in among scholars who expressed a profound suspicion of the trustworthiness of our transmitted text and who proceeded

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


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 Masoretic text".\textsuperscript{10}

In the case of Job the versions provide peculiarly little support for the emendation of the MT.\textsuperscript{11} In short, the verdict of a recent writer\textsuperscript{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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 242. cf. H.M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint, its Use in Textual Criticism", \textit{BA}, IX, (1946), pp. 21 - 34.
\item \textsuperscript{12} D. Winton Thomas, \textit{The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language} (1939), p. 37.
\end{itemize}
have found, or have professed to find, affinities with
Arabic, Aramaic, Assyrian and Babylonian, Edomite, Egyptian, Mishnaic Hebrew and Sumerian. Some have
even gone so far as to maintain that our present work is

13. Alb. Schultens, Liber Jobi (1737), opened a new
epoch in Biblical studies by his philological approach,
explaining words largely on the basis of Arabic. He was
followed by J.J. Reiske, Conjecturae in Jobum et Proverbia
(Lips., 1779), and by Schnurrer, Animadversiones ad quaedam
loca Jobi (Tülb., 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;
K. 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
gyptiennes 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. H. Torczyner regards the book as an inexact translation from an original Aramaic, while F.H. Foster sees Arabic as the original.

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.

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. For his comment cf. Ibn Janah, Sefer ha – Shorashim ed. Bacher (Berlin, 1897), s.v. בֶּלַע

21. נ. ה. גונתרסן. סֵפֶר איוב. (תognito, תג), ר.ש. ידיעת ידיעת הזרע (הכובס, היפש)."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.

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

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

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

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

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

26. H.L. Ginsberg, JBL, 52 (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".

27. 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.

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. Wellhausen maintained that the poet borrowed from a folk-saga both the material and form for his own work. Duhm believed that the entire Prologue and Epilogue were excerpted from a "Volksbuch" and that these antedate the Dialogue. On the other hand, Kautzsch held that nothing more than the name of a righteous man called Job was borrowed from tradition.

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

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

1. See K. Kautzsch, Das Sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob (Leipzig, 1900), for the history of the problem.
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 *bägam*, but as a *sadig*, an epithet exactly fitting the picture in the Prologue, whereas Daniel alone is specifically mentioned by Ezekiel as being a *bägam*. 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.

8. Job 42:8,10.
the prophet refers to our Book of Job, but it does argue strongly for the existence of a common source to both.

The patriarchal setting of the story\(^9\) has long been noted but has generally been regarded as not being conclusive in determining the antiquity of the story. However, there is no satisfactory reason why the author should have invented such a 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) \(םנהי\) 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 42:13 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 \(גִּמְעָה\) (42:11), only elsewhere in Gen. 33:19 and Josh. 24:32.
(i) The Series of Misfortunes.

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

(ii) Formulaic Repetition.

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


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 Mšt.\textsuperscript{20}

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

The striking naming and describing of Job's three daughters as against the anonymity of the sons is in accord with the epic tradition. The Lady Ḥry 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 Yahalk

---


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 ymmt limm, an epithet of the goddess Anat. may represent the Ugaritic ast, "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. nt: III:9. Albright, BASOR, 70, p.19, n.6, suggests that the more usual epithet ymmt is dissimilated from ymmt; so Obermann, Ugaritic Mythology (1948), p.35.

29. UH, III, no. 1809.

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

"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."

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

From these passages and others it is clear that the Hebrew גוח 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.

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, יגרת מות בְּנֶפֶשׁ "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 2:3; 8:13; 10:8; 37:20 cf. 2 Sam. 10:19 where גוח 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 וַיַּעֲבֹר and emended accordingly. 37 The Targum rendered it וַיַּעֲבֹר "fourteen". All the other versions have "seven". Dhorme 38 explains the form as a dual in -ן to which has been attached the -ה 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 יָשָׂע (=2x7) et יָשָׂע ."
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 ḫelonym as "fourteen", must accordingly be rejected and the form otherwise explained.

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

wld šb·ny att itrḥ

"the wives I have wed have born seven"

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

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

39. Num. 27:8
40. 52:64
This unusual construction may well represent an archaic and original usage\(^{42}\) in which \(ןוֹבֵּן\) was a collective and abstract term meaning 'group of three', 'triad', and could still be used with either gender.\(^{43}\)

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

---

41. Job 1:4

42. Contra GKC, op. cit.

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>verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>בגדו</td>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>בגדו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:3</td>
<td>י。”</td>
<td>14:11</td>
<td>י.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:19</td>
<td>י’</td>
<td>19:8</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:16</td>
<td>י’</td>
<td>21:10</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:9</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>30:13</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:15</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>30:17</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:29</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>31:20</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:21</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>32:11</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:4</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>33:25</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:28</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>36:17</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:25</td>
<td>י”</td>
<td>38:17</td>
<td>י”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ibn Ezra acutely observed this situation:

(וֹלָהּ מַלֵּא חֲמָשָׁא בַּאֲוֶיָּבָא שְׁמוּאֵל אֶלֶף, יְאֹבָּא אלֶף)
2. Imperfect followed by simple Perfect

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

2. e.g. 3:10, 23, 25, 26; 5:3; 6:20; 7:5b; 8:4; 10:8; 16:12; 19:9; 24:2; 29:11, 14; 30:11, 19, 26; 31:5, 15; 32:6; 37:21.
But the presence of the Waw can in no sense be regarded as a necessary part of the construction in any way influencing the tense meaning. This is clear from the numerous examples cited above in which the perfect is followed by the simple imperfect, yet with past tense signification. Even more decisive is the use of a consecutive imperfect following a perfect as a frequentative or present tense, exactly as though it were punctuated as a conjunctive Waw.

7:6 יִכְכַּל נָעַר נַעַר 7:9 נְאַחַד נְאַחַד
7:20 שָׁנָה נְאַחַד 11:11 נְאַחַד נְאַחַד 4
12:18 נְאַחַד נְאַחַד 14:2 נְאַחַד נְאַחַד
15:27-28 בֶּקֶר נָעַשׁ נָעַשׁ 19:20 בֵּקֶר נָעַשׁ 7
20:15 בֵּקֶר נָעַשׁ 24:2 בֵּקֶר נָעַשׁ 8
so 24:11 בֵּקֶר נָעַשׁ 30:20 בֵּקֶר נָעַשׁ

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. יָד
5. cf. יָד v.26
6. cf. preceding and following simple imperfects.
7. cf. following simple imperfects.
8. cf.
9. cf. Driver, Tenses §30; GKC §111t.
10. Budde emends to "אֲנִי כִּי הָעָתָה בְּעַזְבִּי".

11. Dhorme maintains that the consecutive expresses Job's mood as a consequence of events summarized by "תָּנָה חֲתִלָה". However, elsewhere it seems to precede contingent assertions (3:13; 6:3; 7:21; 13:19; 14:16). Torcyner therefore, takes "כִּי הָעָתָה" as a condition with the apodosis and emends to conjunctive Waw. Perles, Analekten (Neue Folge), p.9, emends to "כִּי הָעָתָה" "denn sur Zeit, da es dich triift, ermmattest 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 "כִּי הָעָתָה" is found in I.Sam.2:16, following Q, which is to be preferred. v. Driver, Notes, ad loc; B. Jacob, ZAW, 18(1898), p.295-298, ignores both this instance in Job and that in I.Sam.2:16, in neither of which would his explanation of לְכַלְעָתָה = כִּי הָעָתָה fit in.

12. cf. preceding participles.

13. For a similar word play of מְרָאָה followed by לְאָה 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, נַעֲרָתָה , נַעֲרִיתָה

15. cf. אֶלֶּךָ , אֶלֹכָה

16. Gray-Driver, Dillmann, Bickell, Budde, Ehrlich, Kittel all emend both לְכַלְעָתָה and לְכַלְעָתָה 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 גוזה! G.R. Driver, Problems, p.68, takes יכחו = Acc. ֶּֽלַּֽשְׁלֻ, "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. יעק and v.27, יעק, Budde emends every consecutive Waw to a conjunctive.


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

23. Budde emends to תֻּבָּנָן.

24. cf. v.14, יָּרְבָּר, v.15, יָּרְבָּר 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 \textit{Waw} does not determine the tense. There is no difference in signification between the conjunctive and consecutive \textit{Waw}, a fact that has misled many of the commentators into emending the punctuation where the consecutive \textit{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.\footnote{Ps. 18 v. 7 \textit{ישנער} = II Sam. 22. \textit{יישנער}}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Ps. 18 v. 7 & \textit{ישנער} = II Sam. 22. \textit{יישנער} \\
12 & \textit{ירזת} = \textit{ירזת} \\
14 & \textit{יר 자유} = \textit{יר 자유} \\
16 & \textit{יָנֵא} = \textit{יָנֵא} \\
39 & \textit{יאָּחַץָּמ} = \textit{יאָּחַץָּמ} \\
44 & \textit{הַמְּנָעָר} = \textit{הַמְּנָעָר} \\
\end{tabular}

\footnote{25. Driver, \textit{ibid.}, explains \textit{יִרֵיעֵרָה} 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 נָתַן לאו יָתַשְׁפָּה; v.14 יָמְרוּ רָגְזוּ; v.15 יָמְרוּ רָגְזוּ

The insertion of consecutive Waw here would not in any way affect the tense meaning. In fact, in the earliest poetry the Waw is used most sparingly, showing that it is not the tense determinant.

