a ***Grace Notes*** course

JOB

From Commentary on the Old Testament

C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch

adapted for Grace Notes training by Warren Doud

Job - Keil and Delitzsch

Contents

The Authors

Carl Friedrich Keil (26 February 1807 – 5 May 1888) was a conservative German Lutheran Old Testament commentator. He was born at Lauterbach near Oelsnitz, Kingdom of Saxony, and died at Rätz, Saxony.

Franz Delitzsch (Leipzig, February 23, 1813 – Leipzig, March 4, 1890) was a German Lutheran theologian and Hebraist. Born in Leipzig, he held the professorship of theology at the University of Rostock from 1846 to 1850, at the University of Erlangen until 1867, and after that at the University of Leipzig until his death. Delitzsch wrote many commentaries on books of the Bible, Jewish antiquities, biblical psychology, a history of Jewish poetry, and Christian apologetics.

Grace Notes

Grace Notes is a Bible study ministry which began in 1994 using the Internet to distribute lessons and articles to people who are interested in God's Word. Thousands of Christians, in more than 110 countries around the world, have received Grace Notes lessons on the Internet, by E-mail and the World Wide Web. All courses and materials are distributed free of charge, and the work is supported by believers who want to see the ministry continue and grow. Grace Notes studies are also distributed on diskette and CD-ROM in order to reach those who do not have Internet access.

Verse-by-verse (expositional) courses are available in 50 books of the Bible. Some of the courses include word studies (categorical doctrine) or historical articles (isagogics) that are relevant to the passages being discussed. Other courses offered are Bible character studies, comprehensive studies of the Christian Life and Basics of the Christian Life, an extensive series on the Person and Word of Jesus Christ, and a thorough study of the Attributes of God. You are invited to write to the address below, or write by e-mail, to inquire about Grace Notes materials.

Warren Doud, Director
1705 Aggie Lane, Austin, Texas 78757

E-Mail: **wdoud@gracenotes.info**

Web Site: **http://www.gracenotes.info**

JOB

Introduction to the Book of Job

Job, maintaining his virtue, and justifying the utterance of the Creator respecting him, sits upon his heap of ashes as the glory and pride of God. God, and with Him the whole celestial host, witnesses the manner in which he bears his misfortune. He conquers, and his conquest is a triumph beyond the stars. Be it history, be it poetry: he who thus wrote was a divine seer.

Friedr. Heinr. Jacobi
(*Werke,* iii. 427).

In this Introduction but little has been transferred from the Art. *Hiob,* which the Author has contributed to Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie.* It presents a new, independent working up of the introductory matter, and contains only so much of it as is required at the commencement of a Commentary. The Author's treatise on the idea of the book of Job in the *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus u. Kirche,* 1851, S. 65–85, is recapitulatory rather than isagogic, and consequently of a totally distinct character.

Note

[This work is enriched by critical notes contributed by Prof. Dr. Fleischer, and illustrative notes contributed by Dr. Wetzstein, fifteen year Prussian Consul at Damascus.

The end of the volume contains an Appendix contributed by Dr. Wetzstein on the "Monastery of Job" in Hauran, the tradition concerning Job, and a map of the district.—Tr.]

The Problem of the Book of Job

Why do afflictions upon afflictions befall the righteous man? This is the question, the answering of which is made the theme of the book of Job. Looking to the conclusion of the book, the answer stands: that afflictions are for the righteous man the way to a twofold blessedness. But in itself, this answer cannot satisfy; so much the less, as the twofold blessedness to which Job finally attains is just as earthly and of this world as that which he has lost by affliction. This answer is inadequate, since on the one hand such losses as those of beloved children cannot, as the loss of sheep and camels, really be made good by double the number of other children; on the other hand, it may be objected that many a righteous man deprived of his former prosperity dies in outward poverty. There are numerous deathbeds which protest against this answer. There are many pious sufferers to whom this present material issue of the book of Job could not yield any solace; whom, when in conflict at least, it might the rather bring into danger of despair. With reference to this conclusion, the book of Job is an insufficient theodicy, as in general the truth taught in the Old Testament, that the end, אחרית, of the righteous, as of the unrighteous, would reveal the hidden divine recompense, could afford no true consolation so long as this אחרית flowed on with death into the night of Hades, שאול, and had no prospect of eternal life.

But the issue of the history, regarded externally, is by no means the proper answer to the great question of the book. The principal thing is not that Job is doubly blessed, but that God acknowledges him as His servant, which He is able to do, after Job in all his afflictions has remained true to God. Therein lies the important truth, that there is a suffering of the righteous which is not a decree of wrath, into which the love of God has been changed, but a dispensation of that love itself. In fact, this truth is the heart of the book of Job. It has therefore been said—particularly by Hirzel, and recently by Renan—that it aims at destroying the old Mosaic doctrine of retribution. But this old Mosaic doctrine of retribution is a modern phantom. That all suffering is a divine retribution, the Mosaic Thora does not teach. Renan calls this doctrine *la vielle conception patriarcale.* But the patriarchal history, and especially the history of Joseph, gives decided proof against it. The distinction between the

suffering of the righteous and the retributive justice of God, brought out in the book of Job, is nothing new. The history before the time of Israel, and the history of Israel even, exhibit it in facts; and the words of the law, as Deut. 8:16, expressly show that there are sufferings which are the result of God's love; though the book of Job certainly presents this truth, which otherwise had but a scattered and presageful utterance, in a unique manner, and causes it to come forth before us from a calamitous and terrible conflict, as pure gold from a fierce furnace. It comes forth as the result of the controversy with the false doctrine of retribution advanced by the friends; a doctrine which is indeed not Mosaic, for the Mosaic Thora in the whole course of the history of revelation is nowhere impugned and corrected, but ever only augmented, and, consistently with its inherent character, rendered more complete.

But if we now combine both the truths illustrated in the book of Job,—(1) The affliction of the righteous man leads to a so much greater blessedness; (2) The affliction of the righteous is a dispensation of the divine love, which is expressed and verified in the issue of the affliction,—this double answer is still not an adequate solution of the great question of the book. For there ever arises the opposing consideration, wherefore are such afflictions necessary to raise the righteous to blessedness—afflictions which seem so entirely to bear the character of wrath, and are in no way distinguished from judgments of retributive justice?

To this question the book furnishes, as it appears to us, two answers: (1.) The afflictions of the righteous are a means of discipline and purification; they certainly arise from the sins of the righteous man, but still are not the workings of God's wrath, but of His love, which is directed to his purifying and advancement. Such is the view Elihu in the book of Job represents. The writer of the introductory portion of Proverbs has expressed this briefly but beautifully Prov. 3:11; cf. Heb. 12). Oehler, in order that one may perceive its distinction from the view of the three friends, rightly refers to the various theories of punishment. Discipline designed for improvement is properly no punishment, since punishment, according to its true idea, is only satisfaction rendered for the violation of moral order. In how far the speeches of Elihu succeed in conveying this view clear and distinct from the original standpoint of the friends, especially of Eliphaz, matters not to us here; at all events, it is in the mind of the poet as the characteristic of these speeches. (2.) The afflictions of the righteous man are means of proving and testing, which, like chastisements, come from the love of God. Their object is not, however, the purging away of sin which may still cling to the righteous man, but, on the contrary, the manifestation and testing of his righteousness. This is the point of view from which, apart from Elihu's speeches, the book of Job presents Job's afflictions. Only by this relation of things is the chagrin with which Job takes up the words of Eliphaz, and so begins the controversy, explained and justified or excused. And, indeed, if it should be even impossible for the Christian, especially with regard to his own sufferings, to draw the line between disciplinary and testing sufferings so clearly as it is drawn in the book of Job, there is also for the deeper and more acute New Testament perception of sin, a suffering of the righteous which exists without any causal connection with his sin, viz., confession by suffering, or martyrdom, which the righteous man undergoes, not for his own sake, but for the sake of God.

If we, then, keep in mind these two further answers which the book of Job gives us to the question, "Why through suffering to blessedness?" it is not to be denied that practically they are perfectly sufficient. If I know that God sends afflictions to me because, since sin and evil are come into the world, they are the indispensable means of purifying and testing me, and by both purifying and testing of perfecting me,—these are explanations with which I can and must console myself. But this is still not the final answer of the book of Job to its

great question. And its unparalleled magnitude, its high significance in the historical development of revelation, its typical character already recognised in the Old Testament, consists just in its going beyond this answer, and giving us an answer which, going back to the extreme roots of evil, and being deduced from the most intimate connections of the individual life of man with the history and plan of the world in the most comprehensive sense, not only practically, but speculatively, satisfies.

The Chokma-Character of the Book

But before we go so far into this final and highest answer as the province of the Introduction permits and requires, in order to assign to the reader the position necessary to be taken for understanding the book, we ask, How comes it that the book of Job presents such a universal and absolute solution of the problem, otherwise unheard of in the Old Testament Scriptures? The reason of it is in the peculiar mental tendency (*Geistesrichtung*) of the Israelitish race from which it proceeded. There was in Israel a bias of a universalistic, humanic, philosophical kind, which, starting from the fear or worship (religion) of Jehovah, was turned to the final causes of things,—the cosmical connections of the earthly, the common human foundations of the Israelitish, the invisible roots of the visible, the universal actual truth of the individual and national historical. The common character of the few works of his Chokma which have been preserved to us is the humanic standpoint, stripped of everything peculiarly Israelitish. In the whole book of Proverbs, which treats of the relations of human life in its most general aspects, the name of the covenant people, ישׂראל, does not once occur. In Ecclesiastes, which treats of the nothingness of all earthly things, and with greater right than the book of Job may be called the canticle of Inquiry,[1] even the covenant name of God, יהוה, does not occur. In the Song of Songs, the groundwork of the picture certainly, but not the picture itself, is Israelitish: it represents a common human primary relation, the love of man and woman; and that if not with allegorical, yet mystical meaning, similar to the Indian *Gitagovinda,* and also the third part of the Tamul *Kural,* translated by Graul.

So the book of Job treats a fundamental question of our common humanity; and the poet has studiously taken his hero not from Israelitish history, but from extra-Israelitish tradition. From beginning to end he is conscious of relating an extra-Israelitish history,—a history handed down among the Arab tribes to the east of Palestine, which has come to his ears; for none of the proper names contain even a trace of symbolically intended meaning, and romantic historical poems were moreover not common among the ancients. This extra-Israelitish history from the patriarchal period excited the purpose of his poem, because the thought therein presented lay also in his own mind. The Thora from Sinai and prophecy, the history and worship of Israel, are nowhere introduced; even indirect reference to them nowhere escape him. He throws himself with wonderful truthfulness, effect, and vividness, into the extra-Israelitish position. His own Israelitish standpoint he certainly does not disavow, as we see from his calling God יהוה everywhere in the prologue and epilogue; but the non-Israelitish character of his hero and of his locality he maintains with strict consistency. Only twice is יהוה found in the mouth of Job (Job 1:21, 12:9), which is not to be wondered at, since this name of God, as the names *Morija* and *Jochebed* show, is not absolutely post-Mosaic, and therefore may have been known among the Hebrew people beyond Israel. But with this exception, Job and his friends everywhere call God אֱלוֹהַּ, which is more poetic, and for non-Israelitish speakers (vid., Prov. 30:5) more appropriate than אֱלֹהִים, which occurs only three times (Job 20:29, 32:2, 38:7); or they call Him שַׁדַּי, which is the proper name of God in the patriarchal time, as it appears everywhere in Genesis, where in the Elohistic portions the high and turning-points

of the self-manifestation of God occur (Gen. 17:1, 35:11; cf. Ex. 6:3), and when the patriarchs, at special seasons, pronounce the promise which they have received upon their children (Gen. 28:3, 48:3, 49:25; cf. 43:14). Even many of the designations of the divine attributes which have become fixed in the Thora, as רַחוּם, חַנּוּן, אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם, which one might well expect in the book of Job, are not found in it; nor טוב, often used of Jehovah in Psalms; nor generally the too (so to speak) dogmatic terminology of the Israelitish religion;[2] besides which also this characteristic, that only the oldest mode of heathen worship, star-worship (Job 31:26–28), is mentioned, without even the name of God (יהוה צבאות or אלהים צבאות) occurring, which designates God as Lord of the heavens, which the heathen deified. The writer has also intentionally avoided this name, which is the star of the time of the Israelitish kings; for he is never unmindful that his subject is an ante- and extra-Israelitish one.

Hengstenberg, in his *Lecture on the Book of Job,* 1856, goes so far as to maintain, that a character like Job cannot possibly have existed in the heathen world, and that revelation would have been unnecessary if heathendom could produce such characters for itself. The poet, however, without doubt, presupposes the opposite; and if he did not presuppose it, he should have refrained from using all his skill to produce the appearance of the opposite. That he has nevertheless done it, cannot mislead us: for, on the one hand, Job belongs to the patriarchal period, therefore the period before the giving of the law,—a period in which the early revelation was still at work, and the revelation of God, which had not remained unknown in the side branches of the patriarchal family. On the other hand, it is quite consistent with the standpoint of the Chokma, that it presupposes a preparatory self-manifestation of God even in the extra-Israelitish world; just as John's Gospel, which aims at proving in Christianity the absolute religion which shall satisfy every longing of all mankind, acknowledges τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ διεσκορπισμένα also beyond the people of God, 11:52, without on this account finding the incarnation of the Logos, and the possibility of regeneration by it, to be superfluous.

This parallel between the book of Job and the Gospel by John is fully authorized; for the important disclosure which the prologue of John gives to us of the Logos, is already in being in the book of Job and the introduction to the book of Proverbs, especially Prov. 8, without requiring the intervening element of the Alexandrine religious philosophy, which, however, after it is once there, may not be put aside or disavowed. The Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos is really the genuine more developed form, though with many imperfections, of that which is taught of the Chokma in the book of Job and in Proverbs. Both notions have a universalistic comprehensiveness, referring not only to Israel, but to mankind. The חכמה certainly took up its abode in Israel, as it itself proves in the book Σοφια Σειραχ, Job 24; but there is also a share of it attainable by and allotted to all mankind. This is the view of the writer even beyond Israel fellowship is possible with the one living God, who has revealed himself in Israel; that He also there continually reveals himself, ordinarily in the conscience, and extraordinarily in dreams and visions; that there is also found there a longing and struggling after that redemption of which Israel has the clear words of promise. His wonderous book soars high above the Old Testament limit; it is the Melchizedek among the Old Testament books. The final and highest solution of the problem with which it grapples, has a quarry extending out even beyond the patriarchal history. The Wisdom of the book of Job originates, as we shall see, from paradise. For this turning also to the primeval histories of Genesis, which are earlier than the rise of the nations, and the investigation of the hieroglyphs in the prelude to the Thora, which are otherwise almost passed over in the Old Testament, belong to the peculiarities of the Chokma.

Position in the Canon

As a work of the Chokma, the book of Job stands, with the three other works belonging to this class of the Israelitish literature, among the Hagiographa, which are called in Hebrew simply כתובים. Thus, by the side of תורה and נביאים, the third division of the canon is styled, in which are included all those writings belonging neither to the province of prophetic history nor prophetic declaration. Among the Hagiographa are writings even of a prophetic character, as Psalms and Daniel; but their writers were not properly נביאים. At present Lamentations stands among them; but this is not its original place, as also Ruth appears to have stood originally between Judges and Samuel. Both Lamentations and Ruth are placed among the Hagiographa, that there the five so-called מגלות or scrolls may stand together: Schir ha-Schirim the feast-book of the eight passover-day, Ruth that of the second Schabuoth-day, Kinoth that of the ninth of Ab, Koheleth that of the eight Succoth-day, Esther that of Purim. The book of Job, which is written neither in prophetico-historical style, nor in the style of prophetic preaching, but is a didactic poem, could stand nowhere else but in the third division of the canon. The position which it occupies is moreover a very shifting one. In the Alexandrine canon, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Tobit, Judith, Esther, follow the four books of the Kings. The historical books therefore stand, from the earliest to the latest, side by side; then begins with Job, Psalms, Proverbs, a new row, opened with these three in stricter sense poetical books. Then Melito of Sardis, in the second century, places Chronicles with the books of the Kings, but arranges immediately after them the non-historical Hagiographa in the following order: Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Job; here the Salomonic writings are joined to the Davidic Psalter, and the anonymous book of Job stands last. In our editions of the Bible, the Hagiographa division begins with Psalms, Proverbs, Job (the succession peculiar to MSS of the German class); in the Talmud (*Bathra,* 14*b*), with Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs; in the Masora, and in MSS of the Spanish class, with Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs. All these modes of arrangement are well considered. The Masora connects with the נביאים אחרונים the homogeneous book, the Chronicles; the Talmud places the book of Ruth before the Psalter as an historical prologue, or as a connection between the prophetico-historical books and the Hagiographa.[3] The practice in our editions is to put the Psalms as the first book of the division, which agrees with Luke 24:44, and with Philo, who places ὕμνους next to the prophetical books. Job stands only in the LXX at the head of the three so-called poetic books, perhaps as a work by its patriarchal contents referring back to the earliest times. Everywhere else the Psalter stands first among the three books. These three are commonly denoted by the *vox memoralis* ספרי א״מת; but this succession, Job, Proverbs, Psalms, is nowhere found. The Masora styles them after its own, and the Talmudic order ספרי ת״אם.

The System of Accentuation

Manner of Writing in Verses, and Structure of the Strophe

The so-ciphered three books have, as is known, this in common, that they are (with the exception of the prologue and epilogue in the book of Job) punctuated according to a special system, which has been fully discussed in my *Commentary on the Psalms,* and in Baer's edition of the Psalter. This accent system, like the prosaic, is constructed on the fundamental law of dichotomy; but it is determined by better organization, more expressive and melodious utterance. Only the so-called prose accents, however, not the metrical or poetic (with the exception of a few detached fragments), have been preserved in transmission. Nevertheless, we are always still able to discern from these accents how the reading in the synagogue divided the thoughts collected into the form of Masoretic verses, into two chief divisions, and within these again into lesser divisions, and

connected or separated the single words; while the musical rhythm accommodated itself as much as possible to the logical, so that the accentuation is on this account an important source for ascertaining the traditional exegesis, and contains an abundance of most valuable hints for the interpreter. Tradition, moreover, requires for the three books a verse-like short line stich-manner of writing; and פסוק, *versus,* meant originally, not the Masoretic verse, but the separate sentence, στίχος, denoted in the accent system by a great distinctive; as e.g., Job 3:3:

Let the day perish wherein I was born,

And the night, which said, There is a man-child conceived,

is a Masoretic verse divided into two parts by Athnach, and therefore, according to the old order, is to be written as two στίχοι.[4] This also is important. In order to recognise the strophe-structure of Hebrew poems, one must attend to the στίχοι, in which the poetic thoughts follow one another in well-measured flow. Parallelism, which we must likewise acknowledge as the fundamental law of the rhythm of Hebrew poetry, forms the evolutions of thought not always of two members, but often—as e.g., 3:4, 5, 6, 9—also of three.

The poetic formation is not, however, confined to this, but even further combines (as is most unmistakeably manifest in the alphabetical psalms,[5] and as recently also Ewald inclines to acknowledge[6]) such distichs and tristichs into a greater whole, forming a complete circle of thought; in other words, into strophes of four, eight, or some higher number of lines, in themselves paragraphs, which, however, show themselves as strophes, inasmuch as they recur and change symmetrically. Hupfeld has objected that these strophes, as an aggregate formed of a symmetrical number of stichs, are opposed to the nature of the rhythm = parallelism, which cannot stand on one leg, but needs two; but this objection is as invalid as if one should say, Because every soldier has two legs, therefore soldiers can only march singly, and not in a row and company. It may be seen, e.g., from 36:22–25, 26–29, 30–33, where the poet begins three times with הן, and three times the sentences so beginning are formed of eight lines. Shall we not say there are three eight-line strophes beginning with הן? Nevertheless, we are far from maintaining that the book of Job consists absolutely of speeches in the strophe and poetic form. It breaks up, however, into paragraphs, which not unfrequently become symmetrical strophes. That neither the symmetrical nor mixed strophe-schema is throughout with strict unexceptional regularity carried out, arises from the artistic freedom which the poet was obliged to maintain in order not to sacrifice the truth as well as the beauty of the dialogue. Our translation, arranged in paragraphs, and the schemata of the number of stichs in the paragraph placed above each speech, will show that the arrangement of the whole is, after all, far more strophic than its dramatic character allows, according to classic and modern poetic art.[7] It is similar in Canticles, with the melodramatic character of which it better agrees. In both cases it is explained from the Hebrew poesy being in its fundamental peculiarity lyric, and from the drama not having freed itself from the lyric element, and attained to complete independence. The book of Job is, moreover, not a drama grown to complete development. Prologue and epilogue are treated as history, and the separate speeches are introduce din the narrative style. In the latter respect (with the exception of Job 2:10*a*), Canticles is more directly dramatic than the book of Job.[8] The drama is here in reference to the strophic form in the garb of Canticles, and in respect of the narrative form in the garb of history or epopee. Also the book of Job cannot be regarded as drama, if we consider, with G. Baur,[9] dramatic and scenic to be inseparable ideas; for the Jews first became acquainted with the theatre from the Greeks and Romans.[10] Nevertheless, it is questionable whether the drama everywhere presupposes the existence of the stage, as e.g., A. W. v. Schlegel, in his *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature,* maintains. Göthe, at least, more than once

asserts, that "drama and a composition for the stage may be separate," and admits a "dramatic plot and execution" in Canticles.[11]

The Dramatic Art of the Plot and Execution

On the whole, we have as little hesitation as Hupfeld in calling the book of Job a drama; and it is characteristic of the Israelitish Chokma, that by Canticles and the book of Job, its two generic manifestations, it has enriched the national poesy with this new form of poetic composition. The book of Job is, though not altogether, yet substantially, a drama, and one consisting of seven divisions: (1) Job 1–3, the opening; (2) Job 4–14, the first course of the controversy, or the beginning entanglement; (3) Job 15–21, the second course of the controversy, or the increasing entanglement; (4) Job 22–26, the third course of the controversy, or the increasing entanglement at its highest; (5) Job 27–31, the transition from the entanglement (δέσις) to the unravelling (λύσις): Job's monologues; (6) Job 38–42:6, the consciousness of the unravelling; (7) 42:7ff., the unravelling in outward reality. In this we have left Elihu'a speeches (Job 32–37) out of consideration, because it is very questionable whether they are a part of the original form of the book, and not, on the contrary, the introduction of another poet. If we include them, the drama has eight divisions. The speeches of Elihu form an interlude in the transition from the δέσις to the λύσις. The book of Job is an audience-chamber, and one can readily suppose that a contemporary or later poet may have mixed himself up with the speakers. Whether, however, this is really the case, may remain here undecided. The prologue is narrative, but still partly in dialogue style, and so far not altogether undramatical. In form it corresponds most to the Euripidean, which also are a kind of epic introduction to the pieces, and it accomplishes what Sophocles in his prologues so thoroughly understands. At the very beginning he excites interest in the occurrences to be brought forward, and makes us acquainted with that which remains concealed from the actors. After the knot of the puzzle is tied in the prologue, it becomes more and more deeply entangled in the three courses of the controversy. In the monologues of Job it begins to be disentangled, and in the sixth part the unravelling follows, well prepared for, and therefore not ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, and is perfected in the epilogue or exodus: the servant of God, being so far as necessary cleared by penitence, is justified in opposition to his friends; and the victor, tried in accordance with the divine utterance, is crowned. It is therefore a continually progressing history. The remark of Herder,[12] "Here all is stationary in long conversations," is superficial. It is from beginning to end a stream of the most active life, with external incident only in the opening and in the unravelling; what Shlegel says of Göthe's *Iphigenie* holds good of the middle of the book, that the ideas are worked into incidents, and brought, as it were, before the eye. Moreover, as in Göthe's *Tasso,* the deficiency of external action is compensated by the richness and precision with which the characters are drawn. Satan, Job's wife, the hero himself, the three friends,—everywhere diversified and minute description. The poet manifests, also, dramatic skill in other directions. He has laid out the controversy with a masterly hand, making the heart of the reader gradually averse to the friends, and in the same degree winning it towards Job. He makes the friends all through give utterance to the most glorious truths, which, however, *in the application to the case before them,* turn out to be untrue. And although the whole of the representation serves one great idea, it is still not represented by any of the persons brought forward, and is by no one expressly uttered. Every person is, as it were, the consonant letter to the word of this idea; it is throughout the whole book taken up with the realization of itself; at the end it first comes forth as the resulting product of the whole. Job himself is not less a tragic hero than the Oedipus of both Sophicles' tragedies.[13] What is there an inevitable fate, expressed by the oracle, is in the book of Job the decree of Jehovah, over whom is no controlling power, decreed in the assembly

of angels. As a painful puzzle the lot of affliction comes down on Job. At the beginning he is the victor of an easy battle, until the friends' exhortations to repentance are added to suffering, which in itself is incomprehensible, and make it still harder to be understood. He is thereby involved in a hard conflict, in which at one time, full of arrogant self-confidence, he exalts himself heavenward; at another time, sinks to the ground in desponding sadness.

The God, however, against which he fights is but a phantom, which the temptation has presented to his saddened eye instead of the true God; and this phantom is in no way different from the inexorable fate of the Greek tragedy. As in that the hero seeks to maintain his inward freedom against the secret power which crushes him with an iron arm; so Job maintains his innocence against this God, which has devoted him to destruction as an offender. But in the midst of this terrific conflict with the God of the present, this creation of the temptation, Job's faith gropes after the God of the future, to whom he is ever driven nearer the more mercilessly the enemies pursue him. At length Jehovah really appears, but not at Job's impetuous summons. He appears first after Job has made a beginning of humble self-concession, in order to complete the work begun, by condescendingly going forth to meet him. Jehovah appears, and the fury vanishes. The dualism, which the Greek tragedy leaves unabolished, is here reconciled. Human freedom does not succumb; but it becomes evident that not an absolute arbitrary power, but divine wisdom, whose inmost impulse is love, moulds human destiny.

Time of Composition

That this masterpiece of religious reflection and systematic creative art—this, to use Luther's expression, lofty and grand book, in which, as the mountains round an Alpine valley, all the terribly sublime that nature and human history present is ranged one above another—belongs to no other than the Salomonic period, we might almost assume, even if it were not confirmed on all sides. The opinion that Moses wrote the book of Job before the giving of the law, is found in the Talmuds (*jer. Sota V.* 8; *b. Bathra,* 15*a*). This view has been recently revived by Ebrard (1858). But how improbable, all but impossible, that the poetical literature of Israel should have taken its rise with such a *non plus ultra* of reflective poetry, and that this poem should have had Moses the lawgiver for its author? "Moses certainly is not the composer of the book of Job," says Herder rightly,[14] "or Solon might have written the *Iliad* and the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus." This opinion, which is also found in Origen, Jerome, Polychronius, and Julian of Halicarnassus, would surely never have suggested itself to any one, had not the studious avoidance in the book of all reference to the law, prophecy, history, religious worship, and even of the religious terminology of Israel, consequent on its design, produced the appearance of a pre-Sinaitic origin. But, first, this absence of such reference is, as we have already seen, the result of the genius and aim which belong to the book; secondly, the writer distinctly enough betrays his acquaintance with the Thora: for as the Chokma for the most part necessarily presupposes the revelation of God deposited in the Thora, and is even at pains to show its universal and eternal ideas, and its imperishable nature full of meaning for all men, so a book like the book of Job could only have been written by an Israelitish author, only have sprung from the spiritual knowledge and experience rendered possible by the Thora.[15] For as insight into the groping of the heathen world after divine truth is only possible in the light of Christianity, so also such a spiritually bold and accurate reproduction of an old patriarchal tradition was only possible in the light of the revelation of Jehovah: not to mention that the middle part of the book is written in the style of the book of Proverbs, the surrounding parts in evident imitation of the style of the primitive histories of the Pentateuch.

But as the supposition of a pre-Salomonic composition is proved invalid, so also are all the grounds on which it has been sought to prove a

post-Salomonic. Ewald, whom Heiligstedt and Renan follow, is of opinion that it shows very unsettled and unfortunate times in the background, and from this and other indications was written under Manasseh; Hirzel, that the writer who is so well acquainted with Egypt, seems to have been carried into Egypt with King Jehoahaz; Stickel, that the book presupposes the invasion of the Asiatic conqueror as begun, but not yet so far advanced as the destruction of Jerusalem; Bleek, that it must belong to the post-Salomonic period, because it seems to refer to a previous comprehensive diversified literature. But all this rests on invalid grounds, false observation, and deceptive conclusions. Indeed, the assumption that a book which sets forth such a fearful conflict in the depths of affliction must have sprung from a time of gloomy national distress, is untenable: it is sufficient to suppose that the writer himself has experienced the like, and experienced it at a time when all around him were living in great luxury, which must have greatly aggravated his trial. It would be preferable to suppose that the book of Job belongs to the time of the exile (Umbreit and others), and that Job, though not exactly a personification of Israel, is still משל לישראל,[16] a pattern for the people of the exile (Bernstein); for this view, interesting indeed in itself, has the similarity of several passages of the second part of the book of Isaiah in its favour: comp. Isa. 40:14 with Job 21:22, Isa. 40:23 with Job 12:24, Isa. 44:25 with Job 12:17, 20, Isa. 44:24 with Job 9:8, Isa. 49:4 with Job 15:35, Ps. 7:15. These, however, only prove that the severely tried *ecclesia pressa* of the exiles might certainly recognise itself again in the example of Job, and make it seem far more probable that the book of Job is older than that period of Israel's suffering.

The literature of the Chokma began with Solomon. First in the time of Solomon, whose peculiar gift was worldly wisdom, a time which bears the character of peaceful contemplation resulting from the conflicts of belief of David's time,[17] the external and internal preliminary conditions for it existed. The chief part of Proverbs and Canticles is by Solomon himself; the introductory passages (Prov. 1–9) represent a later period of the Chokma, probably the time of Jehoshaphat; the book of Ecclesiastes, which is rightly assigned by H. G. Bernstein in his *Questiones Kohelethanae* to the time between Artaxerxes I Longimanus, and Darius Codomannus, and perhaps belongs to the time of Artaxerxes II Mnemon, represents the latest period. The book of Job is indicated as a work of the first of these three periods, by its classic, grand, and noble form. It bears throughout the stamp of that creative, beginning-period of the Chokma,—of that Salomonic age of knowledge and art, of deeper thought respecting revealed religion, and of intelligent, progressive culture of the traditional forms of art,—that unprecedented age, in which the literature corresponded to the summit of glorious magnificence to which the kingdom of the promise had then attained. The heart of Solomon (according to 1 Kings 5:9f., Heb. 4:29, English version) enclosed within itself a fulness of knowledge, "even as the sand that is on the seashore:" his wisdom was greater than the בני קדם, from whom the traditional matter of the book of Job is borrowed; greater than the wisdom of the מצרים, with whose country and natural marvels the author of the book of Job is intimately acquainted. The extensive knowledge of natural history and general science displayed in the book of Job, is the result of the wide circle of observation which Israel had reached. It was a time when the chasm between Israel and the nations was more than ever bridged over. The entire education of Israel at that time took a so to speak cosmopolitan direction. It was a time introductory to the extension of redemption, and the triumph of the religion of Israel, and the union of all nations in belief on the God of love.

Signs from the Doctrinal Contents

That the book of Job belongs to this period and no other, is confirmed also by the relation of its doctrinal contents to the other canonical

writings. If we compare the doctrine respecting Wisdom—her super-eminence, applicability to worldly matters, and co-operation in the creation of the world—in Prov. 1–9, especially Job 8, with Job 28, it is there manifestly more advanced, and further developed. If we compare the pointing to the judgment of God, Job 19:29, with the hint of a future general judgment, which shall decide and adjust all things, in Eccl. 12:14, we see at once that what comes forward in the former passage only at first as an expression of personal belief, is in the latter already become a settled element of general religious consciousness.

And however we may interpret that brilliant passage of the book of Job, Job 19:25–27, — whether it be the beholding of God in the present bodily, future spiritual, or future glorified state,—it is by no means an echo of an already existing revelation of the resurrection of the dead, that acknowledgment of revelation which we see breaking forth and expanding throughout Isa. 26:19, comp. 25:8, and Ezek. 37 comp. Hos. 6:2, until Dan. 12:2. The prevailing representations of the future in the book of Job are exactly the same as those in the Psalms of the time of David and Solomon, and in the Proverbs of Solomon. The writer speaks as one of the same age in which Heman sighed, Ps. 88:11f., *"Wilt Thou show wonders to the dead? or shall the shades arise and praise Thee? Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, Thy faithfulness in the abyss?"* Besides, the greatest conceivable fulness of allusion to the book of Job, including Elihu's speeches, is found in Ps. 88 and 89, whose authors, Heman and Ethan, the Ezrahites, are not the same as the chief singers of David and of the same name, but the contemporaries of Solomon mentioned in 1 Kings 5:11. These two psalms coincide with the book of Job, both in expressions with which remarkable representations are united, as קדוֹשִׁים of the celestial spirits, רפאים of the shades in Hades, אבדון of Hades itself, and also in expressions which do not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, as אֵמִים and בִּעֻתִים; and the agreement is manifest, moreover, in the agreement of whole verses either in thought or in expression: comp. Ps. 89:38 with Job 16:19, 89:48 with Job 7:7, 89:49 with Job 14:14, 88:5 with Job 14:10, 88:9 with Job 30:10, 89:8 with Job 31:34. In all these passages, however, there is no such similarity as suggests a borrowing, but an agreement which, since it cannot possibly be accidental, may be most easily explained by supposing that the book of Job proceeds from just the same Chokma-fellowship to which, according to 1 Kings 5:11, the two Ezrahites, the writers of Ps. 88 and 89, belong.

One might go further, and conjecture that the same Heman who composed Ps. 88, the gloomiest of all the Psalms, and written under circumstances of suffering similar to Job's, may be the author of the book of Job—for which many probable reasons might be advanced; by which also what G. Baur rightly assumes would be confirmed, that the writer of the book of Job has himself passed through the inward spiritual conflict which he describes, and accordingly gives a page from his own religious history. But we are satisfied with the admission, that the book of Job is the work of one of the wise men whose rendezvous was the court of Solomon. Gregory of Nazianzen and Luther have already admitted the origin of the book in Solomon's time; and among later critics, Rosenmüller, Hävernick, Vaihinger, Hahn, Schlottmann, Keil, and Hofmann (though in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung* he expressed the opinion that it belongs to the Mosaic period), are agreed in this.[18]

Echoes in the Later Sacred Writings

It may be readily supposed, that a book like this, which is occupied with a question of such vital import to every thinking and pious man,— which treats it in such a lively manner, riveting the attention, and bespeaking sympathy,— which, apart from its central subject, is so many-sided, so majestically beautiful in language, and so inexhaustible in imagery,— will have been one of the most generally read of the national books of Israel. Such is found to be the case; and also hereby its origin in the time

of Solomon is confirmed: for at this very period it is to Ps. 88–89 only that it stands in the mutual relation already mentioned. But the echoes appear as early as in the דברי חכמים, which are appended to the Salomonic משלי in the book of Proverbs: comp. the teaching from an example in the writer's own experience, Prov. 24:30ff. with Job 5:3ff. The book of Job, however, next to the Proverbs of Solomon, was the favourite source of information for the author of the introductory proverbs (Prov. 1–9). Here (apart from the doctrine of wisdom) we find whole passages similar to the book of Job: comp. Prov. 3:11 with Job 5:17, 8:25 with Job 15:7; 3:15 with Job 28:18.

Then, in the prophets of the flourishing period of prophetic literature, which begins with Obadiah and Joel, we find distinct traces of familiarity with the book of Job. Amos describes the glory of God the Creator in words taken from it (Amos 4:13, 5:8, after Job 9:8; cf. 10:22, 38:31). Isaiah has introduced a whole verse of the book of Job, almost *verbatim,* into his prophecy against Egypt (Is. 19:5 = Job 14:11): in the same prophecy, Is. 19:13f. refer to Job 12:24f., so also Is. 35:3 to Job 4:4. These reminiscences of the book of Job are frequent in Isaiah (Is. 40–66). This book of solace for the exiles corresponds to the book of Job not only in words, which exclusively belong in common to the two (as גֵּוַע and צאצאים), and in surprising similarity of expression (as Is. 53:9, comp. Job 16:17; Is. 60:6, comp. Job 22:11), but also in numerous passages of similar thought and form (comp. Is. 40:23 with Job 12:24); and in the description of the Servant of Jehovah, one is here and there involuntarily reminded of the book of Job (as Job 50:6, comp. with Job 16:10). In Jeremiah, the short lyric passage, Jer. 20:14–18, in which he curses the day of his birth, falls back on Job 3: the form in which the despondency of the prophet breaks forth is determined by the book of Job, with which he was familiar. It requires no proof that the same prophet follows the book of Job in many passages of Lamentations, and especially the first part of Job 3: he makes use of confessions, complaints, and imagery from the affliction of Job, to represent the affliction of Israel.

By the end of the time of the kings, Job was a person generally known in Israel, a recognised saint: for Ezekiel, in the year 593–2 B.C. (Ezek. 14:14ff.), complains that the measure of Israel's sin is so great, that if Noah, Daniel, and Job were in the midst of Israel, though they might save themselves, they would not be able to hold back the arm of divine justice. The prophet mentions first Noah, a righteous man of the old world; then Daniel, a righteous man of contemporary Israel; and last of all Job, a righteous man beyond the line of the promise.[19] He would not, however, have been able to mention him, if he had not, by means of the written narrative, been a person well known among the people to whom the prophetical discourse was addressed. The literature of the Old Testament has no further reference to the question of the time of the composition of the book of Job; for, on a comparison of Eccl. 5:14 with Job 1:21, it scarcely remains a question to which the priority belongs.

The Chief Critical Questions

Whether, however, the whole book, as we now have it, comes from the time of Solomon, as the work of one poet, or of one chief poet,[20] is a question which can be better determined in the course of the exposition. More or less important doubts have been entertained whether some constituent parts of the whole belong to the original setting. By far the most important question of criticism respects the six chapters of Elihu's speeches (Job 32–37), respecting which the suspicion entertained by the fathers, and first decidedly expressed by Stuhlmann (1804), that not only in form are they inferior to the artistic execution of the rest of the work, but also in contents are opposed to its original plan, is not yet set aside, and perhaps never will be altogether satisfactorily settled. Besides this, Kennicot also has suspected the speech of Job, Job 27:11–28:28, because there Job seems to yield to the friends' controverted doctrine of retribution. De Wette is more inclined here to suppose a want of connection on the part of the

writer than an interpolation. We shall have to prove whether this speech of Job really encroaches upon the province of the unravelling, or renders the transition more complete.

The whole description of *Behemoth* and *Leviathan,* Job 40:15–41:26, is regarded by Ewald as a later addition: De Wette extends this judgment only to Job 41:4–26: Eichhorn was satisfied at first with changing the order of Jehovah's speeches; but in the last edition of his *Einleitung* ascribed the passage about the two monsters to a later poet. The exposition will have to bring the form of expression of the supposed interpolation, and its relation to the purpose of the second speech of Jehovah, in comparison with the first, under consideration. But we need not defer our judgment of the prologue and epilogue. All the doubts raised by Stuhlmann, Bernstein, Knobel (*diss. de carminis Iobi argumento, fine ac dispositione,* and *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1842, ii.), and others, respecting both these essential parts, are put an end to by the consideration, that the middle part of the book, without them, is a torso without head and feet.

The Satan of the Prologue

But the Satan in the prologue is a stumbling-block to many, which, if it does not lead them to doubt the authenticity of the prologue, still causes them to question whether the composition of the book belongs to the time of Solomon. For Satan is first definitely named, Zech. 3, and 1 Chron. 21:1; consequently in writings of the period after the exile. On the other hand, שָׂטָן, Num. 22:22, appellatively describes one who comes forward hostilely, or as a hindrance; and Ps. 109:6 is at least open to question whether the prince of evil spirits may not be meant, which, according to Zech. 3:1, seems to be intended. However, in Micaiah's vision, 1 Kings 22:19–23, where one might expect השׂטן, הרוח is used. It is even maintained in the present day, that the idea of Satan was first obtained by the Israelitish race from contact with the East-Asiatic nations, which began with Israel in the time of Menahem, with Judah in the time of Ahaz; the view of Diestel, that it is the copy of the Egyptian *Set-Typhon,* stands at present alone. When we consider that the redemptive work of Jesus Christ is regarded by Him and His apostles from one side as the overthrow of Satan, it were a miserable thing for the divine truth of Christianity that this Satan should be nothing more than a copy of the Persian *Ahriman,* and consequently a mere phantom. However, supposing there were some such connection, we should then have only two periods at which the book of Job could possibly have been composed,—the time after the exile, and the time of Solomon; for these are the only periods at which not only collision, but also an interchange of ideas, between Israel and the profane nations could have taken place. It is also just as possible for the conception of Satan to have taken possession of the Israelitish mind under Solomon as during the exile, especially as it is very questionable whether the religion of Cyrus, as found in the Zend books, may not have been far more influenced by Israel, than, contrariwise, have influenced Israel.

But the conception of Satan is indeed much older in its existence than the time of Solomon: the serpent of paradise must surely have appeared to the inquiring mind of Israel as the disguise of an evil spirit; and nothing further can be maintained, than that this evil spirit, which in the Mosaic worship of the great day of atonement is called עזאזל (called later בעל זבוב, a name borrowed from the god of Ekron), appears first in the later literature of Israel under the name השׂטן. If now, moreover, the Chokma of the Salomonic period was specially conversant with the pre-Israelitish histories of Genesis, whence indeed even the chief thought of Canticles and the figure of עץ חיים, e.g., frequently occurring in Proverbs are drawn, it is difficulty to conceive why the evil spirit, that in its guise of a serpent aimed its malice against man, could not have been called השׂטן so early as the Salomonic period.

The wisdom of the author of the book of Job, we have said above, springs from paradise. Thence he obtains the highest and ultimate solution of his problem. It is now time to give expression to this. At present we need only do so in outline, since it is simply of use to place us from the commencement at the right standpoint for understanding the book of Job.

The Ultimate Solution of the Problem

The nature of sin is two-sided. It consists in the creature's setting up himself in opposition to God, who is the essence of the personality of the creature. It consists also, on the other side, in the stirring up of the depth of the nature of the creature, whose essential consistence has its harmony in God; and by this stirring up, falls into a wild confusion. In other words, evil has a personal side and a natural side. And just so, also, is God's wrath which it excites, and which operates against it. For God's wrath is, on the one hand, the personal displeasure or aversion into which His love is changed, since the will of the creature and the will of God are in opposition; on the other hand, an excited condition of the contrary forces of the divine nature, or, as Scripture expresses it, the kindling of the fire of the divine glory, in which sense it is often said of wrath, that God sends it forth, that He pours it forth, and that man has to drink of it (Job 21:20, comp. 6:4).[21]

In reference to the creature, we call evil according to its personal side ἔχθρα, and according to its natural side ἀταξία, *turba.* [22] Both personal evil and natural evil have originated in the spirit world: first of all, in a spirit nearest to God, which as fallen is called הַשָּׂטָן. It has sought its own selfish ends, and thereby deranged its nature, so that it has become in every respect the object of the divine wrath, and the material for the burning of the divine wrath: for the *echthra* and *turba* have the intention and the burning of the wrath of God in themselves as divine *correlata;* but Satan, after that he has become entirely possessed of these divine powers (*Energien*), is also their instrument. The spirit of light and love is altogether become the spirit of fire and wrath; the whole sphere of wrath is centred in him. After having given up his high position in the realm of light, he is become lord of the realm of wrath.

He has, from the commencement of his fall, the hell within himself, but is first cast into the lake of fire at the end of the present dispensation (Matt. 25:41; Apoc. 20:10: comp. Dan. 7:11). In the meantime, he is being deprived of his power by the Son of man, who, in the midst of His own and His disciples' victories over the demons, beholds him fall as lightning from heaven (Luke 10:18), and by His death gives him his deathblow,—a final judgment, which, later on, becomes fully manifest in the continuous degradation of the vanquished (comp. Apoc. 12:9, 20:3, 20:10). Accordingly, when Satan, in the book of Job, still appears among the angles of God in heaven, and indeed as κατήγωρ, it is quite in accordance with the disclosures which the New Testament Scriptures give us respecting the invisible angelic side of the present dispensation.

We will now cast a glance at the relation to the wrath of God, and to Satan, into which man has fallen through the temptation of the old serpent. Tempted by Satan, he is himself fallen into the realm of wrath, and become a servant of Satan. He is in his grasp. All calamity that befalls him is divine punishment, either proceeding directly from the wrath of God, or worked by the wrath-spirit, Satan. But in prospect of the future atonement, which was to free man from the wrath of God, and from the power of wrath in which Satan holds him, it was possible for man, even under the Old Testament, to realize this deliverance, by virtue of an apprehension of the grace flowing from God's purpose of redemption. Whoever has been made free by this grace is changed from an object of the divine wrath to an object of the divine love, and nothing that befalls him in this condition proceeds from the wrath of God—all from His love. This love cannot, however, manifest itself so brightly as it would, so long as sin remains in the man and in the world; it is only able to manifest itself as loving wrath, i.e.,

as love controlling, and making wrath serviceable to itself.

