PREFACE

SOME eighteen months before his death in February 1914, Dr. Driver began the actual writing of the volume on "Job" for the "International Critical Commentary." In the middle of January 1914, when the very serious nature of his illness had became evident, he wrote a short memorandum on the state of his MS, and suggestions for the completion of his work. In this he expressed a strong desire that I should complete what he was compelled to leave incomplete. The task, I knew at once, would be arduous and absorb much time; but not to undertake it, or to do less than my best to discharge it, would have been an ill return for all that I had long owed to the friendship and scholarship of Dr. Driver. The time involved has even exceeded my expectations, partly because what remained to be done proved so much more than appeared at first. Finding that the mass of material would be very great, and wishing that the publication of the commentary should not be unduly delayed, Dr. Driver had earlier invited Dr. A. H. McNeile to undertake the exegetical notes and the Introduction, and, under conditions with regard to the claims of other work, Dr. McNeile had consented. It was naturally my own very strong desire that this arrangement should stand, and at first Dr. McNeile agreed that it should, and indeed, in looking through the MS with a view to his own part of the work, added on the first chapters some brief notes which, duly initialed, have been retained. But later the claims of his other work became so pressing that he wished to withdraw from co-operating in this com-

mentary, and, though it was with the greatest regret, I could but acquiesce in his wish. Thus by far the greater part of the work, and the final responsibility for the whole of it, has fallen on me. Of the actual division of the work I will speak further.

In the memorandum to which I have alluded, Dr. Driver wrote: "I began this in Aug. 1912; and have completed the first draft of virtually all the philological notes, and revised them as far as about c. 14: I have also completed virtually the translation and (fairly completely) the exegetical notes on c. 3–9 and 40–41." When the material was handed to me, I found that it contained less of the translation than this might seem to imply: the translation consisted of a text of the RV. with the very extensive alterations placed on the margin; occasionally a choice between one or two renderings was left open for final judgement. These corrections of the RV. began with c. 3 and extended (with the exception of $19^{25\text{-}27}$) to c. 28, and again from 40^{15}–41^{34}. Of these parts, then, the translation in this volume is Dr. Driver's, except that (1) here and there I have modified certain renderings of the RV. left uncorrected, out of regard to other passages or express statements in the notes; (2) that I have exercised the final judgement as between alternative renderings; and (3) that I have throughout determined how the divisions into lines, distichs, and tristichs should be represented. The exegetical notes, which extended only, and that with very varying degrees of completeness, from 3^{2}–9^{10} and 40^{15}–41^{30}, were not in form for publication: in another part of the memorandum the instruction runs: "Such exegetical notes as I have written, he [the editor] can utilize, supplement, or amend, as he likes. I should naturally like the explanations, etc., of my *Job in the RV.* to be, as far as possible, adopted, but I do not make this a *sine qua non*." I have accordingly incorporated much of this material in the commentary on these parts of the text; to have distinguished it constantly from the additions and modifications required would have unduly

complicated the notes, but here and there, especially when my own judgement slightly differed (*e.g.* on 3^{3}), I have made use of inverted commas to indicate direct quotation. Broadly, however, it may be said of pp. 31–87 and 354–371 that the notes on individual verses, as distinct from the introductory and certain longer notes (*e.g.* on pp. 40 f., 77 f.), are very largely in substance and largely also in expression, Dr. Driver's. For the rest the commentary is mine, though in order to perpetuate Dr. Driver's point of view, I have frequently cited not only his *Book of Job in the Revised Version*, but also his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, and occasionally I have transferred to the commentary, as being more appropriate there, a passage from the philological notes, distinguishing this matter by adding "Dr."

With the philological notes I have adopted a different course. It was to these the greatest attention and the fullest revision had been given. It seemed desirable then (1) that they should to the fullest possible extent be reproduced and their authorship made clear; yet (2) that these notes should be as complete and homogeneous as possible. I have, therefore, while adding freely, perhaps to the extent of about a third of the whole, distinguished all my own additions in substance, except in cc. 1. 2. $32^{1\text{-}6}$ and $42^{7\text{-}17}$, which are entirely mine, by placing them in square brackets; but I have not thought it necessary unduly to multiply these signs by using them for the filling in of obvious references left blank in the MS, nor to distinguish slight formal changes made in preparing the MS for press, or in proof. As mentioned in the passage already cited from the memorandum, cc. 1–14 had been more fully revised than the rest; some notes, or parts of notes, were still unwritten even in these earlier chapters, but the blank spaces in the MS were far more frequent in the later chapters, and unfortunately occurred where many of the most important or difficult passages, such as $19^{25\text{f.}}$, were concerned.

Final responsibility for the whole must, as I have said,

under the circumstances rest upon me; but with this proviso the distribution of the work may be thus tabulated:

	TRANSLATION.	COMMENTARY.	PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.
Driver . .	3–28	3–9[10] 40[18]–41[30] (in large part).	3–31, 32[7]–42[6] (except matter enclosed in square brackets).
Gray . . .	1. 2. 29–42; also 19[25-27].	1. 2. 9[11]–40[14]. 42 entire, and the rest in part.	1. 2. 32[1-6] 42[7-17] and, in the remainder, matter enclosed in square brackets.

For the Introduction I am entirely responsible.

The aim of the philological notes is indicated in these sentences of the memorandum: "On philological points I found there was a good deal to say, and I wished the philological basis of the commentary to be strong, and thought that many things deserved a fuller discussion than they generally received in the volumes of the *ICC*. Notes and explanations of the principal emendations of Du. and Be. ought also, I thought, to be given for the use of students (though I do not believe myself that 1 in 10 is necessary or probable),—sometimes also the conjectures of Bi. and others (though I content myself mostly with merely mentioning these from time to time, and do not polemize against them). . . . I have not thought it necessary to quote exhaustively authorities for renderings and readings: the principal recent ones seemed to me sufficient. Improbable conjectures I have also omitted (except sometimes those of Du. and Be[K]). An emendation quoted at the end of a note is not intended to imply my acceptance of it." "In textual matters I generally find myself in agreement with Bu.; but I cannot adopt his view of the Elihu speeches. I intended to acknowledge generously in the Preface the great value and help which Be[T] had been to me. But I cannot accept many of his

emendations; he seems to me often hypercritical and prosaic."

On account of the extent of and the importance attached to the philological notes, Dr. Driver had planned that they should be printed in the larger type, and issued in a separate volume. To this the publishers readily agreed, and on this understanding this part of the work was first printed. But the new conditions created by the war rendered the plan of two volumes undesirable; consequently these notes now appear with a pagination of their own at the end of the one volume.

I need not repeat here much that I wrote in the Preface to *Isaiah*; it applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present commentary; but in the matter of transliterations I may observe that owing to the circumstances under which the present volume has been prepared there remain, much to my regret, certain inconsistencies—the ק, for example, being sometimes transliterated ḳ, sometimes q; and similarly different abbreviations of some names and titles will be found to have been used; but I trust that neither the one inconsistency nor the other will occasion any practical inconvenience.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED

1. TEXTS AND VERSIONS.

'A, Aq. . . .	Aquila.
AVm. . . .	Authorised Version (margin).
EV(V). . . .	English Version(s).
MS(S) Ken., de Rossi	Hebrew Manuscripts as cited in Kennicott or De Rossi.
Oc., Or(ient) . .	Occidental (Palestinian) and Oriental (Babylonian), see G-K. 7*h* n.; and for the readings of the two schools in Job, S. Baer, *Liber Jobi* (1875), pp. 56–58.
OT. . . .	Old Testament.
PBV. . . .	Prayer Book Version.
RVm. . . .	Revised Version (margin).
Σ, Symm. . .	Symmachus.
Θ, Theod. . .	Theodotion.
𝔊	The ancient Greek (LXX) Version of the OT. (ed. Swete, Cambridge, 1887–1894). The readings of the codices are, when necessary, distinguished thus :—$\mathfrak{G}^{A}$ $\mathfrak{G}^{B}$ (Alexandrian, Vatican, etc.). For the cursives, reference has been made to *Vet. Test Græce, cum variis lectionibus*, ed. R. Holmes et J. Parsons (Oxon. 1823), which is cited as HP followed by a numeral denoting the cursive. Editions of Job contain much that is really Θ (see Introd. §§ 48–51): such matter is commonly cited as 𝔊 (Θ).
𝔐	The Hebrew (unvocalized) text, *i.e.* the consonants of the ordinary Hebrew MSS and printed Bibles.
$\mathfrak{M}^{1}$. . . .	The consonants of the traditional Hebrew text (𝔐) irrespective of the present word divisions and after the removal of the vowel consonants (cp. *Isaiah*, p. xxv).
𝔎	The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of 𝔊 (§ 48).
𝔏	Old Latin Version of 𝔊.

𝔐	The Massoretic Text (*i.e.* the vocalized text of the Hebrew Bible). Variants in the Hebrew codices have been cited from De Rossi, *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.*; Kennicott, *Vet. Test. Heb. cum variis lectionibus*; or R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica.*
𝔒	Targum Onkelos.
𝔖	The Syriac Version (Peshiṭta).
𝔖^{H}	The Syro-Hexaplar Version of 𝔊.
𝔗	Targum: 𝔗^{1} 𝔗^{2}, etc., first, second renderings in 𝔗.
𝔙	Vulgate.

2. AUTHORS' NAMES AND BOOKS.

[See also the literature cited, especially in the Introduction, §§ 23 n., 28, 41, 45, 48, 50 n., 51 n.]

Anon. . . .	Anonymous Hebrew Commentary, ed. W. A. Wright, with Eng. tr. by S. A. Hirsch (1905)—later than Ibn Ezra and Qi.
AJSL . . .	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature.*
Baer . . .	S. Baer, *Liber Jobi*, 1875.
BDB . . .	See *Lex.*
Be[er, G.] Be^{T}. Be$^{Kit.}$	(1) *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (1897)—Be^{T}. (2) Notes in R. Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*—Be$^{Kit.}$.
Bi[ckell, G.] . .	(1) *Carmina VT metrice*, 1882, pp. 151–187. (2) *Krit. Bearbeitung des Job-Dialogs, WZKM*, 1892, pp. 137 ff., 241 ff., 327 ff.; 1893, pp. 1 ff., 153 ff. Cp. (3). *Das Buch Hiob nach Anleitung der Strophik u. d. Septuaginta auf seine ursprüngliche Form zurück-geführt u. im Versmasse des Urtextes übersetzt*, 1894.
Boch[art] . .	*Opera Omnia*, Lugd. 1712.
Bolducius . .	*Comm. in Jobum*, 1631.
Bu[dde], K. . .	(1) *Beiträge zur Kritik des B. Hiob*, 1876. (2) *Das Buch Hiob* (in Nowack's, *Handkommentar*), ^{1}1896, ^{2}1913.
Buhl . . .	See G–B.
Carey, C. P. . .	*The Book of Job translated*, etc., 1858.
Ch[e[yne, T. K.] .	(1) *Job and Solomon*, 1887. (2) *Job* and other contributions to *EBi.*
ChWB . . .	See Levy.
CIS . . .	*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 ff.
Cooke, G. A. .	*N[orth] S[emitic] I[nscriptions]*, Oxford, 1903.
Cox, S. . . .	*A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 1880.
CP. . . .	See Rogers.
Da[v[idson], A. B.	(1) *A Commentary on the Book of Job* [i–xiv], 1862. (2) *The Book of Job* in *The Camb. Bible for Schools*, 1884.

DB . . .	Dictionary of the Bible, and in particular *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings, 1898-1904.
Del[itzsch, Franz].	*Das Buch Hiob* in *Biblischer Comm. ü. d. AT*, [1]1864 (Eng. tr.), [2]1876.
Del[itzsch, Fried.].	(1) *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, 1896, cited as *HWB*. (2) *Das Buch Hiob neu übersetzt u. kurzerklärt*, Leipzig, 1902.
Di[llmann, A.] .	*Hiob* (in *K*[*urzgefasstes*] *E*[*xegetisches*] *H*[*andbuch*]), [4]1891.
Dr[iver, S. R.] .	(1) *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, [3]1892. (2) *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (abbreviated *LOT*), [9]1913. (3) *The Book of Job in the Revised Version*, 1906. (4) *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, [2]1913.
Du[hm, B.] . .	*Das Buch Hiob erklärt* in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-commentar zum AT*, 1897.
EBi. . . .	*Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, 1899–1903.
Ehrlich, A. B. .	*Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel* (1913), vi. 180–344.
ET . . .	*Expository Times*.
Ew. . . .	(1) *Lehrbuch d. Hebr. Sprache*. (2) *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, dritter Theil, [2]1854
Exp. . . .	*The Expositor*.
Forms . . .	See Gray, 3.
Freyt[ag, G. W.] .	*Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, 1830.
G-B. . . .	*Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches u. aram. Handwörterbuch über das AT . . . bearbeitet von Frants Buhl*, [16]1915.
Ges[enius, W.] .	*Thes*[*aurus*].
GGA . . .	*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*.
Gi[nsburg, C. D.].	עשרים וארבעה ספרי הקדש וגו, i.e. *The Old Testament in Hebrew according to MSS and old editions*, 1894.
G-K. . . .	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* . . . English edition by A. Cowley, [2]1910 (=28th German edition, 1909).
Gr[ätz, H.] . .	*Emendationes in plerosque . . . VT libros*, 1892.
Gray, G. B. . .	(1) *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, 1896 (abbreviated *HPN*). (2) [*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on*] *Isaiah* [i–xxvii]. (3) [*The*] *Forms* [*of Hebrew Poetry*], 1915.
Ha[hn, H. A.] .	*Commentar über d. B. Hiob*, 1850.
Hfm, or Hoffm. .	*Hiob nach J. C. E. Hoffmann*, 1891.
Hi[tz[ig, F.] . .	*Das Buch Hiob übersetzt u. ausgelegt*, 1874.
Hirzel (or Hrz), L.	*KEH*[1] (1839), see Di.
Honth[eim, J.] .	*Das Buch Hiob als strophisches Kunstwerk nachgewiesen übersetzst u. erklärt*, 1904.

Houb[igant, C. F.]	*Notæ criticæ in universos VT libros*, ii. 155–218 (1777)
HPN . . .	See Gray, 1.
I[bn] E[zra], Abraham († 1167)	Hebrew Comm. on Job in Buxtorf's *Biblia Rabbinica*.
ICC . . .	*International Critical Commentary*.
Isaiah . . .	See Gray, 2.
JBLit. . . .	*Journal of Biblical Literature*.
Jer[ome] († 420) .	
JDT . . .	*Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie*.
JPh . . .	*Journal of Philology*.
JQR . . .	*Jewish Quarterly Review*.
JThS . . .	*Journal of Theological Studies*.
*KAT*³ . . .	*Die Keilinschriften u. d. AT*, von Eberhard Schrader, dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern u. H. Winckler, 1903.
Kamph[ausen] .	In Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, Abth. i. Bd. 3, 1865.
KB . . .	*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, von E. Schrader, 1889–1901.
Ḳi	See Qi.
Klo[stermann, A.].	*Hiob* in *PRE* viii. 97–126.
Kön[ig, E.] . .	*Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebaüde der Hebräischen Sprache*, 1881, 1895: the concluding volume (cited as Kön. iii. or simply Kön.) appeared in 1897 with a fresh title, *Historisch-comparative Syntax d. Hebr. Sprache*.
Kŏnigsb[erger, B.]	*Hiob Studien*, 1896.
Kue[nen, A.] . .	*Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan . . . van de Boeken des Ouden Verbondes*, ²1865.
Lane, E. W. . .	*An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1863.
Lex . . .	Lexicon, and unless otherwise defined *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament based on the Thesaurus of Gesenius*, by F. Brown, C. A. Briggs, and S. R. Driver, Oxford, 1906.
Levy, J. . .	(1) *ChWB*, i.e., *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, Leipzig, 1881. (2) *NHWB*, i.e., *Neuhebräisches u. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim u. Midraschim*, 1876–1889.
Lidz[barski, M.] .	(1) *Handbuch d. Nordsem. Epigraphik*, 1898—*NSE*. (2) *Eph*[*emeris f. sem. Epigraphik*], 1900 ff.
LOT . . .	See Dr. 2.
Matthes, J. C. .	*Het Boek Job vertaald en verklaard*, 1865.
Me[rx, A.] . .	*Das Gedicht von Hiob*, 1871.
Meyer, E. . .	[*Die*] *I*[*sraeliten u. ihre*] *N*[*achbar*] *S*[*tämme*], 1906.
Mich[aelis, J. H.] .	*Annotationes in Hagiogr.*
NH(W)B . . .	See Levy, 2.
Nöl[d[eke, T.] .	*Beitr*[*äge zur sem. Sprachwissenschaft*], 1904.
Nichols, Helen H..	*The Composition of the Elihu Speeches* (in *AJSL*, vol. xxvii., 1911, and printed separately).

NSE . . .	See Lidz.
NSI . . .	See Cooke.
Ol[sh[ausen, J.] .	*KEH*[2] (1852): see Di.
Oo[rt, H.] . .	*Textus Hebraici emendationes quibus in VT Neerlandice vertendo usi sunt A. Kuenen al.*
P[ayne] S[mith, R.]	*Thesaurus Syriacus*, 1900.
Pe[a[ke, A. S.] .	*The Century Bible: Job*, 1905.
PEFQuSt . .	*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement.*
Perles, F. . .	*Analekten zur Textkritik des AT*, 1895.
PL. . . .	Migne, *Paleologia Latina.*
PRE . . .	Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie f. Protestantische Theologie*, 3rd ed. by A. Hauck.
Qi. . . .	David Qimḥi (†1230).
Ralbag . . .	R[abbi] L[evi] b[en] G[ershon] (†1344): Heb. Comm. in Buxtorf's *Biblia Rabbinica.*
Ra[shi] . . .	R[abboni] Sh[elomoh] Y[iṣḥaḳi] (1040–1105). Hebrew Commentary on Job in Buxtorf's *Bibl. Rabbinica.*
RB . . .	*Revue Biblique Internationale publiée par l'École pratique d'Études Bibliques établie au convent Dominicain Saint-Étienne de Jerusalem* (Paris).
R[ei]sk[e, J. J.] .	*Conjecturæ in Jobum et Proverbia*, Lips. 1779.
REJ . . .	*Revue des Études Juives.*
Renan, E. . .	*Le livre de Job*, 1860.
Richter, G. . .	*Dunkle Stellen im Buche Hiob*, 1912.
Rogers, R. W. .	*C[uneiform] P[arallels to the Old Testament].*
Ros[enmüller] .	*Jobus*, Lips. 1806.
Saad . . .	Saadiah (†942).
Sam[*uel*][2] . .	See Dr. 4.
Schl[ottmann] .	*D. B. Hiob*, 1851.
Schnurrer . .	*Animadversiones ad quædam loca Jobi*, Tüb. 1781–2.
Schult[ens, A.] .	*Liber Jobi*, Lugd. 1737.
S[ie]gf[ried, C.] .	*The Book of Job, critical edition of the Hebrew Text*, 1893.
Sievers, E. . .	*Metrische Studien* in the *Abhandlungen der phil.-hist. classe d. königl. sächsischen Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, xxi. (1901). The *Textproben* include Job 3–7.
Sta[de, B.] . .	(1) *Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, 1879. (2) *WB* = Siegfried, C. u. Stade, B., *Hebr. Wörterbuch zum AT.*
St[ick]el . . .	*Das Buch Hiob*, 1842.
Strahan, J. . .	*The Book of Job interpreted*, 1913.
Stu[der, G. L.] .	*Das Buch Hiob*, 1881.
Stuhl[mann, M. H.]	*Hiob*, 1804.
Thomson, W. M. .	*The L[and and the] B[ook]*, 1867.
Tristram, H. B. .	*[The] N[atural] H[istory of the] B[ible]*, 1867.
TSK . . .	*Theologische Studien u. Kritiken.*
Voi[gt, Cl.] . .	*Einige Stellen d. B. Hiob*, Lauban, 1895.

We[llh.] . . . Wellhausen, J.
Wetz[stein] . . Notes in Del.
Wr[ight, G. H. B.] *The Book of Job*, 1883.
WZKM . . *Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes.*
ZA . . . *Zeitschrift f. d. Assyriologie.*
ZA(T)W . . *Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*
ZDMG . . *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*
ZDPV . . . *Zeitschrift d. deutschen Pälastina-Vereins.*

Biblical passages are cited according to the Hebrew enumeration of chapters and verses: where this differs from the English enumeration, the reference to the latter has commonly (except in the philological notes) been added in a parenthesis. In the translation of c. 41, however, it seemed more convenient to place the English enumeration first.

The sign †, following a series of references, indicates that all examples of the phrase, word, form or meaning in question, occurring in the OT, have been cited.

The signs ⌜ ⌝ enclosing words in the translation (*e.g.* 3^{14}) indicate departures from 𝔐 (occasionally also departures even from 𝔐 have been so indicated). Small print in the translation indicates probable additions, and unleaded type the longer interpolations of cc. 28. 32–37.

al. = alii (others).
Cp. = Compare.
Ct. = Contrast.

INTRODUCTION

I. Title and Place in the Canon.

§ 1. The Book of Job is one of the eleven books which constitute the third of the three parts of which the Hebrew Scriptures, תורה נביאים וכתובים, consist. In printed Hebrew Bibles it takes the third place among those eleven books, following Ps. and Pr. This order goes back to Hebrew MSS, especially those of German provenance; but other arrangements occur in other MSS or Jewish lists, Job preceding Pr. in the Talmudic list (*Baba Bathra*, 14b) and in many MSS, especially the Spanish, and preceding both Ps. and Pr. in Jer.'s list of the third part of the Hebrew Scriptures.[1] But of Jewish arrangements it may be said (1) that Job is generally grouped together with the *poetical* books Ps. and Pr.; and (2) that this group generally stands at the beginning of the Hagiographa (and consequently immediately after the prophets), or preceded by one book only (Ruth or Ch.).[2]

In 𝔊 and in Greek and Latin lists, owing to the abandonment of the Jewish tripartite division, the different positions

[1] *Prol. Gal.* (*Præf. in Libr. Samuel et Malachim*): "Tertius ordo Ἁγιόγραφα possidet; et primus liber incipit ab *Job*. Secundus a *David*. . . . Tertius est *Salamon*." The premier position thus given to Job was probably due to a chronological consideration, such as is cited and rejected in *Baba Bathra*, 14b: "The order of the Kethubim is Ruth, the Book of Psalms, Job and Proverbs, etc. . . . Now, if it be said, Job lived in the days of Moses, Job therefore should be placed at the head: verily we do not begin with calamity."

[2] Some exceptions to both these general rules are recorded in H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, 281 f. More generally on the place of Job in lists, Jewish and others, see Ryle, *op. cit.* ch. xii., and Swete, *Introd. to the OT in Greek*, part ii. ch. i.

assigned to Job become far more numerous. "Much difficulty seems to have been felt as to the place of Job: the book normally appears in connexion with the poetical books, either last or first, but it is sometimes placed among the histories (Augustine, Innocent, Cod. Clarom., Ps.-Gelasius, Cassiodorius), or after the Prophets."[1] In EVV., under the influence of what had come to be the standard arrangement of Ⅴ,[2] the book stands in an ambiguous position—last of the historical or first of the poetical books. In deference to theories connecting Job with Moses or his age, the book was placed in Ⅽ between Deut. and Jos.[3] In Epiphanius (*de mens et pond.* 23) it stands between Jos. and Judges.

§ 2. Like Joshua or Ruth, the book bears as its title simply the name of its hero—איוב, *Ἰώβ*. The dissyllabic Hebrew name 'Iyyōb became in Ⅴ Job, and hence in EVV. monosyllabic.

II. Subject and Main Divisions.

§ 3. The Book of Job contains (1) the story of the sudden change in the fortunes of a sheikh of ancient times, and (2) the speeches in a discussion arising out of this. Job, so the story runs, was a man conspicuous for his wealth and good fortune which he had long enjoyed, but not less so for his character, which was beyond reproach from either God or man. On a single day he was stripped of all his possessions and of all his children, and shortly afterwards smitten with a fell disease. The occasion of this tragic change remains unknown to Job, but the reader is at once acquainted with it. One day when Yahweh in heaven was surrounded by the sons of the gods, He commends Job to the attention of one of them, the Satan, as the

[1] Swete, *op. cit.* 228.

[2] MSS of Ⅴ show many different positions of Job (S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 331–339): the still prevailing arrangement according to which Job follows the historical books and immediately precedes Ps. became fixed in the 13th cent. (Berger, p. 304).