In order to be able satisfactorily to explain the apparent irregularities of the sequences of the tense forms, the time aspects involved in their usage have to be considered. To avoid an incongruence of function with nomenclature, the traditional "perfect" and imperfect" is henceforth replaced by the morphologically descriptive qtl and yqt.

C. The preference for the Yqt

One of the major characteristics of the verbal system of the poetry is the use of the yqt as the regular and common verbal form. Its preference over the qtl 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

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

Gesenius\textsuperscript{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 יִנָּשׁ יִנָּשׁ Is. 51:2 הַטְּבוּי הַטְּבוּי The qatal can only be a pure preterite cf. Driver, Problems, p.95. It is impossible to see how, with GKC §107k, הַטְּבוּי can express an action "which from some point in the past is to be represented as future".

31. GKC,§2q-s.
vtl among the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry. Driver\textsuperscript{32} attempted to explain the phenomenon as being due to the livelier image which the \textit{vtl} form presents. He vigorously denies that the \textit{vtl} can ever stand for the \textit{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 \textit{qtl} and \textit{vtl} show that their functions are secondary. The \textit{vtl} 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 \textit{Waw}.

This situation is not restricted to Job but is characteristic of the earliest Hebrew poetry\textsuperscript{33} and is exactly paralleled in Canaanite poetry.\textsuperscript{34} The preference for the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{32} Tenses, §85.
\textsuperscript{33} See Cross & Freedman, \textit{op. cit.}
\end{flushleft}
vaytè therefore can only be regarded as a poetic archaism, a stylistic device developed in Job to its highest form of expression.

D. vaytè expressing past time

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

Examples of a past frequentative abound.
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 *vatl* 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 יָתַר הַיַּעַר so 15:7; 33:21 יָתְרָה הָעַרַיְתָּוָּו so 3:11 יָתַרַע הָעַרַיְתָּו 3:13 יָתַרְמַא! so 25 יָתַרְמַא יִרְשֵׁע 10:18 יָתַרְמַא יִרְשִׁיע

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 vqtl.

3:11 הָעַרְבּ֣וֹן נַעֲרָם וְאָשָׁוָ֨ן אֶמְתָּוָ֔ן
3:16 וְאָשָׁוָ֨ן אֶמְתָּוָ֔ן 10:18 הָעַרְבּ֣וֹן נַעֲרָם
10:19 וְאָשָׁוָ֨ן אֶמְתָּוָ֔ן

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

3:11 הָעַרְבּ֣וֹן נַעֲרָם וְאָשָׁוָ֨ן אֶמְתָּוָ֔ן
29:21 יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה
29:25 לָאֵֽלָה לָאֵֽלָה 30:26 לָאֵֽלָה לָאֵֽלָה
31:17 לָאֵֽלָה לָאֵֽלָה

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

36. Hitzig, Beer emend to יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה "which existed not". But the sentence would then lack a predicate. Wright, Budde omit יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה. Gratz, Torczyner emend יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה to יִרְשָׁ לָאֵֽלָה. LXX does not translate the phrase. The reading יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה is attested by the Targum יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה. Dhorme places the verse after v. 12 with יִרְשָׁ לָאֵֽלָה dependent on יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה. That the v. is connected with vv. 11-12 is undeniable. The preterite signification of יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה is also beyond doubt. A satisfactory solution to the difficulty could be obtained if we read יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה for יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה, the confusion arising out of an original abbreviation יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה, and construe יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה as the emphatic יָרְשֹׁ לָאֵֽלָה. 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,\(^39\) no less than twenty-five are drawn from Job which exhibits a higher percentage of these forms than any other book.\(^40\)

These forms are of three types:

1. with the Waw conjunctive.\(^41\)
2. with no conjunctive.\(^42\)

In both cases the jussives arise out of the vocalization.

3. The shortened form of the \(n^b\) verb.\(^43\)

---

38. For the question of \(y\text{at}l\) 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; 30:23; 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 commentators, 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

\[ \text{Waw} \ldots \text{Waw} \]

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\(^5\) 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\(^5\) not appearing once in Psalm 68 which is full of Ugaritic parallels.\(^5\)

Hitzig's theory, apart from being very doubtful in itself\(^5\) does not explain the examples with the conjunctive

---

52. *op.cit.*, note 28.


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-Leander58 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 הָעָלַי with Ps.18:14 הָעָלַי and many other examples cited by Cross & Freedman, op.cit.

58. HG p.274L citing Gen.49:17 הָעָלַי; Deut. 28:21 הָעָלַי; 32:18 לָעָלַי; Ps. 11:6 לָעָלַי.
precisely the usage in Ugaritic where the jussive with or without Waw may even indicate past time,\textsuperscript{59} there seems not to be the slightest doubt that a similar situation obtains in Biblical Hebrew poetry.

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

F. The Tense Sequence in Verb Repetition.

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

\begin{verbatim}
8:3 בוש...ירדה
13:7 תבד...תבדות
27:16-17 ב...ב
37:4-5 ירעו...יפור
41:16 א"ל...אלים
\end{verbatim}

In these cases it has been usual to regard the

\textsuperscript{60} Problems, p.10.
text as corrupt. 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.

\[\text{e.g. } \text{vsg/ksp yšl/h brs vsg ksp/lalpm brs vsg/m irbbt/vas hym wtbth}^63\]

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

\[\text{špq ilm krn y[n] špq ilht bprt [yn]}^64\]

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

špq is repeated no less than eight times.

---

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

\[\text{LXX } \\ \text{Vulg. supplantat } ... \text{ subvertit} \\ \text{Targ. (a) bντ } (b) \text{ βυτόν}\]

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 \( \text{νυ} \) - viz. \( \text{νυ, νη, νη, νη} \).

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

\( \text{νυνυ, νυνυ, νυνυ, νυνυ} \) v.3a is confirmed by 34:12. Targum to 3a renders \( \text{νυνυ} \) by \( \text{βυτόν} \) but in 34:12 the same word is rendered \( \text{βυτόν} \).

Moreover, an examination of the Targum renderings to \( \text{νυνυ} \) shows wide variety. - Job 15:6, 24:12, 34:12, Ps. 119:78, 146:9, Amos 8:5. 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. 51:1:26-30
64. 51:VI:47-54
65. 2 Aqht:V:31-33.
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. 
2. 15. 

The difficulty of finding the subject of \( \text{הוֹרֶה} \) and \( \text{הוֹרֶה} \) has given way to various emendations and much forced exegesis. 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".

1. For details, see Gray & Driver, op.cit., ad loc.
2. The other versions give no help. LXX has simply \( \text{πρῶτος ἄγκως} \), Theod. & Symm. translated the phrase as \( \text{πρῶτος ἄγκως} \), Vulg. has \text{primogenita mors}. 
The mention of יִכְלָה בִּקְלָה (v.14) confirms a literal rendering for בִּקְלָה בִּקְלָה, 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 בִּקְלָה has acquired a specialized personified meaning analogous to its usage as a proper name in the Ugaritic epics.\(^3\) Specific mention of Môt's first-born has not yet turned up, but reference may be made to Ugaritic Text 49:VI:7-9, which speaks of the "seven sons of the god Môt". Moreover, in Mesopotamian mythology Namtar, the god of pestilence, is the first-born and grim messenger of Ereshkigal, mistress of the netherworld.\(^4\) Môt too is king of the netherworld and it would be quite in keeping with the Near Eastern motif for his first born son too, to be his grim messenger.

The use of the verb בָּשָׁא 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:

*bklat ydy ilhm* ...
"with both my hands I shall devour" ...

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

מְדַנֵּא 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 מְדַנֵּא is an epithet for the netherworld is clear from Ezek. 26:20-21 where it is used synonymously with יָד and נִתְנָה and antithetically

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


7. UH, I, 8:20.
with מֵתוֹן מַלְכוּת. 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 מֵתוֹן מַלְכוּת. This, indeed, was recognized by Duham and Gray who, however, emended the verb to מֵתוֹן מַלְכוּת, 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 מֵתוֹן may be compared several instances of its employment in a figure of destruction:

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

Thus מֵתוֹן is a figure of destruction and the architect of the destruction, or the subject of מֵתוֹן would, ...