Thus Job's suffering is a dispensation of love, but brought about by the wrath-spirit, and with every appearance of wrath. It is so with every trial and chastisement of the righteous. And it cannot be otherwise; for *trial* is designed to be for man a means of overcoming the evil that is external to him, and *chastisement* of overcoming the evil that is within him. There is a conflict between evil and good in the world, which can issue in victory to the good only so, that the good proves itself in distinction from the evil, withstands the assault of evil, and destroys the evil that exists bound up with itself: only so, that the good as far as it is still mixed with the evil is refined as by fire, and more and more freed from it.

This is the twofold point of view from which the suffering of Job is to be regarded. It was designed, first of all, that Job should prove himself in opposition to Satan, in order to overcome him; and since Job does not pass through the trial entirely without sinning, it has the effect at the same time of purifying and perfecting him. In both respects, the history of Job is a passage from the history of God's own conflict with the evil one, which is the substance of the history of redemption, and ends in the triumph of the divine love. And Gaupp[23] well says: In the book of Job, Satan loses a cause which is intended only as prelude to the greatest of all causes, since judgment is gone forth over the world, and the prince of darkness has been cast forth. Accordingly the church has always recognised in the passion of Job a type of the passion of Jesus Christ. James (James 5:11) even compares the patience of Job and the issue of the Lord's sufferings. And according to this indication, it was the custom after the second century to read the book of Job in the churches during passion-week.[24] The ultimate solution of the problem which this marvellous book sets forth, is then this: the suffering of the righteous, in its deepest cause, is the conflict of the seed of the woman with the seed of the serpent, which ends in the head of the serpent being trampled under foot; it is the type or copy of the suffering of Christ, the Holy God, who has himself borne our sins, and in the constancy of His reconciling love has withstood, even to the final overthrow, the assault of wrath and of the angel of wrath.

The real contents of the book of Job is the mystery of the Cross: the Cross on Golgotha is the solution of the enigma of every cross; and the book of Job is a prophecy of this ultimate solution.

The History of the Exposition

Before proceeding to the exposition, we will take a brief review of the *history* of the exposition of the book. The promise of the Spirit to lead into all truth is continually receiving its fulfilment in the history of the church, and especially in the interpretation of Scripture. But nowhere is the progress of the church in accordance with this promise so manifest as in the exposition of the word, and particularly of the Old Testament. In the patristic and middle ages, light was thrown only on detached portions of the Old Testament; they lacked altogether, or had but an inadequate knowledge of, the Hebrew language. They regarded the Old Testament not as the forerunner, but allegory, of the New, and paid less attention to it in proportion as the spiritual perception of the church lost its apostolic purity and freshness. However, so far as inward spiritual feeling and experience could compensate for the almost entire absence of outward conditions, this period has produced and handed down many valuable explanations.

But at the time of the Reformation, the light of the day which had already dawned first spread in all its brightness over the Old Testament. The knowledge of Hebrew, until then the private possession of a few, became the public property of the church: all erroneous interventions which had hitherto separated the church both from Christ and from the living source of the word were put aside; and starting from the central truth of justification by faith and its results, a free but still not unrestricted investigation commenced. Still there was

wanting to this period all perception of historical development, and consequently the ability to comprehend the Old Testament as preparing the way for the New by its gradual historical development of the plan of redemption. The exposition of Scripture, moreover, soon fell again under the yoke of an enslaving tradition, of a scholastic systematizing, and of an unhistorical dogmatizing which mistook its peculiar aim; and this period of bondage, devoid of spirituality, was followed by a period of false freedom, that of rationalism, which cut asunder the mutual relation between the exposition of Scripture and the confession of the church, since it reduced the covenant contents of the church's confession to the most shallow notion of God and the most trivial moral rules, and regarded the Old Testament as historical indeed, but with carnal eyes, which were blind to the work of God that was preparing the way in the history of Israel for the New Testament redemption. The progress of exegesis seemed at that time to have been stayed; but the Head of the church, who reigns in the midst of His enemies, caused the exposition of His word to come forth again from the dead in a more glorious form. The bias towards the human side of Scripture has taught exegesis that Scripture is neither altogether a divine, nor altogether a human, but a divine-human book. The historical method of regarding it, and the advanced knowledge of language, have taught that the Old Testament presents a divine-human growth tending towards the God-man, a gradual development and declaration of the divine purpose of salvation,—a miraculous history moving inward towards that miracle of all miracles, Jesus Christ. Believing on Him, bearing the seal of His Spirit in himself, and partaking of the true liberty His Spirit imparts, the expositor of Scripture beholds in the Old Testament, with open face, now as never before, the glory of the Lord.

The truth of this sketch is confirmed by the history of the exposition of the book of Job. The Greek fathers, of whom twenty-two (including Ephrem) are quoted in the *Catena,* [25] published by Patricius Junius, 1637, furnish little more than could be expected. If there by any Old Testament book whose comprehensive meaning is now first understood according to the external and internal conditions of its gradual advance to maturity, it is the book of Job. The Greek fathers were confined to the LXX, without being in a position to test that translation by the original text; and it is just the Greek translation of the book of Job which suffers most seriously from the flaws which in general affect the LXX. Whole verses are omitted, others are removed from their original places, and the omissions are filled up by apocryphal additions.[26] Origen was well aware of this (*Ep. ad Afric.* § 3f.), but he was not sufficiently acquainted with Hebrew to give a reliable collation of the LXX with the original text in his *Tetrapla* and *Hexapla;* and his additions (denoted by daggers), and the passages restored by him from other translators, especially Theodotion (by asterisks), deprive the Septuagint text of its original form, without, however, giving a correct impression of the original text. And since in the book of Job the meaning of the whole is dependent upon the meaning of the most isolated passage, the full meaning of the book was a perfect impossibility to the Greek fathers. They occupied themselves much with this mysterious book, but typical and allegorical could not make up what was wanting to the fathers, of grammatical and historical interpretation. The Italic, the next version to the LXX, was still more defective than this: Jerome calls the book of Job in this translation, *Decurtatus et laceratus corrosusque.* He revised it by the text of the *Hexapla,* and according to his own plan had to supply not less than about 700–800 *versus* (στίχοι). His own independent translation is far before its age; but he himself acknowledges its defectiveness, inasmuch as he relates, in his *praefatio in l. Iob,* how it was accomplished. He engaged, *non parvis numis,* a Jewish teacher from Lydda, where there was at that time an university, but confesses that, after he had gone through the book of Job with him, he was no wiser than before: *Cujus doctrina an*

aliquid profecerim nescio; hoc unum scio, non potuisse me interpretari nisi quod antea intellexeram. On this account he calls it, as though he would complain of the book itself, *obliquus, figuratus, lubricus,* and says it is like an eel—the more tightly one holds it, the faster it glides away. There were then three Latin versions of the book of Job,—the Italic, the Italic improved by Jerome, and the independent translation of Jerome, whose deviations, as Augustine complains, produced no little embarrassment. The Syrians were better off with their *Peschito,* which was made direct from the original text;[27] but the *Scholia* of Ephrem (pp. 1–19, t. ii. of the three Syriac *tomi* of his works) contain less that is useful than might be expected.[28] The succeeding age produced nothing better.

Among the expositors of the book of Job we find some illustrious names: Gregory the Great, Beda Venerabilis (whose Commentary has been erroneously circulated as the still undiscovered Commentary of Jerome), Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus,[29] and others; but no progress was made in the interpretation of the book, as the means were wanting. The principal work of the middle ages was Gregory the Great's *Expositio in beatum Iob seu Moralium,* ll. xxxv., a gigantic work, which leaves scarcely a dogmatic-ethical theme untouched, though in its own proper sphere it furnishes nothing of importance, for Gregory explained so, *ut super historiae fundamentum moralitatis construeret aedificium et anagoges imposuerit culmen praestantissimum* [30] but the linguistic-historical foundation is insufficient, and the exposition, which gives evidence of significant character and talent, accordingly goes off almost constantly into digressions opposed to its object.

It was only towards the end of the middle ages, as the knowledge of the Hebrew language began, through Jewish converts, to come into the church, that a new era commenced. For what advance the Jewish exposition of the book of Job had hitherto made, beyond that of the church, it owed to the knowledge of Hebrew; although, in the absence of any conception of the task of the expositor, and especially the expositor of Scripture, it knew not how fittingly to turn it to account. Saadia's (born 890) Arabic translation of the book of Job, with explanations,[31] does not accomplish much more than that of Jerome, if we may in general say that it surpasses it. Salomo Isaaki of Troyes (Raschi, erroneously called Jarchi), whose *Commentary on the Book of Job* (rendered incomplete by his death, 1105) was completed by his grandson, Samuel b. Me•r (Raschbam, died about 1160),[32] contains a few attempts at grammatical historical exposition, but is in other respects entirely dependent on *Midrash Haggada* (which may be compared with the church system of allegorical interpretation), whose barren material is treasured up in the catena-like compilations, one of which to the collected books of the Old Testament bears the name of *Simeon ha-Darschan* (ילקוט שמעוני); the other to the three poetical books, the name of *Machir b. Todros* (ילקוט מכירי). Abenezra the Spaniard, who wrote his *Commentary on the Book of Job* in Rome, 1175, delights in new bold ideas, and to enshroud himself in a mystifying nimbus. David Kimchi, who keeps best to the grammatical-historical course, has not expounded the book of Job; and a commentary on this book by his brother, Mose Kimchi, is not yet brought to light. The most important Jewish works on the book of Job are without doubt the Commentaries of Mose b. Nachman or Nahmanides (Ramban), born at Gerona 1194, and Levi b. Gerson, or Gersonides (Ralbag), born at Bagnols 1288. Both were talented thinkers; the former more of the Platonic, the latter of the Aristotelic type. Their Commentaries (taken up in the collective Rabbinical Commentaries), especially that of the latter, were widely circulated in the middle ages. They have both a philosophical bias.[33] What is to be found in them that is serviceable on any point, may be pretty well determined from the compilation of Lyra. Nikolaus de Lyra, author of *Postillae perpetuae in universa Biblia* (completed 1330), possessed, for that age, an

excellent knowledge of the original text, the necessity of which he acknowledged, and regarded the *sensus literalis* as basis of all other *sensus.* But, on the one hand, he was not independent of his Jewish predecessors; on the other, he was fettered by the servile unevangelical spirit of his age.

The bursting of this fetter was the dawn of a new day for exegesis. Luther, Brentius, and other reformers, by the depth of their religious experience, their aversion to the capriciousness of the system of allegorical interpretation and freedom from tradition, were fitted to look into the very heart of the book of Job; and they also possessed sufficient acquaintance with the Hebrew to get an inkling of the carrying out of its chief idea, but no more than an inkling of it. "The book of Job," says Luther in his preface, "treats of the question whether misfortune from God befalls even the godly. Here Job is firm, and maintains that God afflicts even the godly without cause, for His praise alone, as Christ (John 9) also shows from the man who was born blind." In these words the idea of the book is correctly indicated. But that he had only an approximate conception of the separate parts, he openly confesses. By the help of Melancthon and the Hebraist Aurogallus, he translated the book of Job, and says in his epistle on the translation, that they could sometimes scarcely finish three lines in four days. And while engaged upon the translation, he wrote to Spalatin, in his na•ve strong way, that Job seemed to bear his translation less patiently than the consolation of his friends, and would rather remain seated on his dunghill. Jerome Weller, a man who, from inward experience similar to that described in this book, was qualified above many to be its expositor, felt the same unsatisfactoriness. An expositor of Job, says he, must have lain on the same bed of sickness as Job, and have tasted in some measure the bitter experience of Job. Such an expositor was Weller, sorely tried in the school of affliction. But his exposition does not extend beyond the twelfth chapter; and he is glad when at last, by God's grace, he has got through the twelve chapters, as through firm and hard rock; the remaining chapters he commends to another. The most comprehensive work of the Reformation period on the book of Job, is the Sermons (*conciones*) of Calvin. The exegesis of the pre-rationalistic period advanced beyond these performances of the reformers only in proportion as philological learning extended, particularly Mercier and Cocceius in the Reformed, Seb. Schmid in the Lutheran, Joannes de Pineda in the Romish Church. The Commentary of the last named (Madrid, 1597), a surprisingly learned compilation, was also used and admired by Protestants, but zealously guards the immaculateness of the Vulgate. The commentaries of the German reformers are to the present day unsurpassed for the comprehension of the fundamental truth of the book.

With the Commentary of Albert Schultens, a Dutchman (2 vols. 1737), a new epoch in the exposition begins. He was the first to bring the Semitic languages, and chiefly the Arabic, to bear on the translation of the book. And rightly so,[34] for the Arabic has retained more that is ancient than any other Semitic dialect; and Jerome, in his preface to Daniel, had before correctly remarked, *Iob cum arabica lingua plurimam habet societatem.* Reiske (*Conjecturae in Iobum,* 1779) and Schnurrer (*Animadv. ad quaedam loca Iobi,* 1781) followed later in the footsteps of Schultens; but in proportion as the Israelitish element was considered in its connection with the Oriental, the divine distinctiveness of the former was forgotten. Nevertheless, the book of Job had far less to suffer than the other biblical books from rationalism, with its frivolous moral judgments and distorted interpretations of Scripture: it reduced the idea of the book to tameness, and Satan, here with more apparent reason than elsewhere, was regarded as a mythical invention; but there were, however, no miracles and prophecies to be got rid of.

And as, for the first time since the apostolic period, attention was now given to the book as a poetical masterpiece, substantial advantage

arose to the exposition itself from the translations and explanations of an Eckermann, Moldenhauer, Stuhlmann, and others. What a High-German rhymster of the fourteenth century, made known by Hennig, and the Florentine national poet Juliano Dati at the beginning of the sixteenth century, accomplished in their poetical reproductions of the book of Job, is here incomparably surpassed. What might not the fathers have accomplished if they had only had at their disposal such a translation of the book of Job as e.g., that of Böckel, or of the pious Miss Elizabeth Smith, skilled in the Oriental languages (died, in her twenty-eighth year, 1805),[35] or of a studious Swiss layman (*Notes to the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, together with a Translation of the Book of Job,* Basel 1841)?

The way to the true and full perception of the divine in Scripture is through the human: hence rationalism—especially after Herder, whose human mode of perception improved and deepened—prepared the way for a new era in the church's exposition of the book of Job. The Commentaries of Samuel Lee (1837), Vaihinger (1842), Welte (1849), Hahn (1850), and Schlottmann (1851),[36] are the first-fruits of this new period, rendered possible by the earlier Commentaries of Umbreit (1824–32), Ewald (1836–51), and Hirzel (1839, second edition, edited by Olshausen, 1852), of whom the first[37] is characterized by enthusiasm for the poetical grandeur of the book, the second by vivid perception of the tragical, and the third by sound tact and good arrangement,—three qualifications which a young Scotch investigator, A. B. Davidson, strives, not unsuccessfully, to unite in his Commentary (vol. i. 1862).[38] Besides these substantially progressive works, there is the Commentary of Heiligstedt (1847), which is only a recapitulatory *clavis* after the style of Rosenmüller, but more condensed; and for what modern Jewish commentaries, as those of Blumenfeld, Arnheim (1836), and Löwenthal (1846), contain beyond the standpoint of the earlier פרושים and באורים, they are almost entirely indebted to their Christian predecessors. Also in the more condensed form of translations, with accompanying explanations, the understanding of the book of Job has been in many ways advanced. We may mention here the translations of Köster (1831), who first directed attention to the strophe-structure of Hebrew poetry, but who also, since he regarded the Masoretic verse as the constructive element of the strophe, has introduced an error which has not been removed even to the present day; Stickel (1842), who has, not untastefully, sought to imitate the form of this masterpiece, although his division of the Masoretic verse into strophe lines, according to the accents, like Hirzel's and Meier's in Canticles, is the opposite extreme to the mistake of Köster; Ebrard (1858), who translates in iambic pentameters, as Hosse had previously done;[39] and Renan, who solely determines his arrangement of the *stichs* by the Masoretic division of verses, and moreover haughtily displays his scornful opposition to Christianity in the prefatory *Etude.* [40] Besides, apart from the general commentaries (*Bibelwerke*), among which that of Von Gerlach (Bd. iii. *des A. T.* 1849) may be mentioned as the most noted, and such popular practical expositions as Diedrich's (1858), many—some in the interest of poetry generally (as Spiess, 1852), others in the interest of biblical theology (as Haupt, 1847; Hosse, 1849; Hayd, 1859; Birkholz, 1859; and in Sweden, Lindgren, Upsala 1831)—have sought to render the reading of the book of Job easier and more profitable by means of a translation, with a short introduction and occasional explanations.

Even with all these works before us, though they are in part excellent and truly serviceable, it cannot be affirmed that the task of the exposition has been exhaustively performed, so that absolutely no *plus ultra* remains. To adjust the ideal meaning of the book according to its language, its bearing on the history of redemption, and its spiritual character,—and throughout to indicate the relation of the single

parts to the idea which animates the whole is, and remains, a great task worthy of ever-new exertion. We will try to perform it, without presuming that we are able to answer all the claims on the expositor. The right expositor of the book of Job must before everything else bring to it a believing apprehension of the work of Christ, in order that he may be able to comprehend this book from its connection with the historical development of the plan of redemption, whose unity is the work of Christ. Further, he must be able to give himself up freely and cheerfully to the peculiar vein of this (together with Ecclesiastes) most bold of all Old Testament books, in order that he may gather from the very heart its deeply hidden idea. Not less must he possess historical perception, in order that he may be able to appreciate the relativeness with which, since the plan of salvation is actually and confessedly progressive, the development of the idea of the book is burdened, notwithstanding its absolute truth in itself. Then he must not only have a clear perception of the divinely true, but also of the beautiful in human art, in order to be able to appreciate the wonderful blending of the divine and human in the form as in the contents. Finally, he must stand on the pinnacle of linguistic and antiquarian knowledge, in order to be able to follow the lofty flight of its language, and become families with the incomparably rich variety of its matter. This idea of an expositor of the book of Job we will keep in view, and seek, as near as possible, to attain within the limit assigned to this condensed exegetical handbook.

Translation and Exposition of the Book of Job

Ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν τῶν λέξεων [τοῦ βιβλίου] γενόμενοι σαφηνίσωμεν τὴν ἔννοιαν᾽ αὐτοῦ ποδηγούντος ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν᾽ τοῦ καὶ τὸν ἅγιονἸὼβ πρὸς τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐνισχύσαντος.—Olympiodoros.

JOB 1

Ch. 1–3.

Job's Piety in the Midst of the Greatest Prosperity.—Ch. 1:1–5.

The book begins in prose style: as Jerome says, *Prosa incipit, versu labitur, pedestri sermone finitur.* Prologue and epilogue are accordingly excepted from the poetical accentuation, and are accented according to the usual system, as the first word shows; for אִישׁ has, in correct editions, Tebir, a smaller distinctive, which does not belong to the poetical accentuation. The writer does not begin with וַיְהִי, as the writers of the historico-prophetical books, who are conscious that they are relating a portion of the connection of the collective Israelitish history, e.g., 1 Sam. 1:1, וַיְהִי אִישׁ, but, as the writer of the book of Esther (Esth. 2:5) for similar reasons, with אִישׁ הָיָה, because he is beginning a detached extra-Israelitish history.

1 *There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil.*

Job 1:1. The LXX translates, ἐν χώρᾳ τῇ Αὐσίτιδι; and adds at the close of the book, ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρίοις τῆνἸδουμαίας καὶἈραβίας, therefore north-east from Idumea, towards the Arabian desert. There, in the Arabian desert west from Babylon, under the Caucabenes, according to Ptolemy (v. 19, 2), the ΑἰσῖταιἈίσειται), i.e., the Uzzites, dwelt. This determination of the position of Uz is the most to be relied on. It tends indirectly to confirm this, that Οὖσος, in Jos. Ant. i. 6, 4, is described as founder of Trachonitis and Damascus; that the *Jakut Hamawi* and Moslem tradition generally (as recently Fries, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, ii.) mention the East Haran fertile tract of country north-west of *Têmâ* and *Bûzân,* el-Bethenije, the district of Damascus in which Job dwelt;[41] that the Syrian tradition also transfers the dwelling-place of Job to Hauran, where, in the district of Damascus, a monastery to his honour is called Dair Ejjub (vid., Volck, *Calendarium Syriacum,* p. 29). All these accounts agree that Uz is not to be sought in

Idumaea proper *(Gebâl).* And the early historical genealogies (Gen. 10:23, 22:21, 36:28) are not unfavourable to this, since they place Uz in relation to Seir-Edom on the one hand, and on the other to Aram: the perplexing double occurrence of such names as *Têmâ* and *Dûma,* both in Idumaea and East Hauran, perhaps just results from the mixing of the different tribes through migration. But at all events, though Uz did not lie in *Gebâl,* yet both from Lam. 4:21, and on account of the reference in the book of Job itself to the Horites (Job 24:30), a geographical connection between Idumaea and Ausitis is to be held; and from Jer. 25:20 one is warranted in supposing, that עוּץ, with which the Arabic name of Esau, *'yṣ* (*'l-'yṣ*), perhaps not accidentally accords, was the collective name of the northern part of the Arabian desert, extending north-east from Idumaea towards Syria. Here, where the aborigines of Seir were driven back by the Aramaic immigrants, and to where in later times the territory of Edom extended, dwelt Job. His name is not symbolic with reference to the following history. It has been said, אִיּוֹב signifies one hostilely treated, by Satan namely.[42] But the following reasons are against it: (1) that none of the other names which occur in the book are symbolically connected with the history; (2) that the form קְטוֹל has never a properly passive signification, but either active, as יְסוֹר, reprover (as parallel form with קָטֶל), or neuter, as יְלוֹד, born, שְׁכוֹר, drunken, also occasionally infinitive (vid., Fürst, *Concord.* p. 1349 s.), so that it may be more correct, with Ewald, after the Arabic (אוּב, cognate with שׁוּב, perhaps also בּוֹא), to explain the "one going of himself." Similar in sound are, יוֹב, the name of one of the sons of Issachar (Gen. 46:13); the name of the Idumaean king, יוֹבָב, Gen. 36:33 (which the LXX, Aristeas, Jul. Africanus,[43] combine with Job); and the name of the king of Mauritania, Juba, which in Greek is written Ἰόβας (*Didymus Chalcenter. ed. Schmidt,* p. 305): perhaps all these names belong to the root יב, to shout with joy. The LXX writes Ἰώβ with *lenis;* elsewhere the א at the beginning is rendered by *asper,* e.g., Αβραάμ Ἠλίας. Luther writes Hiob; he has preferred the latter mode, that it may not be read Job with consonantal Jod, when it should be Iob, as e.g., it is read by the English. It had been more correctly Ijob, but Luther wished to keep to the customary form of the name so far as he could; so we, by writing Iob with vowel I, do not wish to deviate too much from the mode of writing and pronunciation customary since Luther.[44]

The writer intentionally uses four synonyms together, in order to describe as strongly as possible Job's piety, the reality and purity of which is the fundamental assumption of the history. תָּם, with the whole heart disposed towards God and what is good, and also well-disposed toward mankind; יָשָׁר, in thought and action without deviation conformed to that which is right; יְרֵא אֱלֹהִים, fearing God, and consequently being actuated by the fear of God, which is the beginning (i.e., principle) of wisdom; סָר מֵרָע, keeping aloof from evil, which is opposed to God. The first predicate recalls Gen. 25:27, the fourth the proverbial Psalms (Ps. 34:15, 37:27) and Prov. 14:16. This mingling of expressions from Genesis and Proverbs is characteristic. First now, after the history has been begun in praett., aorr. follow.

2, 3 *And there were born unto him seven sons and three daughters. His substance also was seven thousand sheep, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she-asses, and servants in great number; so that this man was the greatest of all the men of the east.*

Job 1:2, 3. It is a large, princely household. The numbers are large, but must not on that account be considered an invention. The four animals named include both kinds. With the doubled אַלְפֵּי corresponds the also constructive מֵאוֹת, the Tsere of which is never shortened, though in the singular one says מְאַת, from מֵאָה.

The aorists, especially of the verb הָיָה (הוה), which, according to its root, signifies not so much *esse* as *fieri, existere,* are intended to place us at once in the midst of his prosperity. *Ex iis,* says Leo Africanus in reference to flocks, *Arabes suas divitias ac possessiones aestimant.* In fine, Job was without his equal among the בני קדם. So the tribes are called which extend from Arabia Deserta, lying to the east of Palestine, northwards to the countries on the Euphrates, and south over Arabia Petraea and Felix. The wisdom of these tribes, treasured up in proverbs, songs, and traditions, is mentioned in 1 Kings 5:10, side by side with the wisdom of the Egyptians. The writer now takes a very characteristic feature from the life of Job, to show that, even in the height of prosperity, he preserved and manifested the piety affirmed of him.

4, 5 *And his sons went and feasted in the house of him whose day it was, and sent and called for their sisters to eat and drink with them. And it happened, when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt-offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, I may be that my sons have sinned, and dismissed God from their hearts. Thus did Job continually.*

Job 1:4, 5. The subordinate facts precede, v. 4, in *perff.;* the chief fact follows, v. 5, in *fut. consec.* The *perff.* describe, according to Ges. § 126, 3, that which has happened repeatedly in the past, as e.g., Ruth 4:7; the *fut. consec.* the customary act of Job, in conjunction with this occurrence. The *consecutio temporum* is exactly like 1 Sam. 1:3f.

It is questionable whether בֵּית אִישׁ is a distinct adverbial expression, *in domu unuiscujusque,* and יומו also distinct, *die ejus* (Hirz. and others); or whether the three words are only one adverbial expression, *in domo ejus cujus dies erat,* which latter we prefer. At all events, יוֹמוֹ here, in this connection, is not, with Hahn, Schlottm., and others, to be understood of the birthday, as Job 3:1. The text, understood simply as it stands, speaks of a weekly round (Oehler and others). The seven sons took it in turn to dine with one another the week round, and did not forget their sisters in the loneliness of the parental home, but added them to their number. There existed among them a family peace and union which had been uninterruptedly cherished; but early on the morning of every eighth day, Job instituted a solemn service for his family, and offered sacrifices for his ten children, that they might obtain forgiveness for any sins of frivolity into which they might have fallen in the midst of the mirth of their family gatherings.

The writer might have represented this celebration on the evening of every seventh day, but he avoids even the slightest reference to anything Israelitish: for there is no mention in Scripture of any celebration of the Sabbath before the time of Israel. The sacred observance of the Sabbath, which was consecrated by God the Creator, was first expressly enjoined by the Sinaitic Thora. Here the family celebration falls on the morning of the *Sunday,*—a remarkable prelude to the New Testament celebration of Sunday in the age before the giving of the law, which is a type of the New Testament time after the law. The fact that Job, as father of the family, is the *Cohen* of his house,—a right of priesthood which the fathers of Israel exercised at the first passover (פסח מצרים), and from which a relic is still retained in the annual celebration of the passover (פסח הדורות),—is also characteristic of the age prior to the law. The standpoint of this age is also further faithfully preserved in this particular, that עולה here, as also Job 42:8, appears distinctly as an expiatory offering; whilst in the Mosaic ritual, although it still indeed serves לכפר (Lev. 1:4), as does every blood-offering, the idea of expiation as its peculiar intention is transferred to חטאת and אשם. Neither of these forms of expiatory offering is here mentioned. The blood-offering still bears its most general generic name, עוֹלָה, which it received after the flood. This name

indicates that the offering is one which, being consumed by fire, is designed to ascend in flames and smoke. הֶעֱלָה refers not so much to bringing it up to the raised altar, as to causing it to rise in flame and smoke, causing it to ascend to God, who is above. קִדֵּשׁ is the outward cleansing and the spiritual preparation for the celebration of the sacred festival, as Ex. 19:14. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the masculine suffixes refer also to the daughters. There were ten whole sacrifices offered by Job on each opening day of the weekly round, at the dawn of the Sunday; and one has therefore to imagine this round of entertainment as beginning with the first-born on the first day of the week. "Perhaps," says Job, "my children have sinned, and bidden farewell to God in their hearts." Undoubtedly, בֵּרֵךְ signifies elsewhere (1 Kings 21:10; Ps. 10:3), according to a so-called ἀντιφραστικὴ εὐφημία, *maledicere.* This signification also suits Job 2:5, but does not at all suit Job 2:9. This latter passage supports the signification *valedicere,* which arises from the custom of pronouncing a benediction or benedictory salutation at parting (e.g., Gen. 47:10). Job is afraid lest his children may have become somewhat unmindful of God during their mirthful gatherings. In Job's family, therefore, there was an earnest desire for sanctification, which was far from being satisfied with mere outward propriety of conduct. Sacrifice (which is as old as the sin of mankind) was to Job a means of grace, by which he cleansed himself and his family every week from inward blemish. The *futt. consec.* are followed by *perff.,* which are governed by them. כָּכָה, however, is followed by the *fut.,* because in historical connection (cf. on the other hand, Num. 8:26), in the signification, *faciebat h.e. facere solebat* (Ges. § 127, 4, *b*). Thus Job did every day, i.e., continually. As head of the family, he faithfully discharged his priestly vocation, which permitted him to offer sacrifice as an early Gentile servant of God. The writer has now made us acquainted with the chief person of the history which he is about to record, and in v. 6 begins the history itself.

Jehovah's Determination to Try Job.—Ch. 1:6–12.

He transfers us from earth to haven, where everything that is done on earth has its unseen roots, its final cause.

6 *Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before Jehovah; and Satan came also in the midst of them.*

Job 1:6. The translation "it happened on a day" is rejected in Ges. § 109, rem. 1, *c.* [45] The article, it is there said, refers to what precedes—the day, at the time; but this favourite mode of expression is found at the beginning of a narrative, even when it cannot be considered to have any reference to what has preceded, e.g., 2 Kings 4:18. The article is used in the opposite manner here, because the narrator in thought connects the day with the following occurrence; and this frees it from absolute indefiniteness: the western mode of expression is different. From the writer assigning the earthly measure of time to the place of God and spirits, we see that celestial things are represented by him parabolically. But the assumptions on which he proceeds are everywhere recognised in Scripture; for (1.) בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, as the name of the celestial spirits, is also found out of the book of Job (Gen. 6:2; cf. Ps. 29:1, 59:7, Dan. 3:25). They are so called, as beings in the likeness of God, which came forth from God in the earliest beginning of creation, before this material world and man came into existence (Job 28:4–7): the designation בְּנֵי points to the particular manner of their creation. (2.) Further, it is the teaching of Scripture, that these are the nearest attendants upon God, the nearest created glory, with which He has surrounded himself in His eternal glory, and that He uses them as the immediate instruments of His cosmical rule. This representation underlies Gen. 1:26, which Philo correctly explains, διαλέγεται ὁ τῶν ὅλων πατὴρ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεσιν; and in Ps. 59:6–8, a psalm which is closely allied to the book of Job, קְהַל and סוֹד, of the holy ones, is just the assembly of the heavenly spirits, from which, as ἄγγελοι of God, they go forth into the universe

and among men. (3.) It is also further the teaching of Scripture, that one of these spirits has withdrawn himself from the love of God, has reversed the truth of his bright existence, and in sullen ardent self-love is become the enemy of God, and everything godlike in the creature. This spirit is called, in reference to God and the creature, הַשָּׂטָן, from the verb שָׂטַן, to come in the way, oppose, treat with enmity,—a name which occurs first here, and except here occurs only in Zech. 3 and 1 Chron. 21:1. Since the Chokma turned, with a decided preference, to the earliest records of the world and mankind before the rise of nationalities, it must have known the existence of this God-opposing spirit from Gen. 2f. The frequent occurrence of the tree of life and the way of life in the Salomonic Proverbs, shows how earnestly the research of that time was engaged with the history of Paradise: so that it cannot be surprising that it coined the name הַשָּׂטָן for that evil spirit. (4.) Finally, it agrees with 1 Kings 22:19–22, Zech. 3, on the one hand, and Apoc. 12 on the other, that Satan here appears still among the good spirits, resembling Judas Iscariot among the disciples until his treachery was revealed. The work of redemption, about which his enmity to God overdid itself, and by which his damnation is perfected, is during the whole course of the Old Testament history incomplete.

Herder, Eichhorn, Lutz, Ewald, and Umbreit, see in this distinct placing of Satan in relation to the Deity and good spirits nothing but a change of representations arising from foreign influences; but if Jesus Christ is really the vanquisher of Satan, as He himself says, the realm of spirits must have a history, which is divided into two eras by this triumph. Moreover, both the Old and New Testaments agree herein, that Satan is God's adversary, and consequently altogether evil, and must notwithstanding serve God, since He makes even evil minister to His purpose of salvation, and the working out of His plan in the government of the world. This is the chief thought which underlies the further progress of the scene. The earthly elements of time, space, and dialogue, belong to the poetic drapery.

Instead of לִפְנֵי, הִתְיַצֵּב עַל is used elsewhere (Prov. 22:29): עַל is a usage of language derived from the optical illusion to the one who is in the foreground seeming to surpass the one in the background. It is an assembly day in heaven. All the spirits present themselves to render their account, and expecting to receive commands; and the following dialogue ensues between Jehovah and Satan:—

7 *Then Jehovah said to Satan, Whence comest thou? Satan answered Jehovah, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.*

Job 1:7. The *fut.* follows מֵאַיִן in the signification of the *praes.,* Whence comest thou? the *perf.* would signify, Whence hast thou come? (Ges. § 127, 2). Cocceius subtly observes: *Notatur Satanas velut Deo nescio h.e. non adprobante res suas agere.* It is implied in the question that his business is selfish, arbitrary, and has no connection with God. In his answer, שׁוּט בְּ, as 2 Sam. 24:2, signifies rapid passing from one end to the other; הִתְהַלֵּךְ, an observant roaming forth. Peter also says of Satan, περιπατεῖ (1 Pet. 5:8f.).[46] He answers at first generally, as expecting a more particular question, which Jehovah now puts to him.

8 *Then said Jehovah to Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job? for there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil.*

Job 1:8. By כִּי Jehovah gives the reason of His inquiry. Had Satan been observant of Job, even he must have confessed that there was on the earth real genuine piety. שִׂים לֵב, *animum advertere* (for לֵב is *animus,* נֶפֶשׁ *anima*), is construed with עַל, of the object on which the attention falls, and on which it fixes itself, or אֶל, of the object towards which it is directed (Job 2:3). The repetition of the four predicates used of Job (v. 1) in the mouth of Jehovah (though

without the *waw* combining both pairs there) is a skilful touch of the poet. Further on, the narrative is also interwoven with poetic repetitions (as e.g., Job 34 and Gen. 1), to give it architectural symmetry, and to strengthen the meaning and impression of what is said. Jehovah triumphantly displays His servant, the incomparable one, in opposition to Satan; but this does not disconcert him: he knows how, as on all occasions, so here also, to deny what Jehovah affirms.

9–11 *Then Satan answered Jehovah, and said, Doth Job fear God for nought? Hast Thou not made a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? Hast Thou not blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land? But put forth Thine hand now, and touch all that he hath: truly he will renounce Thee to Thy face.*

Job 1:9–11. Satan is, according to the Apoc. 12:10, the κατήγωρ who accuses the servants of God day and night before God. It is a fact respecting the invisible world, though expressed in the language and imagery of this world. So long as he is not finally vanquished and condemned, he has access to God, and thinks to justify himself by denying the truth of the existence and the possibility of the continuance of all piety. God permits it; for since everything happening to the creature is placed under the law of free development, evil in the world of spirits is also free to maintain and expand itself, until a spiritual power comes forward against it, by which the hitherto wavering conflict between the principles of good and evil is decided. This is the truth contained in the poetic description of the heavenly scene, sadly mistaken by Umbreit in his *Essay on Sin,* 1853, in which he explains Satan, according to Ps. 109:6, as a creation of our author's fancy. The paucity of the declarations respecting Satan in the Old Testament has misled him. And indeed the historical advance from the Old Testament to the New, though in itself well authorized, has in many ways of late induced to the levelling of the heights and depths of the New Testament. Formerly Umbreit was of the opinion, as many are still, that the idea of Satan is derived from Persia; but between Ahriman (*Angramainyus*) and Satan there is no striking resemblance;[47] whereas Diestel, in his *Abh. über Set- Typhon, Asasel und Satan, Stud. u. Krit.,* 1860, 2, cannot indeed recognise any connection between עזאזל and the Satan of the book of Job, but maintains a more complete harmony in all substantial marks between the latter and the Egyptian Typhon, and infers that "to Satan is therefore to be denied a purely Israelitish originality, the natural outgrowth of the Hebrew mind. It is indeed no special honour for Israel to be able to call him their own. He never has taken firm hold on the Hebrew consciousness." But how should it be no honour for Israel, the people to whom the revelation of redemption was made, and in whose history the plan of redemption was developed, to have traced the poisonous stream of evil up to the fountain of its first free beginning in the spiritual world, and to have more than superficially understood the history of the fall of mankind by sin, which points to a disguised superhuman power, opposed to the divine will? This perception undoubtedly only begins gradually to dawn in the Old Testament; but in the New Testament, the abyss of evil is fully disclosed, and Satan has so far a hold on the consciousness of Jesus, that He regards His life's vocation as a conflict with Satan. And the *Protevangelium* is deciphered in facts, when the promised seed of the woman crushed the serpent's head, but at the same time suffered the bruising of its own heel.

The view (e.g., Lutz in his *Biblishce Dogmatik*) that Satan as he is represented in the book of Job is not the later evil spirit, is to be rejected: he appears here only first, say Herder and Eichhorn, as impartial executor of judgment, and overseer of morality, commissioned by God. But he denies what God affirms, acknowledges no love towards God in the world which is not rooted in self-love, and is determined to destroy this love as a mere semblance. Where piety is dulled, he rejoices in its obscurity; where it is not, he dims its lustre

by reflecting his own egotistical nature therein. Thus it is in Zech. 3, and so here. Genuine love loves God חִנָּם (adverb from חֵן, like *gratis* from *gratia*): it loves Him for His own sake; it is a relation of person to person, without any actual stipulations and claim. But Job does not thus fear God; יְרֵא is here *praet.,* whereas in vv. 1 and 8 it is the adjective. God has indeed hitherto screened him from all evil; שַׂכְתָּ from שׂוּךְ, *sepire,* and בְּעַד (בַּעַד) composed of בְּ and עַד, in the primary signification *circum,* since עַד expresses that the one joins itself to the other, and בְּ that it covers it, or covers itself with it. By the addition of מִסָּבִיב, the idea of the triple בְּעַד is still strengthened. מַעֲשֵׂה, LXX, Vulg., have translated by the plural, which is not false according to the thought; for מַעֲשֵׂה יָדִים is, especially in Deuteronomy, a favourite collective expression for human enterprise. פָּרַץ, a word, with the Sanskrito-Sem. *frangere,* related to פָּרַק, signifying to break through the bounds, multiply and increase one's self unboundedly (Gen. 30:30, and freq.). The particle אוּלָם, proper only to the oldest and classic period, and very commonly used in the first four books of the Pentateuch, and in our book, generally וְאוּלָם, is an emphatic "nevertheless;" Lat. (suited to this passage at least) *verum enim vero.* אִם־לֹא is either, as frequently, a shortened formula of asseveration: May such and such happen to me if he do not, etc., = forsooth he will (LXX εἰ μήν); or it is half a question: Attempt only this and this, whether he will not deny thee, = *annon,* as Job 17:2, 22:20. The first perhaps suits the character of Satan better: he affirms that God is mistaken. בֵּרֵךְ signifies here also, *valedicere:* he will say farewell to thee, and indeed עַל־פָּנֶיךָ (as Isa. 65:3), meeting thee arrogantly and shamelessly: it signifies, properly, upon thy countenance, i.e., say it to thee, to the very face, that he will have nothing more to do with thee (comp. on Job 2:5). In order now that the truth of His testimony to Job's piety, and this piety itself, may be tried, Jehovah surrenders all Job's possessions, all that is his, except himself, to Satan.

12 *Then Jehovah said to Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy hand; only upon himself put not forth thy hand. And Satan went forth from the presence of Jehovah.*

Job 1:12. Notice well: The divine permission appears at the same time as a divine command, for in general there is not a permission by which God remains purely passive; wherefore God is even called in Scripture *creator mali* (the evil act as such only excepted), Isa. 45:7. Further, the divine arrangement has not its foundation in the sin which still clings to Job. For in the praise conferred upon Job, it is not said that he is absolutely without sin: universal liability to sin is assumed not only of all the unrighteousness, but even of all the righteousness, of Adam's race. Thirdly, the permission proceeds, on the contrary, from God's purpose to maintain, in opposition to Satan, the righteousness which, in spite of the universal liability to sin, is peculiar to Job; and if we place this single instance in historical connection with the development of the plan of redemption, it is a part of the conflict of the woman's seed with the serpent, and of the gradual degradation of Satan to the lake of fire. After Jehovah's permission, Satan retires forthwith. The license is welcome to him, for he delights in the work of destruction. And he hopes to conquer. For after he has experienced the unlimited power of evil over himself, he has lost all faith in the power of good, and is indeed become himself the self-deceived father of lies.

The Four Messengers of Misfortune.—Ch. 1:13ff.

Satan now accomplishes to the utmost of his power, by repeated blows, that which Jehovah had granted to him: first on Job's oxen, and asses, and herdsmen.

13–15 *And it came to pass one day, when his sons and his daughters were eating and drinking wine in the house of their eldest brother, that a messenger came to Job, and said, The oxen were*

ploughing, and the asses feeding beside them, when the Sabeans fell upon them, and carried them away, and smote the servants with the edge of the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.

Job 1:13–15. The principal clause, וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם, in which the art. of הַיּוֹם has no more reference to anything preceding than in v. 6, is immediately followed by an adverbial clause, which may be expressed by participles, Lat. *filiis ejus filiabusque convivantibus.* The details which follow are important. Job had celebrated the usual weekly worship early in the morning with his children, and knew that they were met together in the house of his eldest son, with whom the order of mutual entertainment came round again, when the messengers of misfortune began to break in upon him: it is therefore on the very day when, by reason of the sacrifice offered, he was quite sure of Jehovah's favour. The participial construction, the oxen were ploughing (vid., Ges. § 134, 2, *c*), describes the condition which was disturbed by the calamity that befell them. The verb הָיוּ stands here because the clause is a principal one, not as v. 13, adverbial. עַל-יְדֵי, properly "at hand," losing its radical meaning, signifies (as Judg. 11:26) "close by." The interpretation "in their places," after Num. 2:17, is untenable, as this signification of יָד is only supported in the *sing.* שְׁבָא is construed as *fem.,* since the name of the country is used as the name of the people. In Genesis three races of this name are mentioned: Cushite (Gen. 10:7), Joktanish (Gen. 10:28), and Abrahamic (Gen. 25:3). Here the nomadic portion of this mixed race in North Arabia from the Persian Gulf to Idumaea is intended. Luther, for the sake of clearness, translates here, and 1 Kings 10:1, *Arabia.* In וָאִמָּלְטָה, the *waw,* as is seen from the Kametz, is *waw convertens,* and the paragogic *ah,* which otherwise indicates the cohortative, is either without significance, or simply adds intensity to the verbal idea: I have saved myself with great difficulty. For this common form of the 1 *fut. consec.,* occurring four times in the Pentateuch, vid., Ges. § 49, 2. The clause לְהַגִּיד לָךְ is objective: in order that—so it was intended by the calamity—I might tell thee.

The Second Messenger: V. 16. *While he was yet speaking, another came, and said, The fire of God fell from heaven, and set fire to the sheep and servants, and consumed them; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.*

Job 1:16. The fire of God, which descends, is not a suitable expression for *Samûm* (Schlottm.), that wind of the desert which often so suddenly destroys man and beast, although indeed it is indicated by certain atmospheric phenomena, appearing first of a yellow colour, which changes to a leaden hue and spreads through the atmosphere, so that the sun when at the brightest becomes a dark red. The writer, also, can scarcely have intended lightning (Rosenm., Hirz., Hahn), but rain of fire or brimstone, as with Sodom and Gomorrha, and as 1 Kings 18:38, 2 Kings 1:12.

The Third Messenger: V. 17. *While he was yet speaking, there came also another, and said, The Chaldeans ranged themselves in three bands, and rushed upon the camels, and carried them away, and slew the servants with the edge of the sword; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.*

Job 1:17. Without any authority, Ewald sees in this mention of the Chaldeans an indication of the composition of the book in the seventh century B.C., when the Chaldeans under Nabopolassar began to inherit the Assyrian power. Following Ewald, Renan observes that the Chaldeans first appear as such marauders about the time of Uzziah. But in Genesis we find mention of early Semitic Chaldeans among the mountain ranges lying to the north of Assyria and Mesopotamia; and later, Nahor Chaldeans of Mesopotamia, whose existence is traced back to the patriarchal times (vid., Genesis, p. 422[48]), and who were powerful enough at any time to make a raid into Idumaea. To make an attack divided into several רָאשִׁים, heads, multitudes, bands (two—Gen. 14:15; three—Judg. 7:16, 1 Sam. 11:11; or four—Judg. 9:34), is an ancient

military stratagem; and פָּשַׁט, e.g., Judg. 9:33, is the proper word for attacks of such bands, either for plunder or revenge. In לִפִי־חֶרֶב, at the edge of the sword, *à l'epée,* לְ is like the usual acc. of manner.