[3] Job is also mentioned in this order in Jer. *Ep.* liii. ("Ad Paulinum": Migne, *PL* xxii. 545). "Saint Jérôme, qui écrivait en Syrie, s'est-il inspiré de l'usage des populations qui l'entouraient?" (Berger, *op. cit.* p. 305).

best man on earth. The Satan at once disputes the depth of Job's piety: it is, he suggests, but skin-deep: if Job be deprived of his wealth, he will abandon his fear of God and blaspheme. Yahweh permits the Satan to put the matter to the test. The Satan strips Job of his wealth; but Job stands the test. The Satan then with equal unsuccess tests Job by depriving him also of his health. Job's wife, indeed, now breaks down, and bids her husband curse God and die; but Job himself still with undiminished piety accepts everything in a spirit of resignation. After an interval of, it is implied (see n. on 1^{11-13}), at least some weeks, three friends of Job come to comfort him, and for seven days sit silently with him. Job then breaks the silence in a monologue raising the question why he and other sufferers are born or compelled to live. There follow two cycles each of six speeches, one by each of the three friends and an answer to each by Job, and a third cycle which, whether so originally or not, is now incomplete, two only of the friends taking part in it. In these speeches the friends assert and Job denies that his calamities are due to his sin. After Job's speech at the conclusion of the third cycle, a new speaker, Elihu, intervenes at great length. Then Yahweh replies to Job, eliciting brief responses from him. After the speeches the story is resumed: taking no account of Elihu, Yahweh condemns what the three friends had said, approves what Job had said, and restores to him twice his former wealth. Thus five main divisions of the existing book are clearly marked:

1. Introduction or Prologue, 1–2.
2. Speeches of Job and the three Friends, 3–31.
3. Speeches of Elihu, 32–37.
4. Speeches of Yahweh with Job's responses, 38^{1}–42^{6}.
5. Conclusion or Epilogue, 42^{7-17}.

For fuller analysis of the book see § **31**; and cp. §§ **32–41**.

III. Literary Form.

§ **4.** On the ground of the subject discussed in the speeches (§§ 3, 32–41), Job has commonly and appropriately been classed with Pr., Qoh., Sir., and Wisdom as belonging to the

"Wisdom" or reflective literature[1] of the Jews in which human life is considered broadly without the overruling national interest that characterizes most other Hebrew literature. But in two matters of form Job differs from these other specimens of Jewish wisdom:—(1) in its combination of prose and poetry,[2] the Prologue and Epilogue being prose,[3] the speeches poetry: and (2) in its use of dialogue.[4] Something distantly similar to both these characteristics of the book may be found in other Hebrew literature; but the resemblances are partial, and the book of Job remains unique not only in the "Wisdom," but in the entire literature of the Jews.[5]

[1] See, *e.g.*, C. H. Toy, "Wisdom Literature," in *EBi.*: Dr. *LOT* 392–394; W. T. Davison, *The Wisdom Literature of the O.T.*: C. Siegfried, "Wisdom," in *DB.*

[2] Pr. and Sir. are poetry throughout; Wisdom—written in Greek—is written throughout in a style strongly affected by Hebrew parallelism, possibly also by Hebrew rhythm; whether on this account it should be termed poetry or prose may here be left an open question (cp. *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 32 f., 136). Qoh. "is written, as a whole, in prose; but when the thought becomes elevated, or sententious, it falls into the poetical form of rhythmic parallelism" (Dr. *LOT*[9] 465): yet even though this be so, the distribution of prose and poetry in Job and Qoh. is entirely different: in Job the prose parts are prose not passing into poetry, and the poetry is sustained poetry not dropping into prose.

[3] Prose also are the formulæ introducing the several speeches ($3^{1.2}$ 4^{1} 6^{1} etc.) and the longer introduction to Elihu's speeches (32^{1-6a}). The distinction between poetry and prose, already mentioned by Jer. (*Præf. in Lib. Job: PL* xxvii. 1081), is imperfectly marked in ℵ by the use of two different systems of accentuation—the ordinary system in 1^{1}–3^{1} and 42^{7-17}, the system employed in Pr. and Ps. in 3^{2}–42^{6}, *including* the *prose* of 32^{1-6a} and the introductory formulæ.

[4] Perhaps we might add as a third difference its sustained treatment of a single theme. Sir., the work of a single writer, is indeed longer than Job, but it ranges discursively over a variety of aspects of human life and conduct; so does Pr., the work of many writers. Qoh. and Wisdom are considerably shorter than Job. Outside the "Wisdom" literature the historical compilations are, of course, much longer than Job, but the nearest approach to the sustained treatment of a theme is to be found in Is. 40–55 and Ezk 40–48, both of which are shorter. In any case, Job has this interest that no other single Hebrew poet has left us the same amount of poetry: this remains true even though a considerable part of Job (28. 32–37. 38–41) be assigned to different poets.

[5] Nor is it unique merely as an exotic, which has its own well-defined class elsewhere. It is, for example, no more similar to a Greek or any other epic or drama than to other works of Hebrew literature. A drama

§ 5. Many books of the OT. contain, it is true, both prose and poetry; but those books are either, like the prophetical books, which contain both prose memoirs and prophetic poems (cp. the Introd. to *Isaiah*), not single works, or, as in the prose historical books which *cite* poems, they combine the styles differently. On the other hand, Job, if the substantial integrity of the book can be maintained, is a single work written partly in prose, partly in poetry, the narrative in prose, the speeches in poetry. For analogies to this we must go beyond Hebrew literature: *e.g.* to the *Maḳâmât* of Hariri in which the narrative is in rhymed prose, but the (longer) speeches of the characters are (commonly) metrical poems.

§ 6. Again some analogy to the dialogue, to the response of two or more speakers to one another, is to be found, for example, in Canticles (*e.g.* $1^{7f.\ 16f.}$ 2^{1-3}); but for dialogue as a means of discussing problems of life, we must again pass for analogy beyond Jewish literature. Such dialogue[1] until recently was quite unknown in Babylonian literature; but certain texts —one of the age of Sargon (722–705 B.C.)—have now been published containing what their editor describes as specimens of philosophical dialogue.[2] These, however, offer a very distant

in any strict sense it is certainly not; in the Prologue there is movement indeed, but the Prologue is narrative,—an anticipation of the novel rather than of the drama,—and in the dialogue there is no dramatic movement. There are in the book, it is true, all the elements that might have been combined by a Greek into a great drama: the Hebrew writer has used them differently, and his work was certainly never acted in ancient Judah. Job has, I am informed, been recently staged in New York, and, according to my informant, the performance was very impressive; but this no more proves that the Hebrew work was a drama than H. G. Wells' *Undying Fire* proves that it was a novel. Reference may also be made to the judicious criticism by C. G. Montefiore in the *Harvard Theological Review*, 1919, 219–224, of *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy*, in which the author (H. M. Kallen) seeks to prove that the existing book of Job is the result of editorial manipulations of what was originally a Hebrew imitation of a Euripidean tragedy.

[1] Dialogue of a *different* type was known; and Kön. (*Einl.* 410 f.) had even compared that in the "Descent of Ishtar" (Rogers, *CP* 121 ff.) with that in Job, on the ground that both were cases of dialogue introduced into epic.

[2] E. Ebeling, *Keilinschrifttexte aus Assur rel. Inh.* iii. 193; *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1918², pp. 50–70 (German translation with

parallel to the dialogue as handled in Job; they are simple, brief, and exceedingly schematic. In a dozen sections all cast in the same scheme and some eight lines in length, the advantages and disadvantages of various courses of action are discussed by a master and his slave. Between the Babylonian "philosophical dialogue," so far as yet known, and the dialogue in Job the difference is so great as to render any direct influence of one over the other altogether improbable. And the same is true, though in this case the difference is of quite another kind, of the Greek dialogue. It is curious that the most famous examples of this were written at probably no great distance of time from Job, and it is barely possible, though not probable (§§ 42–47), that the author of Job wrote later than Plato; yet between the dialogue of Job, consisting exclusively of long set speeches in poetical form, and the prose dialogues of Plato, with their closely knit analytical argument carried on by means of much quickly responsive conversation, the difference is so great that the probability that the Hebrew writer was influenced by those Greek literary models is so slight as to be negligible. So long as Job was commonly regarded as long anterior to Plato, it was not customary to look upon Plato as an imitator of Job; there is just as little reason now that Job is referred to a later age than formerly to assert that it is "unquestionably a Hebrew imitation of the philosophical dialogue of Plato."[1] Whence the author derived any suggestion for the use of dialogue in discussing the problems of life thus remains quite obscure.

notes). Cp. *ET*, 1920, pp. 420–423, where will be found an English translation of six of the sections, of which one may here serve as an illustration:

"Slave, attend to me! 'Yes, my lord, yes.'
'I will love a woman.' 'Yes, love, my lord, love!
A man who loves a woman forgets trouble and care.'
'No, slave, I will not love a woman.' 'Love not, my lord, love not.
Woman is a pit, a hole that is dug;
Woman is an iron dagger, sharp, which cuts a man's throat.'"

[1] Oscar Holtzmann in Stade's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 331.

IV. Origin and History of the Book: Possible Sources and Additions.

§ 7. The unique character of the combination of prose and poetry in the book (§ 5) has sometimes been treated as the result of the origin of the book, of the existing material which the author utilized. What was this? That the book is a report of facts of history, the exact record in prose of the actual fortunes of a particular individual and of the words spoken in verse by him and others, is a view that was long maintained or accepted,[1] though not even in earlier times without occasional suggestions that the book is fiction.[2] It is unnecessary to repeat here the arguments against a view which has become entirely antiquated. But if the book is not history, and the speeches not the *ipsissima verba* of speeches reported *verbatim*, it need not be pure invention; the story with which it opens and closes may be, and in part almost certainly is, based on or derived from popular tradition or literature; and, indeed, this is quite certain, if the book is rightly inferred to have been written after the Exile (see § 42 ff.), for Ezk. $14^{14.\ 20}$ refers to

[1] A defence of the strictly historical character of the book may be found in the learned work of S. Lee, *The Book of the Patriarch Job* (1837), p. 6 ff.: this was directed especially against Warburton, *Divine Legation*, Book vi. sect. 2, in which reasons for regarding the book as—in the main at least—not historical are already set forth.

[2] איוב לא היה ולא נברא אלא משל היה is a judgement attributed to an unnamed contemporary of Samuel b. Nachmani (*Baba Bathra*, 15a: Eng. tr., Ryle, *Canon*, 276 f.). Similarly in *Bereshith Rabba*, § 57, a judgement is attributed to Resh Lakish (3rd cent. A.D.)—though it is noted that this conflicts with another judgement assigned to the same Rabbi—to the effect that the sufferings of Job are not historical though, had they actually befallen him, he would have endured them. מאי לא היה ולא נהיה . . . דיש לקיש אמר איוב לא היה ולא נהיה נהיה בייסורים שנכתבו עליו ולמה נכתבו עליו אלא שאילו באו עליו היה יכול לעמוד בהן. See, further, Isaac Wiernikowski, *Das Buch Hiob nach der Auffassung des Talmud u. Midrasch* (Breslau, 1902), p. 28. Maimonides (*Moreh Nebuchim*, iii. 22) says of the book: "its basis is a fiction, conceived for the purpose of explaining the different opinions which people held on Divine Providence. You know that some of our sages clearly stated Job never existed, and was never created, and that he is a poetic fiction. Those who assume that he existed, and that the book is historical, are unable to determine when and where Job lived. . . . This difference of opinion supports the assumption that he never existed in reality."

Job[1] along with Noah and Daniel, as a conspicuously righteous man. Among those—and they are all but all who have discussed the subject—who admit that the author has utilized tradition or popular story,[2] there is, however, wide difference of judgement as to how much he has derived from thence, some holding that he owes nothing more to tradition (and that in the form of popular *oral* tradition) than that there was once a righteous man named Job,[3] others that the entire prologue and epilogue were excerpted by him from *a book* containing the popular story (a "Volksbuch").[4] Between these two extremes it is possible to hold as a middle view that the fundamental elements of the story—the righteousness of Job, his endurance under trial, etc.—the scene in which it is laid and the names of the persons are some or all of them derived from tradition; if this were so, it might offer some suggestions as to whence the story came.

§ 8. The scene of the book is outside the land of Israel. This might be explained as due to the deliberate choice of a "Wisdom" writer, seeking in this way to enforce the wide human and not merely national nature of his subject. If this were the correct explanation, the particular scene chosen by

[1] It is quite unnecessary with Halévy (*REJ* xiv. 20) to substitute אנוש for איוב in Ezk. $14^{14.\ 20}$.

[2] On the divergence of the book of Job from the popular legend, whether written or oral, and for the history of the legend independently of our book of Job, see D B. Macdonald, "Some External Evidence on the Original Form of the Legend of Job" (*AJSL* xiv. (1898) 137–164) and earlier, *JBLit.* xiv. 63–71. Macdonald suggests that not only Ezk. but also James (5^{11}) refers to the legend, not to our book of Job.

[3] So Karl Kautzsch, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob* (1900), 18 ff., 87. Rather more traditional basis is postulated by Che.: "Most probably all that he adopted from legend was (1) the name of the hero and the land in which he lived; (2) the fact of Job's close intercourse with God; and (3) the surprising circumstance that this most righteous and divinely favoured of men was attacked by some dread disease such as leprosy, but was subsequently healed" (*EBi.* ii. 2469).

[4] Du. (p. vii): of the "Volksbuch the opening has been preserved in cc. 1. 2 of the existing book of Job, the conclusion in 42^{7-17} and also perhaps a fragment in 38^{1}; discussions between Job and the three friends, and a speech of Yahweh to Job, also formed part of this popular book, but these have given place to discussions of an entirely opposite character in the existing book."

the writer would be of little significance, and the reason for the author's choice withdrawn from us. On the other hand, if the scene was traditional, it may point to the region whence the story passed to Israel, just as the scene of the story and its place of origin are associated in such a story as that of the Tower of Babel (Babylon). Broadly the scene is clearly fixed as east of Canaan; but whether it lay in or about Edom or farther north, and in particular in the Hauran, is less certain, the evidence afforded by (1) names and terms (§§ 9–13), (2) tradition (§ 14), and (3) the nature of the country implied in the story (§ 15) being inconclusive and conflicting.

§ 9. (1) *Names and terms.*—Job himself lived in the land of ʿÛṣ, and was, it is implied, one of the "sons of the East" (1^5): unfortunately the position of the land of ʿÛṣ cannot be closely determined, and the "sons of the East" is a term of wide application.

The "sons of the East" (בני קדם; cp. הקדמני, Gn. 15^{19}) in Jg. $6^{3.\ 33}$ 7^{12} 8^{10} are coupled with Midianites and Amalekites as nomad raiders of Western Palestine, in Is. 11^{14} they are opposed to the Philistines on the W., and mentioned with, but probably as distinguished from, Edom, Moab and Ammon, and in Ezk. $25^{4.\ 10}$ they are nomads (cp. Jer. 49^{28} nomads: ‖ Ḳedar) distinguished from, as dwelling E. of, Ammon and Moab. In 1 K. 5^{10} (4^{30}) they are merely mentioned as famed for their wisdom; on Gn. 29^1†, see below. The "land of the East" (ארץ קדם) lay east of Abraham's settlement in *southern* Canaan (Gn. 25^6). From Gn. 29^1 it has been inferred that the "sons of the East" and their land extended also to the far *north*-east of Palestine, to beyond the Euphrates; but this is a precarious inference from a composite narrative; the source may rather have intended, as in Gn. 25^6, country E. or *south*-east of Palestine (see Skinner on Gn. 29^1; Meyer, *INS* 242 ff.); a southern, but not necessarily any far northern, district is implied in an Egyptian reference (about 2000 B.C.) to Ḳedem: in this Sinuhe relates that he passed out of Egypt into the desert, moved thence from place to place and arrived at Ḳedem, whence he was invited into Palestine: see W. Max Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 46; Meyer, *l.c.*; Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. 493.

§ 10. The name ʿÛṣ (עוץ) appears to be brought into connection with three distinct districts. (*a*) Northern Mesopotamia: to this district Gn. 10^{23} (P) = 1 Ch. 1^{17} ʿUṣ the "son" of Aram is commonly referred: see Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 206. But apparently the same ʿUṣ is (Gn 22^{21}) brother of Buz., who in Jer. 25^{23} is associated with the distinctly Arabian Dedan and Têma. (*b*) Damascus and the country S. of it: Jos. (*Ant.* I. vi. 4; cp. Jer. *Quæst. in Gen.* 10^{23}) states that Οὖσης the son of Aram (*i.e.* the ʿUṣ of Gn. 10^{23}) founded Damascus and Trachonitis, *i.e.* the volcanic country beginning

25 m. S. of Damascus and 40 m. E. of the sea of Galilee (see *EBi.* TRACHONITIS). (*c*) Edom, or the neighbourhood of Edom: in Gn. 36^{28}= 1 Ch. 1^{42} Uṣ is a figure in the genealogy of "Seir in the land of Edom" (*ib.* $20^{f.}$). In La. 4^{21} "the land of Uṣ" (ארץ עוץ precisely as in Job 1^{1}) stands in parallelism with Edom; unfortunately some doubt rests on the text, for rhythmically the line can spare a word and 𝔊 om. עוץ; however, the mere omission of עוץ with 𝔊 leaves an unsatisfactory phrase and an improbable text. Doubt also rests on ארץ הֻעוץ in Jer. 25^{20}, for 𝔊 omits the clause containing it. If the geographical distribution of the term 'Uṣ was as wide as this survey suggests, viz. from Edom to Northern Mesopotamia, this may have been due to 'Uṣ, or rather 'Aus (𝔊 Αὐσῖτις), itself certainly tribal rather than geographical, being the name of widely scattered tribes—Arab tribes, perhaps, deriving their name from a god 'Auḍ (عوض), as W. R. Smith suggested (*Kinship*, 261, and, in reply to Nö.'s criticism in *ZDMG* xl. 183, *Rel. of the Semites*, 43). But though the tribes of 'Uṣ were widely scattered, it would not necessarily follow that the whole region over which they were scattered, or several distinct districts within it, passed by the name of the *land of Uṣ*. Apart from Job 1^{1}, the only passage casting a direct light on the situation of the *land* of 'Uṣ is, if the text can be trusted, La. 4^{21}, and this decisively connects it with Edom.

§ 11. Of the three friends of Job, Eliphaz certainly appears to come from Edom, Bildad from a tribe that may have been closely associated with Edom, while Ṣophar's origin is very uncertain. (On the name and origin of Elihu, see 32^{2} n.)

Teman, the home of Eliphaz, lay at one, and that probably the northern, extremity of Edom (Ezk. 25^{13}), though other sites within Edom have been attributed to it (see *EBi. s.v.*). Shuaḥ (Gn. 25^{2}= 1 Ch. $1^{32f.}$), Bildad's tribe, claimed descent from Abraham through Ḳeṭurah, and, according to Gn. 25^{2} 𝔊, was "uncle" of Sheba, *Teman* and Dedan, whence we may infer that Eliphaz and Bildad lived in regions not very remote from one another. The suggestion formerly put forward by Fried. Del. and accepted or favourably entertained by many writers (Dr. on Gn. 25^{2}; Peake on Job 1^{1}; G-B.^{15}, *s.v.*; Meyer *INS* 314; Glaser, *Skizzen*, ii. 445 f.), that Bildad's home was Suḥu on the Euphrates—some weeks' journey from Teman—has been withdrawn by Del. himself (*Hiob*, p. 139). Ṣophar the Na'amathite certainly did not come from Na'amah (Jos. 15^{41}) in the Philistine plain (though Ley (*Das Buch Hiob.* 27) is willing to believe it, and to infer that he was intended to play the rôle of a representative of the religion of Israel!), nor necessarily from the Calebite Na'am (1 Ch. 4^{15}), so that Ṣophar also would be an Edomite (*EBi.* 5427), nor from distant Ma'in in southern Arabia, or even from the Minæan colony or trading station at El-Öla—which lay some three or four hundred miles S. of the home of Eliphaz. 𝔊, it is true, describes Sophar as ὁ Μιναίων βασιλεύς, thinking not of El-Öla, which as a trading colony would not be the seat of a king, but presumably of Ma'in 1200 miles away; but this is

in accordance with its tendency to turn Job's friends, great sheikhs of neighbouring tribes, into kings and tyrants of nations. Barton (*JBLit.*, 1912, p. 66), reviving suggestions of Wetzstein in Del., connects Na'amathite with en-No'eme in the Nuḳra (see § 14)—a suggestion that may fall in with but cannot establish a theory—and Temanite with Tema in the same region; but judiciously finds the connection of Shuite with Ṣueta (صويت), also in the same region, "unsatisfying."

§ 12. Some of the personal names are suggestive, or possibly suggestive, of Edom.

Not Job itself: איוב is unknown in Hebrew literature except as the name of the hero of the book, for with יוב (Gn. 46^{13}: EV. Job), and, in spite of 42^{17} 𝔊, יובב (Gn. 10^{29}), it has nothing to do. The name may, on the analogy of יְלוּד, have suggested to Hebrew readers or hearers of the story the meaning "the object of enmity," though the form קטול regularly expresses an active sense; alternatively it has been connected with the root which gives the Arabic أوّاب (penitent). But the etymology and the identification with the proper name A-ia-bu (Tel el-Amarna Tablet, $237^{6.\ 18}$) are alike uncertain. If of foreign origin the name may have been modified in the course of Hebrew tradition so as to express a meaning. Eliphaz, on the other hand, is well authenticated as an Edomite name (Gn. $36^{10f.}$ = 1 Ch. $1^{35f.}$), though being of a(n early) type that was widely spread, it must not be assumed that the name was exclusively Edomite. Bildad (בלדד, Βαλδαδ) is unknown except through the story of Job, though Che. (*EBi.* 4495) and Bu. recall the Edomite בדד (Gn. 36^{35}): the first element perhaps recurs in the Edomite בלהן, Βαλααν (Gn. 36^{27}), which is also the name of a Benjamite (1 Ch. 7^{10}), and in בלעם (Ammonite?; Nu. 22^{5}) and בלשן (Babylonian-Jewish, Ezr. 2^{2}): the second element occurs in the Hebrew אלדד and elsewhere (*HPN* 60 ff.). Ṣophar as written in 𝔐 in 11^{1} 42^{9} (צפר: but צופר in 2^{11} 20^{1}) is identical with the name of the father of Balak, king of Moab, as written in Nu. 22^{10} 23^{18} (צפר; but צפור elsewhere). In 𝔊 the name of Job's friend, Σωφαρ, Σοφαρ, is always distinguished from Balak's father Σεπφωρ, Σεφωρ. In 𝔐 צופר does not occur except in Job; but Σωφαρ occurs in Gn. $36^{11.\ 15}$ (𝔐 צפו), 1 Ch. 1^{36} (𝔐 צפי) in Edomite genealogies and in close connection with Eliphaz and Teman. The Palmyrene צפרא (Lidz. *NSE* 359; *Eph.* i. 347, ii. 293, 312) is Σεφφερα (cp. De Vogué, *Syrie Centrale*, p. 15), and so probably is צפרי (Lidz. i. 199, ii. 303).

§ 13. The references to Sheba (1^{15}) and the "Chaldæans" (1^{17}) as raiding Job have also been invoked in determining the situation of his home: thus Dhorme (*RB*, 1911, 105) concludes that "nous sommes amenés au nord-ouest de l'Arabie quelque part au sud de Ma'an," *i.e.* to the frontiers of Edom. Yet even if the terms are correctly read, such a conclusion is probably too precise.

𝔊 in 1^{15} has *οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύοντες* (=שׁבָה taken collectively), and in ^{17} *οἱ ἱππεῖς*, which may be an interpretation of כשׂרים (see phil. n. on 1^{17}), or a translation of a different text—of פרשׁים (Che. *ET* viii. 433) rather than of רכשׁים (Nestle, *ib.*) or חולים (Hommel, *ib.* 378 f., 431). Barton (*JBLit.*, 1912, 67) follows 𝔊: Che. (*EBi.* 968, 2469) emends כשׂרים into כשׂיים (north-Arabian) Cushites, and Hommel (*l.c.*) into חולים, those of Ḥavilah. None of these suggestions, however, is *more* probable than 𝔐. But what does 𝔐 mean? That Job, a great sheikh indeed but not a monarch, was raided by the forces of two distant and famous kingdoms—the Chaldæans of Babylonia and the Sabæans (see on 1^{15})—is unlikely even in fiction. Even if this is the meaning, which seems highly unlikely, any part of the land of the children of the E. would have been as likely as any other to receive an attack from this curious combination. But if כשׂרים here and in 2 K. 24^{2} are nomads E. or S.E. (note the order in 2 K., particularly if ארם be read for ארם) of Judah (see on 1^{15}, also Dhorme, *RB*, 1910, 384; 1911, 105), Job's home must no doubt be placed not too far north, but whether it is *necessary* to place it farther south than the Hauran is questionable. The Sheba intended, though not the south Arabian kingdom, certainly lay south of Edom (1^{15} n.).

§ 14. (2) Tradition, Christian (from the 4th cent. A.D.) and Moslem, persistently connect Job with the Hauran,[1] and more exactly with the Nukra, "the great plain of the Hauran and the granary of Syria" (Baedeker, *Palestine*[3], 183), where Der 'Eyyub, some forty miles S.S.W. of Damascus, perpetuates Job's name to the present day. Dhorme (*RB*, 1911, 103 f.), however, explains this tradition as due to a series of confusions, and finds traces of an early alternative Christian tradition in Chrysostom on Job 2^{8} and 'Isho'dad († *c.* 850) on Job 1^{1}, who speaks of a land of 'Uṣ still existing in Arabia. However this may be, still earlier association of Job with Edom is certainly found in the appendix to 𝔊, which makes Job a king of Edom.

§ 15. (3) The nature of the country in which Job's home lay, if considered by itself, would point strongly to such a district as the Hauran rather than to Edom. For Job's home lay in a country of great farms, at once near a town and yet open to the desert (see on 1^{1-5}, p. 2). But Edom, the home of Esau, was among the Hebrews proverbially distinguished from such country as being "away from the fatness of the earth and from the dew of heaven" (Gn. 27^{39}). Job obviously in habit

[1] See Wetzstein's Appendix in Del.; Clermont-Ganneau, *Rec. d'Archéologie Orientale*, v. 11 ff.; Guy Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 515.

of life more nearly resembles Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, than Esau.