8. cf. also Ezek.27:36; 28:19.
9. e.g. 51:VIII:7-14; 67:II:14-16.
10. cf. BH ad loc.
most consistently with the mythological picture, be Môt's first-born, in the same way that Namtar, his Mesopotamian counterpart, is the agent of pestilence and destruction. The Idea is that the entire household disintegrates with the death of the wicked master.

\[\text{םָלָחִית} \text{, on the analogy of } 39:16 \text{, requires no emendation, the phrase meaning } "\text{without him"}, \text{ i.e. he, the owner, being gone.} \]

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

\[\text{בַּכָּרָו מִזְאָה} \text{ is to be taken literally and is the subject of } \text{בַּכָּרָו מִזְאָה}. \text{ We have here two examples of a } \text{ת- preformative referring to a masculine antecedent in 3rd. s.} \]

3. 20:9 \[\text{וַּיְזַיְז בַּכָּרָו לֵא בִּטְחּוֹ} \text{. This construction is unique.} \]

11. Here too, BH emends to \[\text{שָׂנַע} \text{.} \]

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

13. Gen.18:24 \[\text{iyor} \text{ refers, not to } \text{עַלְיוֹנָּה} \text{ but to } \text{לָיָּלָה.} \text{ In II Sam.17:12 \[\text{יָהָּן} \text{ has been corrected by Q.} \]
patibility of the undoubtedly masculine מַכְוָא with a verb in the feminine has either led to the emendation of the verb to מַכְוָא or been explained by taking מַכְוָא as the object of the verb with עָלָה in 9a as the subject.

Against this is the pronominal suffix of מַכְוָא which, as in the parallel מַכְוָא and מַכְוָא, must refer to the wicked. This is the tradition of Theodotion and the Vulgate and is supported by the equivalent מַכְוָא (7:10 = Ps.101:5). Accordingly, מַכְוָא must be the subject of מַכְוָא. In fact, were it not for the feminine form of the verb none would question the predicate-subject construction. We are thus faced with another instance of a t- preformative with a masculine connotation in the 3rd s.

4. 22:29 כִּי מָשָׁפֵיוֹ הָאָמָרָהּ גַּאֲה עֲרֻנִים יְשִׁיעָם

The two clauses are obviously intended to be parallel. The second clause is perfectly clear: He (God) saves the lowly. מְשַׁפֵּיוֹ, while a hapax legomenon, is the opposite of מְשַׁפֵּי עֲרֻנִים. מְשַׁפֵּי is derived from מָשָׁה, "to
be humble, abased". It is used in the same sense in 9:13. Significantly, it is found together with הָעִשֵּׂי in Isa.25:12; 26:5. It may therefore be safely assumed that הָעִשֵּׂי in clause 'a' corresponds in meaning to הָעִשֵּׂי 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". 19 is a contraction of הָעִשֵּׂי "pride", 19 which is by no means always used in a bad sense. 20

Whether הָעִשֵּׂי be taken in the sense of "proclaim" or, with Torczyner, as the Acc., amâru, "to be high", "exalted", the clause is parallel to הָעִשֵּׂי 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) הָעִשֵּׂי. The use of הָעִשֵּׂי with הָעִשֵּׂי, 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. 6:2 1 אָשֶׁר .


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, יָדָה is parallel to יִשָּׂרָאֵל 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

Since יָדָה is frequently used in place of יִשָּׂרָאֵל in Job, and since יִשָּׂרָאֵל would be more natural in the context, יִשָּׂרָאֵל 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

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

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

It would thus be tempting to explain יָּרְאָה too, as a
3rd. m.s. and so obviate the incongruence of 2nd person
with רָאָה. However, the impossible והָּאִית 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 ת- in Job, we now
turn to the cognate languages where, as a matter of fact,
the same phenomenon can be found in Phoenician and the
Canaanite glosses of the Armarna tablets.

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

line 10  יִבְּשָׂא אֵלָא תָּיָהָה יָּרְאָה יִבְּשָׂא יָּרְאָה

Now it is true that יִבְּשָׂא might be a feminine noun as in
Ugaritic,23 but there is no evidence for יָּרְאָה as other than
masculine. We have here a case of ת- 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. תיראָ "he loves", תירב


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

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

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

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

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

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 (1943), 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.\textsuperscript{29} 

Job 19:15 מַעֲסֶהָהּ may be another such example.\textsuperscript{30} Most scholars re-arrange vv. 14-15 so that מַעֲסֶהָהּ is attached to the previous verb. While this has the merit of improving the metrical arrangement, it is not without objection:

1. 이ִשָּׁחְשָׁהָל goes better with מַעֲסֶהָהּ.
2. מַעֲשַׁהְוּ is more appropriate to מַעֲשֶׂהָ than to מַעֲשֶׂהָה הָלִיבִיתָן
3. irregular metrical division is fairly common\textsuperscript{31}.
4. the m. suffix of בּוּשָׁהַמָּה, while not entirely anomalous,\textsuperscript{32} goes better with מַעֲשֶׂהָ than to the previous verse.\textsuperscript{33}
5. The form מַעֲשֶׂהָ still remains morphologically difficult even if it refers to מַעֲשֶׂהָה הָלִיבִיתָן alone. Accordingly, it would be best to leave the text as it is and to explain מַעֲשֶׂהָה הָלִיבִיתָן as a Canaanism, an instance of **t**- 3rd m.pl. imperfect form.

change of prefix **v-t-** on the basis of the idiomatic use of the 3rd. f.s. indicative *taqtilu* with a plural subject. For another explanation, see that of Dhomme 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: מַעֲשֶׂהָה הָלִיבִיתָן

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


32. GKC §135 o.

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

The usual perfect Qal form of בָּרֹא in the 2nd m.s. is בָּרַת. Job, however, in one instance, has the unusual form בָּרָד (33:13). Ebeling\textsuperscript{34} has pointed out that this corresponds to the well-attested Qatlāti\textsuperscript{35} perfect form, used side by side with the Qataltī form in the Canaanite glosses to the Amarna tablets. Accordingly, בָּרָד is to be classified as a Canaanism.


\textsuperscript{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 בָּרֵד 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 בָּרֵד, Jer. 8:18 יָבוֹא, for the vowel of which cf. Acc. belēta; 10:17 bō'veš k; 15:10 = בָּרֵד; 22:23 יָבוֹא k; 51:13 = בָּרֵד k. All these cases may be explained as having the verbal suffixes attached to the nominal (participle) form just as in the Accadian status indeterminatus.
III The Relative Pronoun •

The relative pronoun • occurs but once, in k. • (Q •) 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 • to •. This, however, is highly objectionable, for while the omission of the relative pronoun is frequent in Job nowhere is • used in the direct object of the verb. On the analogy of 11:18 a preceding • would be required. No-one familiar with Biblical Hebrew idiom could tolerate a construction ...

The use of the relative • 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 •. The vocalization • is that

1. Minhath Shai, ad loc.
2. Budde, Klostermann, BH, Gray-Driver.
of the proto-Semitic *sa* which is the regular form of the Canaanite relative pronoun as found in the Amarna letters.\(^6\)

As a matter of fact the latter yields a construction identical with that of Job in the use of *sa* in the sense of "that" after the verb *idu*.\(^7\)

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. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ירח לילה</th>
<th>5:22 but</th>
<th>ירח לילה</th>
<th>14:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מיתר לילה</td>
<td>5:25</td>
<td>מיתר לילה</td>
<td>24:4,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נשבר לילה</td>
<td>12:24</td>
<td>נשבר לילה</td>
<td>35:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קצונה לילה</td>
<td>28:24</td>
<td>קצונה לילה</td>
<td>37:3,38:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ירח לילה</th>
<th>12:8 but</th>
<th>עם חי</th>
<th>6:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>רVertexArray</td>
<td>36:30</td>
<td>עם חי</td>
<td>9:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ראשו המים</td>
<td>36:50</td>
<td>עם חי</td>
<td>38:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אלהים</th>
<th>11:8 but</th>
<th>יעל האמה</th>
<th>12:7,22:21,35:11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>באב</td>
<td>22:12</td>
<td>באב</td>
<td>22:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ורחל</td>
<td>22:14</td>
<td>ורחל</td>
<td>26:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צדמק</td>
<td>38:29</td>
<td>צדמק</td>
<td>38:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צדמק</td>
<td>38:33</td>
<td>צדמק</td>
<td>38:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:
   הֲלֹא consistently without the article
   הֲלֹא 4:13
   הֲלֹא 20:8; 33:15
   הֲלֹא 34:20

   Yet in 3:3, the undefined הנ is parallel to הֲלֹא.
   We find מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 30:8; מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 37:9, but מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 30:5.

b) The poetic preposition usually goes with an undefined noun:
   מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 12:22; מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 41:11; מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 18:17, 3 but מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ 31:7 occurs. with the exception of the cliché מַמְלָת הָאָרֶץ, is always undefined.

c) The particle הבו too, never takes the article,
   Yet we find the combination הבו 28:24; 37:3; 41:3.

d) The interrogative הבו 53:19, 24 takes the article but not הבו 38:2; 42:3 or הבו 4:7.

e) We find הבו 38:29 and הבו 6:16; 37:10; הבו 28:12, 20, otherwise always simply הבו.

Finally, comparison between Job and other books is instructive.

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

3. so הבו 16:16; הבו 33:30.
4. cf. Ps. 25:12 הבו.
On the other hand, Isaiah 40:12, but not Job 28:13, but not Jer. 20:14

How is this erraticism in the use of the article to be explained? König maintains that in two parallel clauses, the presence of the article in the first clause also determines thereby the second. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28:12</td>
<td>±20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7. Among the examples he cites is Job 5:10.
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 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 `אלהים, v.23 `אלהים, v.14:24 `אלהים, but v.30 `אלהים; v.19 פסח, v.22 פסח, v.23 פסח.