The Fourth Messenger: V. 18. *While he was yet speaking, another also came, and said, Thy sons and thy daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house: and, behold, a great wind came across from the desert, and smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon the young people, and they are dead; and I only am escaped alone to tell thee.*

Job 1:18. Instead of עוֹד, we have עַד here: the former denotes continuity in time, the latter continuity in space, and they may be interchanged. עַד in the signif. "while" is here construed with the participle, as Neh. 7:3; comp. other constructions, Job 8:21, 1 Sam. 14:19, Jonah 4:2. "From the other side of the desert" is equivalent to, from its farthest end. הַנְּעָרִים are the youthful sons and daughters of Job, according to the epicene use of נַעַר in the Pentateuch (youths and maidens). In one day Job is now bereft of everything which he accounted the gift of Jehovah,—his herds, and with these his servants, which he not only prizes as property, but for whom he has also a tender heart (Job 31); last of all, even his dearest ones, his children. Satan has summoned the elements and men for the destruction of Job's possessions by repeated strokes. That men and nations can be excited by Satan to hostile enterprises, is nothing surprising (cf. Apoc. 20:8); but here, even the fire of God and the hurricane are attributed to him. Is this poetry or truth? Luther, in the *Larger Catechism,* question 4, says the same: "The devil causes strife, murder, rebellion, and war, also thunder and lightning, and hail, to destroy corn and cattle, to poison the atmosphere," etc.,—a passage of our creed often ridiculed by rationalism; but it is correct if understood in accordance with Scripture, and not superstitiously. As among men, so in nature, since the Fall two different powers of divine anger and divine love are in operation: the mingling of these is the essence of the present Kosmos. Everything destructive to nature, and everything arising therefrom which is dangerous and fatal to the life of man, is the outward manifestation of the power of anger. In this power Satan has fortified himself; and this, which underlies the whole course of nature, he is able to make use of, so far as God may permit it as being subservient to His chief design (comp. Apoc. 13:13 with 2 Thess. 2:9). He has no creative power. Fire and storm, by means of which he works, are of God; but he is allowed to excite these forces to hostility against man, just as he himself is become an instrument of evil. It is similar with human demonocracy, whose very being consists in placing itself *en rapport* with the hidden powers of nature. Satan is the great juggler, and has already manifested himself as such, even in paradise and in the temptation of Jesus Christ. There is in nature, as among men, an entanglement of contrary forces which he knows how to unloose, because it is the sphere of his special dominion; for the whole course of nature, in the change of its phenomena, is subject not only to abstract laws, but also to concrete supernatural powers, both bad and good.

The Conduct of Job: Vv. 20, 21. *Then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his head, and fell down upon the ground, and worshipped, and said, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: Jehovah gave, and Jehovah hath taken away; blessed be the name of Jehovah.*

Job 1:20, 21. The first three messengers Job has heard, sitting, and in silence; but at the news of the death of his children, brought by the fourth, he can no longer overcome his grief. The intensity of his feeling is indicated by rising up (cf. Jonah 3:6); his torn heart, by the rending of his mantle; the conscious loss of his dearest ones, by cutting off the hair of his head. He does not, however, act like one in despair, but, humbling himself under the mighty hand of God, falls to the ground and prostrates himself,

i.e., worshipping God, so that his face touches the earth. הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, *se prosternere,* this is the gesture of adoration, προσκήνησις.[49] יָצָתִי is defectively written, as Num. 11:11; cf. *infra,* Job 32:18. The occurrence of שָׁמָּה here is remarkable, and may have given rise to the question of Nicodemus, John 3:4: μὴ δύναται ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν. The writer of Ecclesiastes (Eccles. 5:14) has left out this difficult שׁמה. It means either being put back into a state of unconsciousness and seclusion from the light and turmoil of this world, similar to his former state in his mother's womb, which Hupfeld, in his *Commentatio in quosdam Iobeidos locos,* 1853, favours; or, since the idea of בֶּטֶן אִמִּי may be extended, return to the bosom of mother earth (Ew., Hirz., Schlottm., *et al.*), so that שׁמה is not so much retrospective as rather prospective with reference to the grave (Böttch.), which we prefer; for as the mother's bosom can be compared to the bosom of the earth (Ps. 139:15), because it is of the earth, and recalls the original forming of man from the earth, so the bosom of the earth is compared to the mother's, Sir. 40:1: ἀφ᾽ ἡμέρας ἐξόδου ἐκ γαστρὸς μητρὸς ἕως ἡμέρας ἐπιταφῆς εἰς μητέρα πάντων. The writer here intentionally makes Job call God יהוה. In the dialogue portion, the name יהוה occurs only once in the mouth of Job (Job 12:9); most frequently the speakers use אלוה and שׁדי. This use of the names of God corresponds to the early use of the same in the Pentateuch, according to which שׁדי is the proper name of God in the patriarchal days, and יהוה in the later days, to which they were preparatory. The traditional view, that Elohim describes God according to the attribute of justice, Jehovah according to the attribute of mercy, is only in part correct; for even when the advent of God to judgment is announced, He is in general named Jehovah. Rather, אֱלֹהִים (*plur.* of אֱלוֹהַּ, fear), the Revered One, describes God as object; יְהֹוָה or יְהֹוִה, on the other hand, as subject. אֱלֹהִים describes Him in the fulness of His glorious majesty, including also the spirits, which are round about Him; יהוה as the Absolute One. Accordingly, Job, when he says יהוה, thinks of God not only as the absolute cause of his fate, but as the Being ordering his life according to His own counsel, who is ever worthy of praise, whether in His infinite wisdom He gives or takes away. Job was not driven from God, but praised Him in the midst of suffering, even when, to human understanding and feeling, there was only occasion for anguish: he destroyed the suspicion of Satan, that he only feared God for the sake of His gifts, not for His own sake; and remained, in the midst of *a fourfold temptation, the conqueror.* [50] Throughout the whole book he does not go so far as to deny God (בֵּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים), and thus far he does not fall into any unworthy utterances concerning His rule.

22 *In all this Job sinned not, nor attributed folly to God.*

Job 1:22. In all this, i.e., as the LXX correctly renders it: which thus far had befallen him; Ewald *et al.* translate incorrectly: he gave God no provocation. תִּפְלָה signifies, according to Job 24:12, comp. Job 6:6, saltlessness and tastelessness, dealing devoid of meaning and purpose, and is to be translated either, he uttered not, *non edidit,* anything absurd against God, as Jerome translates, *neque stultum quid contra Deum locutus est;* or, he did not attribute folly to God: so that נתן ל are connected, as Ps. 68:35, Jer. 13:16. Since נָתַן by itself nowhere signifies to express, we side with Hirzel and Schlottm. against Rödiger (in his *Thes.*) and Oehler, in favour of the latter. The writer hints that, later on, Job committed himself by some unwise thoughts of the government of God.

JOB 2

The Fifth and Sixth Temptation.—Ch. 2:1–10.

Satan has now exhausted his utmost power, but without success.

1 *Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before Jehovah, and Satan came also among them, to present himself before Jehovah.*

Job 2:1. The clause expressive of the purpose of their appearing is here repeated in connection with Satan (comp. on the contrary, Job 1:6), for this time he appears with a most definite object. Jehovah addresses Satan as He had done on the former occasion.

2 *And Jehovah said to Satan, Whence comest thou? And Satan answered Jehovah, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and wandering up and down in it.*

Job 2:2. Instead of מֵאַיִן, Job 1:7, we have here the similar expression אֵי מִזֶּה (Ges. § 150, *extra*). Such slight variations are also frequent in the repetitions in the Psalms, and we have had an example in Job 1 in the interchange of עוֹד and עַד. After the general answer which Satan givers, Jehovah inquires more particularly.

3 *Then Jehovah said to Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job? for there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, fearing God and eschewing evil; and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou hast moved me against him, to injure him without cause.*

Job 2:3. From the foregoing fact, that amidst all his sufferings hitherto Job has preserved and proved his תֻּמָּה (except in the book of Job, only Prov. 11:3), the *fut. consec.* draws the conclusion: there was no previous reason for the injury which Satan had urged God to decree for Job. הֲסִית does not signify, as Umbreit thinks, to lead astray, in which case it were an almost blasphemous anthropomorphism: it signifies *instigare,* and indeed generally, to evil, as e.g., 1 Chron. 21:1; but not always, e.g., Josh. 15:18: here it is certainly in a strongly anthropopathical sense of the impulse given by Satan to Jehovah to prove Job in so hurtful a manner. The writer purposely chooses these strong expressions, הֲסִית and בְּלִּעַ. Satan's aim, since he suspected Job still, went beyond the limited power which was given him over Job. Satan even now again denies what Jehovah affirms.

4, 5 *And Satan answered Jehovah, and said, Skin for skin, and all that man hath will he give for his life: stretch forth yet once Thy hand, and touch his bone, and his flesh, truly he will renounce Thee to Thy face.*

Job 2:4, 5. Olshausen refers עוֹר בְּעַד עוֹר to Job in relation to Jehovah: So long as Thou leavest his skin untouched, he will also leave Thee untouched; which, though it is the devil who speaks, were nevertheless too unbecomingly expressed. Hupfeld understands by the skin, that skin which is here given for the other,—the skin of his cattle, of his servants and children, which Job had gladly given up, that for such a price he might get off with his own skin sound; but בְּעַד cannot be used as *Beth pretii:* even in Prov. 6:26 this is not the case. For the same reason, we must not, with Hirz., Ew., and most, translate, Skin for skin = like for like, which Ewald bases on the strange assertion, that one skin is like another, as one dead piece is like another. The meaning of the words of Satan (rightly understood by Schlottm. and the Jewish expositors) is this: One gives up one's skin to preserve one's skin; one endures pain on a sickly part of the skin, for the sake of saving the whole skin; one holds up the arm, as Raschi suggests, to avert the fatal blow from the head. The second clause is climacteric: a man gives skin for skin; but for his life, his highest good, he willingly gives up everything, without exception, that can be given up, and life itself still retained. This principle derived from experience, applied to Job, may be expressed thus: Just so, Job has gladly given up everything, and is content to have escaped with his life. ואולם, *verum enim vero,* is connected with this suppressed because self-evident application.

The verb נָגַע, above, Job 1:11, with בְּ, is construed here with אֶל, and expresses increased malignity: Stretch forth Thy hand but once to his very bones, etc. Instead of עַל־פָּנֶיךָ, Job 1:11, עָל־ךָ is used here with the same force: forthwith, fearlessly and regardlessly (comp. Job 13:15; Deut. 7:10), he will bid Thee farewell.

The Grant of New Power: V. 6. *And Jehovah said to Satan, Behold, he is in thy hand; only take care of his life.*

Job 2:6. Job has not forfeited his life; permission is given to place it in extreme peril, and nothing more, in order to see whether or not, in the face of death, he will deny the God who has decreed such heavy affliction for him. נֶפֶשׁ does not signify the same as חַיִּים; it is the soul producing the spirit-life of man. We must, however, translate "life," because we do not use "soul" in the sense of ψυχή, *anima.*

The Working Out of the Commission: Vv. 7, 8. *Then Satan went forth from the presence of Jehovah, and smote Job with sore boils, from the sole of his foot to his crown. And he took him a potsherd to scrape himself with, and sat in the midst of ashes.*

Job 2:7, 8. The description of this disease calls to mind Deut. 28:35 with 27, and is, according to the symptoms mentioned further on in the book, *elephantiasis* so called because the limbs become jointless lumps like elephants' legs), Arab. *jdâm, 'gudhâm,* Lat. *lepra nodosa,* the most fearful form of *lepra,* which sometimes seizes persons even of the higher ranks. Artapan (C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 222) says, that an Egyptian king was the first man who died of elephantiasis. Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, was afflicted with it in a very dangerous form.[51] The disease begins with the rising of tubercular boils, and at length resembles a cancer spreading itself over the whole body, by which the body is so affected, that some of the limbs fall completely away. Scraping with a potsherd will not only relieve the intolerable itching of the skin, but also remove the matter. Sitting among ashes is on account of the deep sorrow (comp. Jonah 3:6) into which Job is brought by his heavy losses, especially the loss of his children. The LXX adds that he sat on a dunghill outside the city: the dunghill is taken from the passage Ps. 113:7, and the "outside the city" from the law of the מְצֹרָע. In addition to the four losses, a fifth temptation, in the form of a disease incurable in the eye of man, is now come upon Job: a natural disease, but brought on by Satan, permitted, and therefore decreed, by God. Satan does not appear again throughout the whole book. Evil has not only a personal existence in the invisible world, but also its agents and instruments in this; and by these it is henceforth manifested.

First Job's Wife (who is only mentioned in one other passage (Job 19:17), where Job complains that his breath is offensive to her) Comes to Him: V. 9. *Then his wife said to him, Dost thou still hold fast thine integrity? renounce God, and die.*

Job 2:9. In the LXX the words of his wife are unskilfully extended. The few words as they stand are sufficiently characteristic. They are not to be explained, Call on God for the last time, and then die (von Gerl.); or, Call on Him that thou die (according to Ges. § 130, 2); but בָּרַךְ signifies, as Job's answer shows, to take leave of. She therefore counsels Job to do that which Satan has boasted to accomplish. And notwithstanding, Hengstenberg, in his *Lecture on the Book of Job* (1860),[52] defends her against the too severe judgment of expositors. Her desperation, says he, proceeds from her strong love for her husband; and if she had to suffer the same herself, she would probably have struggled against despair. But love hopeth all things; love keeps its despondency hidden even when it desponds; love has no such godless utterance, as to say, Renounce God; and none so unloving, as to say, Die. No, indeed! this woman is truly *diaboli adjutrix* (August.); a tool of the temper (Ebrard); *impiae carnis praeco* (Brentius). And though Calvin goes too far when he calls her not only *organum Satanae,* but even *Proserpinam et Furiam infernalem,* the

title of another Xantippe, against which Hengstenberg defends her, is indeed rather flattery than slander. Tobias' Anna is her copy.[53] What experience of life and insight the writer manifests in introducing Job's wife as the mocking opposer of his constant piety! Job has lost his children, but this wife he has retained, for he needed not to be tried by losing her: he was proved sufficiently by having her. She is further on once referred to, but even then not to her advantage. Why, asks Chrysostom, did the devil leave him this wife? Because he thought her a good scourge, by which to plague him more acutely than by any other means. Moreover, the thought is not far distant, that God left her to him in order that when, in the glorious issue of his sufferings, he receives everything doubled, he might not have this thorn in the flesh also doubled.[54] What enmity towards God, what uncharitableness towards her husband, is there in her sarcastic words, which, if they are more than mockery, counsel him to suicide! (Ebrard). But he repels them in a manner becoming himself.

10 *But he said to her, As one of the ungodly would speak, thou speakest. Shall we receive good from God, and shall we not also receive evil?*

Job 2:10. The answer of Job is strong but not harsh, for the אחת (comp. 2 Sam. 13:13) is somewhat soothing. The translation "as one of the foolish women" does not correspond to the Hebrew; נָבָל is one who thinks madly and acts impiously. What follows is a double question, גַּם for הֲגַם. The גַּם stands at the beginning of the sentence, but logically belongs to the second part, towards which pronunciation and reading must hurry over the first,—a frequent occurrence after interrogative particles, e.g., Num. 16:22, Isa. 5:4*b;* after causal particles, e.g., Isa. 12:1, Prov. 1:24; after the negative פֶּן, Deut. 8:12ff., and often. Hupfeld renders the thought expressed in the double question very correctly: *bonum quidem hucusque a Deo accepimus, malum vero jam non item accipiemus?* גַּם is found also elsewhere at the beginning of a sentence, although belonging to a later clause, and that indeed not always the one immediately following, e.g., Hos. 6:11, Zech. 9:11; the same syntax is to be found with אַף, אַד, and רַק. קִבֵּל, like תֻּמָּה, is a word common to the book of Job and Proverbs (Prov. 19:20); besides these, it is found only in books written after the exile, and is more Aramaic than Hebraic. By this answer which Job gives to his wife, he has repelled the sixth temptation. For

10*b In all this Job sinned not with his lips.*

Job 2:10b. The Targum adds: but in his thoughts he already cherished sinful words. בִּשְׂפָתָיו is certainly not undesignedly introduced here and omitted in Job 1:22. The temptation to murmur was now already at work within him, but he was its master, so that no murmur escaped him.

The Silent Visit.—Ch. 2:11ff.

After the sixth temptation there comes a seventh; and now the real conflict begins, through which the hero of the book passes, not indeed without sinning, but still triumphantly.

11 *When Job's three friends heard of all this evil that was come upon him, they came every one from his own place; Eliphaz from Teman, and Bildad from Shuach, and Zophar from Naama: for they had made an appointment to come together to go and sympathize with him, and comfort him.*

Job 2:11. אֱלִיפַז is, according to Gen. 36, an old Idumaean name (transposed = *Phasaël* in the history of the Herodeans; according to Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 87; *cui Deus aurum est,* comp. Job 22:25), and תֵּימָן a district of Idumaea, celebrated for its native wisdom (Jer. 49:7; Bar. 3:22f.). But also in East-Hauran a *Têmâ* is still found (described by Wetzstein in his *Bericht über seine Reise in den beiden Trachonen und um das Hauran-Gebirge, Zeitschr. für allg. Erdkunde,* 1859), and about fifteen miles south of *Têmâ,* a *Bûzân* suggestive of Elihu's surname

(comp. Jer. 25:23). שׁוּחַ we know only from Gen. 25 as the son of Abraham and Keturah, who settled in the east country. Accordingly it must be a district of Arabia lying not very far from Idumaea: it might be compared with trans-Hauran *Schakka,* though the sound, however, of the word makes it scarcely admissible, which is undoubtedly one and the same with Σακκαία, east from Batanaea, mentioned in Ptolem. v. 15. נַעֲמָה is a name frequent in Syria and Palestine: there is a town of the Jewish *Shephêla* (the low ground by the Mediterranean) of this name, Josh. 15:41, which, however, can hardly be intended here. הַבָּאָה is *Milel,* consequently third pers. with the art. instead of the relative pron. (as, besides here, Gen. 18:21, 46:27), vid., Ges. § 109 *ad init.* The *Niph.* נוֹעַד is strongly taken by some expositors as the same meaning with נוֹעַץ, to confer with, appoint a meeting: it signifies, to assemble themselves, to meet in an appointed place at an appointed time (Neh. 6:2). Reports spread among the mounted tribes of the Arabian desert with the rapidity of telegraphic despatches.

Their Arrival: V. 12. *And when they lifted up their eyes afar off, and knew him not, they lifted up their voice, and wept; and they rent every one his mantle, and threw dust upon their heads toward heaven.*

Job 2:12. They saw a form which seemed to be Job, but in which they were not able to recognise him. Then they weep and rend their outer garments, and catch up dust to throw up towards heaven (1 Sam. 4:12), that it may fall again upon their heads. The casting up of dust on high is the outwards sign of intense suffering, and, as von Gerlach rightly remarks, of that which causes him to cry to heaven.

Their Silence: V. 13. *And they sat with him upon the ground seven days and seven nights; and none spake a word unto him: for they saw that his pain was very great.*

Job 2:13. Ewald erroneously thinks that custom and propriety prescribed this seven days' silence; it was (as Ezek. 3:15) the force of the impression produced on them, and the fear of annoying the sufferer. But their long silence shows that they had not fully realized the purpose of their visit. Their feeling is overpowered by reflection, their sympathy by dismay. It is a pity that they let Job utter the first word, which they might have prevented by some word of kindly solace; for, becoming first fully conscious of the difference between his present and former position from their conduct, he breaks forth with curses.

JOB 3

Job's Disconsolate Utterance of Grief.

Job's first longer utterance now commences, by which he involved himself in the conflict, which is his seventh temptation or trial.

1, 2 *After this Job opened his mouth, and cursed his day. And Job spake, and said.*

Job 3:2. Ver. 2 consists only of three words, which are separated by *Rebia;* and ויאמר, although *Milel,* is vocalized וַיֹּאמַר, because the usual form וַיֹּאמֶר, which always immediately precedes direct narration, is not well suited to close the verse. עָנָה, signifies to begin to speak from some previous incitement, as the New Testament ἀποκρίνεσθαι (not always = הֵשִׁיב) is also sometimes used.[55] The following utterance of Job, with which the poetic accentuation begins, is analysed by modern critics as follows: vv. 3–10, 11–19, 20–26. Schlottmann calls it three strophes, Hahn three parts, in the first of which delirious cursing of life is expressed; in the second, eager longing for death; in the third, reproachful inquiry after the end of such a life of suffering. In reality they are not strophes. Nevertheless Ebrard is wrong when he maintains that, in general, strophe-structure is as little to be found in the book of Job as in Wallenstein's *Monologue.* The poetical part of the book of Job is throughout strophic, so far as the nature of the drama admits it. So also even this first speech. Stickel has correctly traced out its divisions; but accidentally, for he has reckoned according to the Masoretic verses.

That this is false, he is now fully aware; also Ewald, in his *Essay on Strophes in the Book of Job,* is almost misled into this groundless reckoning of the strophes according to the Masoretic verses (*Jahrb.* iii. X. 118, Anm. 3). The strophe-schema of the following speech is as follows: 8. 10. 6. 8. 6. 8. 6. The translation will show how unmistakeably it may be known. In the translation we have followed the complete lines of the original, and their rhythm: the iambic pentameter into which Ebrard, and still earlier Hosse (1849), have translated, disguises the oriental Hebrew poetry of the book with its variegated richness of form in a western uniform, the monotonous impression of which is not, as elsewhere, counter-balanced in the book of Job by the change of external action. After the translation we give the grammatical explanation of each strophe; and at the conclusion of the speech thus translated and explained, its higher exposition, i.e., its artistic importance in the connection of the drama, and its theological importance in relation to the Old and New Testament religion and religious life.

3 *Perish the day wherein I was born.*
And the night which said, A man-child is conceived!

4 *Let that day become darkness;*
Let not Eloah ask after it from above,
And let not the light shine on it.

5 *May darkness and the shadow of death purchase it back;*
Let a cloud lie upon it;
May that which obscures the day terrify it.

Job 3:3–5. The curse is against the day of his birth and the night of his conception as recurring yearly, not against the actual first day (Schlottm.), to which the imprecations which follow are not pertinent. Job wishes his birth-day may become *dies ater,* swallowed up by darkness as into nothing. The elliptical relative clauses, v. 3 (Ges. § 123, 3; cf. 127, 4, *c*), become clear from the translation. Transl. *the night* (לַיְלָה with parag. *He* is *masc.*) *which said,* not: in which they said; the night alone was witness of this beginning of the development of a man-child, and made report of it to the High One, to whom it is subordinate. Day emerges from the darkness as Eloah from above (as Job 31:2, 28), i.e., He who reigns over the changes here below, asks after it; interests Himself in His own (דָּרַשׁ). Job wishes his birth-day may not rejoice in this. The relations of this his birth-day are darkness and the shadow of death. These are to redeem it, as, according to the right of kinsmen, family property is redeemed when it has got into a stranger's hands. This is the meaning of גָּאַל (LXX ἐκλάβοι), not = גָּעַל, *inquinent* (Targ.). עֲנָנָה is collective, as נְהָרָה, mass of cloud. Instead of כִּמְרִירֵי (the *Caph* of which seems pointed as *praepos*), we must read with Ewald (§ 157, *a*), Olshausen, (§ 187, *b*), and others, כַּמְרִירֵי, after the form חַכְלִיל, darkness, dark flashing (vid., on Ps. 10:8), שַׁפְרִיר, tapestry, unless we are willing to accept a form of noun without example elsewhere. The word signifies an obscuring, from כָּמַר, to glow with heat, because the greater the glow the deeper the blackness it leaves behind. All that ever obscures a day is to overtake and render terrible that day.[56]

6 *That night! let darkness seize upon it;*
Let it not rejoice among the days of the year;
Let it not come into the number of the month.

7 *Lo! let that night become barren;*
Let no sound of gladness come to it.

8 *Let those who curse the day curse it,*
Who are skilled in stirring up leviathan.

9 *Let the stars of its early twilight be darkened;*
Let it long for light and there be none;
And let it not refresh itself with eyelids of the dawn.

Job 3:6–9. Darkness is so to seize it, and so completely swallow it up, that it shall not be possible for it to pass into the light of day. It is not to become a day, to be reckoned as belonging to the days of the year and rejoice in

the light thereof. יִחַדְּ, for יִחְדְּ, *fut. Kal* from חָדָה (Ex. 18:9), with *Dagesh lene* retained, and a helping *Pathach* (vid., Ges. § 75, rem. 3, *d*); the reverse of the passage Gen. 49:6, where יֻחַד, from יָחַד, *uniat se,* is found. It is to become barren, גַּלְמוּד, so that no human being shall ever be conceived and born, and greeted joyfully in it.[57] "Those who curse days" are magicians who know how to change days into *dies infausti* by their incantations. According to vulgar superstition, from which the imagery of v. 8 is borrowed, there was a special art of exciting the dragon, which is the enemy of sun and moon, against them both, so that, by its devouring them, total darkness prevails. The dragon is called in Hindu *râhu;* the Chinese, and also the natives of Algeria, even at the present day make a wild tumult with drums and copper vessels when an eclipse of the sun or moon occurs, until the dragon will release his prey.[58] Job wishes that this monster may swallow up the sun of his birth-day. If the night in which he was conceived or born is to become day, then let the stars of its twilight (i.e., the stars which, as messengers of the morning, twinkle through the twilight of dawn) become dark. It is to remain for ever dark, never behold with delight the eyelids of the dawn. רָאָה בְּ, to regale one's self with the sight of anything, refresh one's self. When the first rays of morning shoot up in the eastern sky, then the dawn raises its eyelids; they are in Sophocles's *Antigone,* 103, χρυσέης ἡμέρας βλέφαρον, the eyelid of the golden day, and therefore of the sun, the great eye.

10 *Because it did not close the doors of my mother's womb,*
Nor hid sorrow from my eyes.
11 *Why did I not die from the womb,*
Come forth from the womb and expire?
12 *Why have the knees welcomed me?*
And why the breasts, that I should suck?

Job 3:10–12. The whole strophe contains strong reason for his cursing the night of his conception or birth. It should rather have closed (i.e., make the womb barren, to be explained according to 1 Sam. 1:5, Gen. 16:2) the doors of his womb (i.e., the womb that conceived [*concepit*] him), and so have withdrawn the sorrow he now experiences from his unborn eyes (on the extended force of the negative, vid., Ges. § 152, 3). Then why, i.e., to what purpose worth the labour, is he then conceived and born? The four questions, vv. 11ff., form a climax: he follows the course of his life from its commencement in embryo (מֵרֶחֶם, to be explained according to Jer. 20:17, and Job 10:18, where, however, it is מן local, not as here, temporal) to the birth, and from the joy of his father who took the new-born child upon his knees (comp. Gen. 50:23) to the first development of the infant, and he curses this growing life in its four phases (Arnh., Schlottm.). Observe the *consecutio temp.* The fut. אָמוּת has the signification *moriebar,* because taken from the thought of the first period of his conception and birth; so also וְאֶגְוָע, governed by the preceding *perf.,* the signification *et exspirabam* (Ges. § 127, 4, *c*). Just so אִינָק, but modal, *ut sugerem ea.*

13 *So should I now have lain and had quiet,*
I should have slept, then it would have been well with me,
14 *With kings and councillors of the earth,*
Who built ruins for themselves,
15 *Or with princes possessing gold,*
Who filled their houses with silver:
16 *Or like a hidden untimely birth I had not been,*
And as children that have never seen the light.

Job 3:13–16. The *perf.* and interchanging *fut.* have the signification of oriental *imperfecta conjunctivi,* according to Ges. § 126, 5; כִּי עַתָּה is the usual expression after hypothetical clauses, and takes the *perf.* if the preceding clause specifies a condition which has not occurred in the past (Gen. 31:42, 43:10; Num. 22:29, 33; 1 Sam. 14:30), the *fut.* if a condition is not existing

in the present (Job 6:3, 8:6, 13:19). It is not to be translated: for then; כי rather commences the clause following: so I should now, indeed then I should. Ruins, חֳרָבוֹת, are uninhabited desolate buildings, elsewhere such as have become, here such as are from the first intended to remain, uninhabited and desolate, consequently sepulchres, mausoleums; probably, since the book has Egyptian allusions, in other passages also, a play upon the pyramids, in whose name (III-XPAM, according to Coptic glossaries) III is the Egyptian article (vid., Bunsen, *Aeg.* ii. 361); Arab. without the art. *hirâm* or *ahrâm* (vid., *Abdollatîf, ed. de Sacy,* p. 293, s.).[59] Also Renan: *Qui se b‰tissent des mausolées.* Böttch. *de inferis,* § 298 (who, however, prefers to read רחבות, wide streets), rightly directs attention to the difference between בנה החרבות (to rebuild the ruins) and בנה ח׳ לו (to build ruins for one's self). With אוֹ like things are then ranged after one another. Builders of the pyramids, millionaires, abortions (vid., Eccl. 6:3), and the still-born: all these are removed from the sufferings of this life in their quiet of the grave, be their grave a "ruin" gazed upon by their descendants, or a hole dug out in the earth, and again filled in as it was before.

17 *There the wicked cease from troubling,*
And the weary are at rest.
18 *The captives dwell together in tranquillity;*
They hear not the voice of the taskmaster.
19 *The small and great,—they are alike there;*
And the servant is free from his lord.

Job 3:17–19. There, i.e., in the grave, all enjoy the rest they could not find here: the troublers and the troubled ones alike. רֹגֶז corresponds to the radical idea of looseness, broken in pieces, want of restraint, therefore of *Turba* (comp. Isa. 57:20, Jer. 6:7), contained etymologically in רָשָׁע. The *Pilel* שַׁאֲנַן vid., Ges. § 55, 2) signifies perfect freedom from care. In שָׁם הוּא, הוּא is more than the sign of the copula (Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm.); the rendering of the LXX, Vulg., and Luther., *ibi sunt,* is too feeble. As it is said of God, Isa. 41:4, 43:13, Ps. 102:28, that He is הוּא, i.e., He who is always the same, ὁ αὐτός; so here, הוּא, used purposely instead of הֵמָּה, signifies that great and small are like one another in the grave: all distinction has ceased, it has sunk to the equality of their present lot. Correctly Ewald: *Great and small are there the same.* יַחַד, v. 18, refers to this destiny which brings them together.

20 *Why is light given to the wretched,*
And life to the sorrowful in soul?
21 *Who wait for death, and he comes not,*
Who dig after him more than for treasure,
22 *Who rejoice with exceeding joy,*
Who are enraptured, when they can find the grave?
23 *To the man whose way is hidden,*
And whom Eloah hath hedged round?

Job 3:20–23. The descriptive *partt.* vv. 21*a,* 22*a,* are continued in predicative clauses, which are virtually relative clauses; v. 21*b* has the *fut. consec.,* since the sufferers are regarded as now at least dead; v. 22*b* the simple *fut.,* since their longing for the grave is placed before the eye (on this transition from the *part.* to the *verb. fin.,* vid., Ges. § 134, rem. (2). Schlottm. and Hahn wrongly translate: who would dig (instead of do dig) for him more than for treasure. אֶלֵי־גִיל (with poetical אֶלֵי instead of אֶל) might signify, accompanied by rejoicing, i.e., the cry and gesture of joy. The translation *usque ad exultationem,* is however, more appropriate here as well as in Hos. 9:1. With v. 23 Job refers to himself: he is the man whose way of suffering is mysterious and prospectless, and whom God has penned in on all sides (a fig. like Job 19:8; comp. Lam. 3:5). סָכַךְ, *sepire,* above, Job 1:10, to hedge round for protection, here: forcibly straiten.

24 *For instead of my food my sighing cometh,*
And my roarings pour themselves forth as water.

25 *For I fear something terrible, and it cometh upon me,*

And that before which I shudder cometh to me.

26 *I dwelt not in security, nor rested, nor refreshed myself:*

Then trouble cometh.

Job 3:24–26. That לִפְנֵי may pass over from the local signification to the substitutionary, like the Lat. *pro* (e.g., *pro praemio est*), is seen from Job 4:19 (comp. 1 Sam. 1:16): the parallelism, which is less favourable to the interpretation, before my bread (Hahn, Schlottm., and others), favours the signification *pro* here. The *fut. consec.* וַיִּתְּכוּ (*Kal* of נָתַךְ) is to be translated, according to Ges. § 129, 3, *a, se effundunt* (not *effuderunt*): it denotes, by close connection with the preceding, that which has hitherto happened. Just so v. 25*a:* I fear something terrible; forthwith it comes over me (this terrible, most dreadful thing). אָתָה is conjugated by the ה passing into the original א of the root (vid., Ges. § 74, rem. 4). And just so the conclusion: then also forthwith רֹגֶז (i.e., suffering which disorders, rages and ransacks furiously) comes again. Schlottm. translates tamely and wrongly: then comes—oppression. Hahn, better: Nevertheless fresh trouble always comes; but the "nevertheless" is incorrect, for the *fut. consec.* indicates a close connection, not contrast. The *praett.,* v. 26, give the details of the principal fact, which follows in the *fut. consec.:* only a short cessation, which is no real cessation; then the suffering rages afresh.

Why—one is inclined to ask respecting this first speech of Job, which gives rise to the following controversy—why does the writer allow Job, who but a short time before, in opposition to his wife, has manifested such wise submission to God's dealings, all at once to break forth in such despair? Does it not seem as though the assertion of Satan were about to be confirmed? Much depends upon one's forming a correct and just judgment respecting the state of mind from which this first speech proceeds. To this purpose, consider (1) That the speech contains no trace of what the writer means by ברך את־האלהים: Job nowhere says that he will have nothing more to do with God; he does not renounce his former faithfulness: (2) That, however, in the mind of the writer, as may be gathered from Job 2:10, this speech is to be regarded as the beginning of Job's sinning. If a man, on account of his sufferings, wishes to die early, or not to have been born at all, he has lost his confidence that God, even in the severest suffering, designs his highest good; and this want of confidence is sin.

There is, however, a great difference between a man who has in general no trust in God, and in whom suffering only makes this manifest in a terrible manner, and the man with whom trust in God is a habit of his soul, and is only momentarily repressed, and, as it were, paralysed. Such interruption of the habitual state may result from the first pressure of unaccustomed suffering; it may then seem as though trust in God were overwhelmed, whereas it has only given way to rally itself again. It is, however, not the greatness of the affliction in itself which shakes his sincere trust in God, but a change of disposition on the part of God which seems to be at work in the affliction. The sufferer considers himself as forgotten, forsaken, and rejected of God, as many passages in the Psalms and Lamentations show: therefore he sinks into despair: and in this despair expression is given to the profound truth (although with regard to the individual it is a sinful weakness), that it is better never to have been born, or to be annihilated, than to be rejected of God (comp. Matt. 26:24, καλὸν ἦ αὐτῷ ει᾽ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος). In such a condition of spiritual, and, as we know from the prologue, of Satanic temptation (Luke 22:31, Eph. 6:16), is Job. He does not despair when he contemplates his affliction, but when he looks at God through it, who, as though He were become his enemy, has surrounded him with this affliction as with a rampart. He calls himself a man whose way is hidden, as Zion laments, Isa. 40:27, "My way is hidden from

Jehovah;" a man whom Eloah has hedged round, as Jeremiah laments over the ruins of Jerusalem, Lam. 3:1–13 (in some measure a comment on Job 3:23), "I am the man who has seen affliction by the rod of His wrath … He has hedged me round that I cannot get out, and made my chain heavy."

In this condition of entire deprivation of every taste of divine goodness, Job breaks forth in curses. He has lost wealth and children, and has praised God; he has even begun to bear an incurable disease with submission to the providence of God. Now, however, when not only the affliction, but God himself, seems to him to be hostile (*nunc autem occultato patre,* as Brentius expresses it),[60] we hear from his mouth neither words of *praise* (the highest excellence in affliction) nor words of *resignation* (duty in affliction), but words of *despair:* his trust in God is not destroyed, but overcast by thick clouds of melancholy and doubt.

It is indeed inconceivable that a New Testament believer, even under the strongest temptation, should utter such imprecations, or especially such a question of doubt as in v. 20: Wherefore is light given to the miserable? But that an Old Testament believer might very easily become involved in such conflicts of belief, may be accounted for by the absence of any express divine revelation to carry his mind beyond the bounds of the present. Concerning the future at the period when the book of Job was composed, and the hero of the book lived, there were longings, inferences, and forebodings of the soul; but there was no clear, consoling word of God on which to rely,—no θεῖος λόγος which, to speak as Plato (*Phaedo,* p. 85, D), could serve as a rescuing plank in the shipwreck of this life. Therefore the πανταχοῦ θρυλλούμενον extends through all the glory and joy of the Greek life from the very beginning throughout. The best thing is never to have been born; the second best, as soon as possible thereafter, to die. The truth, that the suffering of this present time is not worthy of the glory which shall be revealed in us, was still silent. The proper disposition of mind, under such veiling of the future, was then indeed more absolute, as faith committed itself blindfold to the guidance of God. But how near at hand was the temptation to regard a troublous life as an indication of the divine anger, and doubtingly to ask, Why God should send the light of life to such! They knew not that the present lot of man forms but the one half of his history: they saw only in the one scale misery and wrath, and not in the other the heaven of love and blessedness to be revealed hereafter, by which these are outweighed; they longed for a present solution of the mystery of life, because they knew nothing of the possibility of a future solution. Thus it is to be explained, that not only Job in this poem, but also Jeremiah in the book of his prophecy, Jer. 20:14–18, curses the day of his birth. He curses the man who brought his father the joyous tidings of the birth of a son, and wishes him the fate of Sodom and Gomorrha. He wishes for himself that his mother might have been his grave, and asks, like Job, "Wherefore came I forth out of the womb to see labour and sorrow, and that my days should be consumed in shame?" Hitzig remarks on this, that it may be inferred from the contents and form of this passage, there was a certain brief disturbance of spirit, a result of the general indescribable distress of the troublous last days of Zedekiah, to which the spirit of the prophet also succumbed. And it is certainly a kind of delirium in which Jeremiah so speaks, but there is no physical disorder of mind with it: the understanding of the prophet is so slightly and only momentarily disturbed, that he has the rather gained power over his faith, and is himself become one of its disturbing forces.

Without applying to this lyric piece either the standard of pedantic moralizing, or of minute criticism as poetry, the intense melancholy of this extremely plaintive prophet may have proceeded from the following reasoning: After I have lived ten long years of fidelity and sacrifice to my prophetic calling, I see that it has totally failed in its aim: all my hopes are blighted; all my exhortations to repentance, and my prayers, have not availed to draw Judah

back from the abyss into which he is now cast, nor to avert the wrath of Jehovah which is now poured forth: therefore it had been better for me never to have been born. This thought affects the prophet so much the more, since in every fibre of his being he is an Israelite, and identifies the weal and woe of his people with his own; just as Moses would rather himself be blotted out form the book of life than that Israel should perish, and Paul was willing to be separated from Christ as anathema if he could thereby save Israel. What wonder that this thought should disburden itself in such imprecations! Had Jeremiah not been born, he would not have had occasion to sit on the ruins of Jerusalem. But his outburst of feeling is notwithstanding a paroxysm of excitement, for, though reason might drive him to despair, faith would teach him to hope even in the midst of downfall; and in reality, this small lyric piece in the collective prophecy of Jeremiah is only as a detached rock, over which, as a stream of clear living water, the prophecy flows on more joyous in faith, more certain of the future. In the book of Job it is otherwise; for what in Jeremiah and several of the psalms is compressed into a small compass,—the darkness of temptation and its clearing up,—is here the substance of a long entanglement dramatically presented, which first of all becomes progressively more and more involved, and to which this outburst of feeling gives the impulse. As Jeremiah, had he not been born, would not have sat on the ruins of Jerusalem; so Job, had he not been born, would not have found himself in this abyss of wrath. Neither of them knows anything of the future solution of every present mystery of life; they know nothing of the future life and the heavenly crown. This it is which, while it justifies their despair, casts greater glory round their struggling faith.

The first speaker among the friends, who now comes forward, is Eliphaz, probably the eldest of them. In the main, they all represent one view, but each with his individual peculiarity: Eliphaz with the self-confident pathos of age, and the mien of a prophet;[61] Bildad with the moderation and caution befitting one poorer in thought; Zophar with an excitable vehemence, neither skilled nor disposed for a lasting contest. The skill of the writer, as we may here at the outset remark, is manifested in this, that what the friends say, considered in itself, is true: the error lies only in the inadequacy and inapplicability of what is said to the case before them.

JOB 4

Second Part.—The Entanglement. Ch. 4–26.

The First Course of the Controversy.—Ch. 4–14.

Eliphaz' First Speech.—Ch. 4–5

In reply to Sommer, who in his excellent *biblische Abhandlungen,* 1846, considers the octastich as the extreme limit of the compass of the strophe, it is sufficient to refer to the Syriac strophe-system. It is, however, certainly an impossibility that, as Ewald (*Jahrb.* ix. 37) remarks with reference to the first speech of Jehovah, Job 38–39, the strophes can sometimes extend to a length of 12 lines = Masoretic verses, consequently consist of 24 στίχοι and more. [Then Eliphaz the Temanite began, and said:]

2 *If one attempts a word with thee, will it grieve thee? And still to restrain himself from words, who is able?*

3 *Behold, thou hast instructed many, And the weak hands thou hast strengthened.*

4 *The stumbling turned to thy words, And the sinking knees thou hast strengthened.*

5 *But now it cometh to thee, thou art grieved; Now it toucheth thee, thou despondest.*

Job 4:2–5. The question with which Eliphaz beings, is certainly one of those in which the tone of interrogation falls on the second of the paratactically connected sentences: Wilt thou, if we speak to thee, feel it unbearable? Similar examples are Job 4:21, Num. 16:22, Jer. 8:4; and with interrogative Wherefore? Isa. 5:4, 50:2: comp. the similar paratactic union of sentences, Job 2:10, 3:11*b.* The question arises here, whether נִסָּה is an Aramaic form of writing for נִשָּׂא (as the *Masora* in distinction from Deut.

4:34 takes it), and also either future, Wilt thou, if we raise, i.e., utter, etc.; or passive, as Ewald formerly,[62] If a word is raised, i.e., uttered, נָשָׂא דָבָר, like נָשָׂא מָשָׁל, Job 27:1; or whether it is *third pers. Piel,* with the signification, attempt, *tentare,* Eccles. 7:23. The last is to be preferred, because more admissible and also more expressive. נִסָּה followed by the *fut.* is a hypothetic *praet.,* Supposing that, etc., wilt thou, etc., as e.g., Job 23:10. מְלִין is the Aramaic *plur.* of מִלָּה, which is more frequent in the book of Job than the Hebrew *plur.* מִלִּים. The *futt.,* vv. 3f., because following the *perf.,* are like *imperfects* in the western languages: the expression is like Isa. 35:3. In כִּי עַתָּה, v. 5, כִּי has a temporal signification, Now when, Ges. § 155, 1, *e,* (*b*).

6 *Is not thy piety thy confidence,*
Thy Hope? And the uprightness of thy ways?

7 *Think now: who ever perished, being innocent?!*
And where have the righteous been cut off?!

8 *As often as I saw, those who ploughed evil*
And sowed sorrow,—they reaped the same.

9 *By the breath of Eloah they perished,*
By the breath of His anger they vanished away.

10 *The roaring of the lion, and the voice of the shachal,*
And the teeth of the young lions, are rooted out.

11 *The lion wanders about for want of prey,*
And the lioness' whelps are scattered.

Job 4:6–11. In v. 6 all recent expositors take the last *waw* as *waw apodosis:* And thy hope, is not even this the integrity of thy way? According to our punctuation, there is no occasion for supposing such an application of the *waw apodosis,* which is an error in a clause consisting only of substantives, and is not supported by the examples, Job 15:17, 23:12, 2 Sam. 22:41.[63] תקותך is the permutative of the ambiguous כסלתך, which, from כָּסַל, to be fat, signifies both the awkwardness of stupidity and the boldness of confidence. The addition of הוּא to מִי, v. 7, like Job 13:19, 17:3, makes the question more earnest: *quis tandem,* like מִי זֶה, *quisnam* (Ges. § 122, 2). In v. 8, כַּאֲשֶׁר is not comparative, but temporal, and yet so that it unites, as usual, what stands in close connection with, and follows directly upon, the preceding: When, so as, as often as I had seen those who planned and worked out evil (comp. Prov. 22:8), I also saw that they reaped it. That the ungodly, and they alone, perish, is shown in vv. 10f. under the simile of the lions. The Hebrew, like the oriental languages in general, is rich in names for lions; the reason of which is, that the lion-tribe, although now become rarer in Asia, and of which only a solitary one is found here and there in the valley of the Nile, was more numerous in the early times, and spread over a wider area.[64] שַׁחַל, which the old expositors often understood as the panther, is perhaps the maneless lion, which is still found on the lower Euphrates and Tigris. נָתַץ = נָתַן, Ps. 58:7, *evellere, elidere,* by zeugma, applies to the voice also. All recent expositors translate v. 11 *init.* wrongly: the lion perishes. The participle אֹבֵד is a stereotype expression for wandering about viewless and helpless (Deut. 26:5, Isa. 27:13, Ps. 119:176, and freq.). The *part.,* otherwise remarkable here, has its origin in this usage of the language. The parallelism is like Ps. 92:10.