Thus a number of small considerations combine to suggest, though not to prove, that certain elements in the story of Job came to Israel from or through Edom; but others, while still compatible with an Eastern origin, would seem to indicate that certain features of the story, if originally Edomite, have become blurred and indistinct or transformed.

§ 16. More recently quite a different class of evidence from that already considered has been adduced in order to suggest that the ultimate source of Job is in Babylonian literature. In this case it is not the scene and the names, but the substance of the story, and in particular the speeches of Job, that are involved. The particular Babylonian poem[1] which has provoked this theory has sometimes been described as the "Babylonian Job." The hero of the poem—a king, as most have concluded—was named Tabi-utul-Bel (Jastrow), or Šubši-mešri-Nergal (Landersdorfer), Tabi-utul-Bel in the latter case being another king warned by Ur-bau in a dream to take a message to Šubši-mešri-Nergal. Tabi-utul-Bel is described as dwelling in Nippur, and the god Marduk is mentioned: other names of places and persons do not occur.

The poem opens:

I will praise the Lord of Wisdom,

[1] It has survived fragmentarily in several copies of the 7th cent. B.C., and a commentary on the poem has also been discovered; and so we may infer that, probably itself far older than the 7th cent., the poem was then still much read and studied. It appears to have extended to four tablets, containing about 300, or perhaps about 480 lines: of the first tablet only a few lines survive, of the second the greater part, of the third and fourth less—in all, probably somewhat more or less than a half. The poem is mostly in 4:4 rhythm (Job is in 3:3: see § 52). On the history, restoration and interpretation of the poem, see M. Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Assyr.* ii. 120–133; *JBLit.*, 1906, 135–191; *Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1906, 801–808; S. Landersdorfer, "Eine babylonische Quelle f. d. B. J." (*Biblische Studien*, xiv. 2), 1911; Martin, "Le juste souffrant," in *Journal Asiatique*, 10th series, xvi. 75–143. See also Zimmern in *KAT*³ 384–386 (where parallelism not with Job, but with the servant of Yahweh is suggested); Rogers, *CP* 164–169 (translation of the second tablet); R. Campbell Thomson, *PSBA*, 1910, 18ff. Further literature is given by Jastrow and Landersdorfer (pp. 11–14).

presumably for release from the sufferings, which the rest of what survives of the first tablet describes :

Although a [kin]g, I have become a slave.
The day is filled with groaning, the night with weeping:
The night with howling, the year with mourning (cp. Job $7^{3f.}$).

The second tablet opens as follows :

I attained to (long) life, I moved beyond the appointed time;
(Wherever) I turn, (there is) evil, evil;
Oppression is increased, righteousness I see not;

and then after recording that he had appealed to his god, his goddess and various classes of enchanters, etc. (ll. 4–9), he passes on to say that trouble has overtaken him as though he had been negligent in his religious duties (12–23), whereas he was only conscious of having been exemplary in his conduct :

But I myself took thought only for prayers and supplications,
Prayer was my rule, sacrifice my order.

This passage concludes with the lines :

The respect of the king I made of highest power :[1]
In reverence of the palace I instructed the people :
For I knew that before the god such deeds are in good favour.

This is immediately followed by reflections on the mysterious ways and judgements of the gods, which are beyond the comprehension of man's short life and subject to sudden changes of fortune :

That which seemeth good to itself, that is evil with god :
And that which in its heart is rejected, that is good with his god.
Who can understand the counsel of the gods in heaven?
The plan of the gods full of darkness, who shall establish it?
How shall pale-faced men understand the way of the god! (cp. Job $4^{17f.}$).
He who lives in the evening is in the morning dead (cp. Job 34^{20} 27^{19} $4^{19f.}$).
Quickly is he in trouble, suddenly is he smitten;
In a moment he is singing and playing,
In an instant he is howling like a complainer;
Every moment, so are their thoughts changed.
Now they are hungry, and are like a corpse,
Again they are full, and like unto their god.
If it go well with them, they speak of climbing up to heaven:
If they be in trouble, they talk of going down to hell.

The suffering king now describes his sufferings and the symptoms of his malady : the particularity of the description and some of the figures employed recall Job's descriptions of himself; of this long description it it must suffice to cite a few lines :

With a whip he has beaten me,—
With a staff he has pierced me, the point was strong.
All day long doth follow the avenger,

[1] Variant : like a god. Jastrow supposes that the king had sinned in allowing the people to pay him divine honour.

In the middle of the night he lets me not breathe for a moment (cp. Jb. $7^{13f.}$ 30^{17}).
Through tearings my joints are sundered,
My limbs are undone . . .
Upon my couch I passed the night like a bull,
I was covered with my excrement like a sheep.
My symptoms of fever were not clear (?) to the magicians.

He felt himself forsaken, in immediate prospect of death, and already given up for dead:

The god helped me not, he took me not by the hand;
My goddess did not pity me, she came not to my side.
The sarcophagus hath opened (cp. Jb. $17^{1.\ 13f.}$) . . .
Before I was dead, the death wail was finished.
My whole land cried out, "Alas!" (or, He is ruined).
Mine enemy heard, his face glowed,
To my female enemy they brought the good tidings, her spirits brightened up.

The opening line of the third tablet, "Heavy was his hand, I could no more endure it" (cp. Jb. 23^{2} G), seems to represent the sufferer as reduced to despair. But God now intervenes on his behalf: for at this point, so far as can be judged from the broken and difficult text, a revelation relating to the sufferer's case is communicated to him. When the text becomes clearer again, the sufferer is obviously recording the removal of his sins and of the various symptoms of his illness:

My sins he caused the wind to carry away;
. . . . . .
Into the depths of the abyss he sent back the evil spirit;

and the poem appears to conclude with the restoration of the sufferer to the favour of Marduk.

§ 17. Among the points of resemblance between this poem and Job are the poetical form, the subject, viz. the sudden reduction of a man of great position, who had already lived a long and prosperous life, to great misery of mind, body and estate, the long description of his sufferings put into the mouth of the sufferer,[1] the contrast between these sufferings and the kind of life to which his long-maintained piety might have been expected to lead, the reflections on the mysteries of God's dealings with mortals. These resemblances are certainly noticeable, but the differences are equally striking. The names of the persons, the topography, the rank[2] of the sufferer

[1] Parallels to this are frequent among the so-called Babylonian "penitential Psalms" and the Hebrew Psalms (*e.g.* 22. 102).

[2] Landersdorfer rightly insists that the transformation of a king into a sheikh is against the normal tendency of popular tradition.

are all different: there is no parallel in the Babylonian work to the combination of narrative[1] and discourse in Job, there is no parallel at all to the dialogue which forms so conspicuous and distinguishing a feature of Job: there is a sharp and crucial difference between the two works on the question of guilt as a cause of the sufferings described; Yahweh in the Prologue and Job in his speeches agree in asserting the innocence of Job; Yahweh asserts the perfection of Job's character, and Job is certain that his sufferings cannot be explained by any sin that he has committed. On the other hand, the Babylonian sufferer, though he is conscious of having been punctilious in the discharge of duties the neglect of which would have explained his sufferings, is anything but certain that he has not committed some sin which, unknown to him, may have been displeasing to the gods and therefore the cause of his sufferings; and he more or less clearly admits that he had done amiss. His problem is to discover what it is that he has done to displease the gods and so to bring his sufferings upon himself. Job's problem is to understand how God can plague him though he has done nothing to displease Him. Finally, the difference in the name and country of the heroes of the two works points strongly away from, at any rate, any close connection between them.[2] At present, at all events, it cannot be said that any Babylonian source of the book of Job has been made out.

§ 18. Whence and in what form the story used by him came to the author of the book of Job, what predecessors he may have had in the employment of dialogue as a literary form, are questions that evidence external to the book and such internal evidence as we have so far examined answer at best very incompletely and uncertainly. But there are some who find a much more precise answer at least to the question in what form

[1] Even if the two or three lines mentioning the name and residence of Tabi-utul-Bel were, as Jastrow claimed, narrative, standing as they do in the middle of the poem and being themselves in verse, they would form no real parallel to the sustained *prose* narrative of the Prologue and Epilogue of Job.

[2] Che (*EBi.* 2469) suggests a different Babylonian origin for both the Hebrew story and the name of its hero: 'Iyyob is Eabani, the friend of Gilgamesh.

the story came to the author of the existing book. On the ground of differences in style and in other respects it has been claimed that the Prologue and Epilogue are the work of a writer not identical with the author of the Dialogue,[1] but that the latter extracted these from a prose book of Job,[2] and inserted his Dialogue between them.

There is one difference between Prologue and Epilogue on the one hand and Dialogue on the other that might at first seem to point to a use of sources in Job similar to that apparent in the Pentateuch: the Prologue and Epilogue employ, the Dialogue (3–31) studiously avoids, the use of the name Yahweh, regularly employing in its stead God (El, Eloah) or, like P, the Almighty (Shaddai).

§ 19. The use of the divine names in different parts of the book is as follows:

Name.	Number of Occurrences in				Total.
	Cc. 1. 2 and 42^{7-17}.	Cc. 3–31.	Cc. 32–37.	Cc. 38–42^{6}.	
אל .	0	33	19	3	55
אלוה .	0	33	6	2	41
שדי .	0	24	6	1	31
אלהים .	8	3	2	1	14
האלהים .	3	0	0	0	3
יהוה .	23	1 (12^{9})	0	5	29

[1] In an earlier stage of criticism, a theory (now generally and rightly abandoned), according to which the Dialogue was written first and the Prologue and Epilogue were added later by another writer, gained some currency: so, according to K. Kautzsch, to whose dissertation, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob*, 3 ff., reference may be made for the history of this theory, first Simon (1685), then Schultens (1737), Hasse (1789), Stuhlmann (1804), de Wette (1807), Studer (1875), who threw out the suggestion that the original introduction to the poem exists in c. 29 f. (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theologie*, i. 706 ff.). S. Lee (1837) held that Job committed the speeches to writing, and that Moses added the Prologue and Epilogue.

[2] So Du. most incisively (see p. xxvi, n. 4). For earlier theories of the Prologue (and Epilogue) as derived from or resting on an earlier popular (prose) book of Job, see Che. *Job and Solomon*, p. 66 ff.; Hoffmann; Bu.

עליון never occurs in Job, nor האל, for in view of the frequent occurrence of אל without the article it would be illegitimate to assume its presence with the particles ל and כ (לְאֵל, כְּאֵל) in 13^{8} 21^{14} 22^{17} 31^{28} 33^{6} $34^{10.37}$ (cp. G-B. pp. 36b, 37a). The pl. אלים occurs nowhere in the existing text, nor should it be introduced by emendation (Che.) in $41^{1(9)}$. אדני occurs only in 28^{28}. The terms regularly used in other parts of the book *never* occur in the Prologue and Epilogue, and the terms used in the Prologue and Epilogue occur either not at all or very rarely, or only under special circumstances, in the other parts of the book: thus the single occurrence in cc. 3–31 of יהוה is in 12^{9}—an interpolated v., and the five occurrences in 38–42^{6} all occur not in the speeches, but in the *narrative* links (38^{1} $40^{1.3.6}$ 42^{1}); the three occurrences of אלהים in 3–31 are in c. 28^{28} (probably an interpolated c.), 20^{29} a rhythmically overloaded line, and 5^{8}, where *perchance* אלהים has arisen from אלוה under the influence of the following אשים; and of two occurrences in 32–37, one occurs in the prose introduction (32^{2}), the other in 34^{9} which may be an interpolation. In part the difference of usage in different parts of the book is merely part of the difference between the language of prose and that of poetry: so at least we may account for the use of אל to the almost complete exclusion of אלהים in the poetical parts. But the use of אל, שדי and אלוה to the complete exclusion of יהוה in the speeches must be due to the fact that the *speakers* are represented as living before, or outside the sphere of, the revelation of the name Yahweh; on the other hand, the *narrator*, alike in the Prologue and Epilogue and in 38–42^{6}, regularly uses Yahweh. Again, as the term Yahweh is avoided in the speeches of 3–42^{6}, so is it absent from the words of Job in 1^{5} 2^{10}, and of the messenger in 1^{16}, and of Job's wife in 2^{9}, אלהים (ה) being used instead; only in 1^{21} is Yahweh used in words of Job, this speech thus differing not only from the longer speeches of 3–42^{6} but also from the briefer sayings in 1. 2. Whether or not this difference *within the Prologue* can be satisfactorily explained, in view of the *difference* of usage *in speeches* within the Prologue and the *identity* of usage *in narrative* in the Prologue and in 38–42^{6} (in 3–31 there is no opportunity for the use of יהוה in narrative), it is very precarious to infer from the use of the divine names that the Prologue and Dialogue are the work of different writers. Other differences may be more significant: viz., in c. 28 the use (see p. 232 n.) of Elohim and Adonai and the greater relative frequency of אל in 32–37 (see § 24).

§ 20. If the differing use of the divine names in the Prologue and Dialogue and the mere fact that the one is prose, the other poetry do not point to difference of authorship, certainly nothing else in the style and vocabulary does so: on the other hand, there are certain noticeable similarities of usage which, if they do not by themselves prove, yet rather favour the common authorship, or, failing that, a rather thorough assimilation by the author of the one of the style of the other.

Thus Prologue and Dialogue agree in describing Job as perfect and in expressing this preferably by the forms תֹּם and תֻּמָּה as against the forms תְּמִים

and שׁם which are more frequent in other books (see n. on 1^1). The particle אולם is a common characteristic of various parts of the book, being as frequent in Job as in the whole of the rest of the OT. (see phil. n. on 33^1); note also בלע, meaning *to destroy* (2^3 n.); נוד, *to console* 2^{11} 42^{11}, ניד, 16^5 (2^{11} n.); על פני פ׳ (defiantly), 1^{11} (׳אל פ, 2^5 13^{15}) 6^{28} 21^{31}, רעים of Job's three friends (2^{11} 19^{21}), כאב, 2^{13} 16^6 (but מכאוב in Elihu, 33^{19}). Most of these with several other—mostly insignificant—similarities of vocabulary are given in K. Kautzsch, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob*, pp. 39–44. Noticeable also in this connection is the presence in 2^{10} of the very pronounced Aramaism קבל (for Hebrew לקח), as a companion of the Aramaisms of the Dialogue (§§ 28, 47). It may be observed that these similarities—for what they may possess of positive worth—are confined to the Prologue, and do not extend to the Epilogue.

Other grounds for assuming difference of authorship have been sought in certain supposed inconsistencies of details, such as the alleged reference in 19^{17} (but see n. there) to Job's children as still living, or of general attitude and purpose (but see §§ 32 ff.). But whether the author was content to provide his dialogue with a ready-made setting, which, according to the exponents of this theory, was incongruous and out of harmony with his own purpose, or whether he moulded the more plastic material of oral story to his own purpose, the work in either case as it left his hands consisted of Prologue, Dialogue and Epilogue. We have next to inquire how far this work has been affected by subsequent expansion, mutilation or other modification.

§ 21. Apart from shorter passages,[1] which have been suspected of being additions to the original text, but which, even if such, do not affect the general structure of the work, there are two sections which are or have been under suspicion of being in whole or in part additions, and a third which has probably been in some way seriously modified.[2] The sections in question are:

[1] See particularly the commentary on 7^8 10^{3c} 11^{6c} $12^{3b.\ 4-12}$ 15^{30a} 16^{9c-11} 17^{8-10} $20^{16.\ 23a}$ 21^{22} $22^{17f.}$ $23^{8f.}$ 24 (introductory note).

[2] Reference may also be made here to the theory that the scenes in heaven (1^{6-11} 2^{1-7a}) are additions to the original Prologue (so, *e.g.*, Kön. *Einl.* 415): certainly 1^{13} connects formally in a certain respect (see n. on 1^{13}) even better with 1^6 than with 1^{12}, and by reading "And *Yahweh* smote" in 2^{7b} this might attach though rather abruptly to 1^{22}. But a theory which on inadequate grounds destroys, as this does, the dramatic effectiveness of the Prologue is not to be accepted.

(*a*) Cc. 25–28, the conclusion of the third cycle of speeches; (*b*) Cc. 32–37, Elihu; (*c*) Cc. 38^{1}–42^{6}, the speeches of Yahweh.

(*a*) Cc. 25–28.[1]—Down to 24 the interchange of speeches has proceeded quite regularly, a speech of one of the friends, ranging in length from 19 to 34 distichs, receiving in reply a speech of Job, in every case longer and in the present probably expanded text of cc. 12–14 much longer. Each of the friends has spoken twice: Eliphaz has also spoken a third time and received Job's reply. After c. 28 there follows a speech of Job (29–31) which, like his opening speech (3), is neither addressed to, nor takes any account of, the friends, though, unlike 3, it is in part, though a very small part, addressed to God (30^{20-23}). Thus the conclusion of the dialogue proper is to be sought in or within 25–28, or rather 25–27, for 28 is, as a quiet impersonal description of Wisdom, differing from the Dialogue in its use of the divine names (§ 19) and for various reasons discussed in the commentary, best regarded as an independent poem, which formed no part of the original work.

Now 25–27 at present contain a brief speech of Bildad (25^{2-6}, consisting of 5 distichs only as against the 19 distichs of the shortest of the preceding speeches, viz. Ṣophar's first speech), and one longer speech (of about 35 distiches), or rather (cp. 27^{1}) of two shorter speeches (of about 13 and 22 distichs respectively), addressed by Job to Bildad in particular (26^{2-4}), or, like Job's previous speeches, to the three friends in common (27^{2-5}). In the brevity of Bildad's third speech and the absence of the attribution of any third speech to Ṣophar, it has frequently been held that the poet provided a formal indication that the friends had exhausted their arguments and thrown up their case. This explanation might be more favourably entertained, if everything else in 22–27 containing the third cycle of speeches were in order; but this is not so. Even in c. 24, as is pointed out in the commentary, there is more or less matter that fits ill in a speech of Job: in 26 f. there is much more: and indeed we may analyse 26 f. into (1) matter appropriate to a speech of

[1] Cp. G. A. Barton, "The Composition of Job 24-30," in *JBLit.*, 1911, 66 ff.

Job's and inappropriate to a speech of one of the friends—$27^{2-6.\,(11)\,12}$; (2) matter inappropriate (for opinions to the contrary, see the commentary) to a speech of Job, but appropriate to the friends—$27^{7-10.\,13-23}$; and (3) neutral matter, *i.e.* matter not inappropriate either in Job or the friends—$26^{2-4.\,5-14}$. Now (2) has been by some (Stu. Bernstein, We. Sgf. Kue.) dismissed as consisting of interpolations; but, since so regarded they are entirely suitable, it is far more probable that these passages are contributions to the third round of the debate by Bildad and Ṣophar. In this case 25–27 should contain in whole or in part Bildad's third speech and Job's reply to it, and Ṣophar's third speech and (unless, as indeed might well be, the monologue in 29–31 takes the place of this) Job's reply to Ṣophar—in all four or, at least, three speeches. But from the limited extent of these chapters we must conclude that part only and not the whole of these four (or three) speeches survive.

The three cc. contain the equivalent of about 40 distichs, whereas four speeches equalling in length only the shortest of the preceding speeches of Job, Bildad and Ṣophar would amount to about 95, three speeches to about 70 distichs. By assigning to Job all the neutral in addition to the positively appropriate matter, 20 distichs can be obtained for him which would perhaps suffice for one speech (his shortest previous speech ran to 28 distichs) though certainly not for two; but in this case there remain only 20 distichs to be distributed among Bildad and Ṣophar which are far too few. On the other hand, if the neutral matter be assigned to Bildad and Ṣophar, even then there is scarcely enough to bring up their speeches to even approximately normal length; and the effect is to leave only 7 distichs in all to Job—altogether insufficient for his reply to Bildad alone, even if 29–31 may be regarded as taking the place of any reply to Ṣophar.

The probability is great, not that to the third cycle Ṣophar contributed nothing and Bildad less than half a dozen distichs, but that the speeches of the third cycle have through some accident reached us in a very imperfect form, part of them having been lost, the remainder dislocated. This single hypothesis of mutilation of the text accounts at once for the whole of the peculiarities of the existing close of the third cycle—the brevity of Bildad's speech, the absence of Ṣophar's, the utterance by Job of matter contradicting his own and in harmony with previous utterances of Bildad and Ṣophar, and the attri-

bution to Job of *two* formal openings (26^{2-4} 27^{2-6}) in reply to a single speech—the brief words of Bildad.

But if there has been serious loss and dislocation of matter, the data for any complete or certain reconstruction of the third cycle do not exist. We cannot determine, for example, whether the loss has affected the speeches of Ṣophar and Bildad equally, whether Ṣophar's speech was wholly lost while most of Bildad's survives, or whether most of Ṣophar's but only a mere fragment of Bildad's has survived. The main point is to recognize that the passages inappropriate in the mouth of Job formed no part of his speech in the original poem.

Under these circumstances it may suffice to record, without entering into particular criticism of them, some of the reconstructions which have been attempted. Most of those who find any of Ṣophar's speech find it in 27^{7-23} to which Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, 1872, pp. 241–250) adds c. 28 as a development of Ṣophar's standpoint in 11^{5-10}. Marshall exceptionally attributes 25^{2-6} 26^{5-14} to Ṣophar; and Bi. (1894) $27^{7-10.\ 14-20}$. Among the reconstructions offered of Bildad's speech are the following:—(1) 25 + 28 (Stuhlmann, 1804); (2) 25 + 26^{5-14} Elzas, *The Book of Job* (1872), p. 83, cited by Che. *Book of Job*, p. 114, n. 1; Che. *ib.* (in *EBi.* 2478 he regards these vv. as substituted for a lost third speech of Bildad); Reuss, Sgf.; (3) 26^{2-4} + 25^{2-6} 26^{5-14} (Du.); (4) $25^{2.\ 3}$ + 26^{5-14}, Peake; (5) 15^{17-19} 25^{4-6}, Honth.; (6) 25. 24^{13-25}, Hoffm.; (7) 25. 24^{18-20} 27^{13-23}, Ley; (8) 24^{18-21}, Marshall; (9) 25. $27^{8-10.\ 13-23}$, Bi. (1882); but, in 1894, $25^{2.\ 3}$ $26^{12.\ 13.\ 14c}$ 25^{4-6}.

§ **22.** (*b*) Cc. 32–37. Elihu.—These cc. consist of a brief introduction in prose (32^{1-6}), and a long speech or series of speeches in verse delivered by Elihu. The cc. were obviously written to occupy their present position in the book: as 32^{1-6} explains, Elihu speaks when the three friends had ceased to reply to Job; and in the speeches Elihu rebukes Job and the friends alike; and from Job's previous speeches he cites actual words, or summarizes statements in them (p. 278), in order to refute them. But it is scarcely less obvious that the rest of the book was not written with any knowledge of these speeches; and consequently that they formed no part of the original work. In contrast to Elihu's frequent direct reference to the friends and to Job, there is no reference, direct or indirect, in any other part of the book to Elihu; the Prologue gives the setting for the debate that follows, and explains how the three

friends who subsequently take part in it come to be present, but it says nothing of Elihu, and the special prose introduction to Elihu's speeches only partially supplies the omission; it gives a reason why Elihu speaks, it gives no reason why he is present. Neither Job nor the friends take the slightest notice of Elihu's attacks on them, or of his arguments; his speech is of greater length than any that have gone before, but no one interrupts him while he is speaking, no one has a word to say of or to him when he has done. Job's last speech closes with an appeal to God to answer him ($31^{35ff.}$), and Yahweh's reply opens (38^{2}) with words obviously addressed to the person who has just finished speaking; since this cannot be Elihu but must be Job, Yahweh's opening admits of no intervening speech of Elihu. Finally, in the Epilogue Yahweh expresses a judgement on what Job has said and what the three friends have said, but makes not the slightest reference to Elihu. Thus this entire section can be removed from the book without any sense of loss or imperfection in its construction being created.

But the speeches are not only superfluous, they are also destructive of the effect of what follows. They are superfluous, because they add nothing substantial to what the friends have said except in so far as they anticipate what Yahweh is to say; they fail, as those speeches had failed, to meet Job's case. They repeat arguments, and even words of the friends (see $33^{9.\ 19.\ 26}$ $34^{7.\ 8-11.\ 21f.}$ 35^{5-7} with nn. there). But they also anticipate (32^{27}–37^{21}) in part what Yahweh says (38^{4-38})—a fact which is entirely explained, if the writer had before him or in his mind the whole book, the speech(es) of Yahweh equally with those of the friends, but most unnaturally if they were the work of the original author who intended Yahweh's speech to round off the debate.