Ecclesiastes too, shows the same inconsistent insertion of the article: - 2:8 `אלים, פסח; 10:20 `אלים, פסח; 12:6 `מדבר, וסיפת, 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 Dahood10 has effectively demonstrated


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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yūmlk} & \quad \text{line 4, } \text{yūmlk} \\
\text{Sidon, Tabnith} & \quad \text{3, } \text{Sidon, Tabnith} \\
\text{Eshmunazar} & \quad \text{9, } \text{Eshmunazar}
\end{align*}
\]

The evidence would seem to decide in favor of the variability in the use of the article as a genuine feature of the language of Job and against the assumption of late editorial addition. Rather is it to be considered another proof of its archaic character and a point of contact with Phoenician and Northern Hebrew.

C. Omission of the Article with the Nota Accusativi

Three times in Job the *nota accusativi* 잧 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.\(^{12}\)

b) that every nota accusativi must be followed by the definite article.\(^{13}\)

a) The nota accusativi in Job

The restricted use of \(\text{נָּא} \) is characteristic of Hebrew poetry in general\(^ {14}\) and of Job in particular\(^ {15}\). However, the particle is to be found several times with suffixes\(^ {16}\) and even with a noun as the direct accusative of a verb.\(^ {17}\)

---


13. Ibid. p. 176, Gray-Driver, op. cit., II, p. 86: "\(\text{נָּא} \) before an indetern. noun is very anomalous".

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

15. Ibid. p. 140, Wilson points out that Job proportionately uses \(\text{נָּא} \) less than any other Biblical book, with the exception of Lamentations, Proverbs and Nahum.

16. וּנְאֵי 14:5; זְמַנִי 13:9,10,11; 27:5;11; cf. on 19:4, 14:5.

17. 7:21 הָאָמֵר הָאָדָם 26:4; יִתְנַבֶּהּ הָאָדָם cf. 32:6 וּזְמַנִי 35:4; זְמַנִי הָאָדָם; cf. 23:23 הָאָדָם.
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\(^{18}\) 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, 12:14, Eccles. 7:7, etc.

This looseness in the combination or omission of the article with \(יְהָֽוָה\) 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.\(^{19}\)

\(^{18}\) Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 214


\(^{20}\) וַיִּקְדֵּשׁ יְהוָֽה ֶ֑כֶּלָּֽם

\(^{21}\) דָּבָר יָבֹעָֽהֲנָה ֖שָׁמְ

\(^{21}\) יָסָמְךָ יָפֹתָה ֖מָשָׁבָה

\(^{21}\) יָסָמְךָ יָפֹתָה ֖מָשָׁבָה
All the afore-going evidence points to the following conclusions: the use of אָּנָּה with a noun in Job is attested firmly; the omission of the article after אָּנָּה 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.

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

Isa. 49:21 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
Ezek. 4:5 נִיאָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
Prov. 22:23 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
II Chron. 32:14 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
cf. Zech. 2:1 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה

In Job itself it is found three times:

7:21 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
26:4 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
28:23 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה אָּנָּה

22. so Gray-Driver, Beer, Budde, Duhm, Kittel.
23. cf. Prov. 23:11 אָּנָּה אָּנָּה
Accordingly, there can be no objection to the presence of מֵאֶ֣דֶן and since, as has been shown, the omission of a following article occasions no difficulty, the emendation to מֵאֶ֣דֶן is entirely unnecessary.

2. 36:7 וְאָמַּ֥ר הַגּוֹמְלָ֣ה לְאֶֽזְרַבָּֽעַ לְמַמְשָׁלָּ֥הוּ

The exegetical difficulty occasioned by the inappropriate mention of מֵאֶ֣דֶן is independent of the syntactical problems of the sentence, which alone engage our attention. Duhm’s suggested emendation to מֵאֶ֣דֶן in no wise improves the text. Perles proposed the reading מֵאֶ֣דֶן. However the Targum and Theod., testify to the antiquity of MT מֵאֶ֣דֶן. It has already been shown that there can be no objections as such to the combination מֵאֶ֣דֶן.

It remains to point out that מֵאֶ֣דֶן 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:

I Kings 15:13
II Kings 16:14
Isa. 57:12

24. cf. the remarks of Dhorme, *ad loc.*
26. *GCK* §111h.
Thus, in Job 36:7, as in the previously cited case, the emendation יַיִּשָּׁא is unnecessary.

3. 41:26 הָאָדָם הָעַמָּה
It is common to emend יַיִּשָּׁא to לָיִּשָּׁא and הָעַמָּה to לָעַמָּה.
The MT however, is supported by 40:11,27 12א הָאָדָם הָעַמָּה.
We have here another instance of יַיִּשָּׁא 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, יִּבְרָה

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 ו 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. בִּיְמֹּן, אָנוֹן, אָבָא, בִּלַּיְתָא, וּעֲלָה, בְּרָשַׁת, עֵדֶּנַּת, מְמִית, מְמוּז.

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

   רְחֹא 33:23
   הָאָב 13:8; הָאָב 13:7
   יָבֵן 20:16; יָבֵן 30:15
   יָבּוֹ 10:19; יָבּוֹ 21:32

1. cf. GKC, 5126n, 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. Konig's phonetic theory was criticized by

2. Syntax, §292n, note 1.
Lambert 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 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 gametz. It is probable that there was a transition period in the shift from ꞏ in which both forms existed side by side. Poetry, in its tendency to use archaism, may well have frequently preserved the older pronunciation of the prepositions with patah.

3. REJ, 37, p.209 note 2.
4. Ibid. p.208, cf. EDB, 208b.
B. The Preposition "from"

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

^5 Gordon, UH,10:1, p.81ff. ח 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. ח; 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 ה "from" is not attested in Phoenician, is not to be taken too literally in view of such forms as לכו and the suffixed לכו.

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

^8 cf. Gordon, op.cit., J. Reider, JJS, III (1952), p.78; Cross & Freedman, JB, LXXII (1955), pp.17, 24, n. 20, 25, n.35, 26 n. 42; S. R. Driver, Notes on... Samuel (2nd. ed.1913) p.LXVII, cites a variety of instances of "orthographic confusion" of the prepositions ה and ה between MT and LXX. Many such can now be explained on the basis of MT ה = "From". The same applies to several of the examples cited by Fried. Delitzsch, Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament (1920), pp.115f. For a case in Biblical Aramaic cf. ה ו Ven Dan. 5:2, 3. It is interesting to note that Ibn Janah, Sefer Harikmah 35, 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. (אֱלֹהִים מַעְרָר כּוֹנָה) in the sense of "from".

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

For cf. Ps. 17:14 Govmo יָרֵא וְלָעֵזל לָעֲדוּ לִשְׁמָו.

Job 22:20. יָרֵא וְלָעֵזל לָעֲדוּ לִשְׁמָו

Fried. Delitzsch,10 even before the days of Ugaritic studies, pointed out that the preposition here is equivalent to the Accad. ina = "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 הב after הב always indicates the agent.11 Following the LXX most moderns emend

9. e.g. 49:VI:27 = 129:17; cf. Job 19:10 Hiph. יָרֵא וְלָעֵזל לָעֲדוּ לִשְׁמָו.


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 is provided by 3 'Aqht: rev. 14:

"...and may he save thee from the hand of 'Anat".

3. 5:21 

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

4. 7:13

This verse affords an excellent example of the interchange of the functions of the prepositions and .

5. 20:20

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, takes , 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. לֶבֶן 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 לֶבֶן here with 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, הבשׁ בדָבָר, הבשׁ בדָבָר. It is simplest to take הבשׁ 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 לֶבֶן בָּאָן אֲחַל
The phrase לֶבֶן is equivalent to לֶבֶן. The phrase לֶבֶן is equivalent to לֶבֶן.

7. 35:16, 36:12 לֶבֶן
לֶבֶן is equivalent to לֶבֶן

14. Ps. 33:17 לֶבֶן תָּחַצַּה לֶבֶן in which the ב is instrument. Amos 2:15a is not really a case in point since לֶבֶן 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 after ב, cf. Exod. 12:43, 44, 45 ב ב with Lev. 7:21 ב ב.
That הָלַךְ here means "from", may be shown by such parallel phrases as:

Prov. 11:8
Ps. 116:8

C. The Preposition ה = "from"

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

1. 8:8

It is possible to treat the preposition as ה רֶחֶי and translate, "concerning the former generation". Such a construction however, is precluded by v. 10. which shows that asking for information from some-one is presupposed. The usual idiom for this is יָדַע, but the use of ה with the same function is not unknown elsewhere. With this vestigial use of Canaanite ה cf. the phrase ה יִזְכָּר, Judg. 20:13; I Sam. 28:6; 30:8.

2. 12:6


17. e.g. II Kings 8:6. Both functions of ה are to be found in I Sam. 30:21. Our phrase ה יָדַע in 8:8 is thus to be compared not with Deut. 4:32, but rather with Deut. 32:7.
The preposition in each clause has generally been taken as expressing the periphrastic genitive\(^1\). Such an interpretation is unwarranted. In the first place, robbers do not usually possess tents but ravage those of others\(^2\). Secondly, the reference here is to the state of the righteous, not of the wicked\(^3\). 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 אָבְנָה, אֵלָה in 11:18 and of עָבְנָה in 12:6. הָאָבִּים v.7, shows that what follows is meant to contradict the preceding. Understanding the passage in this manner, the repeated preposition נַעַר means "from":

---

18. GKC. §129 a-f.

19. cf. Jer.4:20. הָאָבִּים

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

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

4. 20:26

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

The dictionaries 22 take the ב 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 מָשָׂל. Nowhere is the interchange of functions of מָשָׂל, מָשָׂל, מָשָׂל, better illustrated than in the equation מָשָׂל = מָשָׂל.