12 *And a word reached me stealthily,*
And my ear heard a whisper thereof.

13 *In the play of thought, in visions of the night,*
When deep sleep falleth on men,

14 *Fear came upon me, and trembling;*
And it caused the multitude of my bones to quake with fear.

15 *And a breathing passed over my face;*
The hair of my flesh stood up:

16 *It stood there, and I discerned not its appearance:*

An image was before my eyes;
A gentle murmur, and I heard a voice.

Job 4:12–16. The *fut.* יִגָּנֵב, like Judg. 2:1, Ps. 80:9, is ruled by the following *fut. consec.: ad me furtim delatum est* (not *deferebatur*). Eliphaz does not say וַיִּגָּנֵב אֵלַי (although he means a single occurrence), because he desires, with pathos, to put himself prominent. That the word came to him so secretly, and that he heard only as it were a whisper (שָׁמַץ, according to Arnheim, in distinction from שָׁמַע, denotes a faint, indistinct impression on the ear), is designed to show the value of such a solemn communication, and to arouse curiosity. Instead of the prosaic מִמֶּנּוּ, we find here the poetic pausal-form מֶנְהוּ expanded from מֶנּוּ, after the form מֶנִּי, Job 21:16, Ps. 18:23. מִן is partitive: I heard only a whisper, murmur; the word was too sacred and holy to come loudly and directly to his ear. It happened, as he lay in the deep sleep of night, in the midst of the confusion of thought resulting from nightly dreams. שְׂעִפִּים (from שְׂעִיף, branched) are thoughts proceeding like branches from the heart as their root, and intertwining themselves; the מִן which follows refers to the cause: there were all manner of dreams which occasioned the thoughts, and to which they referred (comp. Job 33:15); תַּרְדֵּמָה, in distinction from שֵׁנָה, sleep, and תְּנוּמָה, slumber, is the deep sleep related to death and ecstasy, in which man sinks back from outward life into the remotest ground of his inner life. In v. 14, קְרָאֵנִי, from קָרָא = קָרָה, to meet (Ges. § 75, 22), is equivalent to קָרָנִי (not קְרָנִי, as Hirz., first edition, wrongly points it; comp. Gen. 44:29). The subject of הִפְחִיד is the undiscerned ghostlike something. Eliphaz was stretched upon his bed when רוּחַ, a breath of wind, passed (חָלַף, similar to Isa. 21:1) over his face. The wind is the element by means of which the spirit-existence is made manifest; comp. 1 Kings 19:12, where Jehovah appears in a gentle whispering of the wind, and Acts 2:2, where the descent of the Holy Spirit is made known by a mighty rushing. רוּחַ, πνεῦμα, Sanscrit *âtma,* signifies both the immaterial spirit and the air, which is proportionately the most immaterial of material things.[65] His hair bristled up, even every hair of his body; סָמַר, not causative, but intensive of *Kal.* יַעֲמֹד has also the ghostlike appearance as subject. Eliphaz could not discern its outline, only a תְּמוּנָה, *imago quaedam* (the most ethereal word for form, Num. 12:8, Ps. 17:15, of μορφή or δόξα of God), was before his eyes, and he heard, as it were proceeding from it, דְּמָמָה וָקֹל, i.e., *per hendiadyn:* a voice, which spoke to him in a gentle, whispering tone, as follows:

17 *Is a mortal just before Eloah,*
Or a man pure before his Maker?
18 *Behold, He trusteth not His servants!*
And His angels He chargeth with imperfection.
19 *How much more those who dwell in houses of clay,*
Whose origin is in the dust!
They are crushed as though they were moths.
20 *From morning until evening,—so are they broken in pieces:*
Unobserved they perish for ever.
21 *Is it not so: the cord of their tent in them is torn away,*
So they die, and not in wisdom?

Job 4:17–21. The question arises whether מִן is comparative: *prae Deo,* on which Mercier with penetration remarks: *justior sit oportet qui immerito affligitur quam qui immerito affligit;* or causal: *a Deo, h.e., ita ut a Deo justificetur.* All modern expositors rightly decide on the latter. Hahn justly maintains that עִם and בְּעֵינֵי are found in a similar connection in other places; and Job 32:2 is perhaps not to be explained in any other way, at least that does not restrict the present passage. By the servants of God, none

but the angels, mentioned in the following line of the verse, are intended. שִׂים with בְּ signifies *imputare* (1 Sam. 22:15); in Job 24:12 (comp. 1:22) we read תִּפְלָה, *absurditatem* (which Hupf. wishes to restore even here), joined with the verb in this signification. The form תָּהֳלָה is certainly not to be taken as *stultitia* from the verb הָלַל; the half vowel, and still less the absence of the *Dagesh,* will not allow this. תֹּרֶן (Olsh. § 213, *c*), itself uncertain in its etymology, presents no available analogy. The form points to a *Lamedh-He* verb, as תָּרְמָה from רָמָה, so perhaps from הָלָה, *Niph.* נֶהֱלָא, *remotus,* Micah 4:7: being distant, being behind the perfect, difference; or even from הָלָה (Targ. הֲלָא, *Pa.* הַלֵּי) = לָאָה, weakness, want of strength.[66] Both significations will do, for it is not meant that the good spirits positively sin, as if sin were a natural necessary consequence of their creatureship and finite existence, but that even the holiness of the good spirits is never equal to the absolute holiness of God, and that this deficiency is still greater in spirit-corporeal man, who has earthiness as the basis of his original nature. At the same time, it is presupposed that the distance between God and created earth is disproportionately greater than between God and created spirit, since matter is destined to be exalted to the nature of the spirit, but also brings the spirit into the danger of being degraded to its own level.

Ver. 19. אַף signifies, like כִּי אַף, *quanto minus,* or *quanto magis,* according as a negative or positive sentence precedes: since 18*b* is positive, we translate it here *quanto magis,* as 2 Sam. 16:11. Men are called dwellers in clay houses: the house of clay is their φθαρτὸν σῶμα, as being taken *de limo terrae* (Job 33:6; comp. Wisdom 9:15); it is a fragile habitation, formed of inferior materials, and destined to destruction. The explanation which follows—those whose יְסוֹד, i.e., foundation of existence, is in dust—shows still more clearly that the poet has Gen. 2:7, 3:19, in his mind. It crushes them (subject, everything that operates destructively on the life of man) לִפְנֵי־עָשׁ, i.e., not: sooner than the moth is crushed (Hahn), or more rapidly than a moth destroys (Oehler, Fries), or even appointed to the moth for destruction (Schlottm.); but לִפְנֵי signifies, as Job 3:24 (cf. 1 Sam. 1:16), *ad instar:* as easily as a moth is crushed. They last only from morning until evening: they are broken in pieces (הֻכַּת, from כָּתַת, for הוּכַּת); they are therefore as ephemerae. They perish for ever, without any one taking it to heart (*suppl.* עַל־לֵב, Isa. 42:25, 57:1), or directing the heart towards it, *animum advertit* (*suppl.* לֵב, Job 1:8).

In v. 21 the soul is compared to the cord of a tent, which stretches out and holds up the body as a tent, like Eccl. 12:6, with a silver cord, which holds the lamp hanging from the covering of the tent. Olshausen is inclined to read יִתְדָּם, their tent-pole, instead of יִתְרָם, and at any rate thinks the accompanying בָּם superfluous and awkward. But (1) the comparison used here of the soul, and of the life sustained by it, corresponds to its comparison elsewhere with a thread or weft, of which death is the cutting through or loosing (Job 6:9, 27:8; Isa. 38:12); (12) בָּם is neither superfluous nor awkward, since it is intended to say, that their duration of life falls in all at once like a tent when that which *in them* (בם) corresponds to the cord of a tent (i.e., the נֶפֶשׁ) is drawn away from it. The relation of the members of the sentence in v. 21 is just the same as in v. 2: Will they not die when it is torn away, etc. They then die off in lack of wisdom, i.e., without having acted in accordance with the perishableness of their nature and their distance from God; therefore, rightly considered: unprepared and suddenly, comp. Job 36:12, Prov. 5:23. Oehler, correctly: without having been made wiser by the afflictions of God. The utterance of the Spirit, the compass of which is unmistakeably manifest by the strophic division, ends here. Eliphaz now, with reference to it, turns to Job.

1 *Call now,—is there any one who will answer thee?*

And to whom of the holy ones wilt thou turn?

2 *For he is a fool who is destroyed by complaining,*

And envy slays the simple one.

3 *I, even I, have seen a fool taking root:*

Then I had to curse his habitation suddenly.

4 *His children were far from help,*

And were crushed in the gate, without a rescuer;

5 *While the hungry ate his harvest,*

And even from among thorns they took it away,

And the intriguer snatched after his wealth.

JOB 5

Job 5:1–5. The chief thought of the oracle was that God is the absolutely just One, and infinitely exalted above men and angels. Resuming his speech from this point, Eliphaz tells Job that no cry for help can avail him unless he submits to the all-just One as being himself unrighteous; nor can any cry addressed to the angels avail. This thought, although it is rejected, certainly shows that the writer of the book, as of the prologue, is impressed with the fundamental intuition, that good, like evil, spirits are implicated in the affairs of men; for the "holy ones," as in Ps. 89, are the angels. כִּי supports the negation implied in v. 1: If God does not help thee, no creature can help thee; for he who complains and chafes at his lot brings down upon himself the extremest destruction, since he excites the anger of God still more. Such a surly murmurer against God is here called אֱוִיל. לְ is the Aramaic sign of the object, having the force of *quod attinet ad, quoad* (Ew. § 310, *a*).

Eliphaz justifies what he has said (v. 2) by an example. He had seen such a complainer in increasing prosperity; then he cursed his habitation suddenly, i.e., not: he uttered forthwith a prophetic curse over it, which, though פִּתְאֹם might have this meaning (not *subito,* but *illico;* cf. Num. 12:4), the following *futt.,* equivalent to *imperff.,* do not allow, but: I had then, since his discontent had brought on his destruction, suddenly to mark and abhor his habitation as one overtaken by a curse: the cursing is a recognition of the divine curse, as the echo of which it is intended. This curse of God manifests itself also on his children and his property (vv. 4ff.). שַׁעַר is the gate of the city as a court of justice: the phrase, to oppress in the gate, is like Prov. 22:22; and the form *Hithpa.* is according to the rule given in Ges. § 54, 2, *b.* The relative אֲשֶׁר, v. 5, is here *conj. relativa,* according to Ges. § 155, 1, *c.* In the connection אֶל־מִצִּנִּים, אֶל is equivalent to עַד, *adeo e spinis,* the hungry fall so eagerly upon what the father of those now orphans has reaped, that even the thorny fence does not hold them back. צִנִּים, as Prov. 22:5: the double *praepos.* אֶל־מִן is also found elsewhere, but with another meaning. עַמִּים has only the appearance of being *plur.:* it is *sing.* after the form צַדִּיק, from the verb צָמַם, *nectere,* and signifies, Job 18:9, a snare; here, however, not *judicii laqueus* (Böttch.), but what, besides the form, comes still nearer—the snaremaker, intriguer. The Targ. translates לְסָטֵיסִין, i.e., λῃσταί. Most modern critics (Rosenm. to Ebr.) translate: the thirsty (needy), as do all the old translations, except the Targ.; this, however, is not possible without changing the form. The meaning is, that intriguing persons catch up (שָׁאַף, as Amos 2:7) their wealth.

Eliphaz now tells why it thus befell this fool in his own person and his children.

6 *For evil cometh not forth from the dust,*

And sorrow sprouteth not from the earth;

7 *For man is born to sorrow,*

As the sparks fly upward.

8 *On the contrary, I would earnestly approach unto God,*

And commit my cause to the Godhead;

9 *To Him who doeth great things and unsearchable;*

Marvellous things till there is no number:

10 *Who giveth rain over the earth,*

And causeth water to flow over the fields:

11 *To set the low in high places;*

And those that mourn are exalted to prosperity.

Job 5:6–11. As the oracle above, so Eliphaz says here, that a sorrowful life is allotted to man,[67] so that his wisdom consequently consists in accommodating himself to his lot: if he does not do that, he is an אֱוִיל, and thereby perishes. Misfortune does not grow out of the ground like weeds; it is rather established in the divine order of the world, as it is established in the order of nature that sparks of fire should ascend. The old critics understood by בני רשׁף birds of prey, as being swift as lightning (with which the appellation of beasts of prey may be compared, Job 28:8, 41:26); but רֶשֶׁף signifies also a flame or blaze (Cant. 8:6). Children of the flame is an appropriate name for sparks, and flying upwards is naturally peculiar to sparks as to birds of prey; wherefore among modern expositors, Hirz., Ew., Hahn, von Gerl., Ebr., rightly decide in favour of sparks. Schlottmann understands "angels" by children of flame; but the wings, which are given to angels in Scripture, are only a symbol of their freedom of motion. This remarkable interpretation is altogether opposed to the sententious character of v. 7, which symbolizes a moral truth by an ordinary thing. The *waw* in וּבְנֵי, which we have translated "as," is the so-called *waw adaequationis* proper to the Proverbs, and also to emblems, e.g., Prov. 25:25.

Eliphaz now says what he would do in Job's place. Ew. and Ebr. translate incorrectly, or at least unnecessarily: Nevertheless I will. We translate, according to Ges. § 127, 5: Nevertheless I would; and indeed with an emphatic *I:* Nevertheless I for my part. דָּרַשׁ with אֶל is *constr. praegnans,* like Deut. 12:5, *sedulo adire.* דִּבְרָה is not speech, like אִמְרָה but cause, *causa,* in a judicial sense. אֵל is God as the Mighty One; אֱלֹהִים is God in the totality of His variously manifested nature. The fecundity of the earth by rain, and of the fields (חוּצוֹת = *rura*) by water-springs (cf. Ps. 104:10), as the works of God, are intentionally made prominent. He who makes the barren places fruitful, can also change suffering into joy. To His power in nature corresponds His power among men (v. 11). לָשׂוּם is here only as a variation for הָשָׂם, as Heiligst. rightly observes: it is equivalent to *collacaturus,* or *qui in eo est ut collocet,* according to the mode of expression discussed in Ges. § 132, rem. 1, and more fully on Hab. 1:17. The construction of v. 11*b* is still bolder. שָׂגַב signifies to be high and steep, inaccessible. It is here construed with the *acc.* of motion: those who go in dirty, black clothes because they mourn, shall be high in prosperity, i.e., come to stand on an unapproachable height of prosperity.

12 *Who bringeth to nought the devices of the crafty,*

So that their hands cannot accomplish anything;

13 *Who catcheth the wise in their craftiness;*

And the counsel of the cunning is thrown down.

14 *By day they run into darkness,*

And grope in the noon-day as in the night.

15 *He rescueth from the sword, that from their mouth,*

And from the hand of the strong, the needy.

16 *Hope ariseth for the weak,*

And folly shall close its mouth.

Job 5:12–16. All these attributes are chosen designedly: God brings down all haughtiness, and takes compassion on those who need it. The noun תּוּשִׁיָּה, coined by the Chokma, and out of Job and Proverbs found only in Mic. 6:9, Isa. 28:29, and even there in gnomical connection,

is formed from יֵשׁ, *essentia,* and signifies as it were *essentialitas, realitas:* it denotes, in relation to all visible things, the truly existing, the real, the objective; true wisdom (i.e., knowledge resting on an objective actual basis), true prosperity, real profiting and accomplishing. It is meant that they accomplish nothing that has actual duration and advantage. V. 13*a* cannot be better translated than by Paul, 1 Cor. 3:19, who here deviates from the LXX. With נַמְהָרָה, God's seizure, which prevents the contemplated achievement, is to be thought of. He pours forth over the worldly wise what the prophets call the spirit of deep sleep (תַּרְדֵּמָה) and of dizziness (עִוְעִים). On the other hand, He helps the poor. In מחרב מפיהם the second מִן is local: from the sword which proceeds from their mouth (comp. Ps. 64:4, 57:5, and other passages). Böttch. translates: without sword, i.e., instrument of power (comp. Job 9:15, 21:9); but מן with חרב leads one to expect that that from which one is rescued is to be described (comp. v. 20). Ewald corrects מֶחֶרֶב, which Olsh. thinks acute: it is, however, unhebraic, according to our present knowledge of the usage of the language; for the passives of חָרֵב are used of cities, countries, and peoples, but not of individual men. Olsh., in his hesitancy, arrives at no opinion. But the text is sound and beautiful. עִלָּתָה with pathetic unaccented *ah* (Ges. § 80, rem. 2, *f*), from עִוֹּלָה = עִוְלָה, as Ps. 92:16 *Chethib.*

17 *Behold, happy is the man whom Eloah correcteth;*

So despise not the chastening of the Almighty!

18 *For He woundeth, and He also bindeth up;*
He bruiseth, and His hands make whole.

19 *In six troubles He will rescue thee,*
And in seven no evil shall touch thee.

20 *In famine He will redeem thee from death,*
And in war from the stroke of the sword.

21 *When the tongue scourgeth, thou shalt be hidden;*

And thou shalt not fear destruction when it cometh.

Job 5:17–21. The speech of Eliphaz now becomes persuasive as it turns towards the conclusion. Since God humbles him who exalts himself, and since He humbles in order to exalt, it is a happy thing when He corrects (הוֹכִיחַ) us by afflictive dispensations; and His chastisement (מוּסָר) is to be received not with a turbulent spirit, but resignedly, yea joyously: the same thought as Prov. 3:11–13, Ps. 94:12, in both passages borrowed from this; whereas v. 18 here, like Hos. 6:1, Lam. 3:31ff., refers to Deut. 32:39. רָפָא, to heal, is here conjugated like a ל״ה verb (Ges. § 75, rem. 21). V. 19 is formed after the manner of the so-called number-proverbs (Prov. 6:16, 30:15, 18), as also the roll of the judgment of the nations in Amos 1–2: in six troubles, yea in still more than six. רָע is the extremity that is perhaps to be feared. In v. 20, the *praet.* is a kind of prophetic *praet.* The scourge of the tongue recalls the similar promise, Ps. 31:21, where, instead of scourge, it is: the disputes of the tongue. שׁוֹד, from שֹׁדַד violence, disaster, is allied in sound with שׁוֹט. Isaiah has this passage of the book of Job in his memory when he writes Is. 28:15. The promises of Eliphaz now continue to rise higher, and sound more delightful and more glorious.

22 *At destruction and famine thou shalt laugh,*

And from the beasts of the earth thou hast nothing to fear.

23 *For thou art in league with the stones of the field,*

And the beasts of the field are at peace with thee.

24 *And thou knowest that peace is thy pavilion;*

And thou searchest thy household, and findest nothing wanting.

25 *Thou knowest also that thy seed shall be numerous,*
And thy offspring as the herb of the ground.
26 *Thou shalt come to thy grave in a ripe age,*
As shocks of corn are brought in in their season.
27 *Lo! this we have searched out, so it is:*
Hear it, and give thou heed to it.

Job 5:22–27. The verb שָׂחַק is construed (v. 22) with לְ of that which is despised, as Job 39:7, 18, 41:21 [Hebr.]. עַל־תִּירָא is the form of *subjective* negation *[vid.* Ges. § 152, 1: Tr.]: only fear thou not = thou hast no occasion. In v. 23, בְּרִיתֶךָ is the shortest substantive form for בְּרִית לְךָ. The whole of nature will be at peace with thee: the stones of the field, that they do not injure the fertility of thy fields; the wild beasts of the field, that they do not hurt thee and thy herds. The same promise that Hosea (Hos. 2:20) utters in reference to the last days is here used individually. From this we see how deeply the Chokma had searched into the history of Paradise and the Fall. Since man, the appointed lord of the earth, has been tempted by a reptile, and has fallen by a tree, his relation to nature, and its relation to him, has been reversed: it is an incongruity, which is again as a whole put right (שָׁלוֹם), as the false relation of man to God is put right. In v. 24, שָׁלוֹם (which might also be *adj.*) is predicate: thou wilt learn (וְיָדַעְתָּ, *praet. consec.* with accented *ultima,* as e.g., Deut. 4:39, here with *Tiphcha initiale s. anterius,* which does not indicate the grammatical tone-syllable) that thy tent is peace, i.e., in a condition of contentment and peace on all sides. V. 24*b* is to be arranged: And when thou examinest thy household, then thou lackest nothing, goest not astray, i.e., thou findest everything, without missing anything, in the place where thou seekest it.

Ver. 25 reminds one of the Salomonic Ps. 72:16. צֶאֱצָאִים in the Old Testament is found only in Isaiah and the book of Job. The meaning of the noun כֶּלַח, which occurs only here and Job 30:2, is clear. Referring to the verb כָּלַח, Arabic *qaḥila* (*qalḥama*), to be shrivelled up, very aged, it signifies the maturity of old age,—an idea which may be gained more easily if we connect כֶּלַח with כָּלָה (to be completed), like קֶשַׁח with קָשָׁה (to be hard).[68] In the parallel there is the time of the sheaves, when they are brought up to the high threshing-floor, the latest period of harvest. עָלָה, of the raising of the sheaves to the threshing-floor, as elsewhere of the raising, i.e., the bringing up of the animals to the altar. גָּדִישׁ is here a heap of sheaves, Arab. *kuds,* as Job 21:32 a sepulchral heap, Arab. *jadat,* distinct from אֲלֻמָּה, a bundle, a single sheaf.

The speech of Eliphaz, which we have broken up into nine strophes, is now ended. Eliphaz concludes it by an epimythionic distich, v. 27, with an emphatic *nota bene.* He speaks at the same time in the name of his companions. These are principles well proved by experience with which he confronts Job. Job needs to lay them to heart: *tu scito tibi.*

All that Eliphaz says, considered in itself, is blameless. He censures Job's vehemence, which was certainly not to be approved. He says that the destroying judgment of God never touches the innocent, but certainly the wicked; and at the same time expresses the same truth as that placed as a motto to the Psalter in Ps. 1, and which is even brilliantly confirmed in the issue of the history of Job. When we find Isa. 57:1, comp. Ps. 12:2, in apparent opposition to this, הַצַּדִּיק אָבַד, it is not meant that the judgment of destruction comes upon the righteous, but that his generation experiences the judgment of his loss (*aetati suae perit*). And these are eternal truths, that between the Creator and creature, even an angel, there remains an infinite distance, and that no creature possesses a righteousness which it can maintain before God. Not less true is it, that with God murmuring is death, and that it is appointed to sinful man to pass through sorrow. Moreover, the counsel of Eliphaz is the right counsel: I

would turn to God, etc. His beautiful concluding exhortation, so rich in promises, crowns his speech.

It has been observed (e.g., by Löwenthal), that if it is allowed that Eliphaz (Job 5:17ff.) expresses a salutary spiritual design of affliction, all coherence in the book is from the first destroyed. But in reality it is an effect producing not only outward happiness, but also an inward holiness, which Eliphaz ascribes to sorrow. It is therefore to be asked, how it consists with the plan of the book. There is no doctrinal error to be discovered in the speech of Eliphaz, and yet he cannot be considered as a representative of the complete truth of Scripture. Job ought to humble himself under this; but since he does not, we must side with Eliphaz.

He does not represent the complete truth of Scripture: for there are, according to Scripture, three kinds of sufferings, which must be carefully distinguished.[69] The godless one, who has fallen away from God, is visited with suffering from God; for sin and the punishment of sin (comprehended even in the language in עָוֹן and חַטָּאת) are necessarily connected as cause and effect. This suffering of the godless is the effect of the divine justice in punishment; it is chastisement (מוּסָר) under the disposition of wrath (Ps. 6:2, 38:2; Jer. 10:24ff.), though not yet final wrath; it is punitive suffering (נֶגַע, נָקָם, τιμωρία, *poena*). On the other hand, the sufferings of the righteous flow from the divine love, to which even all that has the appearance of wrath in this suffering must be subservient, as the means only by which it operates: for although the righteous man is not excepted from the weakness and sinfulness of the human race, he can never become an object of the divine wrath, so long as his inner life is directed towards God, and his outward life is governed by the most earnest striving after sanctification. According to the Old and New Testaments, he stands towards God in the relation of a child to his father (only the New Testament idea includes the mystery of the new birth not revealed in the Old Testament); and consequently all sufferings are fatherly chastisements, Deut. 8:5, Prov. 3:12, Heb. 12:6, Apoc. 3:19, comp. Tob. 12:13 (Vulg.). But this general distinction between the sufferings of the righteous and of the ungodly is not sufficient for the book of Job. The sufferings of the righteous even are themselves manifold. God sends affliction to them more and more to purge away the sin which still has power over them, and rouse them up from the danger of carnal security; to maintain in them the consciousness of sin as well as of grace, and with it the lowliness of penitence; to render the world and its pleasures bitter as gall to them; to draw them from the creature, and bind them to himself by prayer and devotion. This suffering, which has the sin of the godly as its cause, has, however, not God's wrath, but God's love directed towards the preservation and advancement of the godly, as its motive: it is the proper disciplinary suffering (מוּסָר or תּוֹכַחַת, Prov. 3:11; παιδεία, Heb. 12). It is this of which Paul speaks, 1 Cor. 11:32. This disciplinary suffering may attain such a high degree as entirely to overwhelm the consciousness of the relation to God by grace; and the sufferer, as frequently in the Psalms, considers himself as one rejected of God, over whom the wrath of God is passing. The deeper the sufferer's consciousness of sin, the more dejected is his mood of sorrow; and still God's thoughts concerning him are thoughts of peace, and not of evil (Jer. 29:11). He chastens, not however in wrath, but בְּמִשְׁפָּט, with moderation (Jer. 10:24).

Nearly allied to this suffering, but yet, as to its cause and purpose, distinct, is another kind of the suffering of the godly. God ordains suffering for them, in order to prove their fidelity to himself, and their earnestness after sanctification, especially their trust in God, and their patience. He also permits Satan, who impeaches them, to tempt them, to sift them as wheat, in order that he may be confounded, and the divine choice justified,—in order that it may be manifest that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, are able

to separate them from the love of God, and to tear away their faith (אמונה) from God, which has remained stedfast on Him, notwithstanding every apparent manifestation of wrath. The godly will recognise his affliction as such suffering when it comes upon him in the very midst of his fellowship with God, his prayer and watching, and his struggling after sanctification. For this kind of suffering—trial—Scripture employs the expressions נִסָּה (Deut. 8:2, 16) and בָּחַן (Prov. 17:3), πειρασμός (Jas. 1:12; 1 Pet. 1:6f., 4:19; comp. Sir. 2:1ff.). Such suffering, according to a common figure, is for the godly what the smelting-furnace or the fining-pot is to precious metals. A rich reward awaits him who is found proof against the trial, temptation, and conflict, and comes forth from it as pure, refined gold. Suffering for trial is nearly allied to that for chastisement, in so far as the chastisement is at the same time trial; but distinct from it, in so far as every trial is not also chastisement (i.e., having as its purpose the purging away of still existing sin).

A third kind of the suffering of the righteous is testimony borne by suffering,—reproach, persecution, and perhaps even martyrdom, which are endured for the sake of fidelity to God and His word. While he is blessed who is found proof against trial, he is blessed in himself who endures this suffering (Matt. 5:11f., and other passages); for every other suffering comes upon man for his own sake, this for God's. In this case there is not even the remotest connection between the suffering and the sinfulness of the sufferer. Ps. 44 is a prayer of Israel in the midst of this form of suffering. Σταυρός is the name expressly used for it in the New Testament—suffering for the kingdom of heaven's sake.

Without a knowledge of these different kinds of human suffering, the book of Job cannot be understood. "Whoever sees with spiritual eyes," says Brentius, "does not judge the moral character of a man by his suffering, but his suffering by his moral character." Just the want of this spiritual discernment and inability to distinguish the different kinds of suffering is the mistake of the friends, and likewise, from the very first, the mistake of Eliphaz. Convinced of the sincere piety of his friend, he came to Job believing that his suffering was a salutary chastisement of God, which would at last turn out for his good. Proceeding upon this assumption, he blames Job for his murmuring, and bids him receive his affliction with a recognition of human sinfulness and the divine purpose for good. Thus the controversy begins. The causal connection with sin, in which Eliphaz places Job's suffering, is after all the mildest. He does not go further than to remind Job that he is a sinner, because he is a man.

But even this causal connection, in which Eliphaz connects Job's sufferings, though in the most moderate way, with previous sin deserving of punishment, is his πρῶτον ψεῦδος. In the next place, Job's suffering is indeed not chastisement, but trial. Jehovah has decreed it for His servant, not to chasten him, but to prove him. This it is that Eliphaz mistakes; and we also should not know it but for the prologue and the corresponding epilogue. Accordingly, the prologue and epilogue are organic parts of the form of the book. If these are removed, its spirit is destroyed.

But the speech of Eliphaz, moreover, beautiful and true as it is, when considered in itself, is nevertheless heartless, haughty, stiff, and cold. For (1.) it does not contain a word of sympathy, and yet the suffering which he beholds is so terribly great: his first word to his friend after the seven days of painful silence is not one of comfort, but of moralizing. (2.) He must know that Job's disease is not the first and only suffering which has come upon him, and that he has endured his previous afflictions with heroic submission; but he ignores this, and acts as though sorrow were now first come upon Job. (3.) Instead of recognising therein the reason of Job's despondency, that he thinks that he has fallen from the love of God, and become an object of wrath, he treats him as self-righteous;[70] and to excite his feelings, presents an oracle to him, which contains nothing but

what Job might sincerely admit as true. (4.) Instead of considering that Job's despair and murmuring against God is really of a different kind from that of the godless, he classes them together, and instead of gently correcting him, present to Job the accursed end of the fool, who also murmurs against God, as he has himself seen it. Thus, in consequence of the false application which Eliphaz makes of it, the truth contained in his speech is totally reversed. Thus delicately and profoundly commences the dramatical entanglement. The skill of the poet is proved by the difficulty which the expositor has in detecting that which is false in the speech of Eliphaz. The idea of the book does not float on the surface. It is clothed with flesh and blood. It is submerged in the very action and history.

JOB 6

[Then began Job, and said:]

2 *Oh that my vexation were but weighed,*
And they would put my suffering in the balance against it!
3 *Then it would be heavier than the sand of the sea:*
Therefore my words are rash.
4 *The arrows of the Almighty are in me,*
The burning poison whereof drinketh up my spirit;
The terrors of Eloah set themselves in array against me.

Job 6:2–4. Vexation (כַּעַשׂ) is what Eliphaz has reproached him with (Job 5:2). Job wishes that his vexation were placed in one scale and his הַיָּה (*Keri* הַוָּה) in the other, and weighed together (יִחַד). The noun הַיָּה (הַוָּה), from הָוָה (הָיָה), *flare, hiare,* signifies properly *hiatus,* then *vorago,* a yawning gulf, χάσμα, then some dreadful calamity (vid., Hupfeld on Ps. 5:10). נָשָׂא, like נָטַל, Isa. 11:15, to raise the balance, as *pendĕre,* to let it hang down; *attollant* instead of the passive. This is his desire; and if they but understood the matter, it would then be manifest (כִּי־עַתָּה, as Job 3:13, which see), or: indeed then would it be manifest (כִּי certainly in this inferential position has an affirmative signification: vid., Gen. 26:22, 29:32, and comp. 1 Sam. 25:34, 2 Sam. 2:27) that his suffering is heavier than the unmeasurable weight of the sand of the sea. יִכְבַּד is neuter with reference to וְהַיָּתִי. לָעוּ, with the tone on the *penult.,* which is not to be accounted for by the rhythm as in Ps. 37:20, 137:7, cannot be derived from לָעָה, but only from לוּעַ, not however in the signification to suck down, but from לוּעַ = לָעָה, Arab. *lagiya* or also *lagâ, temere loqui, inania effutire,*—a signification which suits excellently here.[71] His words are like those of one in delirium. עִמָּדִי is to be explained according to Ps. 38:3; חֲמָתָם, according to Ps. 7:15. יַעַרְכוּנִי is short for יערכו מלחמה עלי, they make war against me, set themselves in battle array against me. Böttcher, without brachylogy: they cause me to arm myself, put one of necessity on the defensive, which does not suit the subject. The terrors of God strike down all defence. The wrath of God is irresistible. The sting of his suffering, however, is the wrath of God which his spirit drinks as a draught of poison (comp. Job 21:20), and consequently wrings from him, even from his deepest soul, the thought that God is become his enemy: therefore his is an endless suffering, and therefore is it that he speaks so despondingly.

5 *Doth the wild ass bray at fresh grass?*
Or loweth an ox over good fodder?
6 *Is that which is tasteless eaten unsalted?*
Or is there flavour in the white of an egg?
7 *That which my soul refused to touch,*
The same is as my loathsome food.

Job 6:5–7. The meaning of the first two figures is: He would not complain, if there were really no cause for it; of the two others: It is not to be expected that he should smile at his suffering, and enjoy it as delicate food. עַל־בְּלִילוֹ I have

translated "over good fodder," for בְּלִיל is mixed fodder of different kinds of grain, *farrago.* "Without salt" is virtually adjective to תָּפֵל, insipid, tasteless. What is without salt one does not relish, and there is no flavour in the slime of the yolk of an egg, i.e., the white of an egg (Targ.),[72] or in the slime of purslain (according to *Chalmetho* in the Peschito, Arab. *ḥamqâ', fatua* = purslain), which is less probable on account of רִיר (slime, not: broth): there is no flavour so that it can be enjoyed. Thus is it with his sufferings. Those things which he before inwardly detested (dirt and dust of leprosy) are now *sicut fastidiosa cibi mei,* i.e., as loathsome food which he must eat. The first clause, v. 7*a,* must be taken as an elliptic relative clause forming the subject: vid., Ges. § 123, 3, *c.* Such disagreeable counsel is now like his unclean, disgusting diet. Eliphaz desires him to take them as agreeable. דְּוַי in כְּדְוַי is taken by Ges. Ew., Hahn, Schlottm., Olsh. (§ 165, *b*), as constr. from דַּוַי, sickness, filth; but דְּוַי, as *plur.* from דָּוֶה, sick, unclean (especially of female menstruation, Isa. 30:22), as Heiligst. among modern commentators explains it, is far more suitable. Hitz. (as anonym. reviewer of Ewald's *Job* in the *liter. Centralblatt*) translates: they (my sufferings) are the morsels of my food; but the explanation of הֵמָּה is not correct, nor is it necessary to go to the Arabic for an explanation of כִּדְוַי. It is also unnecessary, with Böttcher, to read כִּדְוַי (such is my food *in accordance with my disease*); Job does not here speak of his diet as an invalid.

8 *Would that my request were fulfilled,*
And that Eloah would grant my expectation,
9 *That Eloah were willing and would crush me,*
Let loose His hand and cut me off:
10 *Then I should still have comfort—*
(*I should exult in unsparing pain*)—
That I have not disowned the words of the Holy One.

Job 6:8–10. His wish refers to the ending of his suffering by death. Hupfeld prefers to read וְתַאֲוָתִי instead of וְתִקְוָתִי (v. 8*b*); but death, which he desires, he even indeed expects. This is just the paradox, that not life, but death, is his expectation. "Cut me off," i.e., my soul or my life, my thread of life (Job 27:8; Isa. 38:12). The optative מִי יִתֵּן (Ges. § § 136, 1) is followed by optative *futt.,* partly of the so-called jussive form, as יֹאֵל, *velit* (*Hiph.* from וָאַל, *velle*), and יַתֵּר, *solvat* (*Hiph.* from נָתַר). In the phrase הִתִּיר יָד, the stretching out of the hand is regarded as the loosening of what was hitherto bound. The conclusion begins with וּתְהִי, just like Job 13:5. But it is to be asked whether by consolation speedy death is to be understood, and the clause with כִּי gives the ground of his claim for the granting of the wish,—or whether he means that just this: not having disowned the words of the Holy One (comp. Job 23:11f., and אִמְרֵי־אֵל in the mouth of Balaam, the non-Israelitish prophet, Num. 24:4, 16), would be his consolation in the midst of death. With Hupfeld we decide in favour of the latter, with Ps. 119:50 in view: this consciousness of innocence is indeed throughout the whole book Job's shield and defence. If, however, נֶחָמָתִי (with *Kametz impurum*) points towards כִּי, *quod,* etc., the clause וַאֲסַלְּדָה is parenthetical. The cohortative is found thus parenthetical with a conjunctive sense also elsewhere (Ps. 40:6, 51:18). Accordingly: my comfort—I would exult, etc.—would be that I, etc. The meaning of סָלַד, *tripudiare,* is confirmed by the LXX ἡλλόμην, in connection with the Arabic *ṣalada* (of a galloping horse which stamps hard with its fore-feet), according to which the Targ. also translates וֶאֱבוּעַ (I will rejoice).[73] For לֹא יַחְמֹל, comp. Isa. 30:14f. (break in pieces unsparingly). לא יחמל certainly appears as though it must be referred to God (Ew., Hahn, Schlottm., and others), since חילה sounds feminine; but one can either pronounce חִילָה = חיל as *Milel* (Hitz.),

or take לֹא יחמל adverbially, and not as an elliptical dependent clause (as Ges. § 147, rem. 1), but as virtually an adjective: in pain unsparing.

11 *What is my strength, that I should wait,*
And my end, that I should be patient?
12 *Is my strength like the strength of stones?*
Or is my flesh brazen?
13 *Or am I then not utterly helpless,*
And continuance is driven from me?

Job 6:11–13. The meaning of the question (v. 11); is: Is not my strength already so wasted away, and an unfortunate end so certain to me, that a long calm waiting is as impossible as it is useless? הַאֱאָרִיךְ נַפְשִׁי, to draw out the soul, is to extend and distribute the intensity of the emotion, to be forbearing, to be patient. The question (v. 11) is followed by אִם, usual in double questions: or is my strength stone, etc. הַאִם, which is so differently explained by commentators, is after all to be explained best from Num. 17:28, the only other passage in which it occurs. Here it is the same as אִם הֲ, and in Num. אִם הֲלֹא: or is it not so: we shall perish quickly altogether? Thus we explain the passage before us. The interrogative הֲ is also sometimes used elsewhere for הֲלֹא, Job 20:4, 41:1 (Ges. § 153, 3); the additional אם stands *per inversionem* in the second instead of the first place: *nonne an = an nonne, annon:* or is it not so: is not my help in me = or am I not utterly helpless? Ewald explains differently (§ 356, *a*), according to which אִם, from the formula of an oath, is equivalent to לֹא. The meaning is the same. Continuance, תּוּשִׁיָּה, i.e., power of endurance, reasonable prospect is driven away, frightened away from him, is lost for him.

14 *To him who is consumed gentleness is due from his friend,*
Otherwise he might forsake the fear of the Almighty.
15 *My brothers are become false as a torrent,*
As the bed of torrents which vanish away—
16 *They were blackish from ice,*
Snow is hidden in them—
17 *In the time, when warmth cometh to them, they are destroyed.*
It becometh hot, they are extinguished from their place.

Job 6:14–17. Ewald supplies between 14*a* and 14*b* two lines which have professedly fallen out ("from a brother sympathy is due to the oppressed of God, in order he may not succumb to excessive grief"). Hitzig strongly characterizes this interpolation as a "pure swindle." There is really nothing wanting; but we need not even take חֶסֶד, with Hitz., in the signification reproach (like Prov. 14:34): if reproach cometh to the sufferer from his friend, he forsaketh the fear of God. מָס (from מָסַס, *liquefieri*) is one who is inwardly melted, the disheartened. Such an one should receive חֶסֶד from his friend, i.e., that he should restore him ἐν πνεύματι πραὐτητος (Gal. 6:1). The *waw* (v. 14*b*) is equivalent to *alioqui* with the future subjunctive (vid., Ges. § 127, 5). Harshness might precipitate him into the abyss from which love will keep him back. So Schnurrer: *Afflicto exhibenda est ab amico ipsius humanitas, alioqui hic reverentiam Dei exuit.* Such harshness instead of charity meets him from his brothers, i.e., friends beloved as brothers. In vain he has looked to them for reviving consolation. Theirs is no comfort; it is like the dried-up water of a wady. נַחַל is a mountain or forest brook, which comes down from the height, and in spring is swollen by melting ice and the snow that thaws on the mountain-tops; χειμάῤῥους, i.e., a torrent swollen by winter water. The melting blocks of ice darken the water of such a wady, and the snow falling together is quickly hidden in its bosom (הִתְעַלֵּם). If they begin to be warmed (*Pual* זֹרַב, cognate to צָרַב, Ezek. 21:3, *aduri,* and שָׂרַף, *comburere*), suddenly they are reduced to nothing (נִצְמַת,

exstingui); they vanish away בָּחֻמּוֹ, when it becomes hot. The suffix is, with Ew., Olsh., and others, to be taken as neuter; not with Hirz., to be referred to a suppressed עֵת: when the season grows hot. job bewails the disappointment he has experienced, the "decline" of charity[74] still further, by keeping to the figure of the mountain torrent.

18 *The paths of their course are turned about,*
They go up in the waste and perish.
19 *The travelling bands of Têma looked for them,*
The caravans of Saba hoped for them;
20 *They were disappointed on account of their trust,*
They came thus far, and were red with shame.

Job 6:18–20. As the text is pointed, אָרְחוֹת, v. 18, are the paths of the torrents. Hitz., Ew., and Schlottm., however, correct אֹרְחוֹת, caravans, which Hahn even thinks may be understood without correction, since he translates: the caravans of their way are turned about (which is intended to mean: aside from the way that they are pursuing), march into the desert and perish (i.e., because the streams on which they reckoned are dried up). So, in reality, all modern commentators understand it; but is it likely that the poet would let the caravans perish in v. 18, and in vv. 19f. still live? With this explanation, vv. 19f. drag along tautologically, and the feebler figure follows the stronger. Therefore we explain as follows: the mountain streams, נְחָלִים, flow off in shallow serpentine brooks, and the shallow waters completely evaporate by the heat of the sun. עָלָה בַתֹּהוּ signifies to go up into nothing (comp. Isa. 40:23), after the analogy of כָּלָה בֶּעָשָׁן, to pass away in smoke. Thus e.g., also Mercier: *in auras abeunt, in nihilum rediguntur.* What next happens is related as a history, vv. 19f., hence the *praett.* Job compares his friends to the wady swollen by ice and snow water, and even to the travelling bands themselves languishing for water. He thirsts for friendly solace, but the seeming comfort which his friends utter is only as the scattered meandering waters in which the mountain brook leaks out. The *sing.* בָּטָח individualizes; it is unnecessary with Olsh. to read בָּטְחוּ.

21 *For now ye are become nothing;*
You see misfortune, and are affrighted.
22 *Have I then said, Give unto me,*
And give a present for me from your substance,
23 *And deliver me from the enemy's hand,*
And redeem me from the hand of the tyrant?

Job 6:21–23. In v. 21, the reading wavers between לוֹ and לֹא, with the *Keri* לוֹ; but לוֹ, which is consequently the *lectio recepta,* gives no suitable meaning, only in a slight degree appropriate, as this: ye are become it, i.e., such a mountain brook; for הייתם is not to be translated, with Stickel and others, *estis,* but *facti estis.* The Targum, however, translates after the *Chethib:* ye are become as though ye had never been, i.e., nothingness. Now, since לֹא, Aramaic לָה, can (as Dan. 4:32 shows) be used as a substantive (a not = a null), and the thought: ye are become nothing, your friendship proves itself equal to null, suits the imagery just used, we decide in favour of the *Chethib;* then in the figure the עָלָה בתֹּהוּ corresponds most to this, and is also, therefore, not to be explained away. The LXX, Syr., Vulg., translate לי instead of לו: ye are become it (such deceitful brooks) to me. Ewald proposes to read כן עתה הייתם לי (comp. the explanation, Ges. § 137, rem. 3),—a conjecture which puts aside all difficulty; but the sentence with לֹא commends itself as being bolder and more expressive. All the rest explains itself. It is remarkable that in v. 21*b* the reading תִּירְאוּ is also found, instead of תִּרְאוּ: ye dreaded misfortune, and ye were then affrighted. הָבוּ is here, as an exception, *properispomenon,* according to Ges. § 29, 3. כַּח,

as Prov. 5:10, Lev. 26:20, what one has obtained by putting forth one's strength, syn. חַיִל, outward strength.

24 *Teach me, and I will be silent,*
And cause me to understand wherein I have failed.
25 *How forcible are words in accordance with truth!*
But what doth reproof from you reprove?
26 *Do you think to reprove words?*
The words of one in despair belong to the wind.
27 *Ye would even cast lots for the orphan,*
And traffic about your friend.