§ 23. Further in the style and language of these chapters there is, in spite of very much that is common to,[1] much that

[1] See Bu. *Beiträge*, 92–123; W. Posselt, *Der Verfasser d. Elihu Reden* (1909), 67–111. The common features are the natural result of the familiarity of the writer with the book which he was supplementing; so, *e.g.*, he naturally uses the same names for God, but (see § 24) with differing relative frequency.

is notably different from the rest of the book, alike in the verbose prose of 32^{1-6} as compared with the Prologue, and in the poetry of the speeches as compared with the other speeches in the book. Some differentiation in the style and even in vocabulary (Eliphaz, for example, alone uses יראה in the sense of religion, 4^{6} n.) might be attributed to dramatic differentiation: and we might seek to explain the prolixity of these speeches as a dramatist's indication that the speaker is a wise young man who is conscious of possessing much more wisdom than his elders, and makes up for lack of real contribution to a discussion by the abundance and violence of his speech; and yet such an explanation, however consonant with the impression made on many readers by Elihu's speeches, is not true to the writer's own intention (see on 32^{6-22}). And in any case there remains much which cannot be attributed to dramatic differentiation, and which, *in the mass*, is most reasonably attributed to diversity of authorship.

§ 24. (1) Elihu shows a marked relative preference for אל, using this term more frequently than all other terms for God together, whereas in the Dialogue אלוה is used with the same frequency, and שדי also frequently (§ 18).

Naturally enough even in the Dialogue the relative frequency of the three terms differs in different groups of cc.; but never does the difference in any six consecutive cc. equal that found in the six cc. of Elihu's speech; and the occurrences in Bildad's speeches are too few for a safe comparison. The following table will serve to bring out the differences:

Occurrences in	אל	אלוה	שדי
Elihu	19	6	6
Rest of the Book	36	35	25
Job's Speeches down to c. 24	10	17	7
Cc. 26–31	7	7	7
Eliphaz's Speeches	8	6	7
Bildad's ,,	6	0	2
Ṣophar's ,,	2	3	1
Cc. 3–8	5	8	5
,, 9–14	5	7	2
,, 15–20	9	6	1

The net result of Bu.'s additions and omissions is to reduce the occurrences of אלוה and שדי by one each. He adds אל in 32^{8} 33^{27} and omits 33^{4} 36^{26} containing אל, 35^{4} containing שדי, and 37^{15} containing אלוה (also 34^{9} containing אלהים).

Throughout the Dialogue the three names are used without marked preference for any one of them, a more frequent use of one of them, in say a dozen occurrences of all three being balanced by a more frequent use of the others in the following passage: note these most striking cases: in cc. 3–7 אל, אלוה, שדי occur—1, 8, 3 times respectively, in c. 8—4, 0, 2; in cc. 9–11—1, 5, 1; in cc. 12–15—8, 3, 2; in c. 22—3, 2, 5. One consideration governing the choice of the names may be noted: where in each line of a distich a divine name is used (often the parallelism, if expressed at all, is expressed by means of a pronoun), a marked preference is shown for שדי as one of the two: this is true of all parts of the book: in Elihu שדי occurs four times in parallelism with another divine term, twice at most not in such parallelism; in the rest of the book it occurs 17 times in, 8 times not in parallelism with another term. On the other hand, אל occurs in Elihu 15 times not in parallelism against 4 times in parallelism, and in the rest of the book 23 times not in parallelism against 13 times in parallelism. Thus the relative infrequency of שדי in Elihu's speeches is but another side of a difference between those speeches and the rest of the book: in Elihu a single divine name with no expressed parallel is a more frequent occurrence than elsewhere. Finally, when but a single name is used, Elihu shows a very marked preference for אל (אל, 15; אלוה, 6), the rest of the book a slight preference for אלוה (אל, 23; אלוה, 27).

§ 25. (2) Elihu shows a decidedly increased preference for אני rather than אנכי.

The occurrences of the two forms of the 1st pers. pronoun in various parts of the book is as follows:

	אני	אנכי
Prologue	4	0
Dialogue	15	11
Yahweh (40^{14})	1	0
42^{4} (=21^{3a})	0	1
Elihu	9	2

To avoid either over- or under-emphasizing the significance of the figures, a closer analysis of the usage is needed. Increased preponderance of אני over אנכי, in so far as it is due to the age of the writing, is due to lateness (Dr. *LOT* 155 n.). The four occurrences of אני in the Prologue would therefore be striking, if they were really four; but they are merely the four-times repeated phrase ואמלטה רק אני לבדי, where אני follows a particle as it frequently does in both the Dialogue and Elihu. Too slight again is the use in 40^{14} and 42^{4} (a virtual quotation of 21^{3}) to throw light on either the age or authorship of these passages.

As between the Dialogue and Elihu, while some of the difference might be otherwise explained, some of it is most reasonably attributed to the difference of authorship and the somewhat later date of cc. 32–37. One occurrence of אנכי in the Dialogue is due to a repetition ($12^{3}=13^{2}$) probably not in the original text; another is open to some doubt (see phil. n. on 21^{4} where $\mathfrak{G}$ omits אנכי). So also one occurrence of אני (9^{21}) may be secondary. Similarly in Elihu one occurrence of אני occurs in a repetition ($32^{10b}=17b$). Allowing for these textual uncertainties the ratio in the Dialogue is 14 : 9, in Elihu 8 : 2. Both agree in using both forms for the prefixed subj. of a vb.: so in Elihu אני אשיבך 35^{4}, but אנכי ארבר והחרש 33^{31} (cp. 21^{3}); in the Dialogue אני ראיתי 5^{3} and so, though always after ו or other particles, and, except in 19^{25}, with the impf., 5^{8} 6^{24} 7^{11} $13^{3.\ 18}$ $19^{25.\ 27}$, but אנכי ארבר ואנכי שאוני 21^{5} and with preceding ו or other particle 9^{14} 13^{22} 14^{15} 16^{4}, and without preceding ו, 9^{29}. As the subj. of a non-verbal pred., Elihu uses אני in 33^{9a} 32^{6}, אנכי only in 33^{9b}, where desire for a variation in a parallel line may account for the use of the (with Elihu) very infrequent form; the Dialogue so uses אני in 7^{12} 9^{20} ($\ell=21$) 29^{15}, but with equal frequency אנכי 9^{35} 12^{3} ($=13^{3}$) 29^{16}. After particles (other than ו), while Elihu uses אני exclusively (אף אני 32^{10b} ($=17b$) $17a$, הן אני 33^{6}, גם אני 33^{6}, ולא אני 34^{33}), the Dialogue uses both (אולם אני 5^{8} 13^{3}, גם אני 7^{11} 13^{2} כי אני 13^{18}, ולא אני 15^{6}, אשר אני 19^{27}, and אף כי אנכי 9^{14}, גם אנכי 16^{4}, האנכי 21^{4}(?)). In particular, the contrast is interesting between גם אנכי ככם ארברה 16^{4} and הן אני כפיך לאל 33^{6}. To sum up; whereas in the Dialogue אנכי is a frequent alternative to אני, in Elihu אנכי occurs only in 33^{31}, a reminiscence of 21^{3}, and in 33^{9b} where אנכי is a parallel term to אני in 33^{9a}.

§ 26. (3) Similarly Elihu makes distinctly less use of certain rarer forms of particles and pronominal suffixes.

No doubt several of these forms occur too infrequently to have separately much or any significance. But the significance of the whole group is hardly to be cancelled by the considerations which Bu. and Peisselt have brought forward. The usages may be tabulated thus:

Occurrences of	In Elihu (E).	Rest of Job (R).	Rest of OT.
עֲלֵי (6[5] 7[1] nn.)[1] . .	2	13	25
עָדֵי	0	2 (7[4] 20[5])	10 (*Isaiah*, p. 467)
אֵלַי	0	4[2]	0
בָּמוֹ[3]	1	3 (4)	4 (5)
בָּמוֹ	0	11[4]	32
לָמוֹ	0[5]	4[6]	0
מִנִּי[7]	3	16	13
בְּלִי[8] (without prefix) .	2	8	11
לָמוֹ[9]	0	10	45
עָלֵימוֹ[10]	0	8	4

§ 27. (4) In certain cases E expresses ideas common to himself and R by different terms: *e.g.* דַּעַ (p. *234*), תְּמִים (except in E, only in the probably interpolated v. 12[4]) in lieu of תֹּם (p. 3), נַעַר in lieu of נְעָרִים (p. *250*). Cp. also 32[1] n., 33[1] n., and the phil. nn. on מִצְנָה 32[3], פְּעֻלִּי 36[3] (ct. עשני 31[15]), ירשיע 34[12]. Note also that E always uses אֲנִיתִי in phrases of the type אֹ֫ר יִשַּׁי (34[8. 10. 34. 36]: in 37[7] the text is probably corrupt), whereas elsewhere in such phrases מְתִּי is always employed (11[11] 19[19] 22[15] 31[31]).

[1] The occurrences in Job are in 6[5] 7[1] (Qre) 8[9] 9[26] 15[27] 16[15] 18[10] 20[4] 29[3. 4. 7] 38[24] 41[22] | 33[15] 36[28]. Add perhaps 31[21] (l. עלי תם). Cp. the occurrences of על in the poetical parts of the book: R 48+12 (יעל), E 15+1 (יעל). Note further in R עדי and אלי always, and עלי except in four cases (16[15] 18[10] 29[3. 4]), occur before a tone syllable (7[1] n.): both cases in E are before toneless syllables (33[15] 36[28]). עד occurs R 21, E 2 (32[11] 34[36] עד נצח); אל R 22, E 5.

[2] 3[22] 5[16] 15[22] 29[19].

[3] (9[30]) 16[4. 5] 19[16] | 37[8], Is. (25[10]) 43[2] 44[16. 19], Ps. 11[2].

[4] 6[18] 10[22 bis] 12[3] 14[9] 19[22] 28[5] 31[37] 38[14] 40[17] 41[16].

[5] There would be one occurrence in E, if in 33[22] we read מתים לְמֵתִים.

[6] 27[14] 29[21] 38[30] 40[4].

[7] 6[16] 7[6] 9[3. 25] 11[9] 12[22] 14[11] 15[22. 30] 16[6] 18[17] 20[4 bis] 28[1] 30[30] 31[7] | 33[18. 23. 30].

[8] 8[11] 24[10] 30[8] 31[39] 38[2] 39[16]-41[18] 42[3] | 33[9] 34[6].

[9] 3[14] 6[19] 14[21] 15[28] 22[17. 19] 24[16. 17] 30[13] 39[4]. Against these ten occurrences of לו there are in E 1, in R 4 cases of להם: Mandelkern, *Concord. Minor*, 811 f.

[10] Three (20[23] 22[2] 27[23]: cp. also 18[20] ℭ: see nn. on the passages), if the text is correct = עליו (which occurs in E 4, in R 20 times): five times (6[16] 21[17] 30[2. 5] 29[22]) = עליהם (which occurs once in E, twice in R). Statistics based on Mandelkern, *Concord. Minor*, 528, 529. Note also כמוני, 27[23], G-K. 91*l*.

§ 28. (5) In common with R, E contains a number of Aramaisms;[1] but, though this feature has been on the one hand exaggerated, on the other minimized, in E the Aramaic element is somewhat more prominent. Since in detail there is much that is open in varying degrees to uncertainty, exact statistics cannot usefully be presented; but of 32 Aramaisms which Kautzsch (*Die Aramäismen im alten Testament*, p. 101) claims in Job, 5 are common to E and R, 8 peculiar to E, 19 peculiar to R, whereas the ratio of E to R (1 : 6) would lead us to expect but three peculiar to E. I now give the Aramaisms claimed as certain by Kautzsch with the passages under which the words are discussed in the philological notes, and then add a few from Kautzsch's list of uncertain Aramaisms or elsewhere. Most of the words in question occur but once in Job; of those that occur more frequently I place the number of occurrences after the word. I prefix a ? to certain words open to doubt textually or as to their actual Aramaic character, and give references to Nöldeke's criticism in his important review of Kautzsch (*ZDMG* lvii. 412–420: cited below as N with the number of the page)

Common to E and R are אלף (Piel *to teach*, 15^{5} 33^{33} 35^{11}: Qal *to learn*, Pr. $22^{25\dagger}$: in 𝔗𝔖 = Heb. למד), חוה (R 1, E 4) $15^{17,2}$ מלל[3] (R 1, E 1) 8^{2}, מלה[3] (R 20, E 14) 4^{2}, שנא, שנה (R 2 + 1, E 1) 8^{7}.

Peculiar to R are אחוה $13^{17,2}$? הן, *if*,[4] חדה 3^{6}, טוש 9^{26}, ? טפל (2)[5]

[1] On the Aramaisms in Job, cp. in addition to the works cited above and those of Bu. and Posselt cited in § 23 n., Bernstein, "Inhalt, Zweck u. gegenwärtige Beschaffenheit des B. Hiob," in Keil u. Tzschirner's *Analekten* (1813), i. 3, pp. 49–79; Che. *Job and Solomon*, 293–295, in many respects modified in *EBi.* 2486 f.

[2] Che. (*EBi.* 2487) omits 15^{17} and 13^{17}, thus leaving the root חוה confined to E.

[3] N. 413 claims מלל, מלה as "echt hebräisch." In Job מלה is a synonym of דבר and אמר: it is relatively more frequent in E (מלה, 14; אמר, 4; דבר : 4 : R מלה, 20; אמר, 6; דבר, 12). For the Aramaizing pl. (but see N. 413, n. 2) מלין, E has a preference, using it 7 times against מלים 3 times; R מלין 6, מלים 7 times.

[4] Kautzsch claims 6 occurrences—$9^{11f.}$ $12^{14f.}$ 23^{8} 40^{23}; but see 9^{12} n., where Dr. admits at most 9^{13} 40^{23}: cp. N. 416.

[5] N. 415.

יקר, 13^4, *glorious* 31^{26}, פֻּךְ (2) 30^6, כפן (2) 5^{22}, ?? להן, *therefore* 30^{24}, ? מכך[1] 24^{24}, נחת,[2] *to descend* 21^{13} (17^{16}), ערוד[3] 39^5, עתק 21^7, ? עשתות 12^5, קבל (2) 2^{10}, קרב,[4] *war* 38^{23}, שחד 16^{19}, ? שרירים 40^{16}, תקף 14^{20}.

Peculiar to E are ? בחר 34^4, חף[5] 33^9, כהר 36^2, מעבר 34^{25}, עקב (= עכב)[6] 37^4, רעע (= רצץ) 34^{24}, שניא (2) 36^{26}, שרה 37^3.

Other words which should also probably be considered Aramaisms are אכף 33^7, קטל 13^{15} 24^{14} ("probably Aramaic," N. 417), and שלהבת 15^{30} (N. 417)—*i.e.* one word only in E, two only in R. רקב in 13^{28}, if it meant *wine-skin* (Be.; Nestle, *ZATW* xx. 172; Che. *EBi.* 2487), would also be an Aramaism, but מאס 7^5, cited by Kautzsch in his doubtful examples, may be disregarded.

§ 29. (6) As important as the details which can be statistically presented is the general impression of the style. "The *style* of Elihu . . . is prolix, laboured and somewhat tautologous ($32^{6\ \text{end.}\ 10b.\ 17b}$): the power and brilliancy which are so conspicuous in the poem generally are sensibly missing. The reader, as he passes from Job and his three friends to Elihu, is conscious at once that he has before him the work of a writer, not indeed devoid of literary skill, but certainly inferior in literary and poetical genius to the author of the rest of the book. The language is often involved and the thought strained" (Dr. *LOT* 429). With this view Bu., who in his *Beiträge* offered the most elaborate defence of the identity of style in cc. 32–37 and the rest of the book, now practically concurs (Comm. xix.[2] xxvii.): but he attributes this diversity of style in the section as a whole to the interpolation of some 30 verses ($32^{2-5.\ 11-12.\ 15-17}$ $33^{4.\ 15b.\ 33}$ $34^{9.\ 10a.\ 25-28.\ 29c}$ 35^4 $36^{13.\ 14.\ 17.\ 25.\ 26.\ 29.\ 30}$ $37^{13.\ 15.\ 16}$) and much corruption of the text. Some of the harshness and obscurity is certainly due to corruption (see on 33^{21} $34^{20.\ 29-33}$ 36^{33}), and some interpolation there may have

[1] N. 414. [2] N. 414 "kann althebräisch sein."

[3] N. 413—perhaps a good Hebrew synonym of פרא.

[4] N. 413 f.: traditional Aramaic *punctuation* קָרֵב not necessarily correct.

[5] N. 415 points out that the meaning required in 33^9 does not occur in Aramaic.

[6] In addition to the n. on 37^3, cp. Rothstein in *ZDMG* lvii. 82.

been (*e.g.*, perhaps in 34^{25} $36^{26.\ 29-30}$) here, as elsewhere in the book; but it is in general improbable that these chapters have been *more* extensively interpolated than the rest, and in particular there is no sufficient reason for regarding as interpolations most of the passages omitted by Bu. The assumption again, that the omissions of 𝔊 represent additions to the original text, is as precarious here as elsewhere (see § 50). A different theory of diversity of authorship within 32–37 is put forward by Nichols, who distinguishes 32^{11-16} 34. $35^{15.\ 16}$ (placed between 34^{27} and ^{34}) as the words of a "second wise man" addressed not at all to Job (34^{16} is omitted, and with 𝔊 34^{28-33}), but throughout to the wise; the style of both authors in 32–37 is held to differ from that of the rest of the book.

The various reasons already given, independently of considerations adduced in § 32 ff., suffice to show that cc. 32–37 are the work of another writer than the author of the book.

§ 30. (*c*) Cc. 38^{1}–42^{6}, the speech(es) of Yahweh.

The only ground for questioning this section as a whole lies in the nature of the contents which have appeared to some incapable of reconciliation with the standpoint of the author of the Dialogue. This will be discussed below (§§ 38–39). Apart from this everything is in favour of the main part of the section having formed part of the original work. The speeches of Elihu may be removed without causing a tremor to the structure of the book; but without some speech of Yahweh the structure falls to pieces. The book as a finished structure can never have closed with c. 31 (or 37); a speech of Yahweh is the natural, if not the necessary sequel to Job's closing soliloquy; and a speech of Yahweh is certainly presupposed in the opening words of the Epilogue (42^{7}). Thus there are three alternatives: (1) the speech is authentic; (2) the original author left his work unfinished, and a subsequent writer added the speech of Yahweh; (3) the present has been substituted for a speech in the original work. In either of the last two alternatives we might expect difference of style; but such difference, if it can be detected at all, does not extend beyond 40^{6}–$41^{34\ (26)}$. Cc. 38 f. at least are by general consent un-

surpassed for poetical power. On the whole, then, 38. 39 together with 40^{2-5} and 42^{2-6} appear to be integral to the book, but 40^{6}–42^{1} for reasons given in the commentary (pp. 348 f., 351 f.) are probably later additions.

§ 31. The conclusions on the main questions now reached, and those on minor details indicated in the commentary, may be tabulated so as to indicate the original structure of the book and additions which at various times it may have received. The passages absent from 𝔊, representing (in the main) a subsequent abbreviation of the book (§ 48 f.), are also given: as omissions from 𝔊 are reckoned lines absent from 𝔎 (with half a dozen exceptions), or (in 39^{9}–40^{8}) asterisked in $\mathfrak{S}^{H}$, and also 17^{16} 20^{3} (see § 49).

THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE AND SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS OF JOB

Original Elements.	Additions Probable or Possible.	Omissions in 𝔊.
1. Prologue, 1. 2		[Enumeration of vv. by Swete; where that of the translation differs from this, it is added in brackets.]
2. Job's soliloquy, 3		
3. Dialogue between the friends and Job		
First cycle of speeches		
Eliphaz, 4. 5		5^{23a}.
Job, 6. 7 except Bildad, 8	7^{8}	7^{8}.
Job, 9. 10 ,,	10^{3c}	$9^{24b.\ c}$ 10^{4a} (𝔊: $10^{4a.\ b}$ Sw. both = 10^{4b} 𝔎).
Sophar, 11 ,,	11^{6c}	11^{5b}.
Job, 12–14 ,,	$12^{5b.\ 4-12}$	$12^{8b.\ 9.\ 18b.\ 21a.\ 23}$ $13^{19b.\ 20b}$ $14^{12c.\ 18.\ 19}$.
Second cycle of speeches		
Eliphaz, 15 except	15^{30a}	$15^{10.\ 26b.\ 27}$.
Job, 16. 17 ,,	16^{9c-11} 17^{3-10}	$16^{3b.\ 8b.\ 9\ (7b\beta-8)\ 22\ (21)b}$.
		$17^{3b-5a.\ 12.\ 16}$.
Bildad, 18		$18^{9b.\ 10.\ 15\ (but\ 19c\ 𝔊 = 15a\ 𝔎)\ 16.\ 17b}$.
Job, 19		$19^{24a.\ 28b}$.
Sophar, 20 ,,	$20^{16.\ 28}$	$20^{3.\ 9.\ 11-13.\ 14b.\ 20b.\ 21a.\ 23a.\ 25c}$.
Job, 21 ,,	21^{22}	$21^{15.\ 19b.\ 21.\ 23.\ 28-33}$.

THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE AND SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS OF JOB—*continued*

ORIGINAL ELEMENTS.	ADDITIONS PROBABLE OR POSSIBLE.	OMISSIONS IN 𝔊.
3. Dialogue between the friends and Job		
Third cycle of speeches		
Eliphaz, 22 except	$22^{17f.}$	$22^{3b.\ 13\text{-}16.\ 20.\ 24.\ 29.\ 30}$.
Job, 23. 24 „	$23^{8.\ 9}$ and ? parts of 24 (p. 206)	$23^{9.\ 15\ (14)}$ $24^{4b.\ 5c.\ 8a.\ 14\text{-}18a}$ $^{(14a\ Sw.,\ cp.\ 34^{25}\ \mathfrak{M})}$ $^{25b\beta\ (25b)}$.
Bildad, 25 (+? 26)		$26^{5\text{-}11.\ 14a.b}$.
Job, $27^{2\text{-}6.\ 11.\ 12}$ + Sophar ?, $27^{7\text{-}10.\ 13\text{-}23}$		$27^{19b.\ 21\text{-}23}$.
	28 Poem on Wisdom	$28^{23b\text{-}4a.\ 5\text{-}9a.\ 14\text{-}19.\ 21b.\ 22a.\ 26b\text{-}27a}$.
Job's closing soliloquy, 29–31		$29^{10b.\ 11a\ (10a.b:\ Sw.\ 10a=\mathfrak{M}\ 11a)\ 13a.\ 19.\ 20.\ 24b.\ 25}$.
		$30^{1c.\ 2.\ 3.\ 4a\ (?).\ 7a.\ 11b\text{-}13a.\ 16a.\ 18b.\ 20b.\ 27}$.
		$31^{1\text{-}4.\ 18.\ 23b.\ 24a.\ 27a.\ 35a}$.
	32–37 Elihu	$32^{4b.\ 5.\ 11b\ (11c).\ 12.\ 15.\ 16\ (17\ ?)}$.
		$33^{8a.\ 19b.\ 20b.\ 28.\ 29.\ 31b\text{-}33}$.
		$34^{3.\ 4.\ 6b.\ 7.\ 11b.\ 18b.\ 23a.\ 25b.\ 28\text{-}33}$.
		$35^{7b\text{-}10a.\ 12a.\ 15.\ 16.}$ $^{(6a.\ 7b.\ c:\ 6b.\ 7a\ \mathfrak{M}=15b.\ 17a\ \mathfrak{G})}$ $36^{5b.\ 6.\ 7}$ $^{8\text{-}11.\ 13.\ 16.\ 20.\ 21b.\ 22a}$.
		$36^{24b.\ 25a.\ 26.\ 27b.\ 28a.\ 29\text{-}33}$.
		$37^{1\text{-}5a.\ 6b.\ 7a.\ 10a.\ 11a\text{-}12c.\ 15.\ 18.\ 21b\ (c)}$.
4. Yahweh 38^{1}–40^{2} except	39^{17} 40^{6}–$41^{34\ (26)}$	$38^{26.\ 27.\ 32}$ $39^{1a.\ 3b\text{-}4.\ 6b.\ 8}$.
		$39^{13\text{-}18.\ 26.\ 29b.\ 31}$ (40^{1}).
Job, $40^{2\text{-}5}$ $42^{2.\ 3c.\ d.\ 5.\ 6}$		$40^{18\ (23)b.\ 19\ (20).\ 21\ (26)a}$.
		$41^{3\ (12).\ 7\ (16)a.\ 8\ (17).\ 14\ (23)b.\ 17\ (26)b.\ 20\ (29)a.\ 23\ (32)b}$.
5. Epilogue, $42^{7\text{-}17}$		$42^{8d.\ 16c.\ 17}$.

V. THE PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE WRITER.

§ 32. If we are right in concluding that a single writer is responsible for the Prologue, the speeches of Job, of his three friends and of Yahweh (apart from the passages indicated in the preceding table as possible additions), and the Epilogue, what was the purpose of this writer, and what are the distinctive features of his thought and outlook on life which he reveals in his work?