D. The Combination of Prepositions.

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

This phenomenon may be recognized in several passages in Job.

1. 36:3; 39:29 מְלֹא-ָפֶד
2. 5:5 מְלֹא-ָפֶד

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 הָבָר with יִדְוִ. Since however, הָבָר and יִדְוִ are interchangeable, the combination should not be inherently impossible. As a matter of fact, it is actually to be found in:

Lev. 16:15 הָבָר מֶשָּׁה לְדוֹרִים
II Kings 11:15 (= II Chron. 23:14) מֶשָּׁה לְדוֹרִים

However, the phrase מֶשָּׁה לְדוֹרִים is perfectly intelligible. If הָבָר 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 מִשְׁמַר

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

²⁵ GKC. § 55b, c.
We have here a description of the ineluctable fate of the wicked. This word is parallel to בַּלָּה, but so far, has defied all the efforts of the lexicographers to find a satisfactory etymology within the context. The various emendations suggested - בַּלָּהוֹת 26, בַּלָּהוֹת 27, בַּלָּהוֹת 28, בַּלָּהוֹת 29, בַּלָּהוֹת 30, are either too difficult to explain as the original of בַּלָּהוֹת, or do not suit the context. On the critical principle, 'lectio difficilior praeferenda est', it is best to treat בַּלָּהוֹת as בַּלָּהוֹת i.e. as a combination of prepositions with the noun בִּלּוּחַ, 31 "heat", "anger", equivalent to בָּלֵם and synonymous with בִּלּוּחַ. For its use in Job, cf. 6:17 בִּלּוּחַ. In Ugaritic literature, in a not dissimilar context in which a curse is put on the land, we find the same word בִּלּוּחַ with the same denominative verb בִּלּוּחַ used in the parallel clause:

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

The contrast of מִיְּנָע with מוֹטֶנִים 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 מִיְּנָע מִיְּנָע מִיְּנָע while Dhorme prefers מִיְּנָע מִיְּנָע מִיְּנָע .

The original reading may well have been מִיְּנָע מִיְּנָע מִיְּנָע 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 Casanowicz and Smith. 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. I. Eitan, in an exhaustive study, showed that since it appears in the MT as א, it was often mistaken for the negative particle. 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 אֵלֶּה הַאֲשֶׁר אֵין אָדָה

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 א and א, cf. e.g. LXX to Ps. 55:13; Job 9:33.
The difficulty of the negative particle has been universally felt and variously treated. Gray-Driver render: "I had not been", meaning I would have had no existence at all. Tur-Sinai\textsuperscript{13} likewise interprets the last two words as equivalent to \( \textit{נרי נל} 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 \( \textit{נרי נל} \), but the without sentence is then / a predicate. Wright and Budde merely omit \( \textit{נל} \). It is simplest to take \( \textit{נל} \) as the emphatic, and translate:

"I would indeed have been".

2. 9:35 \( \textit{נלי נל} \)

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. \( \textit{נלי נל} \). If \( \textit{נל} \) be recognized as the emphatic, the difficulty disappears and we have the

\[ \textit{נלי נל} \]


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

"I am certainly correct".

3. 21:16 יִדְחֶת אֶלֶף לֹא בִּלְבָּד

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

4. 27:19 יִשְׁרֵי רוֹפֵא וְלֹא יִקָּח

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

14. e.g. Jer. 8:2.
VII THE ENCLITIC -m.

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

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 .

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

1. For a case in Phoenician see CIS. 119.2

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

3. For an example in Accad. cf. Mari Tablets, III:8:16-17 su-ta-as-bu-tum-ma uš-ta-ša-ab-ba-at, "I caused to be undertaken." Similarly, in Ugaritic, 75:1:38, b'î ḫəmd ūḫâm "Baal verily covets."


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

The imbalance of the parallelism is obvious. The sequence מנהל תוחם חותם is extraordinary. Syr., Targ., and Vulg., all omit the preposition and read מנהל חותם חותם, "from the sword of their mouth", figurative for calumny. However, this root is nowhere else used of persons and would be an unlikely parallel to מנהל חותם חותם.

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 מנהל חותם חותם is the enclitic מ to be attached to the preceding word to read מנהל חותם חותם. חותם is the object of חותם חותם and the Waw of חותם is epexegetical. The meaning is that God protects the needy from slanderous

---

JJS, III (1952), 78-79; HUCA, XXIV (1952-53), p. 97. Another example is most likely to be found in Judg. 5:13 מנהל חותם חותם. But these probably represent scribal attempts at removing the difficulty.

8. For the connexion of "sword" with "mouth", cf. Ps. 57:5 צאר חותם חותם; 59:3 מנהל חותם חותם; 64:4 מנהל חותם חותם.

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 מְשַׁלֵּב to מָשַׁל "... death rather than my pains". If however, the preposition be taken as the enclitic of the preceding (מְשַׁל) the perfect balance of the two parallel clauses is restored. מְשַׁל becomes the object of מְשַׁל. The correct translation is then: "So that my soul (= I) chooseth strangulation, my bones (= I) death". 10

3. 8:8

The possessive suffix with מְשַׁל 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 מ. 11

The translation is:

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

10. For the combination מְשַׁל // מְשַׁל cf. Ps.6:3-4; 35:9-10; Prov.16:24. cf. also Isa.66:14 מְשַׁל // מְשַׁל; Prov.15:30 מְשַׁל.

11. cf. Torczyner, ad loc.
4. 3:18 

As the text stands the subject of 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 . If this be taken as the enclitic belonging to the preceding the difficulty disappears. is the subject of both verbs and the translation is:

"If his place devour him and then deny him (saying), 'I have not seen thee.'" 12

5. 15:18

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

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

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

13. i.e. litotes for, "their father plainly declared".
The crux here is the word ירח. Elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew it is found only in the combination ירח ו- (I Sam. 4:21), usually taken as the negative, common in post-Biblical Hebrew and in Phoenician and Ethiopic. However, the etymology of ירח is very doubtful. ירח as a negative in our passage, although attested by the LXX ירח ו- and the Targ. ירח ו- 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 (ותלדא) can escape is to vitiate the force of Eliphaz' entire argument. Moreover, v.30 is obviously intended to be parallel to v.29 ירח ו- ירח ו- ירח ו-. 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 ירח, 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 as the subject of the sentence, i.e. "the innocent deliver a land".

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

In Accadian, we find (masc.), (fem): "ilu ayyumā" "some god or other" "arru(m) ayyumā" "some king or other"

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

Similarly in Arabic we find, "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 'ayah⁷, "O what a brother", as well as in the indefinite,

\[
\text{ibm. blhm 'ay wəty bhm wn 'ay}^8
\]

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

With this latter should be compared the almost identical phrase in Prov.31:4 (Kthib ¹)

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 \( \text{ibm 'ay} \) in a phrase identical with the Ugaritic ibm 'ay in 15:23 \( \text{blhm hlm} \) which should be translated: "he wanders about for some food", i.e. for anything at all to eat.⁹

---

4. A. Ungnad, Grammatik des Akkadischen, §15d.
5. W. Von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, §48b, §49b.
9. This identification was tentatively put forward by H.L. Ginsberg, Kithbei Ugarith, p.73.
The final נ may be due to a scribal misunderstanding and hence expansion of the original particle ק to ק or may well represent an original final vowel as in the Arabic 'ayy. We may now proceed to a consideration of the crux 22:30 מֵלָּה לְזָכָר יָּדָה in which we should recognize, not the meaningless negative, but the indefinite particle, reading: מֵלָּה יָּדָה and translating:

"He delivers whomsoever is innocent".

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

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

\[ \text{st alp qdmh mp(1)a wtk pn} \]

"An ox was placed before her, a fatling right in her face".

so also text 52:51:

\[ \text{bm n} \text{w} \text{hr} \]

"together with kissing there is conception".

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

II Sam.13:20 ... [Name]

"And Tamar remained desolate ..."

II Sam.15:54 [Name]

"Your father's servant I was previously, but now I am your servant."

Hos.8:6 [Name]

"Surely it is (only a product) of Israel".

Amos 3:11 [Name]

"An enemy is around the land".

Amos 4:10 [Name]

"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 jw "to be", which he regards as the base of the Waw consective as well as of this "pleonastic" Waw. 2

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

1. 4:6 ___________ "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 _______ to two persons. The suggestion of Gesenius, 4 followed by Budde and Dhomme, to take _______ 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 מֹּנֶה as the predicate and וָהֵן in the sense of "to be". The emendation of Gratz יָדָּה is open to the same objection. If we recognize the Waw as having the function of the verb "to be", the syntactical difficulty disappears. מְדִיבָּר יָדָּה becomes the predicate of הָבי, yielding the excellent sense, "there the small becomes (as) the great, and the slave is free from his master". 5

3. 20:2

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

4. 26:5

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

5. D. Yellin, (1927), sensed this meaning but proposed the deletion of the Waw.
It is here proposed to read דִּמְעַר, from a noun דָּמָא, "dwelling-place", found in Deut. 12:5 דֵּעַר and now confirmed by the Genizah Ben Sira 14:25 where דָּמָא is synonymous with דָּמָא. As another example of "pleonastic" Waw the rendering is: "The shades tremble, whose dwelling-place is beneath the waters", or, "The shades tremble; Their etc."