Job 6:24–27. נִמְרְצוּ, v. 25, in the signification of נִמְלְצוּ (Ps. 119:103), would suit very well: how smooth, delicate, sweet, are, etc. (Hirz., Ew., Schlottm.); but this meaning does not suit Job 16:3. Hupfeld, by comparison with מַר, bitter, translates: *quantumvis acerba;* but מָה may signify *quidquid,* though not *quantumvis.* Hahn compares the Arabic verb to be sick, and translates: in what respect are right words bad; but physical disease and ethical badness are not such nearly related ideas. Ebrard: honest words are not taken amiss; but with an inadmissible application of Job 16:3. Von Gerl. is best: how strong or forcible are, etc. מָרַץ is taken as related to פָּרַץ, in the signification to penetrate; *Hiph.* to goad; *Niph.* to be furnished with the property of penetrating,—used here of penetrating speech; 1 Kings 2:8, of a curse inevitably carried out; Mic. 2:10, of unsparing destruction. Words which keep the straight way to truth, go to the heart; on the contrary, what avails the reproving from you, i.e., which proceeds from you? הוֹכֵחַ, *inf. absol.* as Prov. 25:27, and in but a few other passages as subject; מִכֶּם, as Job 5:15, the sword going forth out of their mouth. In 26*b* the *waw* introduces a subordinate adverbial clause: while, however, the words of one in despair belong to the wind, that they may be carried away by it, not to the judgment which retains and analyzes them, without considering the mood of which they are the hasty expression. The *futt.* express the extent to which their want of feeling would go, if the circumstances for it only existed; they are subjunctive, as Job 3:13, 16. גּוֹרָל, the lot, is to be supplied to תַּפִּילוּ, as 1 Sam. 14:42. The verb כָּרָה, however, does not here signify to dig, so that שַׁחַת, a pit, should be supplied (Heiligst.), still less: dig out earth, and cast it on any one (Ebrard); but has the signification of buying and selling with עַל of the object, exactly like Job 40:30.

28 *And now be pleased to observe me keenly,*
I will not indeed deceive you to your face.
29 *Try it again, then: let there be no injustice;*
Try it again, my righteousness still stands.
30 *Is there wrong on my tongue?*
Or shall not my palate discern iniquity?

Job 6:28–30. He begs them to observe him more closely; פָּנָה בְּ, as Eccl. 2:11, to observe scrutinizingly. אִם is the sign of negative asseveration (Ges. § 155, 2, *f*). He will not indeed shamelessly give them the lie, viz., in respect to the greatness and inexplicableness of his suffering. The challenging שׁוּבוּ we do not translate: retrace your steps, but: begin afresh, to which both the following clauses are better suited. So Schlottm. and von Gerlach. Hahn retains the *Chethib* שׁובי, in the signification: my answer; but that is impossible: to answer is הֵשִׁיב, not שׁוּב. The עוד drawn to שׁובו by *Rebia mugrasch* is more suitably joined with צדקי־בה, in which בָּהּ refers neutrally to the matter of which it treats. They are to try from the beginning to find that comfort which will meet the case. Their accusations are עַוְלָה; his complaints, on the contrary, are fully justified. He does not grant that the outburst of his feeling of pain (Job 3) is עַוְלָה: he has not so completely lost his power against temptation, that he would not restrain himself, if he should

fall into הַוּוֹת. Thus wickedness, which completely contaminates feeling and utterance, is called (Ps. 52:4).

Job now endeavours anew to justify his complaints by turning more away from his friends and more towards God, but without penetrating the darkness in which God, the author of his suffering, is veiled from him.

1 *Has not a man warfare upon earth,*
And his days are like the days of a hireling?
2 *Like a servant who longs for the shade,*
And like a hireling who waits for his wages,
3 *So am I made to possess months of disappointment,*
And nights of weariness are appointed to me.

JOB 7

Job 7:1–3. The conclusion is intended to be: thus I wait for death as refreshing and rest after hard labour. He goes, however, beyond this next point of comparison, or rather he remains on this side of it. צָבָא is not service of a labourer in the field, but active military service, then fatigue, toil in general (Isa. 40:20; Dan. 10:1). V. 2 Ewald and others translate incorrectly: as a slave longs, etc. כְּ can never introduce a comparative clause, except an infinitive, as e.g., Isa. 5:24, which can then under the regimen of this כְּ be continued by a *verb. fin.;* but it never stands directly for כַּאֲשֶׁר, as כְּמוֹ does in rare instances. In v. 3, שָׁוְא retains its primary signification, nothingness, error, disappointment (Job 15:31): months that one after another disappoint the hope of the sick. By this it seems we ought to imagine the friends as not having come at the very commencement of his disease. Elephantiasis is a disease which often lasts for years, and slowly but inevitably destroys the body. On מנוּ, *adnumeraverunt = adnumeratae sunt,* vid., Ges. § 137, 3*.

4 *If I lie down, I think:*
When shall I arise and the evening break away?
And I become weary with tossing to and fro unto the morning dawn.
5 *My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of earth;*
My skin heals up to fester again.
6 *My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,*
And vanish without hope.

Job 7:4–6. Most modern commentators take מִדַּד as *Piel* from מָדַד: the night is extended (Renan: *la nuit se prolonge*), which is possible; comp. Ges. § 52, 2. But the metre suggests another rendering: מִדַּד constr. of מִדָּד from נָדַד, to flee away: and when fleeing away of the evening. The night is described by its commencement, the late evening, to make the long interval of the sleeplessness and restlessness of the invalid prominent. In נדדים and מדד there is a play of words (Ebrard). רִמָּה, worms, in reference to the putrifying ulcers; and גּוֹשׁ (with גּ זעירא), clod of earth, from the cracked, scaly, earth-coloured skin of one suffering with elephantiasis. The *praett.* are used of that which is past and still always present, the *futt. consec.* of that which follows in and with the other. The skin heals, רָגַע (which we render with Ges., Ew., *contrahere se*); the result is that it becomes moist again. יִמָּאֵס, according to Ges. § 67, rem. 4 = יִמַּס, Ps. 58:8. His days pass swiftly away; the result is that they come to an end without any hope whatever. אֶרֶג is like κερκίς, *radius,* a weaver's shuttle, by means of which the weft is shot between the threads of the warp as they are drawn up and down. His days pass as swiftly by as the little shuttle passes backwards and forwards in the warp.

Next follows a prayer to God for the termination of his pain, since there is no second life after the present, and consequently also the possibility of requital ceases with death.

7 *Remember that my life is a breath,*
That my eye will never again look on prosperity.

8 *The eye that looketh upon me seeth me no more;*
Thine eyes look for me,—I am no more!
9 *The clouds are vanished and passed away,*
So he that goeth down to Sheôl cometh not up.
10 *He returneth no more to his house,*
And his place knoweth him no more.
11 *Therefore I will not curb my mouth;*
I will speak in the anguish of my spirit;
I will complain in the bitterness of my soul.

Job 7:7–11. We see good, i.e., prosperity and joy, only in the present life. It ends with death. שׁוּב with לְ *infin.* is a synonym of הוֹסִיף, Job 20:9. No eye (עַיִן *femin.*) which now sees me (prop. eye of my seer, as Gen. 16:13, comp. Job 20:7, Ps. 31:12, for רֹאֵנִי, Isa. 29:15, or רֹאָנִי, Isa. 47:10; according to another reading, רֹאִי: no eye of seeing, i.e., no eye with the power of seeing, from רֹאִי, vision) sees me again, even if thy eyes should be directed towards me to help me; my life is gone, so that I can no more be the subject of help. For from *Sheôl* there is no return, no resurrection (comp. Ps. 103:16 for the expression); therefore will I at least give free course to my thoughts and feelings (comp. Ps. 77:4, Isa. 38:15, for the expression). The גַּם, v. 11, is the so-called גם *talionis;* the parallels cited by Michalis are to the point, Ezek. 16:43, Mal. 2:9, Ps. 52:7. Here we first meet with the name of the lower world; and in the book of Job we learn the ancient Israelitish conception of it more exactly than anywhere else. We have here only to do with the name in connection with the grammatical exposition. שְׁאוֹל (usually *gen. fem.*) is now almost universally derived from שָׁאַל = שָׁעַל, to be hollow, to be deepened; and aptly so, for they imagined the *Sheôl* as under ground, as Num. 16:30, 33 alone shows, on which account even here, as from Gen. 37:35 onwards, יָרַד שְׁאוֹלָה is everywhere used. It is, however, open to question whether this derivation is correct: at least passages like Isa. 5:14, Hab. 2:5, Prov. 30:15f., show that in the later usage of the language, שָׁאַל, to demand, was thought of in connection with it; derived from which *Sheôl* signifies (1) the appointed inevitable and inexorable demanding of everything earthly (an infinitive noun like אֱלוֹהַּ, פְּקוֹד); (2) conceived of as space, the place of shadowy duration whither everything on earth is demanded; (3) conceived of according to its nature, the divinely appointed fury which gathers in and engulfs everything on the earth. Job knows nothing of a demanding back, a redemption from *Sheôl.*

12 *Am I a sea or a sea-monster,*
That thou settest a watch over me?
13 *For I said, My bed shall comfort me;*
My couch shall help me to bear my complaint.
14 *Then thou scaredst me with dreams,*
And thou didst wake me up in terror from visions,
15 *So that my soul chose suffocation,*
Death rather than this skeleton.
16 *I loathe it, I would not live alway;*
Let me alone, for my days are breath.

Job 7:12–16. Since a watch on the sea can only be designed to effect the necessary precautions at its coming forth from the shores, it is probable that the poet had the Nile in mind when he used יָם, and consequently the crocodile by תַּנִּין. The Nile is also called יָם in Isa. 19:5, and in Homer ὠκεανός, Egyptian *oham* (= ὠκεανός), and is even now called (at least by the Bedouins) *bahhr* (Arab. *baḥr*). The illustrations of the book, says von Gerlach correctly, are chiefly Egyptian. On the contrary, Hahn thinks the illustration is unsuitable of the Nile, because it is not watched on account of its danger, but its utility; and Schlottman thinks it even small and contemptible without assigning a reason. The figure is, however, appropriate. As watches are set to keep the Nile in channels as soon as it breaks forth, and as men are set to watch that

they may seize the crocodile immediately he moves here or there; so Job says all his movements are checked at the very commencement, and as soon as he desires to be more cheerful he feels the pang of some fresh pain. In v. 13, ב after נָשָׂא is partitive, as Num. 11:17; Mercier correctly: *non nihil querelam meam levabit.* If he hopes for such repose, it forthwith comes to nought, since he starts up affrighted from his slumber. Hideous dreams often disturb the sleep of those suffering with elephantiasis, says Avicenna (in Stickel, S. 170). Then he desires death; he wishes that his difficulty of breathing would increase to suffocation, the usual end of elephantiasis. מַחֲנַק is absolute (without being obliged to point it מַחֲנָק with Schlottm.), as e.g., מִרְמַס, Isa. 10:6 (Ewald, § 160, *c*). He prefers death to these his bones, i.e., this miserable skeleton or framework of bone to which he is wasted away. He despises, i.e., his life, Job 9:21. Amid such suffering he would not live for ever. הֶבֶל, like רוּחַ, v. 7.

17 *What is man that Thou magnifiest him,*
And that Thou turnest Thy heart toward him,
18 *And visitest him every morning,*
Triest him every moment?
19 *How long dost Thou not look away from me,*
Nor lettest me alone till I swallow down my spittle?

Job 7:17–19. The questions in v. 17f. are in some degree a parody on Ps. 8:5, comp. 144:3, Lam. 3:23. There it is said that God exalts puny man to a kingly and divine position among His creatures, and distinguishes him continually with new tokens of His favour; here, that instead of ignoring him, He makes too much of him, by selecting him, perishable as he is, as the object of ever new and ceaseless sufferings. כַּמָּה, *quamdiu,* v. 19, is construed with the *praet.* instead of the *fut.:* how long will it continue that Thou turnest not away Thy look of anger from me? as the synonymous עַד־מָתַי, *quousque,* is sometimes construed with the *praet.* instead of the *fut.,* e.g., Ps. 80:5. "Until I swallow my spittle" is a proverbial expression for the minimum of time.

20 *Have I sinned—what could I do to Thee?!*
O Observer of men,
Why dost Thou make me a mark to Thee,
And am I become a burden to Thee?
21 *And why dost Thou not forgive my transgression,*
And put away my iniquity?
For now I will lay myself in the dust,
And Thou seekest for me, and I am no more.

Job 7:20, 21. "I have sinned" is hypothetical (Ges. § 155, 4, *a*): granted that I have sinned. According to Ewald and Olsh., מה אפעל־לך defines it more particularly: I have sinned by what I have done to Thee, in my behaviour towards Thee; but how tame and meaningless such an addition would be! It is an inferential question: what could I do to Thee? i.e., what harm, or also, since the *fut.* may be regulated by the *praet.:* what injury have I thereby done to Thee? The thought that human sin, however, can detract nothing from the blessedness and glory of God, underlies this. With a measure of sinful bitterness, Job calls God נצר האדם, the strict and constant observer of men, *per convicium fere,* as Gesenius not untruly observes, nevertheless without a breach of *decorum divinum* (Renan: *O Espion de l'homme*), since the appellation, in itself worthy of God (Isa. 27:3), is used here only somewhat unbecomingly. מִפְגָּע is not the target for shooting at, which is rather מַטָּרָה (Job 16:12, Lam 3:12), but the object on which one rushes with hostile violence (פָּגַע בְּ). Why, says Job, hast Thou made me the mark of hostile attack, and why am I become a burden to Thee? It is not so in our text; but according to Jewish tradition, עָלַי, which we now have, is only a תקון סופרים, *correctio scribarum,* [75] for עליך, which was removed as bordering on blasphemy: why am I become a burden to Thee, so that Thou

shouldest seek to get rid of me? This reading I should not consider as the original, in spite of the tradition, if it were not confirmed by the LXX, εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ φορτίον.

Here Job's second speech ends; it consists of two parts, which the division of chapters has correctly marked. The first part is addressed to the friends (nowhere specially to Eliphaz), because Job at once considers the address of Eliphaz as at the same time an expression of the thoughts and disposition of the two others who remain silent. In the second part he turns direct to God with his complaints, desponding inquiries, and longing for the alleviation of his sufferings before his approaching end. The correct estimate of this second speech of Job depends upon the right understanding of that of Eliphaz. It is not to be supposed that Job in this speech makes too much of his dignity and merit, as that he intends expressly to defend his innocence, or even enter into the controversy (Ew., Löwenth.); for Eliphaz does not at present go so far as to explain his suffering as the suffering commonly inflicted as punishment. When Job (Job 6:10) incidentally says that he does not disown the words of the Holy One, it does not imply that his sufferings may be chastisement: on the contrary, Job even allows the possibility that he should sin; but since his habitual state is fidelity to God, this assumption is not sufficient to account for his suffering, and he does not see why God should so unmercifully visit such sinfulness instead of pardoning it (Job 7:20, 21).

It is not to be objected, that he who is fully conscious of sin cannot consider the strictest divine punishment even of the smallest sin unjust. The suffering of one whose habitual state is pleasing to God, and who is conscious of the divine favour, can never be explained from, and measured according to, his infirmities: the infirmities of one who trusts in God, or the believer, and the severity of the divine justice in the punishment of sin, have no connection with one another. Consequently, when Eliphaz bids Job regard his affliction as chastisement, Job is certainly in the wrong to dispute with God concerning the magnitude of it: he would rather patiently yield, if his faith could apprehend the salutary design of God in his affliction; but after his affliction once seems to him to spring from wrath and enmity, and not from the divine purpose of mercy, after the phantom of a hostile God is come between him and the brightness of the divine countenance, he cannot avoid falling into complaint of unmercifulness. For this the speech of Eliphaz is in itself not to blame: he had most feelingly described to him God's merciful purpose in this chastisement, but he is to blame for not having taken the right tone.

The speech of Job is directed against the unsympathetic and reproving tone which the friends, after their long silence, have assumed immediately upon his first manifestation of anguish. He justifies to them his complaint (Job 3) as the natural and just outburst of his intense suffering, desires speedy death as the highest joy with which God could reward his piety, complains of his disappointment in his friends, from whom he had expected affectionate solace, but by whom he sees he is now forsaken, and earnestly exhorts them to acknowledge the justice of his complaint (Job 6). But can they? Yes, they might and should. For Job thinks he is no longer an object of divine favour: an inward conflict, which is still more terrible than hell, is added to his outward suffering. For the damned must give glory to God, because they recognise their suffering as just punishment: Job, however, in his suffering sees the wrath of God, and still is at the same time conscious of his innocence. The faith which, in the midst of his exhaustion of body and soul, still knows and feels God to be merciful, and can call him "my God," like Asaph in Ps. 73, —this faith is well-nigh overwhelmed in Job by the thought that God is his enemy, his pains the arrows of God. The assumption is false, but on this assumption Job's complaints (Job 3) are relatively just, including, what he himself says, that they are mistaken, thoughtless words of one in despair. But that despair is sin, and therefore also those curses and despairing inquiries!

Is not Eliphaz, therefore, in the right? His whole treatment is wrong. Instead of distinguishing between the complaint of his suffering and the complaint of God in Job's outburst of anguish, he puts them together, without recognising the complaint of his suffering to be the natural and unblamable result of its extraordinary magnitude, and as a sympathizing friend falling in with it. But with regard to the complaints of God, Eliphaz, acting as though careful for his spiritual welfare, ought not to have met them with his reproofs, especially as the words of one heavily afflicted deserve indulgence and delicate treatment; but he should have combated their false assumption. First, he should have said to Job, "Thy complaints of thy suffering are just, for thy suffering is incomparably great." In the next place, "Thy cursing thy birth, and thy complaint of God who has given thee thy life, might seem just if it were true that God has rejected thee; but that is not true: even in suffering He designs thy good; the greater the suffering, the greater the glory." By this means Eliphaz should have calmed Job's despondency, so as to destroy his false assumption; but he begins wrongly, and consequently what he says at last so truly and beautifully respecting the glorious issue of a patient endurance of chastisement, makes no impression on Job. He has not fanned the faintly burning wick, but his speech is a cold and violent breath which is calculated entirely to extinguish it.

After Job has defended the justice of his complaints against the insensibility of the friends, he gives way anew to lamentation. Starting from the wearisomeness of human life in general, he describes the greatness of his own suffering, which has received no such recognition on the part of the friends: it is a restless, torturing death without hope (Job 7:1–6). Then he turns to God: O remember that there is no second life after death, and that I am soon gone for ever; therefore I will utter my woe without restraint (Job 7:7–11). Thus far (from Job 6:1 onwards) I find in Job's speech no trace of blasphemous or sinful despair. When he says (Job 6:8–12), How I would rejoice if God, whose word I have never disowned, would grant me my request, and end my life, for I can no longer bear my suffering,—I cannot with Ewald see in its despair rising to madness, which (Job 7:10) even increases to frantic joy. For Job's disease was indeed really in the eyes of men as hopeless as he describes it. In an incurable disease, however, imploring God to hasten death, and rejoicing at the thought of approaching dissolution, is not a sin, and is not to be called despair, inasmuch as one does not call giving up all hope of recovery despair.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the book of Job is an oriental book, and therefore some allowance must be made of the intensity and strength of conception of the oriental nature: then that it is a poetical book, and that frenzy and madness may not be also understood by the intensified expression in which poetry, which idealizes the real, clothes pain and joy: finally, that it is an Old Testament book, and that in the Old Testament the fundamental nature of man is indeed sanctified, but not yet subdued; the spirit shines forth as a light in a dark place, but the day, the ever constant consciousness of favour and life, has not yet dawned. The desire of a speedy termination of life (Job 6:8–12) is in Job 7:7–11 softened down even to a request for an alleviation of suffering, founded on this, that death terminates life for ever. In the Talmud (*b. Bathra,* 16, *a*) it is observed, on this passage, that Job denies the resurrection of the dead (מכאן שכפר איוב בתחיים המתים); but Job knows nothing of a resurrection of the dead, and what one knows not, one cannot deny. He knows only that after death, the end of the present life, there is no second life in this world, only a being in *Sheôl,* which is only an apparent existence = no existence, in which all praise of God is silent, because He no longer reveals himself there as to the living in this world (Ps. 6:6, 30:10, 88:11–13, 115:17). From this chaotic conception of the other side of the grave, against which even the psalmists still struggle, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead had not been set forth at the time of Job,

and of the author of the book of Job. The restoration of Israel buried in exile (Ezek. 37) first gave the impulse to it; and the resurrection of the Prince of Life, who was laid in the grave, set the seal upon it. The resurrection of Jesus Christ was first of all the actual overthrow of Hades.

Mortis seu inferni, observes Brentius, in accordance with Scriptures, *ea conditio est, ut natura sua quoscunque comprehenderit tantisper teneat nec dimittat, dum Christus, filius Dei, morte ad infernum descenderit, h.e. perierit; per hunc enim devicta morte et inferno liberantur quotquot fide renovati sunt.* This great change in the destiny of the dead was incomplete, and the better hope which became brighter and brighter as the advent of death's Conqueror drew near was not yet in existence. For if after death, or what is the same thing, after the descent into *Sheôl,* there was only a non-existence for Job, it is evident that on the one hand he can imagine a life after death only as a return to the present world (such a return does, however, not take place), on the other hand that no divine revelation said anything to him of a future life which should infinitely compensate for a return to the present world. And since he knows nothing of a future existence, it can consequently not be said that he denies it: he knows nothing of it, and even his dogmatizing friends have nothing to tell him about it. We shall see by and by, how the more his friends torment him, the more he is urged on in his longing for a future life; but the word of revelation, which could alone change desire into hope, is wanting. The more tragic and heart-rending Job's desire to be freed by death from his unbearable suffering is, the more touching and importunate is his prayer that God may consider that now soon he can no longer be an object of His mercy. Just the same request is found frequently in the Psalms, e.g., Ps. 89:48, comp. 103:14–16: it involves nothing that is opposed to the Old Testament fear of God. Thus far we can trace nothing of frenzy and madness, and of despair only in so far as Job has given up the hope (נואש) of his restoration,—not however of real despair, in which a man impatiently and forcibly snaps asunder the bond of trust which unites him to God. If the poet had anywhere made Job to go to such a length in despair, he would have made Satan to triumph over him.

Now, however, the last two strophes follow in which Job is hurried forward to the use of sinful language, Job 7:12–16: Am I a sea or a sea-monster, etc.; and Job 7:17–21: What is man, that thou accountest him so great, etc. We should nevertheless be mistaken if we thought there were sin here in the expressions by which Job describes God's hostility against himself. We may compare e.g., Lam. 3:9, 10: "He hath enclosed my ways with hewn stone, He hath made any paths crooked; He is to me as a bear lying in wait, a lion in the thicket." It is, moreover, not Job's peculiar sin that he thinks God has changed to an enemy against him; that is the view which comes from his vision being beclouded by the conflict through which he is passing, as is frequently the case in the Psalms. His sin does not even consist in the inquiries, How long? and Wherefore? The Psalms in that case would abound in sin. But the sin is that he dwells upon these doubting questions, and thus attributes apparent mercilessness and injustice to God. And the friends constantly urge him on still deeper in this sin, the more persistently they attribute his suffering to his own unrighteousness. Jeremiah (in ch. 3 of the Lamentations), after similar complaints, adds: Then I repeated this to my heart, and took courage from it: the mercies of Jehovah, they have no end; His compassions do not cease, etc. Many of the Psalms that begin sorrowfully, end in the same way; faith at length breaks through the clouds of doubt. But it should be remembered that the change of spiritual condition which, e.g., in Ps. 6, is condensed to the narrow limits of a lyric composition of eleven verses, is here in Job worked out with dramatical detail as a passage of his life's history: his faith, once so heroic, only smoulders under ashes; the friends, instead of fanning it to a flame, bury it still deeper, until at

last it is set free from its bondage by Jehovah himself, who appears in the whirlwind.

JOB 8

Bildad's First Speech.—Ch. 8

[Then began Bildad the Shuhite, and said:]

2 *How long wilt thou utter such things,*
And the words of thy mouth are a boisterous wind?
3 *Will God reverse what is right,*
Or the Almighty reverse what is just?
4 *When thy children sinned against Him,*
He gave them over to the hand of their wickedness.

Job 8:2–4. Bildad[77] begins harshly and self-confidently with *quousque tandem,* עַד־אָן instead of the usual עַד־אָנָה. אֵלֶּה, not: this, but: of this kind, of such kind, as Job 12:3, 16:2. רוּחַ כַּבִּיר is poetical, equivalent to רוּחַ גְּדוֹלָה, Job 1:19; רוּחַ is *gen. comm.* in the signification wind as well as spirit, although more frequently *fem.* than *masc.* He means that Job's speeches are like the wind in their nothingness, and like a boisterous wind in their vehemence. Bildad sees the justice of God, the Absolute One, which ought to be universally acknowledged, impugned in them. In order not to say directly that Job's children had died such a sudden death on account of their sin, he speaks conditionally. If they have sinned, death is just the punishment of their sin. God has not arbitrarily swept them away, but has justly given them over to the destroying hand of their wickedness,—a reference to the prologue which belongs inseparably to the whole.

5 *If thou seekest unto God,*
And makest supplication to the Almighty,
6 *If thou art pure and upright;*
Surely! He will care for thee,
And restore the habitation of thy righteousness;
7 *And if thy beginning was small,*
Thy end shall be exceeding great.

Job 8:5–7. There is still hope for Job (אַתָּה, in opposition to his children), if, turning humbly to God, he shows that, although not suffering undeservedly, he is nevertheless pure and upright in his inmost mind. V. 6*a* is so intended; not as Mercier and others explain: *si in posterum puritati et justitiae studueris.* שְׁחַר אֶל־אֵל, to turn one's self to God earnestly seeking, *constr. praegnans,* like דָּרַשׁ אֶל־אֵל, Job 5:8. Then begins the conclusion with כִּי־עַתָּה, like Job 13:18. "The habitation of thy righteousness" is Job's household cleansed and justified from sin. God will restore that; שִׁלַּם might also signify, give peace to, but restore is far more appropriate. Completely falling back on שָׁלֵם, the *Piel* signifies to recompense, off like being returned for like, and to restore, of a complete covering of the loss sustained. God will not only restore, but increase beyond measure, what Job was and had. The *verb. masc.* after אַחֲרִית here is remarkable. But we need not, with Olsh., read יַשְׂגֶּה: we may suppose, with Ewald, according to 174, *e,* that אחרית is purposely treated as *masc.* It would be a mistake to refer to Prov. 23:32, 29:21, in support of it.

8 *For inquire only of former ages,*
And attend to the research of their fathers—
9 *For we are of yesterday, without experience,*
Because our days upon earth are a shadow—
10 *Shall they not teach thee, speak to thee,*
And bring forth words from their heart?

Job 8:8–10. This challenge calls Deut. 32:7 to mind. לִבְּךָ is to be supplied to כּוֹנֵן; the conjecture of Olshausen, וּבוֹנֵן, is good, but unnecessary. רִישׁוֹן is after the Aramaic form of writing, comp. Job 15:7, where this and the ordinary form are combined. The "research of their fathers," i.e., which the fathers of former generations have bequeathed to them, is the collective result of their research, the profound wisdom of the ancients gathered from experience. Our

ephemeral and shadowy life is not sufficient for passing judgment on the dealings of God; we must call history and tradition to our aid. We are תְּמוֹל (*per aphaeresin,* the same as אֶתְמוֹל), yesterday = of yesterday; it is not necessary to read, with Olshausen, מִתְּמוֹל. There is no occasion for us to suppose that v. 9 is an antithesis to the long duration of life of primeval man. לֵב (v. 10) is not the antithesis of mouth; but has the pregnant signification of a feeling, i.e., intelligent heart, as we find אִישׁ לֵבָב, a man of heart, i.e., understanding, Job 34:10, 34. יוֹצִיאוּ, *promunt,* calls to mind Matt. 13:52. Now follow familiar sayings of the ancients, not directly quoted, but the wisdom of the fathers, which Bildad endeavours to reproduce.

11 *Doth papyrus grow up without mire?*
Doth the reed shoot up without water?
12 *It is still in luxuriant verdure, when it is not cut off, Then before all other grass it withereth.*
13 *So is the way of all forgetters of God,*
And the hope of the ungodly perisheth,
14 *Because his hope is cut off,*
And his trust is a spider's house:
15 *He leaneth upon his house and it standeth not,*
He holdeth fast to it and it endureth not.

Job 8:11–15. Bildad likens the deceitful ground on which the prosperity of the godless stands to the dry ground on which, only for a time, the papyrus or reed finds water, and grows up rapidly: shooting up quickly, it withers as quickly; as the papyrus plant,[78] if it has no perpetual water, though the finest of grasses, withers off when most luxuriantly green, before it attains maturity. גֹּמֶא, which, excepting here, is found only in connection with Egypt (Ex. 2:3, Isa. 18:2; and Isa. 35:7, with the general קָנֶה as specific name for reed), is the proper papyrus plant *(Cypērus papȳrus,* L.): this name for it is suitably derived in the Hebrew from גָּמָא, to suck up (comp. Lucan, iv. 136: *conseritur bibulâ Memphytis cymba papyro*); but is at the same time Egyptian, since Coptic *kam, cham,* signifies the reed, and *'gôm, 'gōme,* a book (like *liber,* from the bark of a tree).[79] אָחוּ, occurring only in the book of Job and in the history of Joseph, as Jerome (*Opp. ed. Vallarsi,* iv. 291) learned from the Egyptians, signifies in their language, *omne quod in palude virem nascitur:* the word is transferred by the LXX into their translation in the form ἄχι ἄχει), and became really incorporated into the Alexandrian Greek, as is evident from Isa. 19:7 (ערות, LXX καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν) and Sir. 40:16 (ἄχι ἐπὶ παντὸς ὕδατος καὶ χείλους ποταμοῦ πρὸ παντὸς χόρτου ἐκτιλήσεται); the Coptic translates *pi-akhi,* and moreover *ake, oke* signify in Coptic *calamus, juncus.* [80]

לֹא יִקָּטֵף describes its condition: in a condition in which it is not ready for being gathered. By אֲשֶׁר, *quippe, quoniam,* this end of the man who forgets God, and of the חָנֵף, i.e., the secretly wicked, is more particularly described. His hope יִקּוֹט, from קָטַט, or from קוֹט, *med. o,* [81] in neuter signification *succiditur.* One would indeed expect a figure corresponding to the spider's web earlier; and accordingly Hahn, after Reiske, translates: whose hope is a gourd,—an absurd figure, and linguistically impossible, since the gourd or cucumber is קִשּׁוּא, which has its cognates in Arabic and Syriac. Saadia[82] translates: whose hope is the thread of the sun. The "thread of the sun" is what we call the *fliegender Sommer* or *Altweibersommer,* [i.e., the sunny days in the latter months of the year]: certainly a suitable figure, but unsupportable by any parallel in language.[83] We must therefore suppose that יִקּוֹט, *succiditur,* first gave rise to the figure which follows: as easily as a spider's web is cut through, without offering any resistance, by the lightest touch, or a breath of wind, so that on which he depends and trusts is cut asunder. The name for spider's web, בֵּית עַכָּבִישׁ,[84] leads to the description of the prosperity of the ungodly by בַּיִת (v. 15): His house, the spider's house, is not firm to him. Another figure follows: the

wicked in his prosperity is like a climbing plant, which grows luxuriantly for a time, but suddenly perishes.

16 *He dwells with sap in the sunshine,*
And his branch spreads itself over his garden.
17 *His roots intertwine over heaps of stone,*
He looks upon a house of stones.
18 *If He casts him away from his place,*
It shall deny him: I have not seen thee.
19 *Behold, thus endeth his blissful course,*
And others spring forth from the dust.

Job 8:16–19. The subject throughout is not the creeping-plant directly, but the ungodly, who is likened to it. Accordingly the expression of the thought is in part figurative and in part literal, בֵּית אֲבָנִים יֶחֱזֶה (v. 17*b*). As the creeper has stones before it, and by its interwindings, as it were, so rules them that it may call them its own (v. Gerlach: the exuberant growth twines itself about the walls, and looks proudly down upon the stony structure); so the ungodly regards his fortune as a solid structure, which he has quickly caused to spring up, and which seems to him imperishable. Ewald translates: he separates one stone from another; בֵּית, according to § 217, *g,* he considers equivalent to בֵּינַת, and signifies apart from one another; but although חָזָה = חָזַז, according to its radical idea, may signify to split, pierce through, still בֵּית, when used as a preposition, can signify nothing else but, within. Others, e.g., Rosenmüller, translate: he marks a place of stones, i.e., meets with a layer of stones, against which he strikes himself; for this also בֵּית will not do. He who casts away (v. 18) is not the house of stone, but God. He who has been hitherto prosperous, becomes now as strange to the place in which he flourished so luxuriantly, as if it had never seen him. Behold, that is the delight of his way (course of life), i.e., so fashioned, so perishable is it, so it ends. From the ground above which he sprouts forth, others grow up whose fate, when they have no better ground of confidence than he, is the same. After he has placed before Job both the blessed gain of him who trusts, and the sudden destruction of him who forgets, God, as the result of the whole, Bildad recapitulates:

20 *Behold! God despiseth not the perfect man,*
And taketh not evil-doers by the hand.
21 *While He shall fill thy mouth with laughing,*
And thy lips with rejoicing,
22 *They who hate thee shall be clothed with shame,*
And the tent of the ungodly is no more.

Job 8:20–22. "To take by the hand," i.e., ready to help as His own, as Isa. 41:13, 42:6. Instead of עַד (v. 21), there is no great difficulty in reading עוֹד: again (as e.g., Ps. 42:6) He will fill; but even עַד is supportable; it signifies, like Job 1:18, Ps. 141:10, while. On the form יְמַלֵּא, vid., Ges. § 75, 21, *b.* This close of Bildad's speech sounds quite like the Psalms (comp. Ps. 126:2 with v. 21; Ps. 35:26, 109:29, 132:18, with v. 22). Bildad does all he can to win Job over. He calls the ungodly שֹׂנְאֶיךָ, to show that he tries to think and expect the best of Job.

We have seen that Job in his second speech charges God with the appearance of injustice and want of compassion. The friends act as friends, by not allowing this to pass without admonition. After Job has exhausted himself with his plaints, Bildad enters into the discussion in the above speech. He defends the justice of God against Job's unbecoming words. His assertion that God does not swerve from the right, is so true that it would be blasphemy to maintain against him that God sometimes perverts the right. And Bildad seems also to make the right use of this truth when he promises a glorious issue to his suffering, as a substantial proof that God does not deal unjustly towards him; for Job's suffering does actually come to such an issue, and this issue in its accomplishment destroys the false appearance that God had been unjust or unmerciful towards him. Bildad expresses his main point still more prudently, and more in

accordance with the case before him, when he says, "Behold! God does not act hostilely towards the godly, neither does He make common cause with the evil-doer" (v. 20),—a confession which he must allow is on both sides the most absolute truth. By the most telling figures he portrays the perishableness of the prosperity of those who forget God, and paints in glowing colours on this dark background the future which awaits Job. What is there in this speech of Bildad to censure, and how is it that it does not produce the desired cheering effect on Job?

It is true that nothing that God sends to man proceeds from injustice, but it is not true that everything that He sends to him comes from His justice. As God does not ordain suffering for the hardened sinner in order to *improve* him, because He is *merciful,* so He does not ordain suffering for the truly godly in order to *punish* him, because He is *just.* What we call God's attributes are only separate phases of His indivisible holy being,—*ad extra,* separate modes of His operation in which they all share,—of which, when in operation, one does not act in opposition to another; they are not, however, all engaged upon the same object at one time. One cannot say that God's love manifests itself in action in hell, nor His anger in heaven; nor His justice in the afflictions of the godly, and His mercy in the sufferings of the godless.

Herein is Bildad's mistake, that he thinks his commonplace utterance is sufficient to explain all the mysteries of human life. We see from his judgment of Job's children how unjust he becomes, since he regards the matter as the working out of divine justice. He certainly speaks hypothetically, but in such a way that he might as well have said directly, that their sudden death was the punishment of their sin. If he had found Job dead, he would have considered him as a sinner, whom God had carried off in His anger. Even now he has no pleasure in promising Job help and blessing; accordingly from his point of view he expresses himself very conditionally: If thou art pure and upright. We see from this that his belief in Job's uprightness is shaken, for how could the All-just One visit Job with such severe suffering, if he had not deserved it! Nevertheless אם זך וישר אתה (v. 6) shows that Bildad thinks it possible that Job's heart may be pure and upright, and consequently his present affliction may not be peremptory punishment, but only disciplinary chastisement. Job just—such is Bildad's counsel—give God glory, and acknowledge that he deserves nothing better; and thus humbling himself beneath the just hand of God, he will be again made righteous, and exalted.

Job cannot, however, comprehend his suffering as an act of divine justice. His own fidelity is a fact, his consciousness of which cannot be shaken: it is therefore impossible for him to deny it, for the sake of affirming the justice of God; for truth is not to be supported by falsehood. Hence Bildad's glorious promises afford Job no comfort. Apart from their being awkwardly introduced, they depend upon an assumption, the truth of which Job cannot admit without being untrue to himself. Consequently Bildad, though with the best intention, only urges Job still further forward and deeper into the conflict.

But does, then, the confession of sin on the part of constantly sinful man admit of his regarding the suffering thus appointed to him not merely not as punishment, but also not as chastisement? If a sufferer acknowledges the excessive hideousness of sin, how can he, when a friend bids him regard his affliction as a wholesome chastisement designed to mortify sin more and more,—how can he receive the counsel with such impatience as we see in the case of Job? The utterances of Job are, in fact, so wild, inconsiderate, and unworthy of God, and the first speeches of Eliphaz and Bildad on the contrary so winning and appropriate, that if Job's affliction ought really to be regarded from the standpoint of chastisement, their tone could not be more to the purpose, nor exhortation and comfort more beautifully blended. Even when one knows the point of the book, one will still be constantly liable to be misled by the

speeches of the friends; it requires the closest attention to detect what is false in them. The poet's mastery of his subject, and the skill with which he exercises it, manifests itself in his allowing the opposition of the friends to Job, though existing in the germ from the very beginning, to become first of all in the course of the controversy so harsh that they look upon Job as a sinner undergoing punishment from God, while in opposition to them he affirms his innocence, and challenges a decision from God.

The poet, however, allows Bildad to make one declaration, from which we clearly see that his address, beautiful as it is, rests on a false basis, and loses its effect. Bildad explains the sudden death of Job's children as a divine judgment. He could not have sent a more wounding dart into Job's already broken heart; for is it possible to tell a man anything more heart-rending that that his father, his mother, or his children have died as the direct punishment of their sins? One would not say so, even if it should seem to be an obvious fact, and least of all to a father already sorely tried and brought almost to the grave with sorrow. Bildad, however, does not rely upon facts, he reasons only *à priori.* He does not know that Job's children were godless; the only ground of his judgment is the syllogism: Whoever dies a fearful, sudden death must be a great sinner; God has brought Job's children to such a death; ergo, etc. Bildad is zealously affected for God, but without understanding. He is blind to the truth of experience, in order not to be drawn away from the truth of his premiss. He does not like to acknowledge anything that furnishes a contradiction to it. It is this same rationalism of superstition or credulity which has originated the false doctrine of the *decretum absolutum.* With the same icy and unfeeling rigorism with which Calvinism refers the divine rule, and all that happens upon earth, to the one principle of absolute divine will and pleasure, in spite of all the contradictions of Scripture and experience, Bildad refers everything to the principle of the divine justice, and indeed, divine justice in a judicial sense.

There is also another idea of justice beside this judicial one. Justice, צדקה or צדק, is in general God's dealings as ruled by His holiness. Now there is not only a holy will of God concerning man, which says, Be ye holy, for I am holy; but also a purpose for the redemption of unholy man springing from the holy love of God to man. Accordingly justice is either the agreement of God's dealings with the will of His holiness manifest in the demands of the law, apart from redemption, or the agreement of His dealings with the will of His love as graciously manifested in the gospel; in short, either retributive or redemptive. If one, as Bildad, in the first sense says, God never acts unjustly, and glaringly maintains it as universally applicable, the mystery of the divine dispensations is not made clear thereby, but destroyed. Thus also Job's suffering is no longer a mystery: Job suffers what he deserves; and if it cannot be demonstrated, it is to be assumed in contradiction to all experience. This view of his affliction does not suffice to pacify Job, in spite of the glorious promises by which it is set off. His conscience bears him witness that he has not merited such incomparably heavy affliction; and if we indeed suppose, what we must suppose, that Job was in favour with God when this suffering came upon him, then the thought that God deals with him according to his works, perhaps according to his unacknowledged sins, must be altogether rejected.

God does not punish His own; and when He chastises them, it is not an act of His retributive justice, but of His disciplinary love. This motive of love, indeed, belongs to chastisement in common with trial; and the believer who clearly discerns this love will be able to look upon even the severest affliction as chastisement without being led astray, because he knows that sin has still great power in him; and the medicine, if it is designed to heal him, must be bitter. If, therefore, Bildad had represented Job's affliction as the chastisement of divine love, which would humble him in order the more to exalt him, then Job would have humbled

himself, although Bildad might not be altogether in the right. But Bildad, still further than Eliphaz from weakening the erroneous supposition of a hostile God which had taken possession of Job's mind, represents God's justice, to which he attributes the death of his children, instead of His love, as the hand under which Job is to humble himself. Thereby the comfort which Job's friend offers becomes to him a torture, and his trial is made still greater; for his conscience does not accuse him of any sins for which he should now have an angry instead of a gracious God.

But we cannot even here withhold the confession that the composition of such a drama would not be possible under the New Testament. The sight of the suffering of Christ and the future crown has a power in calming the mind, which makes such an outburst of sorrow as that of Job impossible even under the strongest temptation. "If the flesh should murmur and cry out, as Christ even cried out and was feeble," says Luther in one of his consolatory letters (Rambach, *Kleine Schriften Luthers,* S. 627), "the spirit nevertheless is ready and willing, and with sighings that cannot be uttered will cry: Abba, Father, it is Thou; Thy rod is hard, but Thou art still Father; I know that of a truth." And since the consciousness of sin is as deep as the consciousness of grace, the Christian will not consider any suffering so severe but that he may have deserved severer on account of his sins, even though in the midst of his cross he be unable clearly to recognise the divine love. Even such uncharitable, cold-hearted consolation as that of Eliphaz and Bildad, which bids him regard the divine trial as divine chastisement, cannot exasperate him, since he is conscious of the need for even severer divine chastisement; he need not therefore allow the uncharitableness of the friend to pass without loving counter-exhortations.

Hengstenberg observes, in the *Excursus* to his *Commentary on the Psalms,* that the righteousness on which the plea to be heard is based in the Psalms, like Ps. 17, 18:21ff., 44:18–23, is indeed a righteousness of conduct resting on righteousness by faith, and also this again is only to be considered as the righteousness of endeavour; that moreover their strong tone does not sound altogether becoming, according to our consciousness. We should expect each time, as it happens sometimes urgently (e.g., Ps. 143:2), the other side,—that human infirmity which still clings to the righteous should be made prominent, and divine forgiveness for it implored, instead of the plea for deliverance being based on the incongruity of the affliction with the sufferer's consciousness of righteousness towards God. We cannot altogether adopt such psalms and passages of the Psalms as expressive of our Christian feeling; and we are scarcely able to read them in public without hesitation when we attempt it. Whence is this? Hengstenberg replied, "The Old Testament wanted the most effectual means for producing the knowledge of sin—the contemplation of the sufferings of Christ. The New Testament, moreover, possesses a more powerful agency of the Spirit, which does not search more into the depths of the divine nature than it lays open the depths of sin. Hence in Christian songs the sense of sin, as it is more independent of outward occasions than formerly, so it is also more openly disclosed and more delicate in itself; its ground is felt to lie deeper, and also the particular manifestations. It was good that under the Old Covenant the cords of sinful conviction were not strung too rightly, as the full consolation was still not to be found. The gulph closed up again when the sufferings were gone."[85] Such is the actual connection. And this development of the work of redemption in the history of mankind is repeated in the individual experience of every believer. As the individual, the further he progresses in the divine life, becomes the more deeply conscious of the natural depravity of man, and acquires a keener and still keener perception of its most subtle working; so in the New Testament, with the disclosure of actual salvation, a deeper insight into sin is also given. When the infinite depth and extent of the kingdom of light is unveiled,

the veil is for the first time removed from the abyss of the kingdom of darkness. Had the latter been revealed without the former in the dispensation before Christ, the Old Testament would have been not only what it actually was in connection with the then painful consciousness of sin and death,—a school of severe discipline preparatory to the New Testament, a school of ardent longing for redemption,—but would have become an abyss of despair.

JOB 9

Job's Second Answer.—Ch. 9–10.

[Then Job began, and said:]

2 *Yea, indeed, I know it is thus,*
And how should a man be just with God!
3 *Should he wish to contend with God,*
He could not answer Him one of a thousand.
4 *The wise in heart and mighty in strength,*
Who hath defied Him and remained unhurt?