It would no doubt be as inadequate a description of Job, as, for example, of *Paradise Lost*, to call it merely a didactic poem; it would be even further from the truth to regard it as a purely objective dramatic poem in which the author maintains an interested but quite impartial attitude towards the various characters which are introduced and the various points of view which are expressed by them. On the other hand, the author obviously ranges himself with Yahweh in approving Job as against his friends; as passionately as Job he rejects the interpretation of life maintained by the friends, and as decisively as Yahweh the estimate of human character (so closely associated with the friends' outlook on life) that is offered by the Satan. The writer's purpose is never so directly formulated as Milton's—to

> assert Eternal Providence
> And justify the ways of God to men;

nor is it coextensive with it; but it is akin, and not really concealed, and the differences of opinion which have prevailed with regard to the purpose of the book have been due to seeking from the author more than he was able or intended to offer. He had no clear-cut theology, like Milton's, enabling him to say why God acted as He did and thus positively to justify His ways; but through pain and trial he had discovered in his own experience that God did not abandon the sufferer, and therefore he was able to assert that God did not send sufferings on men merely for the reasons commonly assigned, and that it was not necessarily or always true that as an individual suffered so he had sinned; and thus, if he could not positively justify God, he could at least vindicate Him against the ways attributed to Him by the current opinion of his time, represented in the poem by the friends. There was also another side to his experience: he had discovered not only that God did not abandon the sufferer, but also that suffering and loss had not detached him from God, that it was possible to serve and love God not for the outward things He gave, but for what He was in Himself. The book aims not at solving the entire problem of suffering, but at vindicating God and the latent worth of human nature against certain conclusions drawn from a partial observation of life.

§ 33. The book opens with the presentation of a perfect character: Job is so described in the first words of the narrative (1^1), and the truth of the description is endorsed by Yahweh (1^8 2^3); the kind of life and character thus described in general terms is indicated in detail elsewhere in the book (cp. especially c. 31: also, *e.g.*, $4^{3f.}$; and see n. on 1^1). But the Satan disputes the inherent worth of this character: Job, he insinuates, had lived as he had, not simply with the result (1^1 n.) that he had become outwardly prosperous, but in order that he might prosper; he had served God not for God's sake, but to obtain the handsome price of such service: human nature is incapable of pure devotion to God, human conduct is not disinterested; if the payment for it ceases, or becomes uncertain, man's service of God will cease, man will no longer address God reverentially, or affectionately, but blasphemingly; where love and trust had seemed to be while such qualities received their price, there hate and contempt will certainly be when the price is withdrawn. Such is the issue between Yahweh and the Satan, Yahweh upholding, the Satan calling in question, the integrity, the sincerity, the disinterestedness of Job. Such also had been the issue in the mind of the writer who wrote the speeches that follow the opening narrative; he had faced the same problem of life as Plato in the *Republic* (Bk. ii.); he had realized that the really perfect man must be prepared to prove his perfectness by maintaining it even when there befell him calamity such as would have seemed the meet sequel to wickedness, and such as actually had the effect on the ordinary judgement of men of making him seem to have been wicked though actually he had been good. The very friends of Job, held by the dogma that a man of broken fortunes cannot have been "integer vitae scelerisque purus," infer from Job's calamities that he must have been wicked, though his own conscience and God's unerring judgement assert that the life on which these calamities descended had been free from blame.

§ 34. Within the Prologue the issue is decided against the Satan: when the Satan sneeringly says to God, Take away all the wealth Thou hast given Job, then go and see him, and he

will curse Thee, he is obviously contemplating the *immediate* result of deprivation on Job; for when in the second scene in heaven he is challenged by Yahweh to admit that Job's conduct and temper under loss have proved the Satan's estimate of him wrong, he does not plead that the experiment has not had long enough to work, but claims that it is merely necessary to withdraw health as well as wealth, and Job will at once cease blessing and curse. The Satan's estimate is based on weaker characters, exemplified by Job's wife, who would have Job do what the Satan had counted on his doing; but Job himself rejects the advice of his wife in words which are tantamount to saying: to curse God now would be to prove that I have served and blessed Him hitherto not for what He is, but for the good-fortune which for so long He gave me; now that ill-fortune has befallen me I can show that I serve Him for what He is. Thus Job left at last only with bare life, without which he could be no subject of testing, and his character which had been called in question, but which he had maintained intact under the last test that the Satan could suggest, by these words proves his disinterested attachment to Yahweh, that he had not served Him for what He gave, and thus finally and completely puts the Satan in the wrong, and that so obviously that it is unreasonable, as some have done, to complain that the writer has not depicted Yahweh pressing home the Satan's discomfiture, whether by a third scene in heaven, or in the Epilogue.

Job by his attitude in the Prologue has, unknown to himself, vindicated Yahweh's against the Satan's estimate of his character; but the result of the Satan's experiments, the origin and purpose of which remain unknown on earth, is to expose Job's character to attack from another quarter. The Satan in heaven disputes the integrity of Job's character, because prosperity had necessarily left it untested: when his prosperity forsakes Job, his friends on earth dispute his integrity on the ground that he must have sinned because he no longer prospers. Thus the Prologue opens up the question of the relation of loss and suffering to sin: with this question the Dialogue is concerned, and necessarily (for it is a crucial instance for the theory at

issue) interwoven with the discussion of it is the attack on and defence of Job's integrity.

§ 35. Between Job's rebuke of his wife with its implicit assertion of his own resignation and the opening of the Dialogue some weeks intervene: in the interval Job's experience has raised questions in his own mind: why is he, why are men born to suffer? The ready answer of his old faith would have been: men are not born to suffer; they only suffer if they sin; but his experience has proved this false in his own case, and, as he is now ready to believe, it would also be false in the case of countless others, but to the bitter question he now finds no answer. Thus he goes into the following debate convinced that the solution there repeatedly put forward is false, but with no other theory to oppose to it. To these questionings of Job his three friends, who being no fair weather friends had come to him on hearing of his calamities, had listened: they had brought with them the same old faith as Job's, but not the direct personal experience which had proved to Job its inadequacy. In all friendliness they would recall Job to the faith, and lead him to the course which that faith indicated—humble acceptance of the discipline of suffering, confession and abandonment of the sin which had brought his suffering upon him, and return to God. Job cannot accept such advice, for in doing so he would be false to his conviction of his integrity. The nature of the Dialogue—so different from those of Plato—is thus determined by the nature of the difference in character of what the two parties—for the three friends constitute a single party—stand for: the friends maintain a theory, Job defends a fact—the reality and truth of his conviction of innocence. The Dialogue, therefore, is not directed towards reaching a correct or more adequate theory, but towards emphasizing the certainty of the fact and the consequent falseness of the prevailing theory. So far, indeed, is Job from opposing a different *theory* to the theory of the friends that his own outlook, and his own interpretation of what has happened, is still largely governed by the theory which he also had once unquestioningly held; and which is still the only *positive theory* to hold the field till driven from it by the vindication of the truth of Job's conviction, which proves

the theory false. Because he has no other theory of suffering than that of the friends, he can imagine no other *just* cause for his own sufferings than sin on his part; since, then, as he knows directly and for certain that such just cause does not exist, he *infers* that his suffering has been unjustly inflicted, that God—the God at least of his own old and the friends' still cherished theory—is unjustly causing his suffering, has changed without good cause from being his friend into his enemy. In the early days of his loss, Job was conscious only of his own unchanged attitude towards God; as time gives opportunity for reflection, and more especially as the friends press home the inference, inevitable under the theory, that because Job greatly suffers he must have greatly sinned, Job awakes to another aspect of his strange fortunes; loss gives him the opportunity of proving his willingness to receive from God ill-fortune no less than good fortune; of remaining, when rewards fail, for His own sake, the servant, the friend of God; but loss at the same time, if the friends and their theory are right, is God's unambiguous assertion that He has rejected Job and become his enemy. This is Job s severest trial of all—a trial the Satan failed to think of; and under the stress of it Job says much that doubtless needs correction, and yet nothing that corresponds to anything the Satan can have meant by "cursing God to His face," nothing that reflects back upon Job's previous character in such a way as to indicate that it lacked the wholeness which Yahweh claimed for it and the Satan denied. Job nowhere regrets his previous service of God, and never demands the restoration of the previous rewards; what he does seek is God Himself, God unchanged, still his friend—on his side, unestranged from him, and not, as the theory assures him He has now become, his enemy; and what he seeks he never really and permanently despairs of finding; against God, seeming by the calamities He sends to take away his character, he appeals to God to vindicate it (16^{18-21} n. 17^{3}), and rises to certainty that He will do so, if not this side death, then beyond (19^{27}); but it is only for this vindication, for the realization that God really remains his friend, not for the restoration of good fortune, that Job contemplates the intervention of God on his behalf.

§ 36. It is unnecessary to review in detail here all the speeches of the friends and Job's replies to them: they cover the same ground again and again. So far as the friends are concerned it is of the very essence of the writer's purpose that they should one and all say essentially the same thing: they are not introduced to represent many existing theories; but the three of them, expounding the same theory, represent that as the unchallenged judgement of ancient and still current opinion. All the variety that is thus possible in the friends' speeches is variety of expression, the formulation of different aspects of the same theory, or different proofs of it, such as the divine origin of it ($4^{12ff.}$ Eliphaz), its antiquity ($8^{5f.}$ Bildad, $15^{18f.}$ Eliphaz, 20^{4} Ṣophar), the impossibility, due to man's ignorance, of successfully disputing it ($11^{5ff.}$ Ṣophar), or of such subsidiary theories as had been called in to help it out. Of these a word or two may be said here. Briefly, the theory itself is that the righteous prosper, the unrighteous come to grief, and conversely that suffering implies sin in the individual sufferer, and prosperity the righteousness of the prosperous. But the facts of life at any time too obviously challenge this simplest form of theory; and these had already led to certain additional details which accordingly are not represented as elicited by the debate, but are many of them already expressed or implied in the very first speech of Eliphaz. Such details are the suggestions that all men are impure and sinful to some extent, and that therefore suffering is to some extent due to all; that righteous individuals might suffer to some extent and for a time, and unrighteous individuals might similarly prosper, but that the unrighteous did and the righteous did not come to an untimely end (*e.g.* 4^{7} 8^{16-19}); that the wicked, even when seeming to be prosperous, were haunted by terror of the coming calamity that was their due ($15^{20ff.}$). Again—and here there persists the influence of that strong sense of the solidarity of the family or clan, with its relative indifference to the individual, that preceded the increased value set on the individual, which is the presupposition of the book of Job—it is urged that even if an unrighteous man lives out a long prosperous life, his children pay the penalty for it (5^{4}

20^{10}). Or again it is conceded, especially by Eliphaz in his first speech ($5^{17ff.}$: so also Elihu, *passim*), that suffering need not be mere penalty, but may have as its end the conviction and removal of sin, the purification of character; in other words, that suffering is not only penal, but may also be disciplinary. But with all the admissions and concessions that the current theory allows them to make, the friends in the development of the debate clearly make plain that the substance of the theory is that God distributes suffering and prosperity to the unrighteous and righteous respectively, and that in proportion to their righteousness or unrighteousness. Accordingly Eliphaz, who in his first speech introduces the subject of disciplinary suffering (arguing that since no man is free from sin, all men must suffer, but that if they rightly accept suffering due to essential human infirmity, they will ultimately prosper, whereas if they prove obstinate and greatly suffer they must greatly have sinned) in his second speech[1] expresses his conviction that Job must be a peculiarly heinous sinner (15^{14-16}), and in his third speech invents charges against him of certain specific sins of great enormity (22^{5-9}), thus lying on behalf of his theory of God. Bildad and Ṣophar by dwelling in their second speeches (and Ṣophar also in his third, if this survives in 27) almost exclusively on the fate of the wicked—depicted often in colours borrowed from Job's experience—indirectly convey the same judgement that Eliphaz expresses directly.

§ 37. In his replies to the friends, Job insists on his integrity—the fact by which their theory is shattered, their advice rendered nugatory. He agrees with them as to the might of God, and as to the frailty of human nature, carrying with it proneness to sin and yielding to temptation in *all* men, himself included; that *all* should suffer raises a question (3^{20}), which, however, perplexing as it is, would be relatively intelligible and endurable; but while all men sin, men differ widely in the extent to which they sin, and yet it is those who like himself are relatively free from sin and within the limitations of human frailty perfect who suffer—not invariably, but often; and it is

[1] Cp. in Ṣophar's very first speech, 11^{6c}; but the line is probably not original.

the wicked who prosper—not again invariably, but often, so that it may be said that God sends suffering indifferently on the perfect and the wicked (9^{22-24}). *If*, then, suffering is always punishment, God is an unjust judge, inflicting punishment where it is not due, and failing to secure its infliction where it is due. Nor again will the plea of the friends do, that Job's sufferings are sent in kindness by God to deflect him from his wicked way, and so even yet secure an end of life richer and more amply blessed than even his earlier life had been: Job has no wicked way to be deflected from, as his own conscience attests and God Himself—though this, of course, is unknown to Job and the friends—has insisted. Starting from the same point—that all suffering is penal—Job and the friends thus reach different conclusions—he, with eyes opened to the facts of life but himself not yet rid of the theory, concluding that God is unjust ($9^{15ff.}$ 19^{6}) though mighty ($9^{2ff.}$ 12^{13-25}), not only letting Job suffer, but letting the wicked enjoy life to the full and to the end (c. 21), they, distorting or blind to facts, that God is both mighty and just. This is a sufficiently clear-cut difference. But Job is also at issue with himself. The old *theory* leads inevitably to the conclusion that God is unjust, but the old *experience* of God still prompts him to trust God as being good as well as mighty. So long as the theory dominates him, he can only wish and pray that this mighty unjust God would leave him alone, cease to think it worth His while to continue to torment him (7^{17-21} 10^{20} 19^{22}); but when the old experience of God ($29^{2ff.}$) reasserts its influence, what he longs for is that God should again speak to him, recognize him (14^{15}), yearn for him (7^{21d}), admit his innocence and even vindicate it against (16^{18}–17 19^{25-27}) His own charges, made in the language of misfortune, that he has sinned, and so far from being perfect is one of the most imperfect and wicked of men.

§ 38. The double issue—that of Job with the friends, and that of Job with himself—should be determined when God intervenes; and if we have rightly analysed these issues, in the speeches of Yahweh—less directly, perhaps, than we might at first expect—and in the Epilogue, these issues are determined. Certainly the speech of Yahweh does not contain what

Job had not demanded, a positive theory of the meaning or purpose of suffering—and doubtless for the very good reason that the author himself had no such theory; had he had, he would probably have represented Job discovering this theory through suffering, and God at last approving Job's theory as against that of the friends; as it is, he is content to make clear the truth of Job's and the falseness of the friends' assertion as to the fact of Job's integrity. What Job had demanded was that God should formulate the charges of sin for which his sufferings had been sent; and to this God replies in the only possible way (cp. 1^8) by formulating no such charge. The speech of Yahweh contains a charge, it is true; but it is a charge of a different kind; and the Epilogue in the most direct terms pronounces Job in the right and the friends in the wrong. Are the speech with its charge and the Epilogue with its vindication at variance with one another? In particular, does the speech condemn where the Epilogue acquits Job? There certainly is a difference of judgement; but is it on the same issue? When, in the opening words of His speech, Yahweh asks: Who is this that darkeneth the purpose (of God) with words spoken without knowledge, He is certainly under the form of a question definitely charging Job with having spoken ignorantly and misleadingly about God, and this Job in his response admits (42^3). On the other hand, in the Epilogue Yahweh directly asserts that Job has said what was right, and the friends what was wrong about God. Is the one a condemnation, the other an acquittal *on the same charge*? In attempting a reply to this question, it is necessary to take into account the speech of Yahweh as a whole, and to observe what it does not contain as well as what it does. What the speech does not contain is singularly important; for its silence is a tacit repetition of the judgement challenged by the Satan in the Prologue, an anticipation of the vindication of Job against the friends expressed in the Epilogue, and a justification of one of Job's two thoughts of God against the other. The speech in no way goes back on Yahweh's judgement in the Prologue; it does not in the slightest degree admit the justice of the Satan's impugnment of the inner springs, or the friends' impugnment of the outward

elements of Job's conduct before his sufferings came upon him: it does not, as Job had at times feared, show God, when He appears, unjustly treating him as and pronouncing him guilty of sins such as could account for his sufferings. Thus the speech tacitly confirms the voice of Job's conscience, that his life had been free from blame. The condemnation implied in the opening and closing words (38^2 40^2) of the speech is of Job's criticism of God's ways, not as they actually were, but as they would have been if the theory of suffering being always and merely penal were true; in other words, it is a condemnation of something that had taken place *after* the calamity had befallen Job, of something consequently that was not the cause of that suffering. It is at the same time a condemnation of the theory persistently maintained by the friends and only half abandoned by Job himself; for that theory implied a claim to an extent of acquaintance with God's ways which it is the purpose of the speech to show that man did not possess. For the rest, the speech is directed towards illustrating the marvellous range of Yahweh's activities, the innumerable elements, inexplicable by man, in His ways. In certain respects this may seem irrelevant: Job no less than the friends had acknowledged that God's ways were past finding out; but Job in charging God with injustice had made use of the old theory that implicitly laid claim to a complete knowledge of God's ways with men; Job's acknowledgment of fault (42^{3-6}) is accordingly limited to the confession that he had spoken beyond his knowledge.

§ 39. But the speech of Yahweh accompanies an appearance or direct manifestation of Yahweh to Job, and in this respect is the direct response of Yahweh to Job's deepest desire: Job has at last found Yahweh; and, in spite of the rebuke of his words beyond knowledge, he has found Yahweh on his side, no more estranged from him than in the days of his former prosperity, but more intimately known; as compared with his former, his present knowledge is as sight to hearing, as direct, first hand personal to second hand and traditional knowledge. So far from his earlier sense of God's friendship having been shown by his sufferings to be a delusion, its reality has been vindicated,

and by God's response to his appeal his communion with God has been intensified.

So we may relate the speech and the accompanying manifestation of God to the purpose of the book; but inasmuch as that speech had to condemn the theory without putting another in its place and to criticize Job for continuing to make use of it, even when his own experience was showing that it had broken down, for the sake of clearness at least it was essential that the book should close with an unequivocal reassertion of what God had asserted in the Prologue, and the Satan there and the friends in the Debate had denied —the integrity of the man on whom the great sufferings had fallen. This is reasserted in two ways, both of which leave nothing lacking in the explicitness of the assertion. In the first place, Yahweh in the Epilogue directly pronounces Job to have been in the right, the friends to have been in the wrong; but there is one remarkable aspect of Yahweh's words: what He says is that Job has spoken truly and the friends falsely *about Him*: in this there is, so far as the judgement on Job is concerned, an apparent divergence from the condemnatory questions in 38^2 40^2; but in God's speech to Job there was no reference to what the friends had said of Him; and it is this that stands first in the Epilogue and carries with it the judgement on Job's words, which if it stood alone unlimited by the context would perhaps be irreconcilable with 38^2 40^2. It is true, Yahweh might have said expressly that the friends falsely deny, and Job rightly asserts his innocence; but this in itself would only indirectly have indicated the falseness of the friends' *theory of God* in relation to human suffering, which it is, as we have seen, a main purpose of the writer to assert; he has therefore preferred to present Yahweh's judgement on Job and the friends in a form of words which directly asserts that the friends have spoken wrongly about God, and that in the point where they have been wrong Job has been right; in inventing charges against Job they have told lies to maintain their theory of God; in repudiating these charges and denying that his calamities are God's accusation of wickedness in him, Job has spoken right.

§ 40. Not only does Yahweh thus expressly assert Job's

integrity of character, He also marks it by renewed and increased outward tokens of His favour. This aspect of the Epilogue has often been judged unworthy of the author of the poem, and really inconsistent with his purpose of maintaining the possible disinterestedness of human conduct, and a virtual giving of the case away to the friends on the ground that Job's fate illustrates afresh the formula that the righteous can only suffer for their sins for a time and must ultimately prosper. But the two points are not quite rightly taken. If the double prosperity of Job's latter days had been the price he demanded for continued service of God, the objection would hold; but it was not: and what Job had demanded was something very different—the vindication of his character. Again the restoration to fortune falls not after any confession on the part of Job of sins which had caused his sufferings, as Eliphaz had led him to expect that it might, but immediately after the judgement of God that Job the sufferer has far surpassed the friends who had not suffered, in righteousness. Job's character being directly vindicated, his disinterestedness established, there was no reason why the story should end with the sufferings inflicted for a particular purpose made perpetual after the purpose had been achieved.

The removal of the speech of Yahweh, if the Epilogue remained, would leave the vindication of Job and the consequent condemnation of the theory of the friends unobscured, not to say clearer than it is; and since the speech contains no positive theory of suffering, no counter theory to that of the friends, it has to some appeared alien to the original work. Yet the omission of the speech would leave Job without that direct manifestation and speech to him of God which he had desired, and unanswered except by the restoration of his fortunes, which he had not desired; God would still speak at the end of the debate, but—in condemnation, it is true—to Eliphaz only! Towards Job he would then remain silent to the end. If, then, the speech can be related in some such way as has been attempted above to the rest of the book, it is certainly safest to retain it; for (§ 30) there are no independent reasons of style, etc., for regarding the chapters as secondary. Had an inter-

polator felt called upon to compose a speech, it is only too probable that he would, like the author of Elihu, have dwelt more clearly and directly upon Job's blameworthiness. On the other hand, it is difficult to see what kind of speech, creating fewer difficulties or giving greater satisfaction, could have been composed by a writer who like the original author (1) intended to insist that Job had not suffered for sins he had committed, and that the theory which necessitated the inference that he had, was therefore false; and (2) had yet no positive theory of suffering to propound, and was rather, perhaps, inclined to deprecate the formation of fresh theories, lest, resting as they must upon inadequate knowledge, they too should have practical results as terrible as his own experience had shown flowed from the current theory. For these reasons, while still sensible of certain difficulties and the necessity for some subtlety in defending the speech as an integral part of the book, I now retain it more decisively than in my *Crit. Introd. to the OT.*, pp. 119–122.

§ 41. Any judgement of the scope and purpose of the book is much more affected by the question of the integrity of the speech(es) of Elihu. Reasons which have appeared and are likely to appear to many sufficient to show that this part of the book is an addition to the original poem, and consequently must not be used in determining the purpose of the author of the original work, have already been given (§ 22 ff.); and these reasons are enforced rather than weakened by the attempts that have been made to find here the original author's solution of the problem of the book.

The ablest and most elaborate of these attempts is Bu.'s, which is thus described and criticized by Dr. *LOT*[9] 430 f. :—"A different view of the scope of the book is taken by those who—as Schlottmann, Hengst., Riehm (*Einl.* ii. 263 f., 278 f.), and especially Budde—acknowledge the Elihu-speeches as an original part of the poem. These writers consider that what was indicated above as a collateral aim of the book, viz., the doctrine of the *disciplinary* or *purifying* value of suffering, is in reality its main aim — or, at least (Riehm), its main positive aim. Thus Budde (*Comm.* p. xxx ([2] xl) ff. etc.) observes that Job, though righteous before the visit of his friends, in defending his righteousness against their silent reproaches (2^{13}) and (c. 4–5, etc.) open attacks, fell into sin : *spiritual pride*, a sin subtler even than the selfishness of his piety, which was what the

tempter suspected, was latent in his nature from the first (cp. Riehm, p. 263): and the object of the suffering sent upon him was to bring this hidden sin to his consciousness, to lead him to confess it, as he does in 42^{2-6}, and so to purify and confirm his spiritual nature. . . . The original folk-tale [§ 7] of Job, in which the question was, *Is Egoism the root of piety? Is there such a thing as disinterested piety?* . . . the poet adopted as the framework for his thoughts. With him, however, the question becomes a deeper and broader one, *Can the righteous suffer? and if so, why?* and the trial of Job's righteousness (which is the theme of the Prologue) becomes the purification of his character and the confirmation of his faith. . . . Consistently with this view of the general scope of the book, the same writers consider not only that the Elihu-speeches are the work of the original author, but that they present his own solution of the problem. And so Budde remarks (² pp. xlvff., 223) that Eliphaz (c. 4–5) explains suffering only as a punishment of *actual* sin: Job takes the same view of it; Elihu, on the contrary, explains it as designed to make man conscious of *latent* sin, and thereby to enable him to repent and overcome it. Budde defends his theory of the book with marked skill and ability; but it may be doubted whether a doctrine which, however true and profound in the abstract, is so little developed by the poet himself, can have formed the main idea of his work. The doctrine of the disciplinary function of suffering is very subordinate in the book; even in Elihu it does not stand out with the clearness and directness that would be expected, if the poet were there presenting his own solution of the problem. Nor, though it is true that Elihu sees in suffering a purpose of grace, is it at all clear that he views it as sent only (or even chiefly) for the correction of *latent* sin: and pride is alluded to by him only in 33^{17} 36^{9}." It may be added that the text and meaning of 33^{17} is not quite certain (see n. there), and that the term in 36^{9} (יתגבהו) implies anything but subtle spiritual pride: it refers, as the context also shows (vv.$^{10-12}$), to proud, defiant, opposition to God's will and refusal to serve Him—the very opposite of Job's blameless and God-fearing life. There would, too, be something humorous in Elihu, who certainly suffers from no excess of humility, rebuking Job for spiritual pride. See, further, on 33^{8-18} (p. 285) 34^{7}.

Of the very extensive literature, in addition to commentaries, introductions to the OT., and articles in Bible Dictionaries on the purpose of the book, the following may be mentioned: Bernstein (as cited in § 28 n.); Seinecke, *Der Grundgedanke des B. Ijob* (1863); Godet, *Études Bibliques* (1873), E. T. (1875); Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects* (1867), i. 266 f.; Wellhausen, in *JDT*, 1871, 552–557; W. H. Green, *The Argument of the Book of Job unfolded* (1873); J. B. Mozley, *Essays Historical and Theological*, 1878, ii. 164–254; Giesebrecht, *Der Wendepunkt des B. H.* (1879); C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays* (1886), 1–33; A. M. Fairbairn, *The City of God* (1886), 143 ff.; G. G. Bradley, *Lectures on the Book of Job* (1888); Meinhold, "Das Problems des B. H.," in *Neue Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* (1892), 63 ff.; J. Ley, "Das Problem in B. H. u. dessen Lösung," in *Neue Jahrbb. f. Phil. u. Pädag.* (1896), 125 ff.; E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums* (1901), iii. 228–231; A. S. Peake, *The Problem of Suffering in the OT.* (1904), especially c. v.; H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of Job* (1916).