In several Ugaritic passages the rpim are mentioned in parallelism with ylim which in one text are said to reside "two layers beneath the springs of the earth..." (tbt ım ım). The mention of ylim in our Job passage in reference to לַמָּאִים may well be connected with this notion.

All the above-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 יזרעלאי ו <$\text{אוגר}^2$>

It has been usual to accept the Greek reading as superior to the Hebrew. However, both יזרעלאי and <$\text{אוגר}^2$> are frequently used as adverbs determining verbs of destruction.

II Sam. 14:16  יזרעלאי יזרעלאי
Ps. 49:11  יזרעלאי יזרעלאי
Ps. 74:8  יזרעלאי יזרעלאי
Isa. 27:4  יזרעלאי יזרעלאי

Zech. 12:6  <$\text{אוגר}^2$>
Ps. 97:3  <$\text{אוגר}^2$>
Job 19:10  <$\text{אוגר}^2$>
Lam. 2:3  <$\text{אוגר}^2$>

In some of the cases it is clear that יזרעלאי and <$\text{אוגר}^2$> may be used interchangeably. The combination of the two adverbs in our passages conveys the idea of intensity.

Taking the Waw of <$\text{אוגר}^2$> as "pleonastic", we get the excellent translation:

"Thou wouldst utterly destroy me".

6. 15:17 יזרעלאי יזרעלאי

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 'v'ןחא as the object. This fits in better with the two clauses of v.11 and the parallel clause in v.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 ּה , is used
22 times in Job, it being confined elsewhere in poetry
mainly to Deutero-Isaiah. The predominence of the shorter
form may be explained as a Canaanism or at least an
archaism, for Ugaritic has ּה, Phoenician attests ּה instead of Hebrew ּה, pointing to an original ּה, and
the 8th cent. archaising Zenjirli dialect has ּה.

1. v. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p.467
2. v. BDB, p.243c; cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit., for other
correspondences between Job and Deutero-Isaiah.
3. For the origin of the particle ּה, v.1.Eitan,
AJSL, XLV (1928), p.142.
4. UH, 12:7.
5. Friedrich, op.cit., §259.
6. Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p.161, lines
30,31.
XI THE NEGATIVE WITH \( \text{v} \)

The combination \( \text{v} \cdot \times \) (9:33) is unique. LXX and Pesh. read \( \times^{b} = \frac{1}{2} \), 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 \( \text{v} \cdot \times \) thus fits the context better. It is also supported by the assonance with \( \text{v} \cdot \times \) 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 diffused and variegated negation of \( \text{v} \). In Accadian we find \( \text{lásšū} = \text{lā-šū} \) as well as \( \text{ul ōšū} \); Arabic has \( \text{usší} = \text{y} \) with the

---

2. So Gray-Driver and Dhouette.
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 \(\text{נַטְטִי = נַטְטִי + 3 f.s. suffix}\). The Biblical Aramaic \(\text{נַטְטִי (Dn. 2:11)}\) and the later Aramaic \(\text{נַטְטִי = נַטְטִי \text{תִּתְתִי}}\) is certainly an analogic formation, whatever the etymology.

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

---

3. Ungnad, Grammatik, §55; Von Soden, Grundrisse, §111a.
4. Wright, Arabic Grammar, 1,96c, Rem.a.
7. v. Eitan, op.cit., p.188, who doubts the etymological identity of Aramaic \(\text{נַטְטִי}\) with Hebrew \(\text{נַטְטִי}\).
8. אֲרֵי, (2nd ed.) p.369.
has a significant parallel to \( \text{יְכָּנַּה} \) in the form of 
\( \text{יְכָּנַּה} \) (Ps. 135:17).

In short, the evidence points to the conclusion that our \( \text{יְכָּנַּה} \) 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:

line 17-18  סִבּוֹת עָבוֹדַת בּוֹאֵל
"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 istm "a fire, two fires".

2. two-three
   
   33:29  וְהָעָבֻּדָּה בּוֹאֵל is paralleled by
   
   "Baal hates two sacrifices, three the Rider of the Clouds"

1. see above 14f.
2. 137:32
"two stages ... three marches in the hills."

3. six-seven

With the several examples from Ugaritic cited previously 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.

\[phony 41:12\]. The usual meaning "reed" does not fit in here with \[\text{you} \text{. diji rit}\] which rather suggests a connection with fire. Hence, the final \[\text{j}\] is generally regarded as a dittograph and the resultant \[\text{u}\] 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 ٌحم and Assyrian agam, "to be hot, boil". In Ugaritic this vocable appears as agn, "fire". It is possible that ٌحم is a conflation of two forms랭, ٌحم. 21:28, is a distinctly Canaanite collocation. 3

In 15:23, ٌحم corresponds exactly to Ugaritic, ٌحم ay (52:6). ٌحم should be vocalized ٌحم, "whomsoever is innocent he delivers". v. supra pp.91ff.

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

---

2. 52:15, parallel to ٌحم.
5. I.Eitan, A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography (N.Y.1924), pp.50-53, who deals only with the verbal form in Hebrew. The first to suggest the Arabic cognate was Schultens, Origg. Hebraeae (1724),1.2
The difficulty is however, that יִנְטָן is nowhere else used of persons and the nexus of thought would suggest some precise class, rather than a vague and general definition.\(^6\) Ugaritic suggests another possibility. We find there the יִנְטָנ as a certain guild of temple servitors,\(^7\) now accepted as being connected linguistically with the Nethinim mentioned in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.\(^8\) Consonantally, the equation יִנְטָנ = יִנְטָנ presents no difficulties. The root יִנְט early displaced יִנְט in Phoenician and Ugaritic\(^9\) and even spread to Southern Palestine as is evidenced by the Amarna preterite form \(y^{\text{a-di-in}}\).\(^{10}\) In Hebrew a further shift from יִנְט it took place\(^{11}\) giving rise to the nominal forms יִנְט and יִנְט (Hos.2:14) = Ugaritic יִנְט "gift".\(^{12}\) As to the vocalization of our passage, it is probably a Massoretic confusion with the usual Hebrew יִנְטינָה.

\(^{6}\) Budde, op.cit.,p.63, noting the difficulty, suggested the reading יִנְט or יִנְט.

\(^{7}\) 301:1:1; 52:3, which should now be read: יִנְטיר תֶּל "gift of the city on high".


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

\(^{10}\) EA,337:13.

\(^{11}\) J.A. Montgomery, JAOS, 53 (1938), p.135. For the shift יִנְט it cf. also the Aramaic proper name יִנְטינא "Bel gives (a son)". 
This identification of our יִתְנָם = ytnm fits in excellently with the parallel "priests" and the other officers of government mentioned in the passage. That the Nethinim were closely connected with the Priests is evident from several passages and they were also numbered among the rulers of the State. The use of ytnm instead of the Judean Nethinim would be another point of contact with Canaanite source material, suggesting Northern origins.

אֹהֶל 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. רֹאשׁ נְזֶהָרֵי נְהָר Neh. 11:3 with which cf. in Job 12:24.


16. מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוֹת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלוּת מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה מַעֲלָה
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 ɐₚ₃ th₢ₚ₄ₚ₃ (49:1:6; 51:IV:22). Ugaritic orthography does not permit a decision on MT use of the singular as against the usual emendation ḫₚ₄ Voters.

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 ṣₚ₃w.

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 יִ with the uniconsonantal י "hand", exactly as found in a Canaanite gloss of the Amarna letters ba-di-ע, in Ugaritic bd "in the hands of", and in later Phoenician inscriptions. This meaning of י is to be found twice in Job. יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ בּ (17:16), and יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ = "the first-born of Death (Môt) will devour with his hands," (18:13). In both these cases the association of "hand" with "Death" or "Sheol" is appropriate in view of Môt's own description of the method by which he disposes of his victims:

bklat ידיו ילבנ . "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.

---

26. EA, 245:35.
27. 51:1:25 etc.
28. UH, 8:20, p.48.
31. line 6, יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ: "do not listen to their words", v. Slouschz, ... יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ p.21; יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ (רֶבֶנָט), יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ (רֶבֶנָט), יִדְוִוָנֵוֶּ (רֶבֶנָט).
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 kasadu = Heb. } x\text{" in the mind of the scribe who was giving contemporary usage of } x\text{ to the Acc. Our Job passage is thus a very early idiom.}

\[ \text{Semantically equivalent is } \text{ of Ugarian } 33 \]

\[ \text{in the specialized metaphorical sense of "killing", "annihilating" (2:3; 3:18; 10:3; 37:20;) is a reflex of the old Canaanite Mot myth. v. supra, p.17f.}

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

\[ \text{bn il \parallel phr kkbn, "The sons of El" \parallel "the assembly of the stars".}

32. EA, 32:16-17.
33. 51:V:121-22.
34. For sources, v. supra chap.1, notes 24-27.
115.

This unusual parallelism corresponds exactly to the common Ugaritic locution γλυ || βω. In one Ugaritic text βω is followed by πμμ, just as here we have μδ μλα. 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 גל, "to flow", "melt", "waste away". However, the parallel גל suggests a meaning "strength". Almost certainly we have here metathesis for גל as in Deut. 33:25, which corresponds to Ugaritic, גל "strength".