Job 9:2–4. Job does not (v. 1) refer to what Eliphaz said (Job 4:17), which is similar, though still not exactly the same; but "indeed I know it is so" must be supposed to be an assert to that which Bildad had said immediately before. The chief thought of Bildad's speech was, that God does not pervert what is right. Certainly (אָמְנָם, *scilicet, nimirum,* like Job 12:2),—says Job, as he ironically confirms this maxim of Bildad's,—it is so: what God does is always right, because God does it; how could man maintain that he is in the right in opposition to God! If God should be willing to enter into controversy with man, he would not be able to give Him information on one of a thousand subjects that might be brought into discussion; he would be so confounded, so disarmed, by reason of the infinite distance of the feeble creature from his Creator. The attributes (v. 4*a*) belong not to man (Olshausen), but to God, as Job 36:5. God is wise of heart (לֵב = νοῦς) in putting one question after another, and mighty in strength in bringing to nought every attempt man may make to maintain his own right; to defy Him (הִקְשָׁה, to harden, i.e., עֹרֶף, the neck), therefore, always tends to the discomfiture of him who dares to bid Him defiance.

5 *Who removeth mountains without their knowing,*
That He hath overturned them in His wrath;
6 *Who causeth the earth to shake out of its place,*
And its pillars to tremble;
7 *Who commandeth the sun, and it riseth not,*
And sealeth up the stars.

Job 9:5–7. וְלֹא יָדָעוּ (v. 5*a*) may also be translated: without one's perceiving it or knowing why; but it is more natural to take the mountains as the subject. אֲשֶׁר, *quod,* that (not "as," Ewald, § 333, *a*), after יָדַע, as Ezek. 20:26, Eccl. 8:12. Even the lofty mountains are quite unconscious of the change which He effects on them in a moment. Before they are aware that it is being done, it is over, as the *praet.* implies; the destructive power of His anger is irresistible, and effects its purpose suddenly. He causes the earth to start up from its place (comp. Isa. 13:13) which it occupies in space (Job 26:7); and by being thus set in motion by Him, its pillars tremble, i.e., its internal foundations (Ps. 104:5), which are removed from human perception (Job 38:6). It is not the highest mountains, which are rather called the pillars, as it were the supports, of heaven (Job 26:11), that are meant. By the same almighty will He disposes of the sun and stars. The sun is here called חֶרֶס (as in Judg. 14:18 חַרְסָה with unaccented *ah,* and as Isa. 19:18 *'Ir ha-Heres* is a play upon עִיר הַהֶרֶס, Ἡλιούπολις), perhaps from the same root as חָרוּץ, one of the poetical names of gold. At His command the sun rises not, and He seals up the stars, i.e., conceals them behind thick clouds, so that the day becomes dark, and the night is not made bright. One may with Schultens think of the Flood, or with Warburton of the Egyptian darkness, and the standing still of the sun at the word of Joshua; but these are only single historical

instances of a fact here affirmed as a universal experience of the divine power.

8 *Who alone spreadeth out the heavens,*
And walketh upon the heights of the sea;
9 *Who made the Bear, Orion, and the Pleiades,*
And the chambers of the south;
10 *Who doeth great things past finding out,*
And wondrous things without number.

Job 9:8–10. Ewald, Hirzel, and others, understand נֹטֶה (v. 8) according to Ps. 18:10: He letteth down the clouds of heaven, and walketh on the heights of the sea of clouds, i.e., high above the towering thunder-clouds. But parallel passages, such as Isa. 40:22, Ps. 104:2, and especially Isa. 44:24, show that v. 8*a* is to be understood as referring to the creation of the firmament of heaven; and consequently נטה is to be taken in the sense of *expandere,* and is a form of expression naturally occurring in connection with the mention of the waters which are separated by means of the רקיע. The question arises, whether יָם here means the sea of waters above the firmament or upon the earth. According to the idea of the ancients, the waters which descend as rain have their habitation far away in the infinite expanse of the sky; the ocean of the sky (Egyptian *Nun-pa*), through which the sun-god *Ra* sails every day, is there. It is possible that "the heights of the sea" here, and perhaps also "the roots of the sea" (Job 36:30), may mean this ocean of the sky, as Hahn and Schlottmann suppose. But it is not necessary to adopt such an explanation, and it is moreover hazardous, since this conception of the celestial θάλασσα is not found elsewhere (apart from Apoc. 4:6, 15:2, 22:1). Why may not בָּמֳתֵי, which is used of the heights of the clouds (Isa. 14:14), be used also of the waves of the sea which mount up towards heaven (Ps. 107:26)? God walks over them as man walks on level ground (LXX περιπατῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσσης ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους); they rise or lie calmly beneath His feel according to His almighty will (comp. Hab. 3:15).

Job next describes God as the Creator of the stars, by introducing a constellation of the northern (the Bear), one of the southern (Orion), and one of the eastern sky (the Pleiades). עָשׁ, contracted from נְעָשׁ, Arabic *na'š,* a bier, is the constellation of seven stars (*septentrio* or *septentriones*) in the northern sky. The Greater and the Lesser Bear form a square, which the Arabs regarded as a bier; the three other stars, *benâth n'asch,* i.e., daughters of the bier (comp. Job 38:32), seem to be the mourners. כְּסִיל is Orion chained to the sky, which the ancients regarded as a powerful giant, and also as an insolent, foolish fellow[86] (K. O. Müller, *Kleine deutsche Schriften,* ii. 125). כִּימָה is the Pleiades, a constellation consisting of seven large and other smaller stars, Arabic *turayyâ,* which, like the Hebrew (comp. Arab. *kûmat, cumulus*), signifies the heap, cluster (vid., Job 38:31), and is compared by the Persian poets to a bouquet formed of jewels. It is the constellation of seven stars, whose rising and setting determined the commencement and end of their voyages (πλειάς, probably = constellation of navigation), and is to be distinguished from the northern *septentriones.* חַדְרֵי תֵימָן are, according to the Targ., the chambers of the constellations on the south side of the heavens, as also most expositors explain them (Mercier: *sidera quae sunt in altero hemisphaerio versus alterum polum antarcticum*), according to which תֵּימָן, or written defectively תֶּמָן, would therefore be equivalent to כוכבי תמן; or perhaps, in a more general meaning, the regions of the southern sky (*penetralia*), which are veiled, or altogether lost to view (Hirzel). In v. 10, Job says, almost *verbatim,* what Eliphaz had said (Job 5:10). Job agrees with the friends in the recognition of the power of God, and intentionally describes those phases of it which display its terrible majesty. But while the friends deduce from this doctrine the duty of a humble deportment on the part of the sufferer, Job uses it to support the cheerless truth that human right can never be maintained in opposition to the absolute God.

11 *Behold, He goeth by me and I see not,*
And passeth by and I perceive Him not.
12 *Behold, He taketh away, who will hold Him back?*
Who will say to Him: What doest Thou?
13 *Eloah restraineth not His anger,*
The helpers of Rahab stoop under Him—
14 *How much less that I should address Him,*
That I should choose the right words in answer to Him;
15 *Because, though I were right, I could not answer,—*
To Him as my Judge I must make supplication.

Job 9:11–15. God works among men, as He works in nature, with a supreme control over all, invisibly, irresistibly, and is not responsible to any being (Isa. 45:9). He does not turn or restrain His anger without having accomplished His purpose. This is a proposition which, thus broadly expressed, is only partially true, as is evident from Ps. 78:38. The helpers of *Rahab* must bow themselves under Him. It is not feasible to understand this in a general sense, as meaning those who are ready with boastful arrogance to yield succour to any against God. The form of expression which follows in v. 14, "much less I," supports the assumption that עֹזְרֵי רַהַב refers to some well-known extraordinary example of wicked enterprise which had been frustrated, notwithstanding the gigantic strength by which it was supported; and שָׁחֲחוּ may be translated by the present tense, since a familiar fact is used as synonymous with the expression of an universal truth. Elsewhere *Rahab* as a proper name denotes Egypt (Ps. 87:4), but it cannot be so understood here, because direct references to events in the history of Israel are contrary to the character of the book, which, with remarkable consistency, avoids everything that is at all Israelitish. But how has Egypt obtained the name of *Rahab?* It is evident from Isa. 30:7 that it bears this name with reference to its deeds of prowess; but from Ps. 89:11, Isa. 51:9, it is evident that *Rahab* properly denotes a sea-monster, which has become the symbol of Egypt, like *tannîn* and *leviathan* elsewhere. This signification of the word is also supported by Job 26:12, where the LXX actually translate κητος, as here with remarkable freedom, ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐκάμφθησαν κήτη τὰ ὑπ᾽ οὐρανόν. It is not clear whether these "sea-monsters" denote rebels cast down into the sea beneath the sky, or chained upon the sky; but at any rate the consciousness of a distinct mythological meaning in עזרי רהב is expressed by this translation (as also in the still freer translation of Jerome, *et sub quo curvantur qui portant orbem*); probably a myth connected with such names of the constellations as Κῆτος and Πρίστις (Ewald, Hirz., Schlottm.). The poesy of the book of Job even in other places does not spurn mythological allusions; and the phrase before us reminds one of the Hindu myth of *Indras'* victory over the dark demon *Vritras,* who tries to delay the descent of rain, and over his helpers. In *Vritras,* as in רהב, there is the idea of hostile resistance.

Job compares himself, the feeble one, to these mythical titanic powers in v. 14. אַף כִּי (properly: even that), or even אַף alone (Job 4:19), signifies, according as the connection introduces a climax or anti-climax, either *quanto magis* or *quanto minus,* as here: how much less can I, the feeble one, dispute with Him! אֲשֶׁר, v. 15, is best taken, as in Job 5:5, in the signification *quoniam.* The *part. Poel* מְשֹׁפְטִי we should more correctly translate "my disputant" than "my judge;" it is *Poel* which Ewald appropriately styles the conjugation of attack: שׁוֹפֵט, *judicando vel litigando aliquem petere;* comp. Ges. § 55, 1. The *part. Kal* denotes a judge, the *part. Poel* one who is accuser and judge at the same time. On such Poel-forms from strong roots, vid., on Ps. 109:10, where *wedŏrschu* is to be read, and therefore it is written וְדֶרְשׁוּ in correct Codices.

16 *If when I called He really answered,*
I could not believe that He would hearken to me;

17 *He would rather crush me in a tempest,*
And only multiply my wounds without cause;
18 *He would not suffer me to take my breath,*
But would fill me with bitter things.
19 *If it is a question of the strength of the strong—: "Behold here!"*
And if of right—: "Who will challenge me?"
20 *Where I in the right, my mouth must condemn me;*
Were I innocent, He would declare me guilty.

Job 9:16–20. The answer of God when called upon, i.e., summoned, is represented in v. 16*a* as an actual result (*praet.* followed by *fut. consec.*), therefore v. 16*b* cannot be intended to express: I could not believe that He answers me, but: I could not believe that He, the answerer, would hearken to me; His infinite exaltation would not permit such condescension. The אשׁר which follows, v. 17*a,* signifies either *quippe qui* or *quoniam;* both shades of meaning are after all blended, as in v. 15. The question arises here whether שׁוף signifies *conterere,* or as cognate form with שׁאף, *inhiare,*—a question also of importance in the exposition of the *Protevangelium.* There are in all only three passages in which it occurs: here, Gen. 3:15, and Ps. 139:11. In Ps. 139:11 the meaning *conterere* is unsuitable, but even the signification *inhiare* can only be adopted for want of a better: perhaps it may be explained by comparison with צעף, in the sense of *obvelare,* or as a denominative from נֵשֶׁף (the verb of which, נשׁף, is kindred to נשׁב, נשׁם, *flare*) in the signification *obtenebrare.* In Gen. 3:15, if regarded superficially, the meaning *inhiare* and *conterere* are alike suitable, but the meaning *inhiare* deprives that utterance of God of its prophetic character, which has been recognised from the beginning; and the meaning *conterere, contundere,* is strongly supported by the translations. We decide in favour of this meaning also in the present passage, with the ancient translations (LXX ἐκτρίψῃ, Targ. מְדַקֵּדְק, *comminuens*). Moreover, it is the meaning most generally supported by a comparison with the dialects, whereas the signification *inhiare* can only be sustained by comparison with שׁאף and the Arabic *sâfa* (to sniff, track by scent, to smell); besides, "to assail angrily" (Hirz., Ewald) is an inadmissible contortion of *inhiare,* which signifies in a hostile sense "to seize abruptly" (Schlottm.), properly to snatch, to desire to seize.

Translate therefore: He would crush me in a tempest and multiply (*multiplicaret*), etc., would not let me take breath (*respirare*), but (כִּי, Ges. § 155, 1, *e. a.*) fill me (יִשְׂבִּיעַנִי, with *Pathach* with *Rebia mugrasch*) with bitter things (מַמְּרֹרִים, with *Dag. dirimens,* which gives the word a more pathetic expression). The meaning of v. 19 is that God stifles the attempt to maintain one's right in the very beginning by His being superior to the creature in strength, and not entering into a dispute with him concerning the right. הִנֵּה (for הִנֵּנִי as אֶיֵּה, Job 15:23, for אַיּוֹ): see, here I am, ready for the contest, is the word of God, similar to *quis citare possit me* (in Jer. 49:19, 50:44), which sounds as an echo of this passage. The creature must always be in the wrong,—a thought true in itself, in connection with which Job forgets that God's right in opposition to the creature is also always the true objective right. פִּי, with suffix, accented to indicate its logical connection, as Job 15:6: my own mouth.[87] In וַיַּעְקְּשֵׁנִי the *Chirek* of the *Hiphil* is shortened to a *Sheva,* as 1 Sam. 17:25; vid., Ges. § 53, rem. 4. The subject is God, not "my mouth" (Schlottm.): supposing that I were innocent, He would put me down as one morally wrong and to be rejected.

21 *Whether I am innocent, I know not myself,*
My life is offensive to me.
22 *There is one thing—therefore I maintain—:*
The innocent and wicked He destroyeth.
23 *If the scourge slay suddenly,*
He laugheth at the melting away of the innocent.

24 *Countries are given into the hand of the wicked;*

The countenance of its rulers He veileth—

Is it not so, who else doeth it?

Job 9:21–24. Ver. 21 is usually considered to be an affirmation of innocence on the part of Job, though without effect, and even at the peril of his own destruction: "I am innocent, I boldly say it even with scorn of my life" (Schnurr., Hirz., Ewald, Schlottm.). But although לֹא אֵדַע נַפְשִׁי may mean: I care nothing for my soul, i.e., my life (comp. Gen. 39:6), its first meaning would be: I know not my soul, i.e., myself; and this sense is also quite in accordance with the context. He is innocent, but the contradiction between his lot and his innocence seems to show that his self-consciousness is deceptive, and makes him a mystery to himself, leads him astray respecting himself; and having thus become a stranger to himself, he abhors this life of seeming contradictions, for which he desires nothing less than its long continuance (vid., Job 7:16). The אַחַת הִיא which follows we do not explain: "it is all the same to me whether I live or not," but: it is all one whether man is innocent or not. He himself is a proof of this; therefore he maintains, etc. It is, however, also possible that this expression, which is similar in meaning to Eccles. 9:2 (there is one event, מקרה אחד, to the righteous and to the wicked), and is well translated in the Targ. by חדא מכילא היא (there is one measure of retribution, מכילא = מִדָּה, μέτρον, Matt. 7:2), refers to what follows, and that "therefore I maintain" is parenthetical (like אמרתי, Ps. 119:57; לי אמר, Isa. 45:24), and we have translated it accordingly. There is certainly a kind of suspense, and על־כן introduces an assertion of Job, which is founded upon the fact of the continuance of his own misfortune,—an assertion which he advances in direct contradiction to the friends, and which is expressly censured by Elihu.

In vv. 23f., by some striking examples, he completes the description of that which seems to be supported by the conflict he is called to endure. שׁוֹט, a scourge, signifies a judgment which passes over a nation (Isa. 28:15). It swept off the guiltless as well, and therefore Job concludes that God delights in מַסָּה, πειρασμός, trial (compare above, p. 248, note), or perhaps more correctly the melting away (from מָסַס, as Job 6:14) of the guiltless, i.e., their dissolution in anguish and dismay, their wearing away and despondency. Jerome rightly remarks that in the whole book Job says *nihil asperius* than what he says in v. 23. Another example in favour of his disconsolate אחת היא is that whole lands are given into the hand of the wicked: the monarch is an evil man, and the countenance of their judges He (God) covers, so that they do not distinguish between right and wrong, nor decide in favour of the former rather than of the latter. God himself is the final cause of the whole: if not, i.e., if it is not so, who can it then be that causes it? אֵפוֹ (four times in the book of Job instead of the usual form אֵפוֹא) is, according to the current opinion, placed *per hyperbaton* in the conditional instead of the interrogative clause; and אפו מי are certainly not, with Hirzel, to be taken together. There is, however, not a proper *hyperbaton,* but אפו here gives intensity to the question; though not directly as Job 17:15 (Ges. § 153, 2), but only indirectly, by giving intensity to that which introduces the question, as Job 24:25 and Gen. 27:37; translate therefore: if it really is not so (comp. the Homeric expression ει᾽ δ᾽ ἄγε). It is indisputable that God, and no one else, is the final cause of this misery, apparently so full of contradiction, which meets us in the history of mankind, and which Job now experiences for himself.

25 *My days were swifter than a runner,*

They fled away without seeing prosperity,

26 *They shot by as ships of reeds,*

As an eagle which dasheth upon its prey.

27 *If my thought is: I will forget my complaint,*

I will give up my dark looks and look cheerful;

28 *I shudder at all my pains,*

I feel that Thou dost not pronounce me innocent.

Job 9:25–28. Such, as described in the preceding strophe, is the lot of the innocent in general, and such (this is the connection) is also Job's lot: his swiftly passing life comes to an end amidst suffering, as that of an evil-doer whom God cuts off in judgment. In the midst of his present sufferings he has entirely forgotten his former prosperity; it is no happiness to him, because the very enjoyment of it makes the loss of it more grievous to bear. The days of prosperity are gone, have passed swiftly away without טובה, i.e., without *lasting* prosperity. They have been swifter מִנֵּי רָץ. By reference to Job 7:6, this might be considered as a figure borrowed from the weaver's loom, since in the Coptic the threads of the weft (*fila subteminis*) which are wound round the shuttle are called "runners" (vid., Ges. *Thesaurus*); but Rosenmüller has correctly observed that, in order to describe the fleetness of his life, Job brings together that which is swiftest on land (the runners or couriers), in water (fast-sailing ships), and in the air (the swooping eagle). עִם, v. 26*a,* signifies, in comparison with, *aeque ac.* But we possess only a rather uncertain tradition as to the kind of vessels meant by אניות אֵבֶה. Jerome translates, after the Targ.: *naves poma portantes,* by which one may understand the small vessels, according to Edrisi, common on the Dead Sea, in which corn and different kinds of fruits were carried from Zoar to Jericho and to other regions of the Jordan (Stickel, S. 267); but if אבה were connected with אֵב, we might rather expect אִבָּה, after the form אִשָּׁה (from אֵשׁ), instead of אֵבֶה. Others derive the word from אָבָה, *avere:* ships of desire, i.e., full-rigged and ready for sea (Gecatilia in Ges. *Thes. suppl.* p. 62), or struggling towards the goal (Kimchi), or steering towards (Zamora), and consequently hastening to (Symmachuc, σπευδούσαις), the harbour; but independently of the explanation not being suited to the description, it should then be accented *êběh,* after the form נֵדֶה, קֵצֶה, instead of *êbéh.* The explanation, ships of hostility (Syr.[88]), i.e., ships belonging to pirates or freebooters, privateers, which would suit the subject well, is still less admissible with the present pointing of the text, as it must then be אֵבָה (אֵיבָה), with which the Egyptian *uba,* against, and adverse (*contrarius*), may be compared. According to Abulwalid (Parchon, Raschi), אבה is the name of a large river near the scene of the book of Job; which may be understood as either the Babylonian name for river Arab. *'bby,* or the Abyssinian name of the Nile, *abâ;* and אֵבֶה may be compared with לְבְנֶה in relation to the Arabic, *lubna.* But a far more satisfactory explanation is the one now generally received, according to the comparison with the Arabic *abâ'un,* a reed (whence *abaa-t-un,* a reed, a so-called *n. unitatis*): ships made from reeds, like כְּלֵי גֹמֶא, Isa. 18:2, vessels of papyrus, βαρίδες παπύριναι. In such small ships, with Egyptian tackling, they used to travel as far as Taprobane. These canoes were made to fold together, *plicatiles,* so that they could be carried past the cataracts; Heliodorus describes them as ὀξυδρομώτατα.[89] The third figure is the eagle, which swoops down upon its prey; טוּשׁ, like Chaldee טוס, by which the Targ. translates חש, Hab. 1:8; Grätz' conjecture of ישוט (which is intended to mean flutters) is superfluous. Just as unnecessary is it, with Olshausen, to change אִם אָמְרִי into אם אמרתי: "if my saying (thinking)" is equivalent to, "as often as I say (think)." פנים is here (as in the German phrase, *ein Gesicht machen*) an ill-humoured, distorted, wry face. When Job desires to give up this look of suffering and be cheerful (הבליג, like Job 10:20, *hilaritatem prae se ferre, vultum hilarem induere*), the certainty that he is not favoured of God, and consequently that he cannot be delivered from his sufferings, all his anguish in spite of his

struggles against it comes ever afresh before his mind. It is scarcely necessary to remark that תנקני is addressed to God, not to Bildad. It is important to notice that Job does not speak of God without at the same time looking up to Him as in prayer. Although he feels rejected of God, he still remains true to God. In the following strophe he continues to complain of God, but without denying Him.

29 *If I am wicked, why do I exert myself in vain?*
30 *If I should wash myself with snow water,*
And make my hands clean with lye,
31 *Then thou wouldst plunge me into the pit,*
And my clothes would abhor me.
32 *For He is not a man as I, that I should answer Him,*
That we should go together to judgment.
33 *There is not an arbitrator between us*
Who should lay his hand upon us both.

Job 9:29–33. The clause with strongly accented "I" affirms that in relation to God is from the first, and unchangeably, a wicked, i.e., guilty, man (Ps. 109:7) (רָשַׁע, to be a wicked man, means either to act as such [Job 10:15], or to appear as such, be accounted as such, as here and Job 10:7; *Hiph.,* v. 20, to condemn). Why, therefore, should he vainly (הֶבֶל, *acc. adv.,* like breath, useless) exert himself by crying for help, and basing his plaint on his innocence? In v. 30*a* the *Chethib* is בְּמוֹ, the *Keri* בְּמֵי, as the reverse in Isa. 25:10; *mo* itself appears in the signification water (Egyptian *muau*), in the proper names *Moab* and *Moshe* (according to Jablonsky, *ex aqua servatus*); in במו, however, the *mo* may be understood according to Ges. § 103, 2. This is the meaning—no cleansing, even though he should use snow and בֹּר (a vegetable alkali), i.e., not even the best-grounded self-justification can avail him, for God would still bring it to pass, that his clearly proved innocence should change to the most horrible impurity. Ewald, Rödiger, and others translate incorrectly: my clothes would make me disgusting. The idea is tame. The *Piel* תְּעִב signifies elsewhere in the book (Job 19:19, 30:10) to abhor, not to make abhorrent; and the causative meaning is indeed questionable, for מְתָעֵב (Isa. 49:7) signifies loathing, as מְכַסֶּה (Job 23:18) covering, and Ezek. 16:25 certainly borders on the signification "to make detestable," but תעב may also be in the primary meaning, *abominari,* the strongest expression for that contempt of the beauty bestowed by God which manifests itself by prostitution. Translate: My clothes would abhor me; which does not mean: I should be disgusted with myself (Hirzel); Job is rather represented as naked; him, the naked one, God would—says he—so plunge into the pit that his clothes would conceive a horror of him, i.e., start back in terror at the idea of being put on and defiled by such a horrible creature (Schlottm., Oehler). For God is not his equal, standing on the same level with him: He, the Absolute Being, is accuser and judge in one person; there is between them no arbitrator who (or that he) should lay, etc. Mercier correctly explains: *impositio manus est potestatis signum;* the meaning therefore is: *qui utrumque nostrum velut manu imposita coerceat.*

34 *Let Him take away His rod from me,*
And let His terrors not stupify me.
35 *Then I would speak and not fear Him,*
For not thus do I stand with myself.
10:1 *My soul is full of disgust with my life,*
Therefore I will freely utter my complaint;
I will speak in the bitterness of my soul.
2 *I will say to Eloah: Condemn me not;*
Let me know wherefore Thou contendest with me!

JOB 10

Job 9:34–10:2. The two Optatives, v. 34f., as is frequently the case with the Imper., are followed by the Cohortative as the conclusion (אֲדַבְּרָה, therefore will I speak; whereas ואדברה might be equivalent to, in order that I may

speak) of a conditional antecedent clause. שֵׁבֶט is here the rod with which God smites Job; comp. Job 13:21. If God would only remove his pain from him for a brief space, so that he might recover himself for self-defence, and if He would not stifle his words as they come freely forth from his lips by confronting him with His overwhelming majesty, then he would fearlessly express himself; for "not thus am I in myself," i.e., I am not conscious of such a moral condition as compels me to remain dumb before Him. However, we must inquire whether, according to the context, this special reference and shade of meaning is to be given to לא־כן. There is a use of כן = nothing, when accompanied by a gesture expressive of contemptuous rejection, Num. 13:33 (כמו־כן, Isa. 51:6, as nothing);[90] and a use of לא־כן = not only so = not so small, so useless, 2 Sam. 23:5, accompanied by a gesture expressive of the denial of such contempt, according to which the present passage may probably be explained: I am in myself, i.e., according to the testimony of my conscience, not so, i.e., not so morally worthless and devoid of right.

His self-consciousness makes him desire that the possibility of answering for himself might be granted him; and since he is weary of life, and has renounced all claim for its continuance, he will at least give his complaints free course, and pray the Author of his sufferings that He would not permit him to die the death of the wicked, contrary to the testimony of his own conscience. נָקְטָה is equivalent to נָקְטָה, Ezek. 6:9, after the usual manner of the contraction of double *Ayin* verbs (Gen. 11:6, 7; Isa. 19:3; Judg. 5:5; Ezek. 41:7; vid., Ges. § 67, rem. 11); it may nevertheless be derived directly from נָקַט, for this secondary verb formed from the *Niph.* נָקֹט is supported by the Aramaic. In like manner, in Gen. 17:11 perhaps a secondary verb נָמַל, and certainly in Gen. 9:19 and Isa. 23:3 a secondary verb נָפַץ (1 Sam. 13:11), formed from the *Niph.* נָפֹץ (Gen. 10:18), is to be supposed; for the contraction of the *Niphal* form נָקוֹמָה into נָקְמָה is impossible; and the supposition which has been advanced, of a root פצץ = פוץ in the signification *diffundere, dissipare* is unnecessary. His soul is disgusted (*fastidio affecta est,* or *fastidit*) with his life, therefore he will give free course to his plaint (comp. Job 7:11). עָלַי is not *super* or *de me,* but, as Job 30:16, *in me;* it belongs to the Ego, as an expression of spontaneity: I in myself, since the Ego is the subject, ὑποκείμενον, of his individuality (*Psychol.* S. 151f.). The inner man is meant, which has the Ego over or in itself; from this the complaint shall issue forth as a stream without restraint; not, however, a mere gloomy lamentation over his pain, but a supplicatory complaint directed to God respecting the peculiar pang of his suffering, viz., this stroke which seems to come upon him from his Judge (ריב, *seq. acc.,* as Isa. 27:8), without his being conscious of that for which he is accounted guilty.

3 *Doth it please Thee when Thou oppressest,*
That Thou rejectest the work of Thy hands,
While Thou shinest upon the counsel of the wicked?

4 *Hast Thou eyes of flesh,*
Or seest Thou as a mortal seeth?

5 *Are Thy days as the days of a mortal,*
Or Thy years as man's days,

6 *That Thou seekest after my iniquity,*
And searchest after my sin?

7 *Although Thou knowest that I am not a wicked man,*
And there is none that can deliver out of Thy hand.

Job 10:3–7. There are three questions by which Job seeks to exhaust every possible way of accounting for his sufferings as coming from God. These attempts at explanation, however, are at once destroyed, because they proceed upon conceptions which are unworthy of God, and opposed to His nature. *Firstly,* Whether it gives Him pleasure (טוֹב, agreeable, as Job 13:9)

when He oppresses, when He despises, i.e., keeps down forcibly or casts from Him as hateful (מָאַס, as Ps. 89:39, Isa. 54:6) the work of His hand; while, on the contrary, He permits light to shine from above upon the design of the wicked, i.e., favours it? Man is called the יְגִיעַ of the divine hands, as though he were elaborated by them, because at his origin (Gen. 2:7), the continuation of which is the development in the womb (Ps. 139:15), he came into existence in a remarkable manner by the directly personal, careful, and, so to speak, skilful working of God. That it is the morally innocent which is here described, may be seen not only from the contrast (v. 3*c*), but also from the fact that he only can be spoken of as oppressed and rejected. Moreover, "the work of Thy hands" involves a negative reply to the question. Such an unloving mood of self-satisfaction is contrary to the bounty and beneficence of that love to which man owes his existence. *Secondly,* Whether God has eyes of flesh, i.e., of sense, which regard only the outward appearance, without an insight into the inner nature, or whether He sees as mortals see, i.e., judges, κατὰ τὴν σάρκα (John 8:15)? Mercier correctly: *num ex facie judicas, ut affectibus ducaris more hominum.* This question also supplies its own negative; it is based upon the thought that God lookest on the heart (1 Sam. 16:7). *Thirdly,* Whether His life is like to the brevity of man's life, so that He is not able to wait until a man's sin manifests itself, but must institute such a painful course of investigation with him, in order to extort from him as quickly as possible a confession of it? Suffering appears here to be a means of inquisition, which is followed by the final judgment when the guilt is proved. What is added in v. 7 puts this supposition aside also as inconceivable. Such a mode of proceeding may be conceived of in a mortal ruler, who, on account of his short-sightedness, seeks to bring about by severe measures that which was at first only conjecture, and who, from the apprehension that he may not witness that vengeance in which he delights, hastens forward the criminal process as much as possible, in order that his victim may not escape him. God, however, to whom belongs absolute knowledge and absolute power, would act thus, although, etc. עַל, although, notwithstanding (proceeding from the signification, besides, *insuper*), as Job 17:16 (Isa. 53:9), 34:6. God knows even from the first that he (Job) will not appear as a guilty person (רְשָׁע, as in Job 9:29); and however that may be, He is at all events sure of him, for nothing escapes the hand of God.

That operation of the divine love which is first echoed in "the labour of Thy hands," is taken up in the following strophe, and, as Job contemplates it, his present lot seems to him quite incomprehensible.

8 *Thy hands have formed and perfected me*
Altogether round about, and Thou hast now swallowed me up!
9 *Consider now, that Thou has perfected me as clay,*
And wilt Thou turn me again into dust?
10 *Hast Thou not poured me out as milk,*
And curdled me as curd?
11 *With skin and flesh hast Thou clothed me,*
And Thou hast intertwined me with bones and sinews;
12 *Life and favour Thou hast shown me,*
And thy care hath guarded my breath.

Job 10:8–12. The development of the embryo was regarded by the Israelitish Chokma as one of the greatest mysteries (Eccles. 11:5; 2 Macc. 7:22f.). There are two poetical passages which treat explicitly of this mysterious existence: this strophe of the book of Job, and the Psalm by David, 139:13–16 (*Psychol.* S. 210). The assertion of Scheuchzer, Hoffmann, and Oetinger, that these passages of Scripture "include, and indeed go beyond, all recent *systemata generationis,"* attributes to Scripture a design of imparting instruction,—a purpose which is foreign to it. Scripture nowhere attempts an analysis of the workings of nature, but only traces them back to their final cause.

According to the view of Scripture, a creative act similar to the creation of Adam is repeated at the origin of each individual; and the continuation of development according to natural laws is not less the working of God than the creative planting of the very beginning. Thy hands, says Job, have formed (עִצֵּב, to cut, carve, fashion; cognate are חָצַב, קָצַב, without the accompanying notion of toil, which makes this word specially appropriate, as describing the fashioning of the complicated nature of man) and perfected me. We do not translate: made; for עָשָׂה stands in the same relation to ברא and יצר as *perficere* to *creare* and *fingere* (Gen. 2:2; Isa. 43:7). יַחַד refers to the members of the body collectively, and סָבִיב to the whole form. The perfecting as clay implies three things: the earthiness of the substance, the origin of man without his knowledge and co-operation, and the moulding of the shapeless substance by divine power and wisdom. The primal origin of man, *de limo terrae* (Job 33:6; Ps. 139:15), is repeated in the womb. The figures which follow (v. 10) describe this origin, which being obscure is all the more mysterious, and glorifies the power of God the more. The *sperma* is likened to milk; the הִתִּיךְ (used elsewhere of smelting), which Seb. Schmid rightly explains *rem colliquatam fundere et immittere in formam aliquam,* refers to the *nisus formativus* which dwells in it. The embryo which is formed from the *sperma* is likened to גְּבִינָה, which means in all the Semitic dialects cheese (curd). "As whey" (Ewald, Hahn) is not suitable; whey does not curdle; in making cheese it is allowed to run off from the curdled milk. "As cream" (Schlottm.) is not less incorrect; cream is not *lac coagulatum,* which the word signifies. The embryo forming itself from the *sperma* is like milk which is curdled and beaten into shape.

The *consecutio temporum,* moreover, must be observed here. It is, for example, incorrect to translate, with Ewald: Dost Thou not let me flow away like milk, etc. Job looks back to the beginning of his life; the four clauses, vv. 10, 11, under the control of the first two verbs (v. 8), which influence the whole strophe, are also retrospective in meaning. The *futt.* are consequently like synchronous *imperff.;* as, then, v. 12 returns to *perff.,* v. 11 describes the development of the embryo to the full-grown infant, on which Grotius remarks: *Hic ordo est in genitura: primum pellicula fit, deinde in ea caro, duriora paulatim accedunt,* and by v. 12, the manifestations of divine goodness, not only in the womb, but from the beginning of life and onwards, are intended. The expression "Life and favour (this combination does not occur elsewhere) hast Thou done to me" is zeugmatic: He has given him life, and sustained that life amidst constant proofs of favour; His care has guarded the spirit (רוּחַ), by which his frame becomes a living and self-conscious being. This grateful retrospect is interspersed with painful reflections, in which Job gives utterance to his feeling of the contrast between the manifestation of the divine goodness which he had hitherto experienced and his present condition. As in v. 8*b.,* וַתְּבַלְּעֵנִי, which Hirzel wrongly translates: and wilt now destroy me; it is rather: and hast now swallowed me up, i.e., drawn me down into destruction, as it were brought me to nought; or even, if in the *fut. consec.,* as is frequently the case, the consecutive and not the aorist signification preponderates: and now swallowest me up; and in v. 9 (where, though not clear from the syntax, it is clear from the substance that תְּשִׁיבֵנִי is not to be understood as an imperfect, like the *futt.* in vv. 10f.): wilt Thou cause me to become dust again? The same tone is continued in the following strophe. Thus graciously has he been brought into being, and his life sustained, in order that he may come to such a terrible end.

13 *And such Thou hast hidden in Thy heart,*
I perceive that this was in Thy mind:
14 *If I should sin, Thou wouldst take note of it,*
And not acquit me of my iniquity.
15 *If I should act wickedly, woe unto me!*
And were I righteous, I should not lift up my head,

Being full of shame and conscious of my misery.

16 *And were I to raise it, Thou wouldst hunt me as a lion,*

And ever display on me Thy wondrous power,

17 *Thou wouldst ever bring fresh witnesses against me,*

And increase Thy wrath against me,

I should be compelled to withstand continuously advancing troops and a host.

Job 10:13–17. This manifestation of divine goodness which Job has experienced from the earliest existence seems to him, as he compares his present lot of suffering with it, to have served as a veil to a hidden purpose of a totally opposite character. That purpose—to make this life, which has been so graciously called into existence and guarded thus far, the object of the severest and most condemning visitation—is now manifest. Both אֵלֶּה and זֹאת refer to what is to follow: זֹאת עִמָּךְ used of the thought conceived, the purpose cherished, as Job 23:14, 27:11. All that follows receives a future colouring from this principal clause, "This is what Thou hadst designed to do," which rules the strophe. Thus v. 14*a* is to be rendered: If I had sinned, Thou wouldst have kept me in remembrance, properly *custodies me,* which is here equivalent to *custoditurus eras me.* שׁמר, with the acc. of the person, according to Ps. 130:3 (where it is followed by the acc. of the sin), is to be understood: to keep any one in remembrance, i.e., to mark him as sinful (Hirzel). This appears more appropriate than *rigide observaturus eras me* (Schlottm.). ושׁמרתני, according to Ges. § 121, 4, might be taken for ושׁמרת לי (viz., חַטָּאתִי); but this is unnecessary, and we have merely translated it thus for the sake of clearness. His infirmities must not be passed by unpunished; and if he should act wickedly (רָשַׁע, of malignant sin, in distinction from חטא), woe unto him (comp. οἰαί μοι, 1 Cor. 9:16). According to the construction referred to above, וצדקתי is *praet. hypotheticum* (Ges. § 155, 4, *a*); and the conclusion follows without *waw apodosis:* If I had acted rightly, I should not have raised my head, being full of shame and conscious of my misery. The adjectives are not in apposition to ראשׁי (Böttcher), but describe the condition into which he would be brought, instead of being able (according to the ethical principle, Gen. 4:7) to raise his head cheerfully. רְאֵה *constr.* of רָאֶה, as שְׂבַע or שָׂבֵע. It is needless, with Pisc., Hirz., Böttch., and Ewald, to alter it to רֹאֵה, since רָאֶה is verbal adjective like נָכֶה, יָפֶה, קָשֶׁה. Moreover, וּרְאֵה cannot be imperative (Rosenm., De Wette); for although imperatives, joined by *waw* to sentences of a different construction, do occur (Ps. 77:2; 2 Sam. 21:3), such an exclamation would destroy the connection and tone of the strophe in the present case.

Ver. 16. יִגְאֶה is hypothetical, like וצדקתי, but put in the future form, because referring to a voluntary act (Ewald, § 357, *b*): and if it (the head) would (nevertheless) exalt itself (גאה, to raise proudly or in joyous self-consciousness), then (without *waw apod.,* which is found in other passages, e.g., Job 22:28) Thou wouldst hunt me like a *shachal* (vid., Job 4:10),—Job likens God to the lion (as Hos. 5:14, 13:7), and himself to the prey which the lion pursues,—Thou wouldst ever anew show Thyself wonderful at my expense (תָּשׁוּב, voluntative form, followed by a future with which it is connected adverbially, Ges. § 142, 3, *b;* תִּתְפַּלָּא, with *â* in the last syllable, although not in pause, as Num. 19:12; Ewald, § 141, *c.*), i.e., wonderful in power, and inventive by ever new forms off suffering, by which I should be compelled to repent this haughtiness. The witnesses (עֵדִים) that God continually brings forth afresh against him are his sufferings (vid., Job 16:8), which, while he is conscious of his innocence, declare him to be a sinner; for Job, like the friends, cannot think of suffering and sin otherwise than as connected one with the other: suffering is partly the result of sin, and partly it sets the

mark of sin on the man who is no sinner. תֶּרֶב (*fut. apoc. Hiph.* Ges. § 75, rem. 15) is also the voluntative form: Thou wouldst multiply, increase Thy malignity against me. עִם, *contra,* as also in other passages with words denoting strife and war, Job 13:19, 23:6, 31:13; or where the context implies hostility, Ps. 55:19, 94:16. The last line is a clause by itself consisting of nouns. חֲלִיפוֹת וְצָבָא is considered by all modern expositors as *hendiadys,* as Mercier translates: *impetor variis et sibi succedentibus malorum agminibus;* and צבא is mostly taken collectively. Changes and hosts = hosts continuously dispersing themselves, and always coming on afresh to the attack. But is not this form of expression unnatural? By חליפות Job means the advancing troops, and by צבא the main body of the army, from which they are reinforced; the former stands first, because the thought figuratively expressed in תחדשׁ and תרב is continued (comp. Job 19:12): the enmity of God is manifested against him by ever fresh sufferings, which are added to the one chief affliction. Böttcher calls attention to the fact that all the lines from v. 14 end in *î,* a rhythm formed by the inflection, which is also continued in v. 18. This repetition of the pronominal suffix gives intensity to the impression that these manifestations of the divine wrath have special reference to himself individually.

18 *And wherefore hast Thou brought me forth out of the womb?*

I should have expired, that no eye had seen me,

19 *I should have been as though I had never been,*

Carried from the womb to the grave.

20 *Are not my days few? then cease*

And turn from me, that I may become a little cheerful,

21 *Before I go to return no more*

Into the land of darkness and of the shadow of death,

22 *The land of deep darkness like to midnight,*

Of the shadow of death and of confusion,

And which is bright like midnight.

Job 10:18–22. The question Wherefore? v. 18*a,* is followed by *futt.* as *modi conditionales* (Ges. § 127, 5) of that which would and should have happened, if God had not permitted him to be born alive: I should have expired, prop. I ought to have expired, being put back to the time of birth (comp. Job 3:13, where the *praet.* more objectively expressed what would then have happened). These *modi condit.* are continued in v. 19: I should have been (sc. in the womb) as though I had not been (comp. the short elliptical[91] expression, Obad. v. 16), i.e., as one who had scarcely entered upon existence, and that only of the earliest (as at conception); I should have been carried (הוּבַל, as Job 21:32) from the womb (without seeing the light as one born alive) to the grave. This detestation of his existence passes into the wish, v. 20, that God would be pleased at least somewhat to relieve him ere he is swallowed up by the night of Hades. We must neither with the Targ. translate: are not my days few, and vanishing away? nor with Oetinger: will not my fewness of days cease? Both are contrary to the correct accentuation. Olshausen thinks it remarkable that there is not a weaker pausal accent to יָמַי; but such a one is really indirectly there, for *Munach* is here equivalent to *Dechî,* from which it is formed (vid., the rule in *Comm. über den Psalter,* ii. 504). Accordingly, Seb. Schmid correctly translates: *nonne parum dies mei? ideo cessa.* The *Keri* substitutes the precative form of expression for the optative: cease then, turn away from me then (*imper. consec.* with *waw* of the result, Ewald, § 235, *a*); comp. the precative conclusion to the speech, Job 7:16ff., but there is no real reason for changing the optative form of the text. יָשֵׁת (voluntative for יָשֵׁת, Job 9:33) may be supplemented by ידו, פניו, עיניו, or לבו (Job 7:17) (not, however, with Hirz., שׁבטו, after Job 9:34, which is too far-fetched for the usage of the language, or with Böttch., מחנהו, *copias*

suas); שִׁית can however, like שִׂים, Job 4:20, signify to turn one's self to, *se disponere* = to attend to, consequently שׁית מן, to turn the attention from, as שׁעה מן, Job 7:19, Ps. 39:14 (where, as here, ואבליגה follows).

He desires a momentary alleviation of his sufferings and ease before his descent to Hades, which seems so near at hand. He calls Hades the land of darkness and of the shadow of death. צַלְמָוֶת, which occurs for the first time in the Old Testament in Ps. 23:4, is made into a compound from סַלְמוּת, and is the proper word for the obscurity of the region of the dead, and is accordingly repeated later on. Further, he calls it the land of encircling darkness (עֲפָתָה, defective for עיפתה, from עוף, *caligare,* and with *He parag.* intensive for עיפה, in Amos 4:13, who also uses הבליג, Job 5:9, in common with Job), like midnight darkness. אֹפֶל cannot mean merely the grey of twilight, it is the entire absence of sunlight, Job 3:6, 28:3, Ps. 91:6; comp. ex. 10:22, where the Egyptian darkness is called חשׁך אפלה. Böttch. correctly compares אפל and נפל: *mersa ad imum h.e. profunda nox* (the advancing night). Still further he calls it (the land) of the shadow of death, and devoid of order (סְדָרִים, ἅπ. λεγ. in the Old Testament, but a common word in the later Hebrew), i.e., where everything is so encompassed by the shadow of death that it seems a chaos, without any visible or distinct outline. It is difficult to determine whether וַתּפַע is to be referred to ארץ: and which lights (*fut. consec.* as the accent on the *penult.* indicates, the syntax like Job 3:21, 23, Isa. 57:3); or is to be taken as neuter: and it shines there (= and where it shines) like midnight darkness. Since הופיע (from יפע = ופע, to rise, shine forth; vid., on Ps. 95:4), as also האיר, does not occur elsewhere as neuter, we prefer, with Hirzel, to refer it to ארץ, as being more certain. Moreover, אפל is here evidently the intensest darkness, *ipsum medullitium umbrae mortis ejusque intensissimum,* as Oetinger expresses it. That which is there called light, i.e., the faintest degree of darkness, is like the midnight of this world; "not light, but darkness visible," as Milton says of hell.