VI. The Age of the Book.

§ 42. As to the age of Job, opinions have differed perhaps more widely than with regard to any other book of the OT., though in recent times there is increasing agreement that while the book is certainly older than the 1st, it is scarcely older than the 5th or at all events the 6th cent. B.C.

It is often said that the book was traditionally ascribed to Moses; this is not correct, if by it is meant that such was the consistent ancient opinion. On the other hand, early Jewish was scarcely less divided than modern opinion. In the well-known passage in the Babylonian Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, 14b, 15a) on the origin of the books of the OT. it is stated that "Moses wrote his own book, and the passages about Balaam and Job"; but in the discussion that follows various Rabbis ascribe the book (or the lifetime) of Job to the age of Isaac, or Jacob, or Joseph, or the spies, or the Judges, or of the kingdom of Sheba, or of the return from the Captivity, or of Ahasuerus.

The passage is translated in full in Ryle, *Canon of the OT.* 273 ff. The various opinions rest on a very crude form of criticism; *e.g.* the similarity of עץ Job 1^1 and עץ Nu. 13^{20}; the use of אבי in Job 19^{28} and Ex. 33^{16}; the supposition that Job was married to Dinah, Jacob's daughter, since in connection with both Dinah and Job's wife the term נבלה is used or implied (Job 2^{10}, Gn. 34^7).

§ 43. External evidence clearly defines *c.* 100 B.C. as the downward limit of date; and by then the book already contained the speech(es) of Elihu, and had been translated into Greek.

The evidence consists of a passage extracted by Eus. (*Præp. Ev.* ix. 25) from Alexander Polyhistor (80–40 B.C.), who in turn cites from Aristeas; Aristeas having summarized the story in the Prologue runs much more summarily over the rest of the story; in Polyhistor's words: *Ἀριστέας δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων . . . φαύλως δὲ αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἰωβ) διακειμένου ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν Ἐλιφαν τὸν Θαιμανιτῶν βασιλέα καὶ Βαλδαδ τῶν Σαυχαίων τύραννον καὶ Σωφαρ τὸν Μιναίων βασιλέα,* **ἐλθεῖν δὲ καὶ Ἐλιουν τὸν Βαραχιηλ τὸν Ζωβίτην.** *Παρακαλουμένον δὲ, φάναι καὶ χωρὶς παρακλήσεως ἐμμενεῖν αὐτὸν ἔν τε τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ τοῖς δεινοῖς. Τὸν δὲ θεὸν, ἀγασθέντα τὴν εὐψυχίαν αὐτοῦ, τῆς τε νόσου αὐτὸν ἀπυλῦσαι, καὶ πολλῶν κύριον ὑπάρξεων ποιῆσαι.*

Ben-Sirach[1] (*c.* 180 B.C.) refers to Job as a person mentioned in the book of Ezekiel; but this would suggest unfamiliarity rather than familiarity with the *Book* of Job, and yet the parallel passages (§ 45) prove that (unless Job was written later than Sir.) Sir. was actually familiar with the book of Job.

§ 44. We are thus thrown back on internal evidence for such determination of the upward and of such exacter determination of downward limits of date as may be possible.

(1) Since the author's imagination extends to the setting of the poem, it is a mistake to infer the age of the *writer* from the circumstances of the *hero* of the book. Broadly speaking, the age in which the writer intends us to think of Job as living, but certainly not that to which he himself belonged, is the patriarchal age, and he depicts conditions which he regarded as characteristic of that age. This is very clearly seen in the length of life assigned to Job: he lived 140 years after the restoration of his fortunes, and therefore something approaching, if not exceeding 200 in all (perhaps 210 years, 42^{16} n.); in other words, his years exceeded those of Abraham (175, Gn. 25^{7}), Isaac (180, Gn. 35^{28}), and Jacob (147, Gn. 47^{28}), though they fell much short of those of the antediluvians. As part of this imaginative setting, not necessarily as reproducing the conditions actually prevailing in or peculiar to the author's own age, or applying to the writer's own circumstances, we may regard the description of Job's wealth in cattle and slaves (1^{1}, cp. Gn. 13; 26^{12-14} 33), his sacrificing as head of a family, like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, without the assistance of a priest, his use of burnt-offerings rather than the more specific expiatory sacrifices of the later codes (1^{5} n.), the currency of the *qᵉsîṭah* (42^{11}, Gn. 33^{19}, Jos. $24^{32\dagger}$). It is only when familiarity with conditions and customs not belonging to the patriarchal age, or at all events less characteristic of it than of later ages, is shown, that we may look for light on the writer's own age: thus in contrast to the Hebrew patriarchs, Job is apparently himself a monogamist ($2^{9f.}$ 19^{17} 31^{10}) and a

[1] 49^{10} הוכיר את איוב המכלכל כל דרכי צדק . . . יהוקאל. In 𝔊 which mistranslates, and EV. which depends on 𝔊, the reference disappears.

member of a society in which monogamy prevails (27^{15} not being proof to the contrary)—a feature most characteristic of an age later than Dt. (21^{15-17}) and reflected also in other Wisdom literature (cp. *EBi.* 2947); the part played by Sheba —the Sabæans—in 1^{15} n. 6^{19} can be illustrated by an inscription dating probably from about 525 B.C.; and the political vicissitudes reflected in 9^{24} $12^{17ff.}$, the unhappy social conditions suggested by 3^{20} 7^{1} 24^{12}, the developed judicial system implied in the phraseology of 9^{14-19} (cp. Index, *s.v.* Law), are scarcely those of the patriarchal but of some later age, though whether that be the age of Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the Great, or some other, the allusions are far too general to determine. See, further, 15^{19} n.

This line of evidence does not by itself lead to any very precise or secure result, though some of it suggests a date not earlier than the Exile.

§ 45. (2) The book is certainly not a product of the earliest periods of Hebrew literature. It is certainly later than Ps. 8, for in 7^{17} the writer parodies Ps. $8^{5\,(4)}$; if, as is probable, Ps. 8 implies familiarity with P, and P was written about 500 B.C., this alone brings down the book of Job as late as the 5th cent. B.C. It is scarcely less certain that in 3^{3-10} the author of Job is dependent on Jer. 20^{14-18}, though Di. (p. xxxii f.) still strongly argued for the dependence of Jer. 20^{14-18} on Job 3^{3-10}.

There are many other passages in Job which have points of resemblance with passages in other books, and some of such a character as to indicate direct literary dependence on one side or other; but (1) it is generally difficult to determine on which side dependence lies; (2) some of the passages in question are of uncertain date. If the dependence lies mainly or exclusively on the side of Job, it shows very great familiarity of the author with the literature of his people, and also his great literary craftmanship, for the phrases or figures borrowed are used by him freshly and independently; if the dependence is on the side of the other writings, the parallels show the extent of the influence of the book of Job on subsequent writers. Probably by far the greater number of cases of real literary dependence is on the part of the author of Job. Of the vast number of "parallels" that have been collected, a selection may be given, though in by no means all even of these is direct literary connection necessarily implied.

With 14^{11} $12^{24f.}$	cp. Is. $19^{5.\ 13f.}$	With 31^{15}	cp. Mal. 2^{10}
,, 4^{8}	,, Hos. 10^{13}, Pr. 22^{8}	,, 7^{20} 16^{12}	,, La. 3^{12}
,, 5^{18}	,, ,, 6^{1}, Dt. 32^{39}	,, 9^{18}	,, ,, 3^{15}
,, 14^{17}	,, ,, 13^{12} ,, 32^{34}	,, $16^{9f.}$	,, ,, 2^{16} 3^{46}
,, $9^{8.\ 9}$ 12^{15}	,, Am. 4^{13} 5^{8} 9^{6}	,, 30^{9}	,, ,, $3^{14.\ 68}$
,, 18^{16}	,, ,, 2^{9}		
,, 42^{2}	,, Gn. 11^{6} (J)	,, $5^{17f.}$	,, Pr. $3^{11f.}$
		,, 5^{19-24}	,, ,, 3^{23-26}
,, $6^{15ff.}$	,, Jer. 15^{18}	,, 12^{13}	,, ,, 8^{14}
,, 9^{19}	,, ,, 49^{19}	,, 15^{7}	,, ,, 8^{25}
,, 12^{4}	,, ,, 20^{7b}, La. 3^{14}	,, 18^{7}	,, ,, 4^{12}
,, 12^{6} 21^{7} 13^{8}	,, ,, 12^{1}	,, 26^{10}	,, ,, 8^{27}
,, 19^{24}	,, ,, 17^{1}	,, 28^{15-19}	,, ,, $3^{14f.}$ $8^{11.\ 19}$
,, 19^{7}	,, ,, 20^{8}, La. 3^{8}	,, $18^{5f.}$ 21^{17}	,, ,, 13^{9} 24^{20}
		,, 26^{6}	,, ,, 15^{11}
,, 3^{23} 19^{8}	,, Is. 40^{27}, La. 3^{7-9}		
,, 9^{8}	,, ,, 44^{24}	,, 12^{21}	,, Ps. 107^{40}
,, 13^{19}	,, ,, 50^{8}	,, 21^{11}	,, ,, 107^{41} $114^{4.\ 6}$
,, 13^{28}	,, ,, 50^{9}	,, 22^{19}	,, ,, 107^{42}
,, 14^{2}	,, ,, $40^{6f.}$, Ps. 90^{6} $103^{15f.}$	,, $6^{10.\ 25}$	,, ,, $119^{50.\ 103}$
		,, 7^{19} $10^{20f.}$	,, ,, 39^{14}
,, 15^{35}	,, ,, 59^{4}, Ps. 7^{15}	,, 29^{12}	,, ,, 72^{12}
,, 16^{10} 30^{10}	,, ,, 50^{6}		
,, 16^{17}	,, ,, 53^{9}	,, 1^{21}	,, Qoh. 5^{14}
,, $26^{12f.}$	,, ,, $51^{9f.}$		
		,, 4^{7}	,, Sir. 2^{10}
,, 42^{17}	,, Gn. 35^{29} (P) 25^{8} (P)	,, 28^{27}	,, ,, 1^{9}
		,, 31^{18}	,, ,, 4^{10}

For further discussion of these and other parallels and conclusions (often in different directions), see J. Barth, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Hiob*, 1–17; Di. xxx.–xxxiv.; Seyring, *Die Abhangigkeit der Sprüche Salomos cc. 1–9 von Hiob* (1889); H. L. Strack, "Die Priorität d. B. H. gegenüber den Einleitungsreden z. d. Sprüchen Salomonis," in *TSK*, 1896, 609 ff.; Che. *Job and Sol.* 83–89; *The Prophecies of Isaiah*[5], i. 228 (on parallels with the Song of Hezekiah), ii. 245 f.; Dr. *LOT*[9] 434 f.

§ 46. (3) The theology and religious ideas of the book of Job are those of a relatively late period, though not of quite the latest period represented in the OT. The book presupposes (*a*) a general agreement as to the religious value of the individual independently of the community, of personality: yet also (*b*) a practically unchallenged conviction that the real life or personality of the individual is terminated by death; (*a*) is the necessary condition of the entire discussion, and (*b*) determines its limitation: had there been a general belief in the survival

after death of the personality with undiminished or enhanced relations with God, this must have affected the discussion by Job and the friends of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked in this life. Now of these two ideas (*a*) is seen emerging against the still prevalent acceptance of the principle of solidarity at the end of the 7th cent. B.C. (Dt. 24^{16}, Ezk. 18. 33, Jer. $31^{29f.}$), and (*b*) was already discarded by at least the important circles represented by the book of Daniel (12^{2}: cp. also the post-exilic prophecy, Is. 24–27; and see *Isaiah*, p. 399f.), *i.e.* by about 167 B.C.[1] Consequently the book of Job is best explained as the product of a period lying between the close of the 7th and the beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C., and indeed at some distance from either of these extreme limits; considerably earlier than the 2nd cent., for even the Elihu speeches, separated probably, as the linguistic differences suggest, by a century or two from the rest of the book, say nothing of an after life; and considerably later than the 7th cent., for what there appears as a freshly gained perception is here the common possession of Job and his opponents in debate who represent the current theology of the time. Certainly the question of the sufferings of the righteous was much discussed from the close of the 7th cent. onwards, but the question is at first raised either with reference to *nations* (Hab. $1^{13f.}$, Is. 40–55), or if in reference to individuals (Jer. 12^{1-3}) yet in such a way as not to suggest that it was one of general concern. Such Pss. as 37. 49 and 73, which discuss the question, are themselves of uncertain date though scarcely pre-exilic. But Mal. 2^{17} $3^{14.\ 15}$, certainly written in the middle of the 5th cent. B.C., offer significant parallels to the formulation of the problem in Job.

Other ideas agree well with such a date as the 5th cent. or independently suggest it. A lofty monotheism (cp. 1^{6} n. 31^{26-28} n.), such as Deut.-Isaiah had *argued for*, is *presupposed* in all parts of the book; and the descriptions in Job of God's majesty and might in nature and history are not as the similar

[1] The doctrine of a future life also appears in 𝔊—not only in the Appendix to the book, most of which at least is later than the original version, but also in 14^{14}: see *Exp.*, 1920 (June), 430.

description in Deut.-Is. introduced to prove that there is no room for any other but one God, but that that one God's ways are past man's comprehension. Under God are angels (5^1 15^{15} 37^8) with well-defined functions (ct. 1 K. 22), such as that of interceding for men (5^1 n. 33^{23} n.) or criticizing them—the Satan The Satan of Job appears to belong to an earlier period than Satan (without the art) of 1 Ch. 21^1 (not earlier than *c.* 300 B.C.), and is decisively earlier than ὁ διάβολος of Wis. 2^{24}, but is later rather than as early as or earlier than the Satan of Zec. 3 (520 B.C.): see 1^6 n. The highly developed ethical standpoint, implicit particularly in c. 31, also points to a relatively late period.

§ 47. (4) Like the ideas, the language of the book is late, though not so late as that of some other books of the OT. (*e.g.* Eccl. Ch.). Certain linguistic features taken by themselves would point even to a period earlier rather than later than the 5th cent. B.C.: thus אנכי (§ 25) is relatively more frequent in Job than in Is. 40–55 (Job—excluding Elihu—אנכי 12, אני 20; Is. 40–55, אנכי 18, אני 54). Many other features point away from the latest periods—*e.g.* the use of the waw conversive (ct. Eccl.), the avoidance of ש (ct. *e.g.* Eccl.). On the other hand, there are distinct signs of lateness. Even apart from the Elihu speeches, the Aramaisms (§ 28)—decidedly more conspicuous than in Is. 40–55—are very noticeable; and so also is the use of ל as the *nota acc.*: see 5^2 n. 8^8 n. 9^{11} n. 12^{23} 14^{21} 19^{28} 21^{22} 23^8—and perhaps 34^3 (Elihu). The rarer forms of particles and pronominal suffixes (§ 26), which form a striking feature of the language of Job, might be largely explained as the idiosyncrasy of a writer of any period, but as a whole (cp. *Isaiah*, p. 467) point rather to a relatively late period. The vocabulary contains very much that is peculiar (see Index II.) to the book, including a number of words explicable only from the Arabic,[1] and sometimes termed, with questionable propriety, Arabisms; but this does not, at all events directly, contribute anything to the determination of the date.

Thus the various lines of evidence converge towards the conclusion that Job was most probably written in the 5th cent.

[1] See references under "Arabic" in Index I.

B.C.; since much of the evidence taken in isolation is neither rigorous nor indicative of such narrow limits as a century, the possibility of a somewhat earlier or a somewhat later date may be entertained as alternatives; but several lines of evidence are very unfavourable to any theory of much earlier or much later date.

VII. The Text.

§ 48. As in other books of the OT., so in Job variants that materially affect the sense, whether between existing MSS of 𝔐 or between the Qrê and K^{e}thib, are not numerous; but 𝔊 here, as elsewhere, points to the existence of now lost MSS that differed more extensively. Unfortunately the determination of the Hebrew text lying behind 𝔊 is rendered peculiarly difficult in Job by the fact that the version is often free and paraphrastic;[1] and the use of 𝔊 for determining the original text of 𝔐 is greatly limited by the fact that much of that text was not rendered at all.

Printed editions of 𝔊 (including Swete's), following the great mass of Greek MSS, it is true, present a text not differing greatly in extent from 𝔐; but this text, as we know from the most direct and certain evidence,[2] has resulted from the addition to the short ancient version of Job, dating from before, but not necessarily long before, 80 B.C.,[3] of renderings of many passages not contained in that version from later Greek versions, chiefly Θ, very much more rarely 'A, Σ (2nd cent. A.D.). These additions to the original text of 𝔊 were made by Origen in the Hexapla, but were there distinguished by the use of diacritical marks; subsequently the Hexaplaric text drove out the much shorter text, and, further, the diacritical marks were

[1] Many illustrations of this will be found in the phil. nn. (*e.g.* on 8^{19} 9^{13} 14^{14} 15^{28} $17^{1.2}$ 20^{15} 29^{18} $30^{12.14}$ 32^{14} 36^{19}). See also Bi. *De Indole vers. Alex. Jobi*, 1862.

[2] Origen, *Ad African.* 4. Cp. Jer. *Præf. in Hiob.*

[3] Aristeas (*c.* 80 B.C.) made use of the version (cp. § 43). On this and the date of 𝔊, see Swete, *OT. in Greek*, 25, 370f.; Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*^{3}, 311, 356f.; J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 136ff. Grätz in the *Monatsschrift*, 1877, p. 83ff. (cp. *Exp.*, June 1920, p. 430) argued unconvincingly that 𝔊 was no older than the middle of the first cent. A.D.

commonly omitted, surviving only in two Greek minuscules,[1] in two Latin MSS,[2] and in the unique MS of $\mathfrak{S}^{II}$.[3] These five MSS[4] differ in some places as to the positions of the marks, and so leave a certain amount of doubt as to the exact extent of the additions made by Origen.

A witness of another kind to the original extent of $\mathfrak{G}$ appeared with the discovery of $\mathfrak{K}$—the Sahidic version of $\mathfrak{G}$.[5] Ciasca, who edited this, argued that $\mathfrak{K}$ was a pre-Hexaplaric version of $\mathfrak{G}$, and his view was commonly accepted. Burkitt, on the other hand (*EBi.* 5027 f.), argues that $\mathfrak{K}$ is "a translation of Origen's revised text *with the passages under asterisk omitted*"; in this case $\mathfrak{K}$ is still a valuable witness, though its evidence is now in reality early evidence as to the use of the Hexaplaric marks. Be the exact relation of $\mathfrak{K}$ to the Hexaplaric text what it may, from it the passages asterisked in the MSS of $\mathfrak{G}$, $\mathfrak{L}$, and $\mathfrak{S}^{H}$ are, broadly speaking,[6] absent, and

[1] HP 248 (=Cod. Vaticanus, 346, c. xiv. sæc.) and the Cod. Colbertinus (Paris, nr. 1952).

[2] An Oxford MS (Bodleian 2426) and a Tours MS (Turonensis 18): ed. P. de Lagarde in *Mittheilungen*, ii. 193–237: cp. G. Beer in *ZATW*, 1896, 297–314; 1897, 97–122; 1898, 257–286.

[3] Published in facsimile by A. M. Ceriani, *Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus*, Milan, 1874.

[4] The evidence of these together with the fragments of ΘΣ 'A were collected by Field in *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt* (1875)—published before the discovery of $\mathfrak{K}$. For corrections of and additions to Field, see J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra* (1883), 556 f.; E. Klostermann, *Analecta zur Septuaginta* (1895), 68–74. See also E. Tisserant in *RB*, 1912, 481–503; 1919, 89–105, 500–505, and A. Rahlfs, *Mit. d. Septuaginta-Unternehmen*, i. 7 (1915)—all on the Greek Uncial Cod. Hierosolymitanus Sanctæ Crucis, no. 36.

[5] Edited by Ciasca in *Sacrorum Bibl. fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*, Romæ, 1889, ii. 1–68. From mutilation of MSS, cc. 39^{9}–40^{8} of this version are missing. The lower Egyptian, or Bohairic, version of $\mathfrak{G}$ was edited and translated by H. Tattam (*The ancient Coptic Version of the book of Job*, London, 1846); but this version contains the Hexaplaric additions and is of relatively little interest. An index of existing Coptic texts of Job is given by A. Vaschalde in *RB*, 1920, 95–98.

[6] Thus the only stichoi asterisked in $\mathfrak{S}^{H}$ and yet present in $\mathfrak{K}$ are 9^{15b} (in $\mathfrak{K}$ before 9^{15a}) 17^{16b} $20^{3c.\ 4a}$ 25^{6b} 27^{1} 30^{32b}; and of these 25^{6b} and 27^{1} (in $\mathfrak{G}$ exactly $=29^{1}$, which is not asterisked even in $\mathfrak{S}^{II}$) are not asterisked in any other MSS. On the possibility of some of the remaining four passages being pre-Origenian, see p. lxxiii, n. 3.

so far as extent is concerned 𝔎 closely represents the pre-Origenian and presumably also the original state of 𝔊. It is probable, indeed, that to a very small extent the present defect of 𝔎 is due to loss in the transmission of 𝔏 itself.[1] On the other hand, there is some reason for thinking that two passages corresponding to nothing in 𝔐 but found in 𝔏 as in all other authorities for 𝔊 after 2^{9} 42^{17}, formed no part of the original text of 𝔊;[2] and it is also possible that a very small number of entire stichoi common to 𝔊, 𝔎, and 𝔐, are derived from or influenced by the later Greek Versions.[3]

§ 49. Of the existing text of 𝔐, then, there appears to have been in the original text of 𝔊 no equivalent for (1) the passages absent from 𝔎 (except 1^{15b} 6^{15a} 15^{19a} $33^{15b.\ 16a}$ 37^{21b}); (2) some dozen stichoi in 39^{9}–40^{8a} (lost through mutilation of the MS in

[1] Due to loss, probably in the transmission of 𝔎 (and if not, then in the earlier transmission of the text of 𝔊 rendered by 𝔎) are probably the few lines absent from 𝔎 though not asterisked in *any* of the existing MSS containing the Hexaplaric marks: there are 1^{15b} 6^{15a} and 15^{19a} $33^{15b.\ 16a}$ 37^{21b}. In the case of $33^{15b.\ 16a}$, homoioteleuton, as Ciasca pointed out, would easily account for the loss of the lines in Sahidic, while the rendering of רוח by *νοῦς* instead of *πνεῦμα* points strongly to 𝔊 rather than Θ or any of the other later versions.

[2] See *The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job* (*Exp.*, June 1920, 422–438). The conclusions there reached were that the speech of Job's wife in 2^{9} as well as the Appendix (after 42^{17}) formed no part of the original version: the vocabulary in 2^{9} points strongly to a different hand: note λάτρις, *μόχθος*, *αἴθριος*, *διανυκτερεύειν*, *πλανῆτις*, *εἰς τὸ κενόν*. The minor additions of a word or a clause such as occur in $1^{1.\ 9.\ 5.\ 21.\ 22}$ 2^{10} $5^{4.\ 27}$ $7^{16.\ 19}$ 13^{25} 15^{28} 24^{4} 31^{9} 33^{23} 38^{1} 41^{5} $42^{5.\ 10.\ 11.\ 16}$ may most or all of them be original to the version.

[3] From what has been said above (p. lxxii, n. 6), it is clear that the stichoi present in 𝔎, which all the MSS with the Hexaplaric marks *agree* in marking as additions, do not exceed half a dozen. In one or two of these cases, style supports the suggestion of the Hexaplaric marks that the stichoi, though in 𝔎, were derived from, or at least as now read influenced by, Θ. Thus in 17^{16} *χῶμα* (=עפר) points to Θ, who substitutes it for 𝔊's *πέτρα* in 14^{8}, for 𝔊's *γῇ* in 19^{25}; note also in 20^{3} *παιδεία* (cp. Θ 36^{10} 37^{3}; and cf. *νουθέτημα* in 5^{17} 𝔊). It is possible 𝔎 in these cases rests on a text of 𝔊 not yet affected by Θ: thus in 17^{16} ЄΠΚΑϚ *might* render *γῆς* (which, if the stichos actually stood in 𝔊, would almost certainly have been used) just as well as the *χώματος* of the existing text. So in 20^{3} *παιδεία* and perhaps also *ἀποκριθήσεταί μοι* rather point to Θ; but 𝔎 might be a rendering not of these words, but of *νουθέτημα* (cp. 5^{17}) and *δώσει μοι ἀπόκρισιν* (cp. 13^{22} 𝔊 and 𝔎), which would probably have been used by 𝔊.