36. 49:1:6-7; 51:IV:23; 127:4, etc.
38. 137:24.
41. 76:II:21,22. UH,I,p.40, note 5.
36:31. 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 ֹּּ.

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

14:20, has the meaning of "perish". This signification, as in Arabic ָּּ, appears in Ugaritic in the ַּ.45

17:2. ָּּ; This difficult word, following ַּ, may well be connected with Ugaritic ָּּּ ָּ, throat, or gorge, of מָּ.

42. so Graetz, Bear, Dhorne, Kittel.
43. 126:III:14; 'nt 1:12, so the reading of Cassuto, Anat, pp.63, 75.
44. w.E.L. Sukenik, PEQ (1940), p.59-60.
45. 'nt: v:10-11; 3 Ḥqht, Rev.11-12; Cassuto, op.cit., p.86.
46. 67:I:7-8.
on the analogy of the figurative use of 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". v. 7. would then follow naturally this verse. In Ps. 140:11 is used similarly and may be a metaphor of Sheol, especially in view of the Talmudic "burial places" 20:18, in view of the parallel may also be connected with the same root.

The "pleonastic" Waw as found in Ugaritic explains several passages in Job v. supra, pp. 95ff.

35:10. 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. ; Ben Yehuda, Thesaurus, VI, p. 2832, s.v. "}


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

MAT points to "to rejoice", which Kautzsch regards as a pure Aramaism. But the exact phrase is found in Ugaritic al thd altan. 53

is to be understood as the Ugaritic "to destroy". Accepting Dhorame's identification of with Acc. this 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, is unique. 8:13 defines the 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 n lb is to be found as a characterisation of Aght by El because

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

51. in this sense is also to be found in the pr.n. "strong", and pr.ns. 52. op. cit., p.29.

53. 3 Aght : rev.9; nt: V:30.

54. Dhorame, ad loc.
he was guilty of an act of presumption against the gods, in this case against Anat. There can be no doubt that our and the use of is borrowed from Canaanite usage.

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

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 with identical meaning.

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

55 3Aqht rev:17.

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


59. 2Aqht 1:21, v. supra, p.102f.
is thrice employed as an unusual parallel to מַלּ or מַלִּים,

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".

38:7 v. supra, s. מַשֵּׁר יָדָיו.

in the sense of "from" occurs in several passages v. supra p. 75ff.

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

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

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

as the genius of destruction and aridity as in Canaanite literature is clearly indicated in 18:13. The reference to מַשֵּׁר יָדָיו, "first born of Môt", must be connected with the "seven sons of the god Môt" of Ugaritic. 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 יָדָה is the common Ugaritic verb for the gods smiting their enemies. Significantly, the only other usage of יָדָה in Job (5:13) also refers to God.

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

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

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

38:16 יָדָה; 28:11 יָדָה יָדָה are phraseologically equivalent to Ugaritic mbk nhrm, "sources of the rivers",

64. 49:II:36.
65. E. Kautzsch, op.cit., p.57.
66. 68:7.
cf. Ug. nbk "a well", MT לִבְּרָא should now be emended to לִבְּרֶא. 69

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

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

לִבְּרָא 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 לִבְּרָא 4:21, "remove from"

לִבְּרָא parallel to בְּלָא 36:11; The same pair of synonyms occurs in Ugaritic לִבְּרָא. In Phoenician likewise לִבְּרָא means "good". 74

69. Ginsberg, JRAS (1935), p. 53; Albright, AJSL, 35 (1919), 161-195
70. GKC, §95k.
72. Kautzsch, op. cit, p. 64.
73. 'nt: I: 19-20.
74. cf. yhmlk, line 8 לִבְּרָא.
36:14. v. infra, s.v. אדנת.

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

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

The "counting of months" in Ugaritic has two significations, implying either the months of pregnancy77 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 אֶבֶן עַר. 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. אָנָא, pl.VI:IV:1; 51:1:13,18; IV:52:56, always parallel to מִלח, abode.
77. אָנָא, II:43-44.
78. Ibid, VI:28-29.
his message of surrender to Môt:

ｂｄｋ ａｎ ｗｄ ʾｌｍｋ
"Thy slave am I, yea thine for ever." 30

39:14 is more likely to be connected with Ug. ʿdb
"to prepare, arrange, set", than with ʿšy "to forsake".
The nexus of thought with v.15, shows that the
emphasis is clearly on ʾｙḥ ʿｔ↟ ʾｙ✘ ｂＹ 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 ʿｙḥ. 81 However, the word occurs as
ʿｙḥ 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 ʿｙḥ ｐｅｅ aficionecessarily parallels
י ｂעס. In the afore-mentioned inscription
we read line 19, ʾｙḥ חו ʿｔ↟ ʾｙ✘ ｂＹ ʿｔ↟. There can
be no doubt that Job is referring to this demoness
that haunts the dark places. Our ʿｙḥ is thus
a Hebraized orthography for the Aramaic f.pl.

30. 67:II:12.
31. GKC §90g.
emphatic form מִשָּׁלֶל. 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. מִשָּׁלֶל 28:21, has the usual signification "hidden", parallel to מִשָּׁלֶל. On the other hand, מִשָּׁלֶל corresponds exactly to 33:2 מִשָּׁלֶל, i.e. מִשָּׁלֶל means "to be dark". This applies to 6:16 where the parallel מִשָּׁלֶל means, "to be dark". Now it is true that there is a semantic relationship between "to conceal" and "to be dark", but the equation מִשָּׁלֶל = מִשָּׁלֶל is very precise. Philological evidence also points to two unrelated Semitic stems. מִשָּׁלֶל "to conceal" corresponds to Arabic מִשָּׁלֶל. But in Ugaritic we also find מִשָּׁלֶל parallel to מִשָּׁלֶל, meaning "darkness". 83

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

6:16 בְּּוֹל בַּּוֹלמ יְּהֵש "snow becomes dark".⁸⁵
42:3 בְּּוֹל בַּּוֹלמ "who darkens ...?"

In all probability the nominal form בְּּוֹל מ יְּהֵש 11:6; 28:11, should be rendered "dark places".⁸⁶

בְּּוֹל מ is here used in its Ugaritic signification of "strength", parallel to בְּּוֹל מ.⁸⁷

---

⁸⁴. Otherwise the equation is Arabic ג = Hebrew פ = Ugaritic ג or פ.

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

⁸⁶. In 28:11 יְּהֵש is contrasted with יְּהֵש

127.

In Ugaritic

means "eyes". This

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

and is supported by 

in 41:10.

Eitan identified with Arabic "to go to", "approach", "to turn".

As early as the Targum it was recognized that "left" and "right" here stand for "North" and "South". The root has now been attested in Ugaritic, used too in connection with direction.

The North is the abode of the gods in Canaanite mythology. 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 

to 

or of 

to is required.

88. Krt: 147, 295.


90. Cassuto, " (אֶל טֹבָה תְּכֵרָתֵי) יֶבֶן לְיָדָם";


91. Isa. 14:13; Ps.48:3 and Job itself 37:22.
21:7 is generally taken as "grow old", in which sense it is an Aramaism. 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 ṭq. In one Ugaritic text we find this verb together with umbnailum denoting the passage of time. We may therefore have here, Job 21:7, an elliptical usage of ṭq in the same sense: "They pass (their days) in amassing wealth." cf. v.13.

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

2:10 bis, is usually regarded as an Aramaism. However, the vocable has now been attested in the Amarna texts.

92. E. Kautzsch, op. cit., p.73.
94. v. Morgenstern, HUCA, 16 (1941), p.65.
95. BASOR, 89 (1943), p.29ff.
33:6. The phrase, equivalent to the Accadian expression \textipa{garâsu titâ}, now has its counterpart in Ugaritic \textipa{argētī}, "to shape clay into an effigy". 96

5:1; 15:15. This term is found in the Arslan Tash inscription, line 11-12, where \textipa{ārnu ḫu} is parallel to \textipa{gērī ḫu}, leaving no doubt that the \textipa{ārnu} are gods. Similarly, Ugaritic \textipa{bēn ġus} 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 \textipa{šēnā} 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 \textipa{bēl ṭā}. Dhorme takes \textipa{bēl ṭā} as an abstract noun meaning "adolescence". But from the analogies he quotes we should expect a form \textipa{šēnā}, while there is no evidence for the use of \textipa{ṭā} in this sense. Others 98 have argued that the 

\begin{footnotesize}

96. 126:V:29.
97. 137:21,38; 2'Aqht:I:4,9,14.
98. Gray-Driver, ad loc.
\end{footnotesize}
an untimely death. This explanation does not remove the syntactical difficulty. In Ugaritic we find a class of priests known as ḏām. A list of temple functionaries mentions ṇrm together with ḏām and ḥnm.100 It is here suggested therefore, that our ḏ refers to a guild of temple servitors (cf. supra, s.v. ṭnḫn Westminster). The reference here maybe to some historic event. The Book of Kings mentions repeated persecutions of the ṭnăr 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.