In this speech (Job 9–10) Job for the first time assents to the principle on which the attack of the friends is founded. It is primarily directed against Bildad, but applies also to Eliphaz, for the two hold the same opinion. Therefore, because in the first part of the speech Job does not expressly address him or all the friends, it cannot, with Ewald, be said that it bears the characteristics of a soliloquy. To Job 9:28 Job inclines towards the friends; and when he afterwards addresses God, all that he says to God is affected by the manner in which the friends have advanced against him.

The maxim of the friends is: God does not pervert right, i.e., He deals justly in all that He does. They conclude from this, that no man, no sufferer, dare justify himself: it is his duty to humble himself under the just hand of God. Job assents to all this, but his assent is mere sarcasm at what they say. He admits that everything that God does is right, and must be acknowledged as right; not, however, because it is right in itself, but because it is the act of the absolute God, against whom no protest uttered by the creature, though with the clearest conviction of innocence, can avail. Job separates goodness from God, and regards that which is part of His very being as a produce of His arbitrary will. What God says and does must be true and right, even if it be not true and right in itself. The God represented by the friends is a God of absolute justice; the God of Job is a God of absolute power. The former deals according to the objective rule of right; the latter according to a freedom which, because removed from all moral restraint, is pure caprice.

How is it that Job entertains such a cheerless view of the matter? The friends, by the strong view which they have taken up, urge him into another extreme. On their part, they imagine

that in the justice of God they have a principle which is sufficient to account for all the misfortunes of mankind, and Job's in particular. They maintain, with respect to mankind in general (Eliphaz by an example from his own observation, and Bildad by calling to his aid the wisdom of the ancients), that the ungodly, though prosperous for a time, come to a fearful end; with respect to Job, that his affliction is a just chastisement from God, although designed for his good. Against the one assertion Job's own experience of life rebels; against the other his consciousness rises up with indignation. Job's observation is really as correct as that of the friends; for the history of the past and of the present furnishes as many illustrations of judgments which have suddenly come upon the godless in the height of their prosperity, as of general visitations in which the innocent have suffered with the guilty, by whom these judgments have been incurred. But with regard to his misfortune, Job cannot and ought not to look at it from the standpoint of the divine justice. For the proposition, which we will give in the words of Brentius, *quidquid post fidei justificationem pio acciderit, innocenti accidit,* is applicable to our present subject.

If, then, Job's suffering were not so severe, and his faith so powerfully shaken, he would comfort himself with the thought that the divine ways are unsearchable; since, on the one hand, he cannot deny the many traces of the justice of the divine government in the world (he does not deny them even here), and on the other hand, is perplexed by the equally numerous incongruities of human destiny with the divine justice. (This thought is rendered more consolatory to us by the revelation which we possess of the future life; although even in the later Old Testament times the last judgment is referred to as the adjustment of all these incongruities; vid., the conclusion of Ecclesiastes.) His own lot might have remained always inexplicable to him, without his being obliged on that account to lose the consciousness of the divine love, and that faith like Asaph's, which, as Luther says, struggles towards God through wrath and disfavour, as through thorns, yea, even through spears and swords.

Job is passing through conflict and temptation. He does not perceive the divine motive and purpose of his suffering, nor has he that firm and unshaken faith which will keep him from mistaken views of God, although His dispensations are an enigma to him; but, as his first speech (Job 3) shows, he is tormented by thoughts which form part of the conflict of temptation. The image of the gracious God is hidden from him, he feels only the working of the divine wrath, and asks, Wherefore doth God give light to the suffering ones?—a question which must not greatly surprise us, for, as Luther says, "There has never been any one so holy that he has not been tormented with this *quare, quare,* Wherefore? wherefore should it be so?" And when the friends, who know as little as Job himself about the right solution of this mystery, censure him for his inquiry, and think that in the propositions: man has no righteousness which he can maintain before God, and God does not pervert the right, they have found the key to the mystery, the conflict becomes fiercer for Job, because the justice of God furnishes him with no satisfactory explanation of his own lot, or of the afflictions of mankind generally. The justice of God, which the friends consider to be sufficient to explain everything that befalls man, Job can only regard as the right of the Supreme Being; and while it appears to the friends that every act of God is controlled by His justice, it seems to Job that whatever God does *must* be right, by virtue of His absolute power.

This principle, devoid of consolation, drives Job to the utterances so unworthy of him, that, in spite of his conviction of his innocence, he must appear guilty before God, because he must be speechless before His terrible majesty,—that if, however, God would only for once so meet him that he could fearlessly address Him, he would know well enough how to defend himself (Job 9). After these utterances of his feeling, from which all consciousness of the divine love is absent, he puts forth the touching prayer:

Condemn me not without letting me know why Thou dost condemn me! (Job 10:1–7).

As he looks back, he is obliged to praise God, as his Creator and Preserver, for what He has hitherto done for him (Job 10:8–12); but as he thinks of his present condition, he sees that from the very beginning God designed to vent His wrath upon him, to mark his infirmities, and to deprive him of all joy in the consciousness of his innocence (Job 10:13–17). He is therefore compelled to regard God as his enemy, and this thought overpowers the remembrance of the divine goodness. If, however, God were his enemy, he might well ask, Wherefore then have I come into being? And while he writhes as a worm crushed beneath the almighty power of God, he prays that God would let him alone for a season ere he passes away into the land of darkness, whence there is no return (Job 10:18–22).

Brentius remarks that this speech of Job contains *inferni blasphemias,* and explains them thus: *non enim in tanto judicii horrore Deum patrem, sed carnificem sentit;* but also adds, that in passages like Job 10:8–12 faith raises its head even in the midst of judgment; for when he praises the mercies of God, he does so *spiritu fidei,* and these he would not acknowledge were there not a *fidei scintilla* still remaining. This is true. The groundwork of Job's faith remains even in the fiercest conflict of temptation, and is continually manifest; we should be unable to understand the book unless we could see this *fidei scintilla,* the extinction of which would be the accomplishment of Satan's design against him, glimmering everywhere through the speeches of Job. The unworthy thoughts he entertains of God, which Brentius calls *inferni blasphemias,* are nowhere indulged to such a length that Job charges God with being his enemy, although he fancies Him to be an enraged foe. In spite of the imagined enmity of God against him, Job nowhere goes so far as to declare enmity on his part against God, so far as ברך אלהים. He does not turn away from God, but inclines to Him in prayer. His soul is filled with adoration of God, and with reverence of His power and majesty; he can clearly discern God's marvellous works in nature and among men, and His creative power and gracious providence, the workings of which he has himself experienced. But that mystery, which the friends have made still more mysterious, has cast a dark cloud over his vision, so that he can no longer behold the loving countenance of God. His faith is unable to disperse this cloud, and so he sees but one side of the divine character—His Almightiness. Since he consequently looks upon God as the Almighty and the Wrathful One, his felling alternately manifests itself under two equally tragical phases. At one time he exalts himself in his consciousness of the justice of his cause, to sink back again before the majesty of God, to whom he must nevertheless succumb; at another time his feeling of self-confidence is overpowered by the severity of his suffering, and he betakes himself to importunate supplication.

It is true that Job, so long as he regards his sufferings as a dispensation of divine judgment, is as unjust towards God as he believes God to be unjust towards him; but if we bear in mind that this state of conflict and temptation does not preclude the idea of a temporal withdrawal of faith, and that, as Baumgarten (*Pentat.* i. 209) aptly expresses it, the profound secret of prayer is this, that man can prevail with the Divine Being, then we shall understand that this dark cloud need only be removed, and Job again stands before the God of love as His saint.

JOB 11

Zophar's First Speech.—Ch. 11

[Then began Zophar the Naamathite, and said:]

2 *Shall the torrent of words remain unanswered,*
And shall the prater be in the right?
3 *Shall thy vain talking silence the people,*
So that thou mockest without any one putting thee to shame,
4 *And sayest: my doctrine is pure,*
And I am guiltless in Thine eyes?
5 *But oh that Eloah would speak,*

And open His lips against thee,

6 *And make known to thee the secrets of wisdom,*

That she is twofold in her nature—

Know then that Eloah forgetteth much of thy guilt.

Job 11:2–6. When Job has concluded his long speech, Zophar, the third and most impetuous of the friends, begins. His name, if it is to be explained according to the Arabic Esauitish name *el-assfar,* [92] signifies the yellow one (*flavedo*), and the name of the place whence he comes, pleasantness (*amaenitas*). The very beginning of his speech is impassioned. He calls Job's speech רֹב דְּבָרִים, a multitude of words (besides here, Prov. 10:19, Eccles. 5:2), and asks whether he is to remain unanswered; לֹא יֵעָנֶה, *responsum non feret,* from נָעַנָה, not the sense of being humbled, but: to be answered (of the suppliant: to be heard = to receive an answer). He calls Job אִישׁ שְׂפָתַיִם, a prater (distinct from איש דברים, a ready speaker, Ex. 4:10), who is not in the right, whom one must not allow to have the last word. The questions, v. 2, are followed by another which is not denoted by the sign of a question, but is only known by the accent: Shall not thy בַּדִּים, meaningless speeches (from בדד = בטא, βαττολογεῖν), put men (מְתִים, like other archaisms, e.g., תֵּבֵל, always without the article) to silence, so that thou darest mock without any one making thee ashamed, i.e., leading thee on *ad absurdum?* Thou darest mock *God* (Hirzel); better Rosenmüller: *nos et Deum.* The mockery here meant is that which Zophar has heard in Job's long speech; mockery at his opponents, in the belief that he is right because they remain silent. The *futt. consec.,* vv. 3f., describe the conduct of Job which results from this absence of contradiction. Zophar, in v. 4, does not take up Job's own words, but means, that one had better have nothing more to do with Job, as he would some day say and think so and so, he would consider his doctrine blameless, and himself in relation to God pure. לֶקַח occurs only here in this book; it is a word peculiar to the book of Proverbs (also only Deut. 32:2, Isa. 29:24), and properly signifies the act of appropriating, then that which is presented for appropriation, i.e., for learning: the doctrine (similar to שמועה, the hearing, ἀκοή, and then the discourse); we see from the words "my doctrine is pure," which Zophar puts into the mouth of Job, that the controversy becomes more and more a controversy respecting known principles.

Ver. 5. With ואולם, *verum enim vero,* Zophar introduces his wish that God himself would instruct Job; this would most thoroughly refute his utterances. מי יתן is followed by the *infin.,* then by *futt.,* vid., Ges. § 136, 1; כִּפְלַיִם (only here and Isa. 40:2) denotes not only that which is twice as great, but generally that which far surpasses something else. The subject of the clause beginning with כִּי is הִיא understood, i.e., divine wisdom: that she is the double with respect to (לְ, as e.g., 1 Kings 10:23) reality (תּוּשִׁיָה, as Job 5:12, 6:13, *essentia, substantia*), i.e., in comparison with Job's specious wisdom and philosophism. Instead of saying: then thou wouldst perceive, Zophar, realizing in his mind that which he has just wished, says imperiously וְדַע (an *imper. consec.,* or, as Ewald, § 345, *b,* calls it, *imper. futuri,* similar to Gen. 20:7, 2 Sam. 21:3): thou must then perceive that God has dealt far more leniently with thee than thou hast deserved. The causative הִשָּׁה (in Old Testament only this passage, and Job 39:17) denotes here *oblivioni dare,* and the מן of מֵעֲוֹנֶךָ is partitive.

7 *Canst thou find out the nature of Eloah,*

And penetrate to the foundation of the existence of the Almighty?

8 *It is as the heights of heaven—what wilt thou do?*

Deeper than Hades—what canst thou know?

9 *The measure thereof is longer than the earth,*

And broader than the sea.

Job 11:7–9. The majority of modern commentators erroneously translate חֵקֶר searching = comprehension, and תַּכְלִית perfection, a meaning which this word never has. The former, indeed, signifies first in an active sense: finding out by search; and then also objectively: the object sought after: "the hidden ground" (Ewald), the depth (here and Job 38:16; also, according to Ew., Job 8:8, of the deep innermost thought). The latter denotes penetrating to the extreme, and then the extreme, πέρας, itself (Job 26:10, 28:3). In other words: the nature that underlies that which is visible as an object of search is called חקר; and the extreme of a thing, i.e., the end, without which the beginning and middle cannot be understood, is called תכלית. The nature of God may be sought after, but cannot be found out; and the end of God is unattainable, for He is both: the Perfect One, *absolutus;* and the Endless One, *infinitus.*

Job 11:8, 9. The feminine form of expression has reference to the divine wisdom (*Chokma,* v. 6), and amplifies what is there said of its transcendent reality. Its absoluteness is described by four dimensions, like the absoluteness of the love which devised the plan for man's redemption (Eph. 3:18). The pronoun הִיא, with reference to this subject of the sentence, must be supplied. She is as "the heights of heaven" (comp. on *subst. pro adj.* Job 22:12); what wilt or canst thou do in order to scale that which is high as heaven? In v. 9*b* we have translated according to the reading מִדָּהּ with *He mappic.* This feminine construction is a contraction for מִדָּתָהּ, as Job 5:13, ערמם for ערמתם; Zech. 4:2, גלה for גלתה, and more syncopated forms of a like kind (vid., *Comm. über den Psalter,* i. 225, ii. 172). The reading recorded by the Masora is, however, מִדָּהּ with *He raph.,* according to which the word seems to be the accusative used adverbially; nevertheless the separation of this *acc. relativus* from its *regens* by the insertion of a word between them (comp. Job 15:10) would make a difficulty here where הִיא is wanting, and consequently מדה seems to signify *mensura ejus* whichever way it may be written (since *ah raphe* is also sometimes a softened form of the suffix, Job 31:22; Ewald, § 94, *b*). The wisdom of God is in its height altogether inaccessible, in its depth fathomless and beyond research, in its length unbounded, in its breadth incomprehensible, stretching out far beyond all human thought.

10 *When He passes by and arrests*
And calls to judgment, who will oppose Him?
11 *For He knoweth the men devoid of principle,*
And seeth wickedness without observing it.
12 *But before an empty head gaineth understanding,*
A wild ass would become a man.

Job 11:10–12. In יַחֲלֹף God is conceived as one who manifests himself by passing to and fro in the powers of nature (in the whirlwind, Isa. 21:1). Should He meet with one who is guilty, and seize and bring him to judgment, who then (*waw apod.*) will turn Him back, i.e., restrain Him? הקהיל is used of bringing to judgment, with reference to the ancient form of trial which was in public, and in which the carrying out of the sentence was partly incumbent on the people (1 Kings 21:9: Ezek. 16:40, 23:46). One might almost imagine that Zophar looks upon himself and the other two friends as forming such an "assembly:" they cannot justify him in opposition to God, since He accounts him guilty. God's mode of trial is summary, because infallible: He knows altogether מְתֵי שָׁוְא, people who hypocritically disguise their moral nothingness (on this idea, vid., on Ps. 26:4); and sees (looks through) אָוֶן (from the root *ân,* to breathe), otherwise grief, with which one pants, in a moral sense worthlessness, without any trace whatever of worth or substance. He knows and sees this moral wretchedness at once, and need not first of all reflect upon it:

non opus habet, as Abenezra has correctly explained, *ut diu consideret* (comp. the like thought, Job 34:23).

Ver. 12 has been variously misinterpreted. Gesenius in his *Handwörterbuch* [93] translates: but man is empty and void of understanding; but this is contrary to the accentuation, according to which אישׁ נבוב together form the subject. Olshausen translates better: an empty man, on the other hand, is without heart; but the *fut.* cannot be exactly so used, and if we consider that *Piel* has never properly a privative meaning, though sometimes a privative idea (as e.g., סקּל, *operam consumere in lapidos, scil. ejiciendos*), we must regard a privative *Niphal* as likewise inadmissible. Stickel translates peculiarly: the man devoid of understanding is enraged against God; but this is opposed to the manifest correlation of נבוב and יִלָּבֵב, which does not indicate the antithesis of an empty and sulky person (Böttcher): the former rather signifies empty, and the latter to acquire heart or marrow (Heidenheim, יקנה לב), so that לב fills up the hollow space. Hirzel's rendering partly bears out the requirement of this correlation: man has understanding like a hollow pate; but this explanation, like that of Gesenius, violates the accentuation, and produces an affected witticism. The explanation which regards v. 12 as descriptive of the wholesome effect of the discipline of the divine judgments (comp. Isa. 26:9) is far better; it does not violate the accent, and moreover is more in accordance with the future form: the empty one becomes discerning thereby, the rough, humane (thus recently Ewald, Heiligst., Schlottm.); but according to this explanation, v. 12 is not connected with what immediately precedes, nor is the peculiarity of the expression fully brought out. Hupfeld opens up another way of interpreting the passage when he remarks, *nil dicto facilius et simplicius;* he understands 12*a* according to 12*b:* But man is furnished with an empty heart, i.e., receives at his birth an empty undiscerning heart, and man is born as a wild ass's colt, i.e., as stupid and obstinate. This thought is satisfactorily connected with the preceding; but here also נבוב is taken as predicate in violation of the accentuation, nor is justice done to the correlation above referred to, and the whole sentence is referred to the portion of man at his birth, in opposition to the impression conveyed by the use of the *fut.* Oehler appears to us to have recognised the right sense: But an empty man is as little endowed with sense, as that a wild ass should ever be born as man—be, so to speak, born again and become a man.[94]

The *waw* in וְעַיִר is just like Job 5:7, 12:11, and brings into close connection the things that are to be compared, as in the form of emblematic proverbs (vid., Herzog's *Real Encyklopädie,* xiv. 696): the one will happen not earlier than, and as little as, the other. The *Niphal* נוֹלַד, which in Prov. 17:17 signifies to become manifest, here borders on the notion of *regenerari;* a regeneration would be necessary if the wild ass should become human,—a regeneration which is inconceivable. It is by nature refractory, and especially when young (עַיִר from Arab. *'âr, fut. i* in the signification *vagari, huc illuc discurrere,* of a young, restless, wild, frisking animal). Just so, says Zophar, the vacuum in an empty man is incapable of being filled up,—a side hit at Job, which rebounds on Zophar himself; for the dogma of the friends, which forms the sole contents of their hollowness, can indeed not fill with brightness and peace a heart that is passing through conflict. The peculiarity of the expression is no longer unintelligible; Zophar is the most impassioned of the three friends.

13 *But if thou wilt direct thy heart,*
And spread out thy hands to Him—
14 *If there is evil in thy hand, put it far away,*
And let not wickedness dwell in thy tents—
15 *Then indeed canst thou lift up thy face without spot,*
And shalt be firm without fearing.

Job 11:13–15. The phrase הֵכִין לֵב signifies neither to raise the heart (Ewald), nor to

establish it (Hirz.), but to direct it, i.e., give it the right direction (Ps. 78:8) towards God, 1 Sam. 7:3, 2 Chron. 20:33; it has an independent meaning, so that there is no need to supply אֶל־אֵל, nor take וּפָרַשְׂתָּ to be for לפרוש (after the construction in 2 Chron. 30:19). To spread out the hands in prayer is פָּרַשׂ(כַּפַּיִם); ידים is seldom used instead of the more artistic כפים, *palmas, h.e. manus supinas.* The conditional antecedent clause is immediately followed, v. 14, by a similarly conditional parenthetical clause, which inserts the indispensable condition of acceptable prayer; the conclusion might begin with הַרְחִיקֵהוּ: when thou sendest forth thy heart and spreadest out thy hands to Him, if there is wickedness in thy hand, put it far away; but the antecedent requires a promise for its conclusion, and the more so since the *praet.* and *fut.* which follow אִם, v. 13, have the force of *futt. exact.: si disposueris et extenderis,* to which the conclusion: put it far away, is not suited, which rather expresses a preliminary condition of acceptable prayer. The conclusion then begins with כִּי־אָז, then indeed, like Job 8:6, 13:19, comp. 6:3, with כִּי עַתָּה, now indeed; the causal signification of כי has in both instances passed into the confirmatory (comp. 1 Sam. 14:44, Ps. 118:10–12, 128:2, and on Gen. 26:22): then verily wilt thou be able to raise thy countenance (without being forced to make any more bitter complaints, as Job 10:15f.), without spot, i.e., not: without bodily infirmity, but: without spot of punishable guilt, *sceleris et paenae* (Rosenmüller). מִן here signifies without (Targ. דְּלָא), properly: far from, as Job 21:9, 2 Sam. 1:22, Prov. 20:3. Faultless will he then be able to look up and be firm (מֻצָּק from יָצַק, according to Ges. § 71), *quasi ex aere fusus* (1 Kings 7:16), one whom God can no longer get the better of.

16 *For thou shalt forget thy grief,*
Shalt remember it as waters that flow by.
17 *And thy path of life shall be brighter than mid-day;*
If it be dark, it shall become as morning.
18 *And thou shalt take courage, for now there is hope;*
And thou shalt search, thou shalt lie down in safety.
19 *And thou liest down without any one making thee afraid;*
And many shall caress thy cheeks.
20 *But the eyes of the wicked languish,*
And refuge vanisheth from them,
And their hope is the breathing forth of the soul.

Job 11:16–20. The grief that has been surmounted will then leave no trace in the memory, like water that flows by (not: water that flows away, as Olshausen explains it, which would be differently expressed; comp. Job 20:28 with 2 Sam. 14:14). It is not necessary to change כִּי אַתָּה into כִּי עַתָּה (Hirzel); אתה, as in v. 13, strengthens the force of the application of this conclusion of his speech. Life (חֶלֶד, from חָלַד to glide away, slip, i.e., pass away unnoticed,[95] as αἰών, both life-time, Ps. 39:6, and the world, Ps. 49:2, here in the former sense), at the end of which thou thoughtest thou wert already, and which seemed to thee to run on into dismal darkness, shall be restored to thee (יקום with *Munach* on the *ult.* as Job 31:14, not on the *penult.*) brighter than noon-day (מִן, more than, i.e., here: brighter than, as e.g., Mic. 7:4, more thorny than); and be it ever so dark, it shall become like morning. Such must be the interpretation of תְּעֻפָּה. It cannot be a substantive, for it has the accent on the *penult.;* as a substantive it must have been pointed תְּעוּפָה (after the form תְּעוּדָה, תְּקוּמָה, and the like). It is one of the few examples of the paragogic strengthened voluntative in the third pers., like Ps. 20:4, Isa. 5:19[96] (Ges. § 48, 3); the cohortative form of the future is used with or without אִם (vid., on Ps. 73:16) in hypothetical antecedent clauses (Ges. § 128, 1). Translate therefore: should it become dark (accordingly

correctly accented with *Rebia mugrasch*), from עוּף, to envelope one's self, to darken (whence עֵפָתָה, Job 10:22), not: shouldst thou become dark (Schlottm.). The feminine forms are instead of the neuter, like תַּמְטִיר, it rains, Amos 4:7; חָשְׁכָה, it becomes dark, Mic. 3:6 (Ges. § 137, 2).

The *fut.* is followed by *perff. consecutiva* in v. 18: And thou shalt take confidence, for there is ground for hope for thee; יֵשׁ, with the force of real and lasting existence. וְחָפַרְתָּ is also *perf. consec.,* and is rightly accented as such. If it were to be interpreted *et si erubueris pudore tranquille cubabis,* it would require the accent on the *penult.,* since it would be a *perf. hypotheticum.* But although the seeming antithesis of וחפרת and לבטח (comp. Job 6:20) appears to favour this interpretation, it is nevertheless inadmissible, since it introduces a sadness into the promise: granted that thou shouldest be put to shame at this or that prospect; whereas, if חפר be taken in the sense of *scrutari,* as it is used by our poet (Job 3:21, 39:29) (not with Böttch., who comp. Eccles. 5:11, in the signification *fodere* = to labour in the field, in which meaning it is not common), the tone of sadness is removed, and the accentuation is duly observed: and thou shalt search about (i.e., examine the state of thy household, which is expressed by וּפָקַדְתָּ in Job 5:24), thou shalt lay thyself down in peace (i.e., because thou findest everything in a prosperous condition, and hast no anxiety). This felling of security against every harm that may befall one's person or property, gained from trust in God, is expressed (v. 19*a*) under the figure of the peaceful situation of a herd when removed from danger,—a figure which is borrowed from Lev. 26:6, and is frequently repeated in the prophets (Isa. 17:2; Zeph. 3:13). The promises of Zophar culminate in a future exaltation which shall command reverence and inspire trust: *et mulcebunt faciem tuam multi.* חִלָּה פְּנֵי, to approach any one in humble entreaty, generally used in reference to God; less frequently, as here and Ps. 45:13, Prov. 19:6, in reference to men in high positions. The end of the wicked, on the other hand, is told in v. 20. Zophar here makes use of the choicest expressions of the style of the prophetic psalms: כָּלָה, otherwise frequently used of those who pine away with longing, here and Job 17:5 of eyes that languish with unsatisfied longing; מִגְהָם (Aram. מִגְהוֹן), poetic for מַהֵם; מַפַּח נֶפֶשׁ, after the phrase נָפַח נֶפֶשׁ, he breathes forth his soul (Jer. 15:9, comp. Job 31:39). The meaning is not that death is their only hope, but that every expectation remains unfulfilled; giving up the ghost is that whither all their disappointed hopes tend.

That Zophar, in the mind of the poet, is the youngest of the three speakers, may be concluded from his introducing him last of all, although he is the most impetuous. Zophar manifests a still greater inability than the other two to bring Job to a right state of mind. His standpoint is the same as that of the others; like them, he regards the retributive justice of God as the principle on which alone the divine government in the world is exercised, and to which every act of this government is to be attributed, and it may indeed be assumed to be at work even when the relation of circumstances is mysterious and impenetrably dark to us. This limited view which the friends take of the matter readily accounts for the brevity of their speeches in comparison with Job's. This one *locus communis* is their only theme, which they reiterate constantly in some new and modified form; while the mind of Job is an exhaustless fountain of thought, suggested by the direct experiences of the past. Before the present dispensation of suffering came upon Job, he enjoyed the peace of true godliness, and all his thoughts and feelings were under the control of a consciousness, made certain by his experience, that God makes himself known to those who fear Him. Now, however, his nature, hitherto kept in subjection by divine grace, is let loose in him; the powers of doubt, mistrust, impatience, and despondency have risen up; his

inner life is fallen into the anarchy of conflict; his mind, hitherto peaceful and well-disciplined, is become a wild chaotic confusion; and hence his speeches, in comparison with those of the friends, are as roaring cataracts to small confined streams. But in this chaos lie the elements of a new creation; the harsh pertinacity with which the friends maintain their one dogma only tends to give an impulse to it. The new truth, the solution of the mystery, springs from this spiritual battle Job has to fight, from which, although not scathless, he still shall come forth as conqueror.

When, therefore, Zophar regards the speeches of Job, which are the involuntary expression of the severity of his conflict, as a torrent of words, he shows that from the haughty elevation of his narrow dogma he does not understand this form of experience; and when he reproaches Job by saying, Whoever can babble so much shows that he is not in the right, he makes use of a maxim which is true enough in itself, but its application to Job proceeds from the most uncharitable misconstruction of his suffering friend. As he looks upon Job, who, in the midst of his fierce conflict, struggles after comfort, but thrusts away all false consolation, he regards him as a cavilling opponent because he cuts the knot instead of untying it. He is so blinded by the idea that he is in possession of the key to the mystery, that he malignantly reproaches Job with being an incorrigible "empty-pate." As though there could be hollowness where there is a heart that seethes like metal in the refiner's crucible; and as though the dogma of the friends, which forms the sole contents of their hollowness, could possibly impart light and peace to a heart so sorely troubled!

Is the dogma of the friends, then, so pure a doctrine (לקח זך) as that which, according to Zophar's words, Job claims for himself? On Zophar's side it is maintained that God always acts in accordance with justice, and Job maintains that God does not always so act. The maxim of the friends is false in the exclusiveness with which they maintain it; the conclusion to which they are urged gives evidence of the fallacy of the premises: they must condemn Job, and consequently become unjust, in order to rescue the justice of God. Job's maxim, on the other hand, is true; but it is so unconnected as it stands, that it may be turned over any moment and changed into a falsehood. For that God does not act everywhere as the Just One is a truth, but that He sometimes acts unjustly is blasphemy. Between these two Job hangs in suspense. For the stedfast consciousness of his innocence proves to him that God does not always act as the Just One; shall he therefore suppose that God deals unjustly with him? From this blasphemous inversion of his maxim, Job seeks refuge in the absolute power of God, which makes that just which is unjust according to the clearest *human* consciousness. This is the feeble thread on which Job's piety hangs. Should this be cut, it would be all over with him. The friends do their best to cut it in twain. Zophar's speech is like a sword-thrust at it.

For while Eliphaz and Bildad with cautious gentleness describe suffering more as chastisement than as punishment, Zophar proceeds more boldly, and demands of Job that he should humble himself, as one who has incurred punishment from God. Of sin on Job's part which may have called down the divine judgment, Zophar knows as little as Job himself. But he wishes that God would grant Job some revelation of His infinite wisdom, since he refuses to humble himself. Then he would confess his folly, and see that God not only does not punish him unjustly, but even allows much of his guilt to go unpunished. Job is therefore to turn penitently to God, and to put away that evil which is the cause of his suffering, in order that he may be heard. Then shall his hopeless condition become bright with hope; whereas, on the other hand, the downfall of the wicked is beyond recovery. Ewald aptly remarks that thus even the concluding words of the speeches of the friends are always somewhat equivocal. "Eliphaz just adds a slight caution, Bildad introduces the contrast in a few words, and Zophar adds but a word; all these seem to be as

the forerunners of a multitude of similar harsh threatenings, Job 15, 18, 20."

What impression will this harsh treatment of Zophar's produce on Job? Job is to humble himself as a sinner who is undergoing the punishment of his sin, though the measure of it is far below the degree of his guilt; and while he does not deny his sinful weaknesses, he is nevertheless convinced that he is righteous, and having as such experienced the favour of God, cannot become an object of punishment. Brentius discriminatingly observes here: *Videntur et Sophar et reliqui amici Hiob prorsus ignorare quid sit aut efficiat Evangelion et fides in promissionem Dei; sic argumentantur contra Hiobem, quasi nullus unquam possit coram Deo fide justificari.* The language is rather too much in accordance with the light of the New Testament; but it is true that the friends know nothing whatever of the condition of a truly righteous man, over whom the law with its curse, or the retributive justice of God, has no power. The interpretation of affliction in accordance with the recognition of this principle is strange to them; and this is just the issue which is developed by the drama in the case of Job—the idea which comes to light in the working out of the plot. Even Job does not perceive the solution of the mystery, but, in the midst of the conflict, is in a state of ignorance which excites compassion; the ignorance of the friends arising from their shallowness of understanding, on the contrary, creates aversion. When Zophar, therefore, wishes that God would grant Job some revelation of His infinite wisdom, it is indeed true that Job is greatly in need of it; but it is self-deceiving pride which leads Zophar to imagine that he has no need of it himself. For this Wisdom which has decreed the suffering of Job is hidden from his also; and yet he does not treat the suffering of his friend as a divine mystery. He explains it as the working of the retributive justice of God; but since he endeavours thus to explain the mystery, he injures his cause, and if possible injures also the slender thread by which Job's faith hangs. For should Job regard his sufferings as a *just* divine retribution, he could then no longer believe on God as the Just One.

JOB 12

Job's Third Answer.—Ch. 12–14.

Schema: 5. 8. 8. 6. 6. 10. 8. | 4. 8. 10. 10. 6. 6. 6. 7. | 6. 7. 7. 7. 10. 7. 6.

[The Job began, and said:]

2 Truly then ye are the people,
And wisdom shall die with you!
3 I also have a heart as well as you;
I do not stand behind you;
And to whom should not such things be known?

Job 12:2, 3. The admission, which is strengthened by כִּי אָמְנָם, truly then (distinct from אָמְנָם כִּי, for truly, Job 36:4, similar to כִּי הִנֵּה, behold indeed, Ps. 128:4), is intended as irony: ye are not merely single individuals, but the people = race of men (עָם, as Isa. 40:7, 42:5), so that all human understanding is confined to you, and there is none other to be found; and when once you die, it will seem to have died out. The LXX correctly renders: μὴ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἄνθρωποι μόνοι (according to the reading of the Cod. Alex.); he also has a heart like them, he is therefore not empty, נבוב, Job 11:12. Heart is, like Job 34:10, comp. נלבב, Job 11:12, equivalent to νοῦς διάνοια; Ewald's translation, "I also have a head even as you" ("brains" would better accord with the connection), is a western form of expression, and modern and unbiblical (vid., Division "Herz und Haupt," Psychol. iv. § 12). He is not second to them; מִן נָפַל, like Job 13:2, properly to slip from, to be below any one; מִן is not the comparative (Ewald). Oetinger's translation is not bad: I cannot slink away at your presence. Who has not a knowledge of such things as those which they, by setting themselves up as defenders of God, have presented to him! אִתִּי הָיָה is equivalent to יָדַעְתִּי, σύνοιδα, Isa. 59:12.

4 I must be a mockery to my own friend,
I who called on Eloah and He heard me;
A mockery—the just, the godly man.

5 Contempt belongs to misfortune, according to the ideas of the prosperous;

It awaits those who are ready to slip.

6 Tents of the destroyer remain in peace,

And those that defy God are prosperous,

Who taketh Eloah into his hand.

Job 12:4–6. The synallage of לְרֵעֵהוּ for לְרַעְיִ is not nearly so difficult as many others: a laughing-stock to his own friend; comp. Isa. 2:8, they worship the work of their (his) own hands (ידיו). "One who called on Eloah (לֶאֱלוֹהַּ, for which לֵאלֹוהַּ is found in LXX at Job 36:2) and He heard him" is in apposition to the subject; likewise תמים צדיק, which is to be explained according to Prov. 11:5, צדיק (from צדק, Arab. ṣdq, to be hard, firm, stiff, straight), is one who in his conduct rules himself strictly according to the will of God; תמים, one whose thoughts are in all respects and without disguise what they should be,—in one word: pure. Most old translators (Targ., Vulg., Luther) give לַפִּיד the signification, a torch. Thus e.g., Levi v. Gerson explains: "According to the view of the prosperous and carnally secure, he who is ready for falterings of the feet, i.e., likely to fall, is like a lighted torch which burns away and destroys whatever comes in contact with it, and therefore one keeps aloof from him; but it is also more than this: he is an object of contempt in their eyes." Job might not inappropriately say, that in the eyes of the prosperous he is like a despised, cast-away torch (comp. the similar figure, Isa. 14:19, like a branch that is rejected with contempt); and v. 5b would be suitably connected with this if לְמוֹעֲדֵי could be derived from a substantive מֹעַד, vacillatio, but neither the usage of the language nor the scriptio plena (after which Jerome translates tempus statutum, and consequently has in mind the מועדים, times of festal pilgrimages, which are also called רְגָלִים in later times), nor the vowel pointing (instead of which מָעֲדֵי would be expected), is favourable to this. רגל מועדי signifies vacillantes pede, those whose prosperity is shaken, and who are in danger of destruction that is near at hand. We therefore, like Abenezra and modern expositors, who are here happily agreed, take לפיד as composed of ל and פִּיד, a word common to the books of Job (Job 30:24, 31:29) and Proverbs (Prov. 24:22), which is compared by the Jewish lexicographers, according both to form and meaning, to כִּיד (Job 21:20) and אִיד, and perhaps signifies originally dissolution (comp. פדה), decease (Syr. f'jodo, escape; Arab. faid, dying), fall, then generally calamity, misfortune: contempt (befits) misfortune, according to the thoughts (or thinking), idea of the prosperous. The pointing wavers between לְעַשְׁתּוֹת and the more authorized לְעַשְׁתּוּת, with which Parchon compares the nouns עַבְדוּת and מַרְדוּת; the ת, like ד in the latter word, has Dag. lene, since the punctuation is in this respect not quite consistent, or follows laws at present unknown (comp. Ges. § 21, rem. 2). V. 5b is now suitably connected: ready (with reference to בוז) for those who stumble, i.e., contempt certainly awaits such, it is ready and waiting for them, נָכוֹן, ἕτοιμος, like Ex. 34:2.

While the unfortunate, in spite of his innocence, has thus only to expect contempt, the tents, i.e., dwellings and possessions, of the oppressor and the marauder remain in prosperity; יִשְׁלָיוּ for יִשְׁלוּ, an intensive form used not only in pause (Ps. 36:8; comp. Deut. 32:37) and with greater distinctives (Num. 34:6; Ps. 122:6), but also in passages where it receives no such accent (Ps. 36:9, 57:2, 73:2). On אֹהָלִים, instead of אָהֳלִים, vid., Ges. § 93, 6, 3. The verbal clause (v. 6a) is followed by a substantival clause (6b). בַּטָּחוֹת is an abstract plural from בָּטוּחַ, perfectly secure; therefore: the most care-less security is the portion of those who provoke God (LXX παροργίζουσι);97 and this is continued in an individualizing form: him who causes Eloah to go into his hand. Seb. Schmid explains this passage in the main correctly: qui Deum in manu fert h.e. qui manum aut potentiam suam pro Deo habet et licitum sibi putat quodlibet; comp. Hab. 1:11: "this his strength becomes God to him," i.e., he deifies his own power, and puts it in the place of God. But הֵבִיא signifies, in this connection with לְיָדוֹ (not בידו), neither to carry, nor to lead (Gesenius, who compares Ps. 74:5, where, however, it signifies to cause to go

into = to strike into); it must be translated: he who causes Eloah to enter into his hand; from which translation it is clear that not the deification of the hand, but of that which is taken into the hand, is meant. This which is taken into the hand is not, however, an idol (Abenezra), but the sword; therefore: him who thinks after the manner of Lamech,98 as he takes the iron weapon of attack and defence into his hand, that he needs no other God.

7 But ask now even the beasts—they shall teach it thee;

And the birds of heaven—they shall declare it to thee:

8 Or look thoughtfully to the ground—it shall teach it thee;

And the fish of the sea shall tell it thee.

9 Who would not recognise in all this

That the hand of Jehovah hath wrought this,

10 In whose hand is the soul of every living thing,

And the breath of all mankind?!

Job 12:7–10. The meaning of the whole strophe is perverted if זאת (v. 9), is, with Ewald, referred to "the destiny of severe suffering and pain," and if that which precedes is accordingly referred to the testimony of creation to God as its author. Since, as a glance at what follows shows, Job further on praises God as the governor of the universe, it may be expected that the reference is here to God as the creator and preserver of the world, which seems to be the meaning of the words. Job himself expresses the purpose of this hymn of confession, vv. 2f., 13:1f.: he will show the friends that the majesty of God, before which he ought, according to their demands, to humble himself in penitence, is not less known to him than to them; and with ואולם, verum enim vero, he passes over to this subject when he begins his third answer with the following thought: The perception in which you pride yourselves I also possess; true, I am an object of scornful contempt to you, who are as little able to understand the suffering of the godly as the prosperity of the godless, nevertheless what you know I also know: ask now, etc. Bildad had appealed to the sayings of the ancients, which have the long experience of the past in their favour, to support the justice of the divine government; Job here appeals to the absoluteness of the divine rule over creation. In form, this strophe is the counterpart of Job 8:8–10 in the speech of Bildad, and somewhat also of Job 11:7–9 in that of Zophar. The working of God, which infinitely transcends human power and knowledge, is the sermon which is continuously preached by all created things; they all proclaim the omnipotence and wisdom of the Creator.

The plural בְּהֵמוֹת is followed by the verb that refers to it, in the singular, in favour of which Gen. 49:22 is the favourite example among old expositors (Ges. § 146, 3). On the other hand, the verb might follow the collective עוֹף in the plural, according to Ges. § 146, 1. The plural, however, is used only in v. 8b, because there the verb precedes instead of following its subject. According to the rule Ges. § 128, 2, the jussive form of the fut. follows the imperative. In the midst of this enumeration of created things, שִׂיחַ, as a substantive, seems to signify the plants—and especially as Arab. šîḥ even now, in the neighbourhood of Job's ancient habitation, is the name of a well-known mountain-plant—under whose shade a meagre vegetation is preserved even in the hot season (vid., on Job 30:4ff.). But (1) שִׂיחַ as subst. is gen. masc. Gen. 2:5); (2) instead of לָאָרֶץ, in order to describe a plant that is found on the ground, or one rooted in the ground, it must be על־הארץ or בארץ; (3) the mention of plants between the birds and fishes would be strange. It may therefore be taken as the imperative: speak to the earth (LXX, Targ., Vulg., and most others); or, which I prefer, since the Aramaic construction לוֹ סָח, narravit ei, does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew (although perhaps implicite, Prov. 6:22, לך תשׂיחך = תשׂיח, favulabitur, or confabulabitur tibi), as a pregnant expression: think, i.e., look meditatively to the earth (Ewald), since שׂוּחַ (שִׂיחַ), like הָגָה, combines the significations of quiet or articulate meditation on a subject. The

exhortation directs attention not to the earth in itself, but to the small living things which move about on the ground, comprehended in the collective name רֶמֶשׂ, syn. שֶׁרֶץ (creeping things), in the record of creation. All these creatures, though without reason and speech, still utter a language which is heard by every intelligent man. Renan, after Ewald, translates erroneously: qui ne sait parmi tous ces êtres. They do not even possess knowledge, but they offer instruction, and are a means of knowledge; בְּ with יָדַע, like Gen. 15:8, 42:33, and freq. All the creatures named declare that the hand of Jehovah has made "this," whatever we see around us, τὸ βλεπόμενον, Heb. 11:3. In the same manner in Isa. 66:2, Jer. 14:22, כָּל־אֵלֶּה is used of the world around us. In the hand of God, i.e., in His power, because His workmanship, are the souls of all living things, and the spirit (that which came direct from God) of all men; every order of life, high and low, owes its origin and continuance to Him. אִישׁ is the individual, and in this connection, in which נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ (= נְשָׁמָה) are certainly not unintentionally thus separated, the individual man. Creation is the school of knowledge, and man is the learner. And this knowledge forces itself upon one's attention: quis non cognoverit? The perf. has this subjunctive force also elsewhere in interrogative clauses, e.g., Ps. 11:3 (vid., on Gen. 21:7). That the name of God, JEHOVAH, for once escapes the poet here, is to be explained from the phrase "the hand of Jehovah hath made this," being a somewhat proverbial expression (comp. Isa. 41:20, 66:2).

Job now refers to the sayings of the fathers, the authority of which, as being handed down from past generations, Bildad had maintained in his opposition to Job.

11 Shall not the ear try sayings,
As the palate tasteth food?
12 Among the ancients is wisdom,
And long life is understanding.
13 With Him is wisdom and strength;
Counsel and understanding are His.

Job 12:11–13. The meaning of v. 11 is, that the sayings (מְלִּין, Job 8:10, comp. 5:27) of the ancients are not to be accepted without being proved; the waw in וְחֵךְ is waw adaequationis, as Job 5:7, 11:12, therefore equivalent to quemadmodum; it places together for comparison things that are analogous: The ear, which is used here like αίσθητήριον (Heb. 5:14), has the task of searching out and testing weighty sayings, as the palate by tasting has to find out delicious and suitable food; this is indicated by לוֹ, the dat. commodi. So far Job recognises the authority of these traditional sayings. At any rate, he adds (v. 12): wisdom is to be expected from the hoary-headed, and length of life is understanding, i.e., it accompanies length of life. "Length of days" may thus be taken as the subject (Ewald, Olsh.); but בְּ may also, with the old translations and expositors, be carried forward from the preceding clause: ἐν δὲ πολλῷ βίῳ ἐπιστήμη (LXX). We prefer, as the most natural: long life is a school of understanding. But—such is the antithesis in v. 13 which belongs to this strophe—the highest possessor of wisdom, as of might, is God. Ewald inserts two self-made couplets before v. 12, which in his opinion are required both by the connection and "the structure of the strophe;" we see as little need for this interpolation here as before, Job 6:14b. עִמּוֹ and לוֹ, which are placed first for the sake of emphasis, manifestly introduce an antithesis; and it is evident from the antithesis, that the One who is placed in contrast to the many men of experience is God. Wisdom is found among the ancients, although their sayings are not to be always implicitly accepted; but wisdom belongs to God as an attribute of His nature, and indeed absolutely, i.e., on every side, and without measure, as the piling up of synonymous expressions implies: מָהֳכָ, which perceives the reason of the nature, and the reality of the existence, of things; עֵצָה, which is never perplexed as to the best way of attaining its purpose; תְּבוּנָה, which can penetrate to the bottom of what is true and false, sound and corrupt (comp. 1 Kings 3:9); and also גְּבוּרָה, which is able to carry out the plans, purposes,

and decisions of this wisdom against all hindrance and opposition.

In the strophe which follows, from his own observation and from traditional knowledge (Job 13:1), Job describes the working of God, as the unsearchably wise and the irresistibly mighty One, both among men and in nature.

14 Behold, He breaketh down and it cannot be built again,

He shutteth up, and it cannot be opened.

15 Behold, He restraineth the waters and they dry up,

And He letteth them out and they overturn the earth.

16 With Him is might and existence,

The erring and the deceiver are His.

Job 12:14–16. God is almighty, and everything in opposition to Him powerless. If He break down (any structure whatever), it can never be rebuilt; should He close upon any one (i.e., the dungeon, as perhaps a cistern covered with a stone, Lam. 3:53, comp. Jer. 38:6; עַל with reference to the depth of the dungeon, instead of the usual בְּעַד), it (that which is closed from above) cannot be opened again. In like manner, when He desires to punish a land, He disposes the elements according to His will and pleasure, by bringing upon it drought or flood. יַעְצֹר, coercet, according to the correct Masoretic mode of writing יַעָצֹר with dagesh in the Ssade, in order clearly to distinguish in the pronunciation between the forms j'a-ssor and jaa'ssor (יַעֲצֹר);99 וְיָבָשׁוּ (for which Abulwalid writes וְיִבָּשׁוּ) is a defective form of writing according to Ges. § 69, 3, 3; the form וְיַהַפְכוּ with the similarly pointed fut. consec., 1 Sam. 25:12, form a pair (זוּג) noted by the Masora. By תּוּשִׁיָּה, which is ascribed to God, is here to be understood that which really exists, the real, the objective, knowledge resting on an objective actual basis, in contrast with what only appears to be; so that consequently the idea of vv. 16a and 13a is somewhat veiled; for the primary notion of חָכְמָה is thickness, solidity, purity, like πυκνότης.100 This strophe closes like the preceding, which favours our division. The line with עִמּוֹ is followed by one with לוֹ, which affirms that, in the supremacy of His rule and the wisdom of His counsels, God makes evil in every form subservient to His designs.

17 He leadeth away counsellors stripped of their robes,

And maketh judges fools.

18 The authority of kings He looseth,

And bindeth their loins with bands.

19 He leadeth away priests stripped of their robes,

And overthroweth those who are firmly established.

20 He removeth the speech of the eloquent,

And taketh away the judgment of the aged.

21 He poureth contempt upon princes,

And maketh loose the girdle of the mighty.

Job 12:17–21. In vv. 17, 19, שׁוֹלָל is added to מוֹלִיךְ as a conditional accusative; the old expositors vary in the rendering of this word; at any rate it does not mean: chained (Targ. on v. 17), from שׁלל (שׁרר), which is reduplicated in the word שַׁלְשֶׁלֶת, a chain, a word used in later Hebrew than the language of the Old Testament (שַׁרְשֶׁרָה is the Old Testament word); nor is it: taken as booty, made captive (LXX αἰχμαλώτους; Targ. on v. 19, בְּבִזְתָּא, in the quality of spoil) = מָשׁוֹלָל; but it is a neuter adjective closely allied to the idea of the verb, exutus, not however mente (deprived of sense), but vestibus; not merely barefooted (Hirz., Oehler, with LXX, Mic. 1:8, ἀνυπόδετος), which is the meaning of יָחֵף, but: stripped of their clothes with violence (vid., Isa. 20:4), stripped in particular of the insignia of their power. He leads them half-naked into captivity, and takes away the judges as fools (יְהוֹלֵל, vid., Psychol. S. 292), by destroying not only their power, but the prestige of their position also. We find echoes of this utterance respecting God's paradoxical rule in the world in Isa. 40:23, 44:25; and Isaiah's oracle on Egypt, Job 19:11–15, furnishes an illustration in the reality.

It is but too natural to translate v. 18: the bands of kings He looses (after Ps. 116:16, למוסרי פתחת,

Thou hast loosed my bands); but the relation of the two parts of the verse can then not be this: He unchains and chains kings (Hirz., Ew., Heiligst. Schlottm.), for the fut. consec. וַיֶּאְסֹר requires a contrast that is intimately connected with the context, and not of mere outward form: fetters in which kings have bound others (מלכים, gen. subjectivus) He looses, and binds them in fetters (Raschi),—an explanation which much commends itself, if מוּסַר could only be justified as the construct of מוֹסֵר by the remark that "the o sinks into u" (Ewald, § 213, c). מוֹסֵר does not once occur in the signification vinculum; but only the plur. מוֹסֵרִים and מוֹסֵרוֹת, vincula, accord with the usage of the language, so that even the pointing מוֹסַר proposed by Hirzel is a venture. מוּסַר, however, as constr. of מוּסָר, correction, discipline, rule (i.e., as the domination of punishment, from יסר, castigare), is an equally suitable sense, and is probably connected by the poet with תֻּחַפּ (a word very familiar to him, Job 30:11, 39:5, 41:6) on account of its relation both in sound and sense to מוֹסֵרִים (comp. Ps. 105:22). The English translation is correct: He looseth the authority of kings. The antithesis is certainly lost, but the thoughts here moreover flow on in synonymous parallelism.

Ver 19. It is unnecessary to understand כהנים, after 2 Sam. 8:18, of high officers of state, perhaps privy councillors; such priest-princes as Melchizedek of Salem and Jethro of Midian are meant. יְטָנִיאֵ, which denotes inexhaustible, perennis, when used of waters, is descriptive of nations as invincible in might, Jer. 5:15, and of persons as firmly-rooted and stedfast. נֶאֱמָנִים, such as are tested, who are able to speak and counsel what is right at the fitting season, consequently the ready in speech and counsel. The derivation, proposed by Kimchi, from נָאַם, in the sense of diserti, would require the pointing נַאֲמָנִים. טַעַם is taste, judgment, tact, which knows what is right and appropriate under the different circumstances of life, 1 Sam. 25:33. יְקֻח is used exactly as in Hos. 4:11. V. 21a is repeated verbatim, Ps. 107:40; the trilogy, Ps. 105–107, particularly Ps. 107, is full of passages similar to the second part of Isaiah and the book of Job (vid., Psalter, ii. 117). אֲפִיקִים (only here and Job 41:7) are the strong, from אָפַק, to hold together, especially to concentrate strength on anything. מֶזְיַח (only here, instead of מַזַּח, not from מָזַח, which is an imaginary root, but from זָחַח, according to Fürst equivalent to זָקַק, to lace, bind) is the girdle with which the garments were fastened and girded up for any great exertion, especially for desperate conflict (Isa. 5:27). To make him weak or relaxed, is the same as to deprive of the ability of vigorous, powerful action. Every word is here appropriately used. This tottering relaxed condition is the very opposite of the intensity and energy which belongs to "the strong." All temporal and spiritual power is subject to God: He gives or takes it away according to His supreme will and pleasure.

22 He discovereth deep things out of darkness,

And bringeth out to light the shadow of death;

23 He giveth prosperity to nations and then destroyeth them,

Increase of territory to nations and then carrieth them away;

24 He taketh away the understanding of the chief people of the land,

And maketh them to wander in a trackless wilderness;

25 They grope in darkness without light,

He maketh them to stagger like a drunken man.

Job 12:22–25. The meaning of v. 22 in this connection can only be, that there is nothing so finely spun out that God cannot make it visible. All secret plans of the wicked, all secret sins, and the deeds of the evil-doer though veiled in deep darkness, He bringeth before the tribunal of the world. The form of writing given by the Masora is עֲמוּקוֹת with koph raphatum, consequently plur. from עָמוּק, like עֲרוּמִים, עֲצוּמִים from עָרוּם, עָצוּם, not from עָמֹק.101 The LXX translates משגיא πλανῶν, as it is also explained in several Midrash-passages, but only by a few Jewish expositors (Jachja, Alschech) by מטעה. The word, however, is not מַשְׁגִּיא, but מַשְׂגִּיא with

ש sinistrum, after which in Midrash Esther it is explained by מגדיל; and Hirzel correctly interprets it of upward growth (Jerome after the Targ. unsuitably, multiplicat), and שׂטח, on the other hand, of growth in extent. The latter word is falsely explained by the Targ. in the sense of expandere rete, and Abenezra also falsely explains: He scatters nations, and brings them to their original peace. The verb שׂטח is here connected with לְ, as הִפְתָּה (Gen. 9:27); both signify to make a wider and longer space for any one, used here of the ground where they dwell and rule. The opposite, in an unpropitious sense, is הִנָּחָה, which is used here, as 2 Kings 18:11, in a similar sense with הִגְלָה (abducere, i.e., in servitutem). We have intentionally translated גוים nations, עם people; for גּוֹי, as we shall show elsewhere, is the mass held together by the ties of a common origin, language, and country; (עָם) עַם, the people bound together by unity of government, whose membra praecipua are consequently called רָאשֵׁי הָעָם. הארץ is, in this connection, the country, although elsewhere, as Isa. 24:4, comp. 42:5, הארץ עם signifies also the people of the earth or mankind; for the Hebrew language expresses a country as a portion of the earth, and the earth as a whole, by the same name. Job dwells longer on this tragic picture, how God makes the star of the prosperity of these chiefs to set in mad and blind self-destruction, according to the proverb, quem Deus perdere vult prius dementat. This description seems to be echoed in many points in Isaiah, especially in the oracle on Egypt, Is. 19 (e.g., כַּשִּׁכּוֹר, 19:14). The connection לא בתהו דרך is not genitival; but לא דרך is either an adverbial clause appended to the verb, as לא חקר, Job 34:24, לא בנים, 1 Chron. 2:30, 32, or, which we prefer as being more natural, and on account of the position of the words, a virtual adjective: in a trackless waste, as לֹא אִישׁ, Job 38:26; לא עבות, 2 Sam. 23:4 (Olsh.).

JOB 13

Job here takes up the tone of Eliphaz (comp. Job 5:13f.). Intentionally he is made to excel the friends in a recognition of the absolute majesty of God. He is not less cognizant of it than they.

1 Lo, mine eye hath seen all,
Mine ear hath heard and marked it.
2 What ye know do I know also,
I do not stand back behind you.

Job 13:1, 2. Job has brought forward proof of what he has stated at the commencement of this speech (Job 12:3), that he is not inferior to them in the knowledge of God and divine things, and therefore he can now repeat as proved what he maintains. The plain כֹּל, which in other passages, with the force of הַכֹּל, signifies omnes (Gen. 16:12; Isa. 30:5; Jer. 44:12) and omnia (Job 42:2; Ps. 8:7; Isa. 44:24), has the definite sense of haec omnia here. לָהּ (v. 1b) is not after the Aramaic manner dat. pro acc. objecti: my ear has heard and comprehended it (id); but dat. commodi, or perhaps only dat. ethicus: and has made it intelligible to itself (sibi); בִּין of the apprehension accompanying perception. He has a knowledge of the exalted and glorious majesty of God, acquired partly from his own observation and partly from the teachings of others. He also knows equal to (instar) their knowledge, i.e., he has a knowledge (יָדַע as the idea implied in it, e.g., like Ps. 82:5) which will bear comparison with theirs. But he will no longer contend with them.

3 But I would speak to the Almighty,
And I long to reason with God.
4 And ye however are forgers of lies,
Physicians of no value are ye all.
5 Oh that ye would altogether hold your peace,
It would be accounted to you as wisdom.
6 Hear now my instruction,
And hearken to the answers of my lips!

Job 13:3–6. He will no longer dispute with the friends; the more they oppose him, the more earnestly he desires to be able to argue his cause before God. אוּלָם (v. 3) is disjunctive, like ἀλλά, and introduces a new range of thoughts; LXX ου᾽ μὴν δὲ ἀλλά, verum enim vero. True, he has said in Job 9 that no one can maintain his cause before God; but his confidence in God grows in proportion as his distrust of the

friends increases; and at the same time, the hope is begotten that God will grant him that softening of the terror of His majesty which he has reserved to himself in connection with this declaration (Job 9:34, comp. 13:20f.). The infin. absol. הוֹכֵחַ, which in Job 6:25 is used almost as a substantive, and indeed as the subject, is here in the place of the object, as e.g., Isa. 5:5, 58:6: to prove, i.e., my cause, to God (אֶל־אֵל, like v. 15, אֶל־פָּנָיו) I long. With וְאוּלָם (v. 4) the antithesis is introduced anew: I will turn to God, you on the contrary (καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ). Since the verb טָפַל, from its primary meaning to spread on, smear on (whence e.g., Talmudic טָפֵלָה, the act of throwing on, as when plastering up the cracks of an oven), cogn. תָּפַל (whence תָּפֵל, plaster, and perhaps also in the signification tasteless, Job 6:6 = sticky, greasy, slimy), does not signify, at least not at first, consuere, but assuere (without any relation of root with תָּפַר), we explain, not with Olshausen and others, concinnatores mendacii, such as sew together lies as patchwork; but with Hirzel and others, assutores mendacii, such as patch on lies, i.e., charge falsely, since they desire throughout to make him out to be a sinner punished according to his desert. This explanation is also confirmed by Job 14:17. Another explanation is given by Hupfeld: sarcinatores false = inanes, inutiles, so that שֶׁקֶר signifies what lies = what deceives, as in the parallel member of the verse אֱלִיל,102 nothingness, and also עָמָל (Job 16:2) in a similar connection, is not an objective but attributive genitive; but Ps. 119:69 is decisive against this interpretation of שֶׁקֶר טָפְלֵי. The parallelism is not so exactly adjusted, as e.g., even רֹפְאֵי does not on account of the parallel with טָפְלֵי signify patchers, ῥάπται, but: they are not able to heal Job's wounds with the medicine of consolation; they are medici nihili, useless physicians. Prov. 17:28, "Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise," applies to them, si tacuisses, sapiens mansisses; or, as a rabbinical proverb of similar meaning, quoted by Heidenheim, says, השׂגה בהשׂגה הלאות, "the fatigue of comprehension is comprehension," i.e., the silent pause before a problem is half the solution. The jussive form וּתְהִי, it would be (Ges. § 128, 2), is used in the conclusion of the wish. Thus he challenges them to hear his תּוֹכַחַת (תּוֹכֵחָה) and his רִבּוֹת. Hirzel is quite right when he says the former does not mean defence (justification), nor the latter proofs (counter-evidence); תוכחת is, according to his signification (significatus, in distinction from sensus), ἔλεγχος, correptio (LXX, Vulg.), and here not so much refutation and answer, as correction in an ethical sense, in correspondence with which בותר is also intended of reproaches, reproofs, or reprimands.

7 Will ye speak what is wrong for God,
And speak what is deceitful for Him?
8 Will ye be partial for Him,
Or will ye play the part of God's advocates?
9 Would it be pleasant if He should search you out,
Or can ye jest with Him, as one jesteth with men?
10 He will surely expose you
If ye secretly act with partiality.
11 Will not His majesty confound you,
And His fear fall upon you?

Job 13:7–11. Their advocacy of God—this is the thought of this strophe—is an injustice to Job, and an evil service rendered to God, which cannot escape undisguised punishment from Him. They set themselves up as God's advocates (לָאֵל רִיב, like לַבַּעַל רִיב, Judg. 6:31), and at the same time accept His person, accipiunt (as in acceptus = gratus), or lift it up, i.e., favour, or give preference to, His person, viz., at the expense of the truth: they are partial in His favour, as they are twice reminded and given to understand by the fut. energicum תִּשָּׂאוּן. The addition of בַּסֵּתֶר (v. 10b) implies that they conceal their better knowledge by the assumption of an earnest tone and bearing, expressive of the strongest conviction that they are in the right. They know that Job is not a flagrant sinner; nevertheless they deceive themselves with the idea that he is, and by reason of this delusion they take up the cause of God against him. Such perversion of the truth in

majorem Dei gloriam is an abomination to God. When He searches them, His advocates, out (תָּקַר, as Prov. 28:11), they will become conscious of it; or will God be mocked, as one mocketh mortal men? Comp. Gal. 6:7 for a similar thought. הָתֵל is inf. absol. after the form הָסֵב, and תְּתָהֵלּוּ is also to be derived from תָּלַל, and is fut. Hiph., the preformative not being syncopated, for תְּתֵלּוּ (Ges. § 53, rem. 7); not Piel, from הָתַל (as 1 Kings 18:27), with the doubling of the middle radical resolved (Olsh. in his Lehrb. S. 577). God is not pleased with λατρεία (John 16:2) which gives the honour to Him, but not to truth, such ζῆλος Θεοῦ ἀλλ᾽ ου᾽ κατ᾽ ἐπίγνωσιν (Rom. 10:2), such advocacy contrary to one's better knowledge and conscience, in which the end is thought to sanctify the means. Such advocacy must be put to shame and confounded when He who needs no concealment of the truth for His justification is manifest in His שְׂאֵת, i.e., not: in the kindling of His wrath (after Judg. 20:38, Isa. 30:27), but: in His exaltation (correctly by Ralbag: התנשׂאותו ורוממותו), and by His direct influence brings all untruth to light. It is the boldest thought imaginable, that one dare not have respect even to the person of God when one is obliged to lie to one's self. And still it is also self-evident. For God and truth can never be antagonistic.

12 Your memorable words are proverbs of dust,

Your strongholds are become strongholds of clay!

13 Leave me in peace, and I will speak,

And let what will come on me.

14 Wherefore should I bear my flesh in my teeth?

I take my soul in my hands.

15 Behold, He slayeth me—I wait for Him:

I will only prove my way before Him.

16 Even this would by my salvation,

That a hypocrite dare not appear before Him.

Job 13:12–16. The words by which they exhort and warn him are called יִמְזְכְּרֹנִי, not because they recall the experience and teaching of the ancients (Hirz.), but as sayings to which attention and thought should be given, with the tone of זכר־נא, Job 4:7 (Hahn); as זכרון ספר, Mal. 3:16, the book of remembrance; and זכרנות ספר, Esth. 6:1, the book of memorabilia or memoranda. These their loci communes are proverbs of ashes, i.e., proverbs which in respect to the present case, say nothing, passing away like ashes (אֵפֶר = vanity, Isa. 44:20). While v. 12a says what their speeches, with the weighty nota bene, are, v. 12b says what their גַּבֵּיהֶם become; for לְ always denotes a κίνησις = γένεσις, and is never the exponent of the predicate in a simple clause.103 Like the Arabic ḍahr, גַּב signifies a boss, back, then protection, bulwark, rampart: their arguments or proofs are called גבים (עַצֻמוֹת, Isa. 41:21; comp. ὀχυρώματα, 2 Cor. 10:4); these ramparts which they throw up become as ramparts of clay, will be shown to be such by their being soon broken through and falling in. Their reasons will not stand before God, but, like clay that will not hold together, fall to pieces.

Ver. 13. Be silent therefore from me, he says to them, i.e., stand away from me and leave me in peace (opp. אֶל החריש, Isa. 41:1): then will I speak, or: in order that I may speak (the cohortative usual in apod. imper.)—he, and he alone, will defend (i.e., against God) his cause, which they have so uncharitably abandoned in spite of their better knowledge and conscience, let thereby happen (עבר, similar to Deut. 24:5) to him מָה, whatever may happen (שׁיעבר מה); or more simply: whatever it may be, quidquid est, as 2 Sam. 18:22 מה ויהי, let happen whatever may happen; or more simply: whatever it may be, like מָה דְּבַר quodcunque, Num. 23:3; מִי occurs also in a similar sense, thus placed last (Ewald, § 104, d).

Ver. 14. Wherefore should he carry away his flesh in his teeth, i.e., be intent upon the maintenance of his life, as a wild beast upon the preservation of its prey, by holding it between its teeth (mordicus tenet) and carrying it away? This is a proverbial phrase which does not occur elsewhere; for Jer. 38:2 (thy life shall

become as spoil, לְשָׁלָל, to thee) is only similar in outward appearance. It may be asked whether v. 14b continues the question begun with מָּה־עַל (vid., on Isa. 1:5): and wherefore should I take my soul in my hands, i.e., carefully protect it as a valuable possession? (Eichh., Umbr., Vaih.). But apart from Ps. 119:109 (my soul is continually in my hand),—where it may be asked, whether the soul is not there regarded as treasure (according to the current religious phrase: to carry his soul in his hand = to work out the blessedness of his soul with fear and trembling),—בְּכַפָּיו נַפְשׁוֹ שִׂים signifies everywhere else (Judg. 12:3; 1 Sam. 19:5, 28:21) as much as to risk one's life without fear of death, properly speaking: to fight one's way through with one's fist, perishing so soon as the strength of one's fist is gone (Ewald); comp. the expression for the impending danger of death, Deut. 28:66. If this sense, which is in accordance with the usage of the language, be adopted, it is unnecessary with Hirz., after Ewald, § 352, b, to take וְנַפְשִׁי for נפשׁי גם: also, even my soul, etc., although it cannot be denied that ו, like καί and et, sometimes signifies: also, etiam (Isa. 32:7, 2 Chron. 27:5, Eccles. 5:6, and according to the accents, Hos. 8:6 also; on the contrary, 2 Sam. 1:23, Ps. 31:12, can at least by explained by the copulative meaning, and Amos 4:10 by "and indeed"). The waw joins the positive to the negative assertion contained in the question of v. 14a (Hahn): I will not eagerly make my flesh safe, and will take my soul in my hand, i.e., calmly and bravely expose myself to the danger of death. Thus v. 15 is most directly connected with what precedes.

Ver. 15. This is one of eighteen passages in which the Chethib is לא and the Keri לו; Job 6:21 is another.104 In the LXX, which moreover changes איחל into הֶחֵל, ἄρχεσθαι, the rendering is doubtful, the Cod. Vat. translating ἐάν με χειρώσηται, the Cod. Alex. ἐὰν μή με χειρ. The Mishna b. Sota, 27, b, refers to the passage with reference to the question whether Job had served God from love or fear, and in favour of the former appeals to Job 27:5, since here the matter is doubtful (שׁקול הדבר), as the present passage may be explained, "I hope in Him," or "I hope not." The Gemara, ib. 31, a, observes that the reading לא does not determine the sense, for Isa. 63:9 is written לא, and is not necessarily to be understood as לו, but can be so understood.105 Among the ancient versions, the Targ., Syr., and Jerome (etiamsi occiderit me, in ipso sperabo) are in favour of לו. This translation of the Vulgate is followed by the French, English, Italian, and other versions. This utterance, in this interpretation, has a venerable history. The Electoress Louise Henriette von Oranien (died 1667), the authoress of the immortal hymn, "Jesus meine Zuversicht" [the English translation begins, "Jesus Christ, my sure defence"], chose these words, "Though the Lord should slay me, yet will I hope in Him," for the text of her funeral oration. And many in the hour of death have adopted the utterance of Job in this form as the expression of their faith and consolation.106 Among these we may mention a Jewess. The last movement of the wasted fingers of Grace Aguilar was to spell the words, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him."107

The words, so understood, have an historic claim in their favour which we will not dispute. Even the apostles do not spurn the use of the Greek words of the Old Testament, though they do not accord with the proper connection in the original text, provided they are in accordance with sacred Scripture, and give brief and pregnant expression to a truth taught elsewhere in the Scriptures. Thus it is with this utterance, which, understood as the Vulgate understands it, is thoroughly Job-like, and in some measure the ultimate solution of the book of Job. It is also, according to its most evident meaning, an expression of perfect resignation. We admit that if it is translated: behold, He will slay me, I hope not, i.e., I await no other and happier issue, a thought is obtained that also agrees with the context. But יְחֵל does not properly mean to hope, but to wait for; and even in Job 6:11, 14:14, where it stands as much without an object as here, it has no other meaning but that of waiting; and Luther is true to it when he translates: behold, He will destroy me, and I cannot expect it; it is, however,

strange; and Böttch. translates: I will not wait to justify myself, which is odd. The proper meaning of יחל, praestolari, gives no suitable sense. Thus, therefore, the writer will have written or meant לו, since לְ יָחֵל is also elsewhere a familiar expression with him, Job 29:21, 23, 30:26. The meaning, then, which agrees both with the context and with the reality, is: behold, He will slay me, I wait for Him, i.e., I wait what He may do, even to smite with death, only I will (אַךְ, as frequently, e.g., Ps. 49:16, does not belong to the word which immediately follows, but to the whole clause) prove my ways to Him, even before His face. He fears the extreme, but is also prepared for it. Hirzel, Heiligst., Vaihinger, and others, think that Job regards his wish for the appearing of God as the certain way of death, according to the belief that no one can behold God and not die. But יְקָטְלֵנִי has reference to a different form of idea. He fears the risk of disputing with God, and being obliged to forfeit his life; but, as איחל לו implies, he resigns himself even to the worst, he waits for Him to whom he resigns himself, whatever He may do to him; nevertheless (אַךְ restrictive, or as frequently אָכֵן adversative, which is the same thing here) he cannot and will not keep down the inward testimony of his innocence, he is prepared to render Him an account of the ways in which he has walked (i.e., the way of His will)—he can succumb in all respects but that of his moral guiltlessness. And in v. 16 he adds what will prove a triumph for him, that a godless person, or (what is suitable, and if it does not correspond to the primary idea,108 still accords with the use of the word) a hypocrite, one who judges thus of himself in his own heart, would not so come forward to answer for himself before God (Hahn). It can be explained: that a godless person has no access to God; but the other explanation givers a truer thought. הוא is here used as neuter, like Job 15:9, 31:28 comp. 11, 41:3, Ex. 34:10. Correctly LXX, καὶ τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν. יְשׁוּעָה here (comp. Job 30:15) has not, however, the usual deeper meaning which it has in the prophets and in Psalms. It means here salvation, as victory in a contest for the right. Job means that he has already as good as won the contest, by so urgently desiring to defend himself before God. This excites a feeling in favour of his innocence at the onset, and secures him an acquittal.

17 Hear, O hear my confession,
And let my declaration echo in your ears.
18 Behold now! I have arranged the cause,
I know that I shall maintain the right.
19 Who then can contend with me?
Then, indeed, I would be silent and expire.

Job 13:17–19. Eager for the accomplishment of his wish that he might himself take his cause before God, and as though in imagination it were so, he invites the friends to be present to hear his defence of himself. מִלָּה (in Arabic directly used for confession = religion) is the confession which he will lay down, and אַחֲוָה the declaration that he will make in evidence, i.e., the proof of his innocence. The latter substantive, which signifies brotherly conduct in post-biblical Hebrew, is here an ἅπ. λεγ. from חָוָה, not however with Aleph prostheticum from Kal, but after the form אַזְכָּרָה = הַזְכָּרָה, from the Aphêl = Hiphil of this verb, which, except Ps. 19:3, occurs only in the book of Job as Hebrew (comp. the n. actionis, אַחֲוָיָה, Dan. 5:12), Ewald, § 156, c. It is unnecessary to carry the שִׁמְעוּ on to v. 17b (hear now … with your own ears, as e.g., Jer. 26:11); v. 17b is an independent substantival clause like Job 15:11, Isa. 5:9, which carries in itself the verbal idea of תְּהִי or תָּבֹא (Ps. 18:7). They shall hear, for on his part he has arranged, i.e., prepared (מִשְׁפָּט עָרַךְ, causam instruere, as Job 23:4, comp. 33:5) the cause, so that the action can begin forthwith; and he knows that he, he and no one else, will be found in the right. With the conviction of this superiority, he exclaims, Who in all the world could contend with him, i.e., advance valid arguments against his defence of himself? Then, indeed, if this impossibility should happen, he would be dumb, and willingly die as one completely overpowered not merely in outward appearance, but in reality vanquished. עמדי יריב following הוא מי (comp. Job 4:7) may be

taken as an elliptical relative clause: qui litigare possit mecum (comp. Isa. 50:9 with Rom. 8:34, τίς ὁ καταδρίνων); but since זה הוא מי is also used in the sense of quis tandem or ecquisnam, this syntactic connection which certainly did exist (Ewald, § 325, a) is obliterated, and הוא serves like זה only to give intensity and vividness to the מי. On עַתָּה כִּי (in meaning not different to אָז כִּי), vid., Job 3:13, 8:6. In v. 19 that is granted as possible which, according to the declaration of his conscience, Job must consider as absolutely impossible. Therefore he clings to the desire of being able to bring his cause before God, and becomes more and more absorbed in the thought.

20 Only two things do not unto me,

Then will I not hide myself from Thy countenance:

21 Withdraw Thy hand from me,

And let Thy fear not terrify me—

22 Call then and I will answer,

Or I will speak and answer Thou me!

Job 13:20–22. He makes only two conditions in his prayer, as he has already expressed it in Job 9:34: (1) That God would grant him a cessation of his troubles; (2) That He would not overwhelm him with His majesty. The chastening hand of God is generally called יָד elsewhere; but in spite of this prevalent usage of the language, כַּף cannot be understood here (comp. on the contrary Job 33:7) otherwise than of the hand (Job 9:34: the rod) of God, which lies heavily on Job. The painful pressure of that hand would prevent the collecting and ordering of his thoughts required for meeting with God, and the אֵימָה (Codd. defectively אֵמָתְךָ) of God would completely crush and confound him. But if God grants these two things: to remove His hand for a time, and not to turn the terrible side of His majesty to him, then he is ready whether God should himself open the cause or permit him to have the first word. Correctly Mercerus: optionem ei dat ut aut actoris aut rei personam deligat, sua fretus innocentia, sed interim sui oblitus et immodicus. In contrast with God he feels himself to be a poor worm, but his consciousness of innocence makes him a Titan.

He now says what he would ask God; or rather, he now asks Him, since he vividly pictures to himself the action with God which he desires. His imagination anticipates the reality of that which is longed for. Modern expositors begin a new division at v. 23. But Job's speech does not yet take a new turn; it goes on further continually uno tenore.

23 How many are mine iniquities and sins?

Make me to know my transgression and sin!——

24 Wherefore dost Thou hide Thy face,

And regard me as Thine enemy?

25 Wilt Thou frighten away a leaf driven to and fro,

And pursue the dry stubble?

Job 13:23–25. When עָוֹן and חַטָּאת, פֶּשַׁע and חַטָּאת, are used in close connection, the latter, which describes sin as failing and error, signifies sins of weakness (infirmities, Schwachheitssünde); whereas עון (prop. distorting or bending) signifies misdeed, and פּשׁע (prop. breaking loose, or away from, Arab. fsq) wickedness which designedly estranges itself from God and removes from favour, both therefore malignant sin (Bosheitssünde 109). The bold self-confidence which is expressed in the question and challenge of v. 23 is, in v. 24, changed to grievous astonishment that God does not appear to him, and on the contrary continues to pursue him as an enemy without investigating his cause. Has the Almighty then pleasure in scaring away a leaf that is already blown to and fro? הֲעָלֶה, with He interrog., like הֲחָכְמָה, Job 15:2, according to Ges. § 100, 4. עָרַץ used as transitive here, like Ps. 10:18, to terrify, scare away affrighted. Does it give Him satisfaction to pursue dried-up stubble? By אֶת (before an indeterminate noun, according to Ges. § 117, 2) he points δεικτικῶς to himself: he, the powerless one, completely deprived of strength by sickness and pain, is as dried-up stubble; nevertheless God is after him, as though He would get rid of every trace of a dangerous

enemy by summoning His utmost strength against him.

26 For Thou decreest bitter things against me,

And causest me to possess the iniquities of my youth,

27 And puttest my feet in the stocks,

And observest all my ways.

Thou makest for thyself a circle round the soles of my feet,

28 Round one who moulders away as worm-eaten,

As a garment that the moth gnaweth.

Job 13:26–28. He is conscious of having often prayed: "Remember not the sins of my youth, and my transgressions: according to Thy mercy remember Thou me," Ps. 25:7; and still he can only regard his affliction as the inheritance (i.e., entailed upon him by sins not repented of) of the sins of his youth, since he has no sins of his mature years that would incur wrath, to reproach himself with. He does not know how to reconcile with the justice of God the fact that He again records against him sins, the forgiveness of which he implores soon after their commission, and decrees (כָּתַב, as Ps. 149:9, and as used elsewhere in the book of Job with reference to the recording of judgment) for him on account of them such bitter punishment (מְרֹרוֹת, amara, bitter calamities; comp. Deut. 32:32, "bitter" grapes). And the two could not indeed be harmonized, if it really were thus. So long as a man remains an object of the divine mercy, his sins that have been once forgiven are no more the object of divine judgment. But Job can understand his affliction only as an additional punishment. The conflict of temptation through which he is passing has made God's loving-kindness obscure to him. He appears to himself to be like a prisoner whose feet are forced into the holes of a סַד, i.e., the block or log of wood in which the feet of a criminal are fastened, and which he must shuffle about with him when he moves; perhaps connected with Arab. sadda, occludere, opplere (foramen), elsewhere מַהְפֶּכֶת (from the forcible twisting or fastening), Chald. סִדְנָא, סַדְיָא, Syr. sado, by which Acts 16:24, ξύλον = ποδοκάκη, is rendered; Lat. cippus (which Ralbag compares), codex (in Plautus an instrument of punishment for slaves), or also nervus. The verb תָּשֵׂם which belongs to it, and is found also in Job 33:11 in the same connection, is of the jussive form, but is neither jussive nor optative in meaning, as also the future with shortened vowel (e.g., Job 27:22, 40:19) or apocopated (Job 18:12, 23:9, 11) is used elsewhere from the preference of poetry for a short pregnant form. He seems to himself like a criminal whose steps are closely watched (שָׁמַר, as Job 10:14), in order that he may not have the undeserved enjoyment of freedom, and may not avoid the execution for which he is reserved by effecting an escape by flight. Instead of אָרְחֹתָי, the reading adopted by Ben-Ascher, Ben-Naphtali writes אֹרְחֹתָי, with Cholem in the first syllable; both modes of punctuation change without any fixed law also in other respects in the inflexion of אֹרַח, as of אֹרְחָה, a caravan, the construct is both אָרְחוֹת, Job 6:19, and אֹרְחוֹת. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the verbs in v. 27bc are addressed to God, and are not intended as the third pers. fem. in reference to the stocks (Ralbag). The roots of the feet are undoubtedly their undermost parts, therefore the soles. But what is the meaning of תְּתַחֲקֶה? The Vulg., Syr., and Parchon explain: Thou fixest thine attention upon …, but certainly according to mere conjecture; Ewald, by the help of the Arabic tahhakkaka ala: Thou securest thyself …, but there is not the least necessity to depart from the ordinary use of the word, as those also do who explain: Thou makest a law or boundary (Aben-Ezra, Ges., Hahn, Schlottm.). The verb חָקָה is the usual word (certainly cognate and interchangeable with חָקַק) for carved-out work (intaglio), and perhaps with colour rubbed in, or filled up with metal (vid., Job 19:23, comp. Ezek. 23:14); it signifies to hew into, to carve, to dig a trench. Stickel is in some measure true to this meaning when he explains: Thou scratchest, pressest (producing blood); by which rendering, however, the Hithpa. is not duly recognised. Raschi is better, tu t'affiches, according to which Mercerus: velut affixus

vestigiis pedum meorum adhaeres, ne quâ elabi possim aut effugere. But a closer connection with the ordinary use of the word is possible. Accordingly Rosenm., Umbreit, and others render: Thou markest a line round my feet (drawest a circle round); Hirz., however, in the strictest sense of the Hithpa.: Thou diggest thyself in (layest thyself as a circular line about my feet). But the Hithpa. does not necessarily mean se insculpere, but, as התפשט sibi exuere, התפתח sibi solvere, התחנן sibi propitium facere, it may also mean sibi insculpere, which does not give so strange a representation: Thou makest to thyself furrows (or also: lines) round the soles of my feet, so that they cannot move beyond the narrow boundaries marked out by thee. With וְהוּא, v. 28, a circumstantial clause begins: While he whom Thou thus fastenest in as a criminal, etc. Observe the fine rhythmical accentuation achālo ‘asch. Since God whom he calls upon does not appear, Job’s defiance is changed to timidity. The elegiac tone, into which his bold tone has passed, is continued in Job 14.

JOB 14

1 Man that is born of a woman,
Short of days and full of unrest,
2 Cometh forth as a flower and is cut down;
He fleeth as a shadow, and continueth not.
3 Moreover, Thou openest Thine eyes upon him,
And Thou drawest me before Thy tribunal.

Job 14:1–3. Even if he yields to the restraint which his suffering imposes on him, to regard himself as a sinner undergoing punishment, he is not able to satisfy himself by thus persuading himself to this view of God’s conduct towards him. How can God pass so strict a judgment on man, whose life is so short and full of sorrow, and which cannot possibly be pure from sin?—V. 1. אָדָם is followed by three clauses in apposition, or rather two, for אִשָּׁה יְלוּד (LXX γεννητὸς γυναικός, as Matt. 11:11; comp. γέννημα γυν. Sir. 10:18) belongs to the subject as an adjectival clause: woman-born man, short-lived, and full of unrest, opens out as a flower. Woman is weak, with pain she brings forth children; she is impure during her lying-in, therefore weakness, suffering, and impurity is the portion of man even from the birth (Job 15:14, 25:4). As קְצַר is the constr. of קָצֵר, so (רַגָּז) שְׂבַע is from שָׂבֵעַ, which here, as Job 10:15, has the strong signification: endowed (with adversity). It is questionable whether וַיִּמָּל, v. 2, signifies et marcescit or et succiditur. We have decided here as elsewhere (vid., on Ps. 37:2, 90:6, Genesis, S. 383) in favour of the latter meaning, and as the Targ. (אֶתְמוֹלַל), translated “he is mown down.” For this meaning (prop. to cut off from above or before, to lop off),—in which the verb מָלַל (מוּל נָמַל) is become technical for the περιτομή,—is most probably favoured by its application in Job 24:24; where Jerome however translates, sicut summitates spicarum conterentur, since he derives ימלו from מלל in the signification not found in the Bible (unless perhaps retained in מְלִילָה, Deut. 23:26), fricare (Arab. mll, frigĕre, to parch). At the same time, the signification marcescere, which certainly cannot be combined with praecidere, but may be with fricare (conterere), is not unnatural; it is more appropriate to a flower (comp. ציץ נבל, Isa. 40:7); it accords with the parallelism Ps. 37:2, and must be considered etymologically possible in comparison with אָ־מַ֫ל קָ־מַל. But it is not supported by any dialect, and none of the old translations furnish any certain evidence in its favour; יְמוֹלֵל, Ps. 90:6, which is to be understood impersonally rather than intransitively, does not favour it; and none of the passages in which יִמַּל occurs demand it: least of all Job 24:24, where praeciduntur is more suitable than, and Job 18:16, praeciditur, quite as suitable as, marcescit. For these reasons we also take וַיִּמָּל here, not as fut. Kal from מלל, or, as Hahn, from נָמַל = נָבֵל, to wither, but as fut. Niph. from מָלַל, to cut down. At the same time, we do not deny the possibility of the notion of withering having been connected with ימל, whether it be that it belonged originally and independently to the root מל, or has branched off from some other radical notion, as “to fall in pieces” (LXX here ἐξέπεσεν, and similarly also Job 18:16, 24:24; comp. מְלָחִים, rags, נִמְלַח, to

come to pieces, to be dissolved) or "to become soft" (with which the significations in the dialects, to grind and to parch, may be connected). As a flower, which having opened out is soon cut or withered, is man: אף, accedit quod, insuper. This particle, related to ἐπί, adds an enhancing cumulat. More than this, God keeps His eye open (not: His eyes, for the correct reading, expressly noted by the Masora, is עֵינֶךָ without Jod plur.), עַל־זֶה, super hoc s. tali, over this poor child of man, who is a perishable flower, and not a "walking light, but a fleeting shadow" (Gregory the Great), to watch for and punish his sins, and brings Job to judgment before himself, His tribunal which puts down every justification. Elsewhere the word is pointed בַּמִּשְׁפָּט, Job 9:32, 22:4; here it is בָּמִשְׁפָּט, because the idea is rendered determinate by the addition of עמך.

4 Would that a pure one could come from an impure!

Not a single one——

5 His days then are determined,

The number of his months is known to Thee,

Thou hast appointed bounds for him that he may not pass over:

6 Look away from him then, and let him rest,

Until he shall accomplish as a hireling his day.

Job 14:4–6. Would that perfect sinlessness were possible to man; but since (to use a New Testament expression) that which is born of the flesh is flesh, there is not a single one pure. The optative מִי־יִתֵּן seems to be used here with an acc. of the object, according to its literal meaning, quis det s. afferat, as Job 31:31, Deut. 28:67, Ps. 14:7. Ewald remarks (and refers to § 358, b, of his Grammar) that לֹא, v. 4b, must be the same as לוּ; but although in 1 Sam. 20:14, 2 Sam. 13:26, 2 Kings 5:17, לא might be equivalent to the optative לו, which is questionable, still אחד לא here, as an echo of אין גם־אחד, Ps. 14:3, is Job's own answer to his wish, that cannot be fulfilled: not one, i.e., is in existence. Like the friends, he acknowledges an hereditary proneness to sin; but this proneness to sin affords him no satisfactory explanation of so unmerciful a visitation of punishment as his seems to him to be. It appears to him that man must the rather be an object of divine forbearance and compassion, since absolute purity is impossible to him. If, as is really the case, man's days are חֲרוּצִים, cut off, i.e., ἀποτόμως, determined (distinct from חָרוּצִים with an unchangeable Kametz: sharp, i.e., quick, eager, diligent),—if the number of his months is with God, i.e., known by God, because fixed beforehand by Him,—if He has set fixed bounds (Keri חֻקָּיו) for him, and he cannot go beyond them, may God then look away from him, i.e., turn from him His strict watch (מן שׁעה, as Job 7:19; מן שׁית, 10:20), that he may have rest (חְדָל, cesset), so that he may at least as a hireling enjoy his day. Thus ירצה is interpreted by all modern expositors, and most of them consider the object or reason of his rejoicing to be the rest of evening when his work is done, and thereby miss the meaning.

Hahn appropriately says, "He desires that God would grant man the comparative rest of the hireling, who must toil in sorrow and eat his bread in the sweat of his brow, but still is free from any special suffering, by not laying extraordinary affliction on him in addition to the common infirmities beneath which he sighs. Since the context treats of freedom from special suffering in life, not of the hope of being set free from it, comp. Job 13:25–27, 14:3, the explanation of Umbreit, Ew., Hirz., and others, is to be entirely rejected, viz., that God would at least permit man the rest of a hireling, who, though he be vexed with heavy toil, cheerfully reconciles himself to it in prospect of the reward he hopes to obtain at evening time. Job does not claim for man the toil which the hireling gladly undergoes in expectation of complete rest, but the toil of the hireling, which seems to him to be rest in comparison with the possibility of having still greater toil to undergo." Such is the true connection.110 Man's life—this life which is as a hand-breadth (Ps. 39:6), and in Job 7:1f. is compared to a hireling's day, which is sorrowful enough—is

not to be overburdened with still more and extraordinary suffering.

It must be asked, however, whether רצה seq. acc. here signifies εὐδοκεῖν᾽τὸν βίον, LXX), or not rather persolvere; for it is undeniable that it has this meaning in Lev. 26:34 (vid., however Keil [Pent., en loc.]) and elsewhere (prop. to satisfy, remove, discharge what is due). The Hiphil is used in this sense in post-biblical Hebrew, and most Jewish expositors explain ירצה by ישלים. If it signifies to enjoy, עַד ought to be interpreted: that (he at least may, like as a hireling, enjoy his day). But this signification of עַד (ut in the final sense) is strange, and the signification dum (Job 1:18, 8:21) or adeo ut (Isa. 47:7) is not, however, suitable, if ירצה is to be explained in the sense of persolvere, and therefore translate donec persolvat (persolverit). We have translated "until he accomplish," and wish "accomplish" to be understood in the sense of "making complete," as Col. 1:24, Luther ("vollzählig machen") = ἀνταναπληροῦν.

7 For there is hope for a tree:
If it is hewn down, it sprouts again,
And its shoot ceaseth not.
8 If its root becometh old in the ground,
And its trunk dieth off in the dust:
9 At the scent of water it buddeth,
And bringeth forth branches like a young plant.

Job 14:7–9. As the tree falleth so it lieth, says a cheerless proverb. Job, a true child of his age, has a still sadder conception of the destiny of man in death; and the conflict through which he is passing makes this sad conception still sadder than it otherwise is. The fate of the tree is far from being so hopeless as that of man; for (1) if a tree is hewn down, it (the stump left in the ground) puts forth new shoots (on הֶחָלִיף, vid., on Ps. 90:6), and young branches (יוֹנָקֶת, the tender juicy sucker μόσχος) do not cease. This is a fact, which is used by Isaiah (Is. 6) as an emblem of a fundamental law in operation in the history of Israel: the terebinth and oak there symbolize Israel; the stump (מצבת) is the remnant that survives the judgment, and this remnant becomes the seed from which a new sanctified Israel springs up after the old is destroyed. Carey is certainly not wrong when he remarks that Job thinks specially of the palm (the date), which is propagated by such suckers; Shaw's expression corresponds exactly to תחדל לא: "when the old trunk dies, there is never wanting one or other of these offsprings to succeed it." Then (2) if the root of a tree becomes old (חִזְקִין inchoative Hiphil: senescere, Ew. § 122, c) in the earth, and its trunk (גֶּזַע also of the stem of an undecayed tree, Isa. 40:24) dies away in the dust, it can nevertheless regain its vitality which had succumbed to the weakness of old age: revived by the scent (רֵיחַ always of scent, which anything exhales, not, perhaps Cant. 1:3 only excepted, odor = odoratus) of water, it puts forth buds for both leaves and flowers, and brings forth branches (קָצִיר, prop. cuttings, twigs) again, נָטַע כמו, like a plant, or a young plant (the form of נָטָע in pause), therefore, as if fresh planted, LXX ὥσπερ νεόφυτον. One is here at once reminded of the palm which, on the one hand, is pre-eminently a φιλυδρον φυτόν,111 on the other hand possesses