𝔖), viz. $39^{13-18.\ 28.}$ (ἐπ' ἐξοχῇ πέτρας καὶ ἀποκρύφῳ) $^{29b.\ 30}$ asterisked in $\mathfrak{S}^{H}$, and in some or all of the other MSS giving the Hexaplaric marks; (3) certain stichoi, present in 𝔖 but asterisked in $\mathfrak{S}^{H}$ and (or) other MSS, such as 17^{16} 20^{3}. The number of stichoi involved in (1) and (2) is between 350 and 400; to these (3) adds at most a relatively negligible quantity.[1] A list of the omissions of 𝔊 is given in § 31.

§ 50. Does, now, this defect of 𝔊 represent an earlier or later form of the text than 𝔐? [2] Is it due—in the main at least—to the loss or disregard on the part of the translation of what previously existed? or is it due to the subsequent expansion of the Hebrew text by the addition of the matter now found in 𝔐, but absent from the earlier form of 𝔊? In considering this question these observations may be made:

(1) The main structure of the book is unaffected by the defect of 𝔊: in 𝔊 as in 𝔐 there are found Prologue, Dialogue, with three cycles—two complete and one incomplete—of speeches, the speeches of Elihu, the speeches of Yahweh (including the lengthy descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan), and the Epilogue.

(2) The defect is not at all evenly distributed over the book. The following table may serve to indicate this sufficiently:

[1] A defect of 350 stichoi represents about $\frac{1}{8}$ of the whole, the total length of the existing text of 𝔐 being equivalent to about 2200 stichoi, and the stichoi of the conflate Greek text ranging in different MSS from 2021^{A} 2126^{N} to 2153^{B}. Some of the stichometries indicate a larger proportion of originally absent stichoi, giving the number of non-asterisked stichoi, *i.e.* the stichoi of the original version, as 1800, 1700, 1600, the last figure having the better authority (cp. Swete, *Introduction*, 347, 350; *PRE* viii. 101 with references). Klostermann (*ib.* 102) concludes that 𝔊 was originally shorter by at least a quarter than the existing text of 𝔐.

[2] The priority of 𝔐 was generally unchallenged till 1889, when E. Hatch, in *Essays on Biblical Greek* (vi.), argued for the priority of 𝔊—that, in the main 𝔊 represented the original extent of the book and 𝔐 an amplification. In favour of the priority of 𝔊 is also Bi. (2); cp. the English translation of Job by E. J. Dillon in *The Sceptics of the OT.*, 1895. This theory has been criticized and the priority of 𝔊 maintained especially by Di. (*Sitzungsberichte d. Berliner Ak.*, 1890, pp. 1345-1373), Dr. (*Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1896, p. 159 ff.), Bu.

	Stichoi absent from 𝔊.	Approximate Percentage of the whole Number of Stichoi in 𝔐.
Prologue	1	
First Cycle of Speeches—		
Cc. 3-6	0	
„ 7-11	6	
„ 12-14	17-23	4
Second Cycle 15-21 . .	59	16
Third „ 22-31 . .	124	25
Elihu 32-37 . .	114	35
Yahweh 38-42[26] . .	43	16
Epilogue	3	

(3) The passages absent from 𝔊 are not in Hebrew distinguished from the rest by any differences of style and vocabulary, but on the other hand they are connected with them by some noticeable similarities. Thus what is absent from 𝔊 employs the same three terms for God—אל (7 times), אלוה (3 times), שדי (2 times); and as within 𝔐 there is a difference in the degree of preference for אל (see above, § 24), so also is there in the passages of Elihu absent from 𝔊 (אל six times, אלוה once). Similarly the passages absent from 𝔊 contain in 𝔐 several of the rarer particles (see above, § 26), as, *e.g.*, אלי in 29[19] and עלימו (27[23] 30[27]).

(4) The removal of the passages absent from 𝔊 in many cases destroys the poetical structure by depriving one parallel line of its fellow, *e.g.* 10[4a] 20[14b] 31[27a] 33[8a] 34[6b. 11b. 18b] 39[6b], while in few if any cases does 𝔊 yield good distichs where 𝔐 has tristichs or isolated stichoi. It is true Bi. establishes at least an appearance of a very rigid poetical structure, but this he does not by accurately reproducing 𝔊, but by omitting both more and less: *e.g.* in 10[4] he omits 10[4a] with 𝔊, but then also 10[5a] without the authority of 𝔊, in order to obtain a distich of sorts indeed, but inferior to either of the distichs in 𝔐.

Of the foregoing (1) is obviously quite indecisive: a book of the present length of 𝔐 may have been abbreviated; on the other hand, a shorter book which had already been expanded

by the addition of the speeches of Elihu might at a later date have been expanded in quite a different way by the addition of what is present in 𝔐, but was absent from 𝔊. But (2) already inclines the balance against the priority of 𝔊: it would have been natural for an abbreviator to shorten increasingly in the successive cycles, which in general cover much the same ground, and most of all in the speeches of Elihu, which contribute so little that is fresh. On the other hand, increasing activity on the part of an expander such as would be required to account for the distribution of the additional matter is less likely. Finally, (3) and (4) tell heavily against the priority of 𝔊 and in favour of 𝔐.

But although in the main 𝔐, so far as extent is concerned, represents an earlier text than 𝔊, some of the omissions of 𝔊 are of passages which there are independent reasons for suspecting not to belong to the original text of 𝔐: see, *e.g.*, 7^8 12^9 23^9 with the notes. Yet it must remain uncertain whether even these passages which relatively to the whole omissions of 𝔊 are exceedingly few, are absent because not in 𝔊's Hebrew text, or like the rest of the omissions are due to abbreviation—in these cases accidentally restoring the original text.

§ 51. In those parts of the book rendered by the early version, 𝔊 sometimes points to a better text than 𝔐, though less frequently, and on account of its paraphrastic tendency less clearly, than in some other books (*e.g.* Samuel). The other ancient versions[1] made direct from the Hebrew rarely serve, where 𝔊 fails, to correct 𝔐. Many places remain in which neither 𝔐 nor any text to which the versions point can be regarded as original: in these cases the original must be regained, if at all, by conjecture, and here rhythm becomes a valuable aid.

[1] On these see for 𝔖, A. Mandl, *Die Peschittha z. Hiob*, Leipzig, 1892; E. Stenij, *De Syriaca libri Jobi interpretatione quæ Peschîta vocatur*, Helsingfors, 1887; E. Baumann, "Die Verwendbarkeit der Pešita z. B. Hiob für die Textkritik," in *ZATW*, 1898-1900: for 𝔗, W. Bacher, "Das Targum z. Hiob," in *Monatsschrift*, 1871, 208-223, 283f.; M. Lewin, *Targum u. Midrasch zum Buche Hiob*, 1895.

VIII. The Rhythms[1] of the Book of Job.

§ 52. The prevailing rhythmical form in the book is that of the balanced distich of two lines each containing three stresses (3 : 3); but this is only the prevailing, not the exclusive rhythm; still less do the lines necessarily consist exclusively of seven syllables (Bi.), or the distichs regularly coalesce into quatrains (Bi. Du.).

The dominance of the 3 : 3 rhythm is too obvious to call for proof here, but on the extent of departure from it—certainly in the existing and probably also in the original text—something more must be said. It follows from their rigid quatrain theory that Bi. and Du. allow no tristichs in the original text, though in what they regard as additions to the original they sometimes imagine more tristichs than exist now, or ever existed (see p. 205). In the existing text there are in all a considerable number of tristichs, or, alternatively, distichs preceded or followed by isolated stichoi;[2] some of these are open to more or less suspicion,[3] but a number remain which there is no reason whatever, beyond the fact that they are tristichs, for questioning. Although elsewhere combined with 3 : 3 there occur as occasional variants other divisions of the full six-stress period, viz. 2 : 2 : 2 or 2 : 4 or 4 : 2; in the book of Job these variants are at most exceedingly rare: see phil. n. on $17^{1.\,11}$, also *AJSL* xxxvi. 95 ff. A striking example of 2 : 2 : 2 would be 9^{21}, if the text is correct there.

On the other hand, of other rhythms there are examples, relatively rare, it is true, yet actually too numerous in the present text for it to be probable that none are original. Thus in the phil. n. on 17^{14} (p. *114*) references are given to 22

[1] Cp. G. B. Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*; and more briefly, *Isaiah*, pp. lix–lxviii, on the subject of Hebrew rhythm generally. For rhythm in Job in particular, see Bi.; J. Ley, *TSK*, 1895, 635 ff., 1897, p. 7 ff.; P. Vetter, *Die Metrik des Buches Job*, 1897; H. Grimme, *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1898, pp. 295 ff., 421 ff., 1899, 112 ff., 259 ff.; Sievers; Honth. 44–70. Bu.'s Comm. contains much detailed criticism of Bi.

[2] See $3^{4.\,5.\,6.\,9}$ 4^{16} 5^{5} $6^{4.\,10}$ 7^{11} 8^{6} 9^{24} $10^{3.\,17\,(?).\,22}$ $11^{6.\,18f.}$ $12^{3.\,4.\,6.\,13.\,27}$ $14^{4f.\,7.\,12.\,13.\,14.\,19}$ $15^{28.\,30}$ $(17^{1.\,11})$ 18^{4} $19^{12.\,27.\,29}$ 20^{23} $21^{17.\,33}$ $24^{5.\,12.\,13.\,15.\,18\,(20).\,24}$ 26^{14} $28^{3.\,4.\,28}$ 30^{3} $31^{7.\,34}$ $33^{15.\,23f.}$ 34^{37} $37^{21.\,23}$ 38^{41} 39^{25}.

[3] See, *e.g.*, p. 30 on the four tristichs in $3^{1\text{-}10}$.

examples of 3 : 2 (several with the echoing parallelism characteristic of this rhythm: see, *e.g.*, 8^{21} 12^{17} 18^{18} 27^{21} 29^{5} 33^{22} 36^{14} 37^{9} 38^{9} 39^{3}), to which a few more might be added, for example, two in 7^{21}. But 40^{24} is very questionable proof that 2 : 3 was used. Of 4 : 3 a dozen examples are referred to in the same note; and of these, too (add $4^{2.\ 10}$ and 29^{13}), a few are likely to be original, though several are open to serious doubt on one ground or another. Even possible instances of 3 : 4 are very rare (phil. n. on 21^{16}, p. *147*: cp. 29^{6}, p. *200*). The examples of 4 : 4 are few: however, see 3^{3} 15^{20} 22^{18} 27^{13} 29^{4} 34^{29}, but 15^{23} 21^{23} and 23^{9} are all doubtful (see phil. nn.). The rhythm 2 : 2, *i.e.* a single period of four stresses divided into equal parallel lines, is very rare; but 10^{6} seems a secure example of it: 19^{14} is much more doubtful (see phil. n.).

INDEXES.

I ENGLISH.

The *italicized* figures refer to the pages of the Philological Notes.

Abaddon, 220, 242, 265, *341*.
Adultery, 209 f., 213, 264 f.
Aiabu, xxix.
Alexander Polyhistor, lxv.
Angels, lxx, 10–12, 46 f., 52, 135, 160, 328, *248*, *276*, *335*.
  of death, 289, 291.
  intercession of, 48 f., 290.
Anger of God, 88 f.
Arabic, words in Job explained from, *18*, *33*, *35*, *51*, *53*, *60*, *73*, *79*, *100 f.*, *122*, *124*, *141*, *148*, *151*, *199*, *216*, *261*, *265*, *270*, *282*, *289*, *292*, *294*, *310*, *326 f.*, *344*.
Aramaisms, xxxvii, xlvi, lxx, *315*.
Aristeas, lxv, lxxi.
Arm, fig. use of, 194, 217, 349.
Arrows, 180, 232.
Ass, 5.
  wild, 207, 338 ff.
Assonance, 65, *112*, *153*, *275*, *330*.
Aurora Borealis, 323. *311*.
'Aus, xxviii.
Autumn, fig. of ripeness, *199*.
Avenger of Blood, 173.

Babylonian, literary parallels, xxiii, xxxi ff., xxxi. See also inscriptions: cp. mythological allusions.
Barachel, 279, *282*.
Bear, the Great, 86, 335.
Bedawin, 51, 208.
Behemoth, 351 ff.
Beryl, 240.
Bildad, xxviii f., lvi f., 27, etc.
Birds, knowledge possessed by, 239, 242, 346.
Birthday, 7, 31.
Blasting, 238, *194*.
Blood, 148, 273.
Bone, expressing reality, *148*.
Bones, seat of disease, 22.
  functions attributed to, 45, 257.
Book, or scroll, 170, 274 f.
Bowels, seat of emotion, 260.
Bronze, 237.
Broom, 253.
Burnt-offerings, lxvi, 6, 8, 374.
Buzite, 279.

Camels, 5 f., 15.
Canaanites = merchants, 362.
Captives, 38.
Chaldæans. See Kasdim.
Children, 5, 50.
  of the wicked, fate of, lvi, 182 f., 186 f., 229 f.
Clouds, 220 f., 315, 335 f.
Cock, 336, *311*.
Conjectural translation, *88*.
Consecration, 8.
Constellations, 86, 333 f.
Copper. See Bronze.
Coptic versions, lxxii.
Coral, 241.
Covenant, 57, 262.
Creation, 222 ff., 233, 243, 327 ff.
Crocodile, 34, 71, 352 f., 354, 359, 361, 364 ff., *333*.
Crystal, 241.
Curse, 50, 212.

Darkness, 104, 331.
Day, uses of term, 30 f., 206.
Death, state after, lxviii, 19, 62, 129, 150, 172, *218*. (See also Abaddon, Sheol.)
  personified, 160.
Demons, 56, *201*.
Desert (Syrian), 6, 18.
Dialogue, xxii, liv.

Disciplinary suffering, lvii, lxiii, 43, 287 ff.
Dragons, 33, 71.
Dreams, 72, 287.
Dress, tunic, 257.
mᵉʿil, 19.
"Dust," 27, 51, 82, 173 f., 178, 237, 351, *127*, *210*.

Eagle, 94.
Earth and heaven, Hebrew ideas of, 85, 219 f., 221 f., 327 ff.
Earthquakes, 85.
East, children of the, xxvii, 2, 6.
land of the, xxvii.
wind. See Sirocco.
Eclipses, 33.
Edom, xxviii ff., 2.
Egypt, author's acquaintance with, 79, 93, *333* (352 ff.).
Elephantiasis, 23, 72, 147, 160.
Elf, 57, 272
Elihu, xl ff., lxiii, lxv, lxix, 40, 277 ff.
Eliphaz, xxviii f., lvi f., 27, 40 ff., etc.
Emphasis, *84*, *88*, *204*.
Ethical terms, ideas, and ideals, lxx, 3 f., 54, 227, 263 f., 265, 266 f., 270
Evaporation, 315.
Expiation, 8.

Falcon, 239.
Firmament, 321.
"First-born," 160.
Flocks = sheep and goats, 5.
Folk-lore, 57, 148.
Folk-story or -book of Job, xxvi.
Funeral rites and customs, 190, 230.
Future life. See Death, state after.

Gate(-ways), 50.
Giants, 219.
Glass 241.
Goats, 5.
wild, 337 ff.
God, terms for, xxxv, lxxv, 4, 20, 232. *198*.
Gods, sons of the, 9, 297, 328.
Gold, 236. 241. *296*.
of Ophir, 198, 240, *156*.
Grammar, notes on—
Accusative of limitation, *4*.
time, *3*, *260*.
product, *71*. *95*, *155*, *190*.
state, *10*, *24*, *78*, *143*, *188*, *206*, *210*.
Anticipatory suffix, *199*, *245*.
Article omitted, *9*; as relative, *14*.
Asyndeton, *73*, *138*, *200*, *256*, *315*.
Grammar, notes on—
"Conjugation of attack," 57.
Diminutives, *106*.
Feminine, uses of, *4*, *8*, *23*, *119*, *264*, *318*.
Gaʾya, *17*, *27*.
Gender of parts of the body, *125 f.*
Hifil written defectively, *67*.
Hypothetical sentences, *22*, *23*, *26*, *45*, *48*, *66*, *73*, *122*, *124*, *145*, *162*, *334*.
Imperfect, incipient use of, *19*.
final, *221*.
synchronistic, *223*, *299*.
with ו instead of ו, *20*.
Indefinite, 3rd p. pl., *26*, *45*, *120*, *136*.
Interrogation, unexpressed, 358, *332*.
Jussive, forms incorrectly written or pointed as, *87*, *111*, *118*, *137 f.*, *140*, *226*, *288*.
Masculine suffixes and verbal forms referring to fem., *8f.*, *50*, *123 f.*
Narration, indirect, changing to direct and *vice versa*, *132*, *155*, *267*.
Nifal, privative sense of, questionable, *71*.
Participial constructions, *79*, *191*.
Plural, alleged 3 fem of vb. in ה, *107*.
Relative, omission of, *119*, *125*, *177*.
Scripto defectiva, *4*, *129*.
Sing., change from pl. and *vice versa*, 152, *92*, *187 f.*, *193*.
Subject, implicit, *26*.
Tone, *16*.
Vocative followed by 3rd pers., *76*, *117*.
Waw *adæquationis*, *29*.
introducing pred., *138*.
Greek thought and literature, alleged influence of, xxiv, 235, 315.
Greek version, early, xxviii, xxx, lxxi ff.
Additions, lxxiii, 8, 15, 24 f., *4*, *8*, *10*, *13*,
Date, lxv, lxxi.
Dogmatic renderings, *92*, *147*, *299*.
Double renderings, *2*, *187*, *207*, *243*, *303*.
Idiomatic renderings, *63*, *127*, *145*.
Insertion of τοιαῦτα, *237*.
Omissions, xlix, lxxiv f., *235* (xii).
Paraphrases, lxxi, 32, *9*, *54*, *110*, *193*, *201 f.*, *207*, *214*, *237*, *249*, *280*, *328*.
Renderings of בן, *159*, of רוח (νοῦς, πνεῦμα), lxxiii.

Greek version, early, and parallelism, 149, *116*.
and rhythm of Hebrew text, *113*, *116*, *157*, *316* (cp. lxxv).
Greek versions, later, lxxi ff.

Hail, 319, 332, *292*.
Hand, gestures of, 109, 269.
in various phrases, 151, 200, 299, *111*, *160*.
Hauran, xxvii, xxx, 2, *213*.
Hawk, 346.
Heart = courage, 368.
= understanding, 73, 79, 84, *113*.
= conscience, 226.
Heaven. See Earth.
Hexapla, lxxi.
Hippopotamus, 352, 354 ff., *326 ff*.
Hired servant, 68, 127.
Horn, fig. use of, 147, *107*.
Horse, 345.
Hospitality, 270 f.
Houses of clay, 47, 210.
Hypocrisy, 271.

Ice, 319, 333, *306*.
Idolatry, 268 f.
Individual, religious value of the, lxix.
Inscriptions—
Aramaic, *238*.
Babylonian, xxiv, xxxi ff., 89, 327, *181 f*.
Egyptian, 269, 353.
Minæan, 16.
Phœnician, 171, 219.
Inspiration, 217, 280.
Iron, 237.

Jackals, 260 f.
Jemimah, 376.
Job, name, xx, xxix, 2.
book of. See Table of Contents.
character of, lii ff., 1 ff., 12 f., 15, 20, 42, 261 ff.
country of, xxvi ff., 2.
disease of, 22 f.
Jordan, 352.

Kasdim, xxx, 17.
Ḳedem, xxvii.
Keren-happuch, 376.
Ḳesiah, 376.
Kings, 118.
Kiss, 269.

Lamp, 158, 246.
Lapis lazuli, 238, *194*.
Law and legal procedure, references to, 90, 124 f., 193, 206 f., 209, 265, 276, 299, *229*.
Lead, *126*.
tablets of, 171.
Leviathan, 33 f., 224, 351 ff., 356, 359 ff.
Light, 330 f.
Lightning, 17, 181, 232, 317, 319 f., 332, 336.
Lions, 44, 102 f., 337, *312*.
smell of, *37*.
Litteræ Suspensæ, *302*.
Loin-cloth, *79*.
Loins, 355.
Lotus trees, 357.
Lye, 95.

Maimonides, xxv.
Ma'in, xxviii.
Malachite, 240.
Mallows, 214, *174*.
Marduk, 71, 89, 223.
Marriage, 7.
Mastema, 9.
Meal, sacred, 6, 8, 271.
banquet, 6, *8*.
ordinary, 6, 266 f.
Meteor, 336.
Migration of birds, 346.
Military similes, 103, 129, 146, 166, 256.
Millstones, 368.
Minæans, xxviii, 16 f.
Mines, miners, 236 ff., *192 f*.
Mirror, 321.
Monogamy, lxvi, 7.
Monotheism, lxix, 9, 269, 328.
Moon, 216, 221, 268 f., *179*.
Moses, xxxv (cp. xxv), lxv.
"Mother Earth," 19 f., cp. 209.
Mourning, mourners, 18, 24, 53, 146.
Murder, 209.
Musical instruments, 184, 261, 346.
Mythological allusions, 34, 71, 89, 134, *210*, *222 ff*., 317, 328, 334, 352 f.

Na'am, Na'aman, Na'amathite, xxviii.
Nettles, 253.
Night, fig. use of, 306, 313.
mist, 333.
North, the, 202, 220 f., 323, *296*.
Nuḳra, the, xxix f.
Numbers, significant, 5.
in "ascending enumeration," 56.

Oath, 225 f.
Olives, 140.
Omniscience, 107 f.
Onyx, 240.
Ophir. See Gold.

Origen, lxxi f.
Orion, 86, 334, *307*.
Orphans, 265 f.
Ostrich, 260 f., 342 ff.
Oxen, 5.
  wild, 340 ff.

Papyrus, 80, 357, *59 f.*
Parallel passages, lxvii, 117.
Parallelism, 41, 54, 80, 135, *215*, *224*, *240 f.*, *257*, *293*. See Repetition.
Particles, stressed and unstressed, *69*, *104*, *150*, *187*, *205*.
Pearls, 241.
Persian influence, alleged, 268.
Personality, lxviii.
Phœnix, *202*.
Physicians, 121.
Pit, the, 156.
Plant life, allusions to, 79, 81, 140, 161.
Pledges, 151, 193.
Pleiades, the, 86, 334 f., *306 f.*
Poplars, 357.
Prayer, 147, 198, 291 f., 374.
Priests, lxvi, 119.
Purslain, 60.
Pyramids, 37.

Quatrains, lxxvii, 30.
Questions, at beginning of speeches, 41, 176.

Rahab, 89, 223 f.
Rain, 315 f., 332 f.
Ram, 279.
Raphael, 49.
Ravens, 337, *312*.
Reed, aromatic, *202*.
Refrains, 232.
Reins, 175.
Repetition of same term in parallel lines, 98, *33*, *49*, *80*, *82*, *114*, *251*, *261*, *303 f.*
  with difference of meaning, *69*.
Resurrection, 173, *204*.
Revelation, 44 ff., 135, 197, 285 ff.
Rhyme, *63*, *314*.
Rhythm, *138*, *145*, *154*, *172*, *191*, *207*, *213*, *217*, *249*, *256*, *260*, *288*, *297*.
Rhythms, lxxvii—
  2 : 2—*123*, *192*, *214*, *315*, *333*.
  2 : 2 : 2—*47*, *110*, *128*, *171*, *185*, *214*, *216*, *283*, *290*, *337*.
  3 : 2—*114*, *145*, *157*, *177*, *248*, *255*, *276*, *278*, *290*, *315*.
  2 : 3—177 f., *332*, *347*.
  3 : 3—lxxvii. Cp Rhythm.
  4 : 3—*112*, *114*, *116*, *126 f.*, *128*, *148*, *216*, *252*, *316*.
Rhythms, lxxvii—
  3 : 4—*147*, *257*, *293*, *331*.
  4 : 4—*46 f.*, *99*, *147*, *150*, *186*, *187*, *273*, *289*, *300*.
Right hand, *212*.
Rings, 375.
Rubies, 241.

Sab'a. Sabæan, xxx. See Sheba.
Sacrifice, lxvi, 8.
Sahidic. See Coptic.
Salt wort, 252.
Sapphire. See Lapis lazuli.
Satan, lii f., lxx, 4, 9 ff., 305, *12*.
Satyrs, 57.
Sea, 71, 219, 328, 330. See also Tiâmat.
Seals, sealing, 211, 288, 366, *243*, *339*.
Serpent, fleeing, 223 f.
Shade, *18*.
Shades, the, 218 f.
Sheba, xxix f., lxvii, 16, 64.
Sheep, 5.
Sheol, 28, 32, 36, 69, 104, 131, 155 f., 162, 217 ff., 242, 259, 331, 351.
Shuaḥ, xxviii, 27.
Silver, 236, 273.
Sin-offering, 8.
Sirius, 87.
Sirocco, 18, 44, 232, 321.
Slaves, 68, 208, 265 f.
Snow, 318, 332.
Ṣophar, xxviii f., lvi f., 27, 105, etc.
Soul, seat of desire, 61, *244*.
  departure of, *230*.
Spiders, 81, 231, 336, *310*.
Spirit, 249, 280, 297.
Stars, 194 f., 216, 328.
Stichoi, number of, in Job, lxxiv.
Stocks, 126.
Storehouses of winds, etc., 319, 332, *291*.
Stress. See Particles.
Suḥu, xxviii.
Sun and Moon, worship of, 268 ff.
Syriac version, xx, lxxvi.
  additions, *7 f.*, *14*.
  doublets, *166*, *202*.

Taskmaster, 38.
Teima, 64.
Tema, 16, 64.
Teman, xxviii, 27.
Temple-prostitutes, 311.
Temple worship, 291 f.
Tents, 220 f.
Theft, thieves, 209 f.
Theodotion's version, style of, lxxiii

Threshing-drag, 369.
Threshing floor, 58.
Throne, Yahweh's, 221, *284.*
Thunder, 222, 315 f., 317.
Tiâmat, 34, 71, 89, 223.
Tikkûne-sopherim, 48, 233.
Tomb, *151.*
Topaz, 241.
Transposition of lines, 239, 345, 360, *167, 170.*
of verses, 261, 369.
of words, 305.
Tristichs, lxxvii.

'Ûṣ, xxvii f., xxx, 2.

Vision, 175, 372.
Vulture, 94, 347.

Wady, 63, 190, 253, 357.
Water, fig. use of, 39, 110, *188.*
Widows, 207, 213, 230, 265 f., 267.
Wife as property, 265.
Wind(s), 223 f., 243, 332, *182, 290, 304.*
Wise, the, 54, 295.
Wisdom literature, xxii.

Yahweh, use of the name in Job, xxxv f.

Zeugma, 44, 220, *63.*

II. HEBREW.

The *italicized* figures refer to the pages of the Philological Notes.

Forms and meanings marked with an asterisk are in the Hebrew of the OT. peculiar to the book of Job; several of these, as pointed out in the notes, rest merely on punctuation or are due to textual corruption.

Words enclosed in brackets do not occur in 𝔐 of Job, but rest on a different punctuation or emendations of the text, not in all cases adopted in the notes and translation.

אב, *greenness,** 80.
אֲבָה,* *59.*
אבות (*wine-skins,** *238.*
אבי, *I pray,** 265.
אבר, Hif.,* *323.*
אברה, *317.*
אגל,* *305.*
אגמון, *340.*
(אגם), *boiling,** *340.*
אד, 316, *282, 304.*
אדם, ? *individual, 262.*
אדני, xxxvi, 232, *198.*
אובד, 249.
אולם, xxxvii, *7, 239.*
אָוֶן, 43.
אור, 210, 269.
אות, 189.
אז, *61.*
אזר, *79.*
אול, *91.*
אחו, 80, *51.*
אֲחָוָה,* xlvi, *85.*
אחז, Pi.,* *to shut in, 179.*
אַחַר, *129.*
אחרון, *120, 127.*
אחרית, *51.*
אט, *96.*
אי, neg., *158.*
איד, *99, 119, 148, 226.*
איתן, *79.*
אך, *123.*
אכור, 363, *337.*
אֵל, *234.*
אֵלֶף,* xlvii, *240.*
אֵל, ? substantive,* *175.*
אֵל and על, interchanging, *6 f., 92, 100, 261.*
אֵל, xxxv, xlii, lxxv, *126, 158.*
אלה, xxxv, xlii, lxxv, *147, 158.*
אלהים, xxxv, 232.
אֵלִים, not used in Job, xxxvi.
אלח, Nif., *97.*
אֵלִי,* xlv, *21.*
אליל, *82.*
אללי, *64.*
אלף, Pi.,* xlvi.
אמן, Hif., *322.*
(אמר בי (אשר, 274, 295.
אמש, *208.*
אמת, 3.
אן, *49.*
אני and אנכי, xliii f., lxx, *84.*
אסר, *to gird, 79.*
אף, *235, 288.*
(אפו(א, lxv, *59.*
אפיקים, ? *mighty,** *80.*
אֲרֵב,* *312.*
ארג, *shuttle,** *46.*
אשר = *that,* 115.
אשר על כן, *260.*
אֵת, 13.
אתה, *296.*

ב, 115, *224, 265, 323*; partitive, *149, 319*: ב *essentiæ, 141, 162, 285.*

באשה,* *231.*
ברי for מרי, *q.v.*
בדים, *limbs,** *119, 338; boastings,* 105, *338.*
ברי שאול, *114.*
בהיר, 322, *295.*
בהל, Nif., *24.*
בהל = יבול, *q.v.*
בָּהָחוֹת,* *77.*
בחר, xlvii.
בכי, *trickling,** *195.*
בל, 352, *342.*
בלג, *60.*
בלה, *146.*
בלהות, 159.
בלי, xlv, 352, *91, 240, 319, 343.*
בלי, 60, *36, 166.*
בלימה,* *179.*
בליעל, 298, *120, 257.*
בלע, xxxvii, 21.
בלתי, *91.*
בין, בונן, התבונן, *43, 56, 218.*
במו, xlv, *60.*
במתי, *55 f.*
בצה, 80, *330.*
בצע, 61, *185.*
בָּצָר,* *156.*
בר, 95; *open country,** *315.*
ברך, *to curse, 4 f.*
בשר, *125, 129.*
בתוך, 11.
בתולה, 262.

גאה, *51.*
גאון, 350.
גאל, 32, *17.*
גֹּאַל, 173.
גב, *83.*
גבינה,* *cheese* (as جبن, נובנא), 10[10].
גביש,* *196.*
גבר, Hithp., lxiv, 138, *100, 274.*
גֶּבֶר, 31, *17.*
(גדש* جدث), *151.*
גו, *the midst,** *209.*
גַּוָּה, *back,** *141, 244.*
גאוה = גוה, *157, 244.*
גוע, *20.*
גור, גֵּר, 167, *192 f.*
גיש, גוש,* *46.*
גוע, 128, *102.*
גזר, *157.*
גיח, *299.*
גל, *heap, 52.*
? well, 29, 52 f.
גלד,* *107.*
גללו, *136.*
גלמוד, 33, *102, 208.*
גם, *14, 159.*
גצל, Hif.,* *145.*
געש, *258.*
גרם, *bone, 327.*
גרע, 133; Pi.,* *
גרר, Nif., *143.*
גשם, 318.
גת, *168.*

דָּאָבָה,* 341.
דברה, *cause, word,** *29.*
דוי, *37, 119.*
דוין,* *340.*
דין, *133.*
דלל, *to dangle,** *192.*
דלף, *108.*
דַּעַ,* *123, 234.*
דרום, *south wind,** *294.*
דרש, *17, 62.*

(הא), *39.*
הָאֵם, *39.*
הבל, 72, *186.*
הדך,* *326.*
היה = הוא, *289.*
הַוָּה, הָוָה, *35.*
(הון), *336.*
(היך), *165.*
הכר,* *122.*
הלך, *2 f.*: Hithp., 12.
הליך,* *200.*
הלינות, *travelling-companies,** *41.*
(הסס*), *149.*
הן, *if,* xlvi, *56.*
הפך, Hof.,* *215.*
הרה, Pu.,* *16.*
(הרמות*), **37.**
התל, *83.*
(הַתְלָה*), *25.*
התולים,* *83, 111.*

זה, collective, *125.*
והם,* *37, 245.*
(והר), *296.*
(וון), *284.*
וחל, *to be in dread,** *233*
וחלי, *77, 233.*
וך, 4, *40.*
וכוחים,* *196.*
וכרון, *83.*
וָלָה, 265, *112.*
(ומורה), *102.*
וער,* 110.
ורב,* *41.*
ורם, 208, *231.*
ורק, *15.*

חב,* *bosom, 228.*
חבל, *to offend, 263.*
(חֶבֶל*), *fœtus, 315.*
חבלים, *147.*
חבר (خبر، حبر), *103.*
חֲבָרִים,* 362, *333.*
חבש, *326.*
*to rule,** *256.*
חדה, xlvi, *19.*
חֲדוּרִי,* *344.*
חֶדֶר, *290.*
חוג, vb.,* *180.*
noun, *154.*
חוה, xlvi, *85, 97, 234.*
ח(ו)ח, 361, *333.*
חול, vb., *178.*
noun, *202.*
חולל, *to wait,** *269.*
חון, *30, 120.*
חוש, *134.*
(חזו*), *53.*
חזו, *53, 197.*
(חור*), *53.*
חטא, *33, 342.*
חטאת, 303.
חיה, syn. of נפש, *244.*
חיל, *139.*
חילה, *39.*

חין,* *333.*
חכר,* *122.*
חלה, *63, 65, 73.*
חלילה, *254.*
חליפות, *65.*
חלל, *183.*
חלם, *to be healthy, 315.*
חֲלָמוּת,* *36, 209.*
חלף, *56, 141*: Hif. *65, 90.*
חלק, 152, *222, 237 f.*
חלש, *90.*
חמר, *139.*
חָמָה, *220.*
(חֲמָה*), *278.*
חמרמר, *107.*
חסר, *40.*
חנן, *to be offensive,* * *124.*
חנף, 80.
חץ,* xlvii, *240.*
חפץ (خفض),* *327.*
חפר, 110: *to paw,* * *321.*
חפש, Hithp., *216.*
חצן, *148.*
חק, 204, *89, 162, 180, 300.*
חקה, Hithp.,* *87.*
חקר, 107, *50.*
חרבות, *20.*
חרול, 254.
חרין חרוץ, 370.
חרם, *55.*
חרף, *199.*
חרש, Hif. *to make silent,* * *67.*
חת, 352, *346.*
חֵתֶת, *43.*
חתת, *146.*
(טוב(ה), 70.
טול, *335, 337.*
טוש,* xlvi, *60.*
טחות, *310.*
טמם * or טמה,* *117.*
טמן, *reserve for,* * *142.*
טפל, xlvi, *82.*
(טפש), *250.*
טרח, Hif.,* *291.*

יאורים, *galleries,* * *194.*
יבול, *143, 329.*
יגיע, 97, *62, 138.*
ידע, 92
יהוה, xxxv, xlii.
יחדו, יחד, *20, 149.*
יחל, *84.*
יסר, 42, *23.*
יְסוֹר,* *325.*
יצק, *72, 191, 200, 291, 294, 311, 341.*
יְצָרִים,* *112.*
יקב, *168.*
יקר, *glorious,* * xlvi, 226.
יראה, 42.
ירם, *106.*
יש, *133.*
יֵשׁ,* *77.*
ישע, ישעה, *215, 279.*
יִתֹּר,* *316.*
יתר, 197; *? tent-cord,* * *26.*

כאב, xxxvii, 28, *245.*
כביר, *49.*
כבר, Hif.,* *49, 284.*
כון, כונן, *50, 224.*
כוב, *337.*
כי, 235, *190*; כי או, *71*; כי עתה, *49.*
כיר,* *143.*
כידר,* *340.*
כירר,* *100.*
כימה, 87.
כלה, 175.
כלח,* *33.*
(כַּמְרִירִי*), *19.*
כָּמָה, *48.*
כָּמוֹ, xlv.
כנה, Pi., *238.*
כסיל, 86.
כסף, Qal. and Nif., *92.*
כעש * = כעס, 49, *27, 104.*
כָּעַת, *319.*
כָּפַי, *217, 240.*
כְּפִים, xlvi, *210.*
כפלאים, *68.*
כָּפָן,* xlvi, *33.*
כָּפָר, 291.
כרה על, *44.*
(כרר*), *44, 122.*
כתר, *to wait,* * xlvii, *272.*
כתת, *26.*

ל, *nota acc.*, lxx, *27, 29, 56, 62, 132.*
reflexive, *42, 82, 133, 316.*
of the norm, *96, 199, 313.*
denoting transition into, *83.*
לא, *66, 81.*
not = *nothing, 42.*
force of, extending to second line, *19, 219.*
לבב, Nif., *to get understanding,* * *70.*
לָהֵן, *therefore,* xlvii, *219.*
(לוע*), *324.*
לחום, *flesh, 141.*
(לילית), *120.*
ליש, 24.
לכר, Hithp.,* *306.*
לכן, *134.*
לבת (behaviour), *67.*
לָמוֹ, xlv. *170.*
לָמוֹ,* xlv, *187.*
לעה,* 35.
לפני, *21, 26.*
לפת, *41.*
לָקָה, 67.
לקש,* *166.*

מאום, *222*
מאס, xlvii, *47.*
(מַבְּכֵי*), *195.*
מדד, *46.*
מדה, *69.*
(מָדַי), *46, 323.*
מה על כמה, *84.*
מום, 352.
מוכיח, 96.
מיסר, *78, 243, 248.*
מוֹסָר, *78, 243.*
מוער, *259.*
מוקש, 358.
מוצא, *305*; *mine,* * *190.*
מורשי לבב, *113.*
(מווים), *291, 304.*
מָזוֹן,* *80.*
מורים,* *290.*
מורות,* *308.*

מִן* (for מֵחַ), 21^{26}.
ממיל,* *328.*
מְמַסְּנִים, 39.
ממרה, *48.*
מן, constructions with, *68, 89. 126, 160.*
מנאוב, xxxvii, *245.*
מִנְבִּיר(ל),* *284.*
מִסְכָּ, xlvii, *174.*
מסא, Hithp.,* *105.*
מִלָּה. xlvi, *23, 97, 211.*
מלילה. *101.*
מלין, 149, *108.*
מלכרת,* *118.*
כֹּל, xlvi, *49.*
[מלל] יָקֹל, *83.*
(מלץ, Nif.), *43.*
מכר,* *293.*
מְכֻרִים,* *58.*
מן, *262*; temporal, *19*: = *without*, *71*, *145*: partitive, *68*, *119.*
מנה, *45.*
מְנָדוֹ,* *24.*
מנהם,* *74.*
מני = מן, xlv, *41*, *222.* = ממני, *104.*
מנלם,* *101.*
מס, adj.,* *39.*
מְסִבּוֹת,* *292.*
מסס, *46 f.*
מִסְעָ, *dart*,* *344.*
מִסְפּוֹ, *59.*
מעבר,* xlvii, *260.*
מענרת (מענדת*), *306 f.*
מעיל, 19.
מִפְעַל, *123.*
מענה, *answer*, *232.*
מְסֻכָּנָע,* *285* (cp. p. 74 on 7^{20}).
מפניע, *285.*
מִפֶּ.* See נפח.
מכפל, *341.*
מפלאות,* *293.*
מפלש,* *293.*
מפרש, *283.*
מצוד, *123.*
מצוקה, *72.*
מצם. See יצי.
מקום, ? fem., *136.*
מקנה, 5.
מרא, Hif.,* *320.*
מרום, *320.*
(מרון), *320.*
מרי, *159.*
מרעים, *3.*
מרץ, *43*, *103.*
מִרְרָה* (= מְרֹרָה), *106.*
מְרֹרִים (cp. מרורות, 13^{26}), *58.*
משא, *48.*
(משבץ*), *smiting*, *280.*
משבר,* *309.*
משך, *152*, *173*, *307*, *333.*
מִשְׁכָּ, 232, 241, *196.*
משכות,* *307.*
משלו, *his like*,* *345.*
משפט, 349.
מִשְׁ, *81.*
משתה, 6, *3.*

נִגְבֵי,* *303.*
נבל, *93.*
נבל(ה), נבל, *26*, *262*, *374*, *211.*
(נבע, Hif.), *82.*
נגר, Hif., *to denounce*, *111.*
נגע ב, 13.
נגר, Nif., *143.*
נגש, *329.*
נדר, *136*; נְדָרִים,* 7^{41}.
נהק,* *36.*
נהרה,* *17.*
נוד, xxxvii, 27; נִיר* (16^{51}).
נוה, 50, *50.*
נחל, *dust*,* *151.*
palm, *202.*
shaft,* *192.*
נחירים,* *nostrils*, 41^{12t}.
נחר,* *snorting* (39^{20}), *321.*
נחת, xlvii, *115*, *146.*
נטפים, *drops*,* *282.*
נין, *120.*
נכא (= נגה), Nif.,* *211.*
נכר, *120.*
נכון, ? *a stroke*,* 76.
נֶכֶר, *99. 222.*
√נכר, *150.*
נער, *250.*
נְעָרִים. 17, 208, 247, *10.*
נפח, Hif., *cause to expire*,* 230.
נֶפֶל, 37.
נפש, *breath*, *340.*
נץ, 346.
נקי, 4.
נקף, *4*, *129 f.*
נְשָׁף, 35.
נְשָׁק, 180.
נְשֶׁר, 94.
נתח* (= נתץ), *213.*
נתע* (for נתץ), *24.*

סגור, *195*, *339.*
סד,* 126, *87.*
סדר,* *66.*
סוד, 168, *95*, *199.*
סוך. See שוך.
(סוּכָה), *61.*
(סחיבה*), *94.*
סלד,* *38.*
סלה, *to weigh*,* 232.
סלף, *80.*
סמר, *25.*
סערה, 325.
ספח, *210.*
ספיח, *94.*
ספק, *189*, *266*, *278.*
ספר, *294*, *311.*

עֲבוֹדָה, *2.*
עבר, *40.*
עבר, *to render pregnant*,* 145.
עגם,* *220.*
עד, *236.*
עֲדִי, xlv.
עדה, 232, *194.*
עוגב, 184.
עוה, Hif., *251.*
עויל,* *105*, *124.*
עין, xxvii f., lxv.
עוֹר, 21, *125*, *129.*
עֵזֹת, *49*, *122.*
עמין,* *149.*
עמישה,* *339.*
עמף, *to turn back*,* *161.*
עי, *219.*

עו(י)ש, 86, 335.
עכר, *36*.
על, *62*, *208*, *216*, *223*, *293*, *309* (see also אל): על פני, xxxvii.
על פני, xxxvii.
עלה, *to vanish*, *280*.
עלומים, *137*.
עֲלֵי, xlv, *36*, *45*.
=עליהם עליכו, xlv.
=עליו, xlv, *141*, *153*, *188*.
עלין, not used in Job, xxxvi.
עלל, *107*.
עלם, *39*.
עלע,* *324*.
(עלעלה*), *whirlwind*, *287*.
עם, *35*, *59*, *186*, *201*, *294*.
עמד, *25*; Hif., *to place*, *260*.
עמל, 35, 43, 69, *140*.
ענה דין, *297*.
עני, 310, *165*.
ענגה,* *18*.
עפר. See "Dust," Index I.
עפתה,* *66*.
עֵצָה, 326.
עצם, *148*; fem. *126*: expressing reality, *148*.
עקב, xlvii, *289*.
עֲרָב, *46*.
ערבים, 357.
ערוד,* xlvii, *316*.
ערוץ, *gully*,* *210*.
עריץ, 66.
ערך, *36*, *85*, *196*, *239*, *279*, *294*.
עֲרֵךְ, *338*.
ערן, 125, *228*.
ערק,* *to gnaw*, *208*.
(עֲרָקִים*), *216*.
(עש*), עש, *187*.
עשה כשתה, *3*.
עשק, *330*.
עשתות,* xlvii, *76*.
עתי, *19*.
עתק, xlvii, *93*, *145*, *237*.

פֹּא,* *300*.
פרע* (פרן), *248*.
פתרין,* *327*.
פיר, *99*, *148*.
פיכה,* *100*.
(פלאים), *68*.
פלח, *to bring forth*,* *314*.
פלם, *to bring forth*, *146*, *314*.
פלץ,* *55*.
פלצות, *55*.
פנים, 241.
(פעה), *313*.
פעל, *wages*, 45.
פקר, 266.
פקדה, *providence*,* 101.
פרחח,* *212*.
פרן, *192 f.*
פרר, Pilp.,* *106*.
פרשו,* *179*.
פש,* 270.
פשע, 303.
פתה, 49.
פֶּתַח, *223*.
פת, 267, *36*.

צאלים,* *330*.
צאן, 5.
צאצאים, *33*, *223*.
צבא, *65*.
צד(י)ק, 3 f., 91.
צהר, Hif.,* *168*.
צוק, *72*.
צוק, questionably = צק, *q.v.*
צלכות, 32, *18*.
צֵלֶל, harpoon,* *334*.
צמת, 52, 82.
צמים,* *28*, *118*.
צמת, Nif.,* *41*.
צנים, *28*, *332*.
ציר, *94*.
צפה, *98*.
צפן, *98*.
צפר, צפור, צופר, צפרא, xxix.
צר, 312 f., *339*.

קבל = לקח, xxxvii, xlvii, *14*.
קברים, *110*.
קדם, הקדים, 364.
קרמן, *120*.
קדר, 53.
קדש, 8.
קדשים, 311.
(קורים, קוים), *62*.
קוט, *62*.
קטם,* *51*.
קטל, xlvii, *85*.
קים, *opponents*,* *155*.
קטם, *105*.
קנאה, 4, 9, *286*.
קנה,* *socket*, *226*.
קנצי,* *116*.
קפץ, Nif.,* *175*.
קרא, *to cite* (legal), 90.
קֶרֶב, *war*, xlvii, *304*.
קרב מפני, *113*.
קרן, *? fore-lock*, *107*.
קרן, *240*.
קרת, *200*.
קשׂמה, lxvi, 375.
קשה, Hif., *319*.

ראה, Pu.,* *247*.
רְאֵה,* *64*.
ראי, *mirror*,* *294*.
ראמות, 241.
ראשים, *9*.
ראשית, 355.
רבים, *great* (*men*), *268*.
רַבְּנִי,* *151*.
רגז, 37. 40, *20*, *288*, *322*.
רגע, *181*; *to become hard*,* *46*.
רָגַע, *146*.
(רהב), Hif.), *134*.
(רָוָה), *64*.
רוח, 46, *25*, *49*, *135*.
רום,* 96.
רַחַב,* 312, *277*.
רטב,* *52*.
רטפש,* *250*.
ריב, *? to vanish*,* *245*.
רי, *291*.
ריר, *36*.
רנה* (=רנן). *321*.
רננה, 177.
רננים,* *317*.
רסן, 352.

רֵעִים, xxxvii.
רעמה,* *320.*
רעע (=רצץ), xlvii, *259.*
רעש, *321.*
רפאים, 219.
רפד, *to spread,** *113.*
רפה,* *181.*
רצה, *89, 136.*
רצץ, *136, 138.*
רקב, *27, 87.*
(לֶקֶב*), *wine-skin*, xlvii, *87.*
רקבון,* *344.*
רקע, 220, Hif.,* *294.*
רשע, 3, 91.
רשע, Hif., *to act wickedly*, *255 f.*
רשף, *29.*

שאת, *83, 136, 342.*
שב, ptcp.,* *96.*
שבכה, *a net*,* *118.*
שבע, Nif.,* *227.*
שגא,* xlvi, *50, 281.*
שגב, 314, *30*; Hif.,* *281.*
שגה, xlvi, *50.*
שגיא,* xlvii, *50, 282.*
שהר,* xlvii, *108.*
שוך, *6, 21, 299.*
שמם, *105, 218.*
שיא,* *136.*
שיח, plants, 114, *209.*
(ה)שיח, *to muse*, *47, 77.* *musing*, 133, *74.*
שים (שית) לב על, 12, 73, *26.*
שכוי, *311.*
שכות, *barbs*,* *334.*
שכך, Po'el,* *63.*
שעפים,* 45, *24.*
שערה, *25, 57.*
שפק (=פסק, *q.v.*), *189.*
שִׁפָּק,* *140, 278.*
שרג, 355.
שריד, *120.*
שת, *342.*

ש, *133.*
שׁאף, *28.*
שבי,* *117.*
שברים, *? consternation*,* *342.*
שׁר for שׂר, *167.*
שרי, xxxv, xlii, lxxv.
שהם, 240.
שְׁוָא, 68, 263.
שואה, משואה, חשואה, *209, 214, 218.*
שוב שבית, *349.*
שְׁוָה, *251.*
שוט, 12.
שוע, *a cry*, 219. *opulent*, *258, 279.*
שוף, *57.*
שור, *47, 242.*
שורה, *a row*, *168.*
שוף, *136.*
שחין, 23.
שחל, *24.*
שחץ,* *194.*
שחקים, *skies, clouds.* 321, *267, 294.*
שחר, *to become black*,* 30[36]†.
שחר, *seek diligently*, *49.*
שחת, 156.
שית, seq. ם, *65.*
שלה, *185.*
שלהבת, xlvii, *101.*
שלו(ה), *139, 149.*
שָׁלָה, *244.*
שלם, *155*; Hif., *33.*
שלף (שָׁלָף*), *141 f.*
שם, temporal (?), *268.*
(שכם), *105.*
שכם, Hif. intrans.,* *144.*
שמע ב, *96.*
שמץ,* *whisper*, *24.*
שעה, *66.*
שפם, Po'el, *57.*
שפי, *246.*
(שפע), *321.*
שפעה, *154, 331.*
שְׁפָרָה,* *181.*
שקע, *331, 333.*
(שקק), *331.*
שרה, *to loose*, xlvii, *288.*
שריה,* *344.*
שריר,* xlvii, *327.*
(שרץ), *77.*

(תאנות), *241.*
תבואה, *156.*
תהו, 64.
תְּהִלָּה,* *25.*
תו, 274, *229.*
תועפות, *157.*
תורה, 197.
תושיה, *30, 39, 218.*
תותח,* *344.*
תחבולת, *292.*
תחת, *214, 260.*
תכונה, *tribunal*,* xii, *160.*
תכלית, 107.
תכן, *197.*
תלל. See החל.
תם, תמים, תמה, xxxvi, *3, 1, 225.*
תמונה, 46.
תמורה, *102.*
תמן, 87.
תנואות, *240.*
תנין, 71, 89.
תעפה, *73.*
תפל, *36.*
תפלה, *10.*
תפת, *thing spat upon*,* *112.*
תקוה, 69.
(תקיף), *80.*
תקף, xlvii, *94.*
תרועה, 293.
תשואה, *283.* See שואה.