The locution ṭnăr ṭnăr 3:11; 10:18; 33:8 is phraseologically equivalent to the Ugaritic ụl.101

100. 113:60.

101. Ḫqht:II:9, according to J. Obermann, How Daniel was Blessed with a Son, (A.O.S. Offprint Series, No. 20), p.4. line 93.
and in the Ugaritic texts. It is noteworthy that in several passages in the latter, rpim 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 ḫn 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 ḫn never appears. From Judg.16:25 it may be inferred that ḫn belongs to the spoken language, ḫn to the literary dialect. The exclusive use of ḫn 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 3, 62:45-46; 122:2-4, 9-12 etc.
103. Text IV:79.
104. Text 17:5.
105. Text 17:5.
26:6; הָרֹאִים 17:14. Both these synonyms for the netherworld are masculine only here in Job. It is quite possible that the gender has been influenced by the identification of the netherworld with Môt who ruled it, so 27:15, 28:22; 30:23; 38:17. The employment of the masculine for these terms shows the strong mythological strain underlying their usage. 108

42:13; This hapax legomenon corresponds to Ugaritic sb‘ny 109 (v. supra, pp. 18ff).

36:19 may be connected with וַיֵּאָס, "sacrifice" as in Phoenician. This fits in well with יֵאָס v. 18

This unique phrase has been variously explained. Duhrn went so far as to emend to יַאָס. 111 Those who retain יַאָס regard

108. v. supra. s.v. הָרֹאִים
109. 52:64.
111. cf. BH, 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

\[ \text{m} \text{s} \text{b} \text{t} \text{ h} \text{n} \text{ b} \text{s} \text{h} \text{ ttpl} \]

"A seventh, lo, he fell by the sword;"

This hapax legomenon is regarded as a pure Aramaism cognate to "to loosen". However, Ugaritic

\[ \text{srh} \text{ lars} \text{ brgm} \]

"he flashes lightning to the earth";
suggests rather that the final \( \text{r} \) is radical and original and that we have here a Canaanite root \( \text{srh} \) "to flash" (lightning).

112. cf. Gray-Driver II ad loc.


114. Kautzsch, Aramaismen, p. 90.

115. 51:V:71.

116. On this word v. Ginsberg \( \text{h} \text{y} \text{v} \) \( \text{h} \text{y} \text{v} \) \( \text{h} \text{y} \text{v} \) p. 31; JBL, LXII (1943), p. 109f; BA, VIII (1945), p. 57.
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

\[
\text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה}
\]

18:16

\[
\text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה}
\]

cf. Phoenician,118

\[
\text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה}
\]

and Ugaritic, šrēk bars al yr/riš šly bd ns-k.120

\[
\text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה}
\]

is thrice synonymous with bn (28:14; 33:16; 41:23-24)
The identical parallel occurs in Ugaritic wm – thm.121

\[
\text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה}
\]

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

\[
\text{סֹרֶה} \quad \text{סֹרֶה}
\]

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. Almost every one of these views has found a protagonist among modern scholars who have done little more than enlarge the range of possibilities. Thus, Ébrard and Rawlinson supported Mosaic authorship. Luther and Franz Delitzsch argued for the Solomonic age. Nöldeke and Hitzig assigned the book to the times of Isaiah, whilst Ewald looked to the seventh century and Cheyne, Duhm and Budde to the fifth, for the time of composition. C. Siegfried has even argued for a Maccabean dating - a claim obviously absurd, since Ben Sira was certainly influenced by Job.

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.8.
2. For details, see Karl Budde, Das Buch 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 Qatlâti perfect form, used once in Job.

(iii) The Canaanite poetic tradition is followed in the employment of the yqtl 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 accusativi without the definite article.
(vii) The schematized or climactic use of numbers, attested several times in the poetry, is a typical Canaanite literary device.

(viii) A study of the prepositions is particularly revealing.

The vocalization most frequently betrays the older pronunciation with a patah.

Both א and ב are employed in the sense of "from", exactly as in Ugaritic.

The accretion of prepositions represents a significant point of contact with Phoenician.

The Lamedh of Reinforcement" is frequently attested.

Recognition of the true function of the prepositions removes many exegetical obscurities and obviates the need for textual emendation.

(ix) Textual and exegetical clarification likewise results from recognizing the presence of the archaic enclitic particle -m in several passages and of the indefinite particle 'ay twice.

(x) The Waw in a number of difficult passages is seen to be employed "pleonastically", as is the case in Ugaritic, and the understanding of the text in such cases is considerably improved.
(xi) The studies in the lexicon reveal a considerable number of points of contact with the ancient Canaanite literature of a lexical, phraseological, mythological and stylistic nature.

Several common Hebrew vocabables have specialized meanings or usages, specifically Canaanite, viz., יִשָּׂא, צְרִי, יִתְנָה, קְדִים, בָּרוֹךָ, מֶשֶׁח, חָתוֹם, בַּמֶּשְׁכַּל, נַחֲלָה, הָדוֹר, כֶּפֶל, מָשָׁה, שָׁם, יָבֹא, וֹסָד, קֶרֶן, לִיְם, גָּלֶה, אַדְוָנָה, עָלָה, לִיָּבֹא, לִיְם, לִיְם. Many rare or difficult words can be explained by reference to the Canaanite dialects, viz., יִשָּׂא, צְרִי, יִתְנָה, קְדִים, בָּרוֹךָ, מֶשֶׁח, חָתוֹם, בַּמֶּשְׁכַּל, נַחֲלָה, הָדוֹר, כֶּפֶל, מָשָׁה, שָׁם, יָבֹא, וֹסָד, קֶרֶן, לִיְם, גָּלֶה, אַדְוָנָה, עָלָה, לִיְם, לִיְם.

Several unusual word-combinations, pairs of synonyms, clichés and stylistic peculiarities are seen to belong to the Canaanite literary heritage, viz., יִשָּׂא, צְרִי, יִתְנָה, קְדִים, בָּרוֹךָ, מֶשֶׁח, חָתוֹם, בַּמֶּשְׁכַּל, נַחֲלָה, הָדוֹר, כֶּפֶל, מָשָׁה, שָׁם, יָבֹא, וֹסָד, קֶרֶן, לִיְם, גָּלֶה, אַדְוָנָה, עָלָה, לִיְם, לִיְם.

Some previously believed Aramaïsms can now be shown to be, on the contrary, early Canaanisms, viz., יִשָּׂא, צְרִי, יִתְנָה, קְדִים, בָּרוֹךָ, מֶשֶׁח, חָתוֹם, בַּמֶּשְׁכַּל, נַחֲלָה, הָדוֹר, כֶּפֶל, מָשָׁה, שָׁם, יָבֹא, וֹסָד, קֶרֶן, לִיְם, גָּלֶה, אַדְוָנָה, עָלָה, לִיְם.

(xii) The Book of Job is extraordinarily rich in mythological references, note of which has been constantly taken.
in these studies as a background for the proper 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; מִלְחָמָה (5:1; 15:15) and מִטְנָה (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 מַעֲשֵׂי הָאָרֶץ as the appellation of the Divine throne (36:29); מְשֹׁפְטָה 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); מֶשֶׁד, by metonomy, used of the netherworld (27:15 etc); the method by which Môt disposes of his victims (17:16; 18:13); רְכִבָּה as the shades of the dead residing beneath the waters (26:5); the specialized use of יִשְׁרָאֵל in the sense of the netherworld (10:21:22); the exceptional employment of יִשְׁרָאֵל and יִשְׁעָל 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"⁶ and the period to which it is ascribed are very arbitrary. In the first place, since literary prophecy began relatively late we have no means of knowing exactly how early is the Canaanite influence and whether, in fact, the sources at our disposal represent a revival, i.e., an innovation in Israel, or the continuance of a literary tradition. Secondly, it is arguing in a circle to assume that all "heathen" influence must be exilic or postexilic and then to assign all passages exhibiting such influence to the exilic or postexilic periods. This is particularly true of such references in the first Isaiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and the Psalms.⁷

As far as Job is concerned, the evidence all points, in the opinion of the present writer, to an early, 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 and, 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., דָּרִי - בְּרִי (3:25); לֶא - מֶא (16:19); כֶּנֶש - כֶּנֶשׁ (19:27); כֶּנֶשׁ - מֶלֶךְ (29:22); מַה - מַה (39:5); הָיָה - מִרְמָה (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 ו and the feminine demonstrative pronoun ה never occur. Totally absent too is the *Hireq compaginis* - very remarkably, in view of the relatively large number of participial forms. The *Holem compaginis* likewise does not appear - again surprising since the frequently used cliché יְהִי appears elsewhere as יְהִי. 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: הבואת 34:13 is a genuine object, on which see Wright, *Comparative Grammar* p.141; המדקיה 37:12 and התלט 5:16, are fossilized accusatives used nominatively. On התלט 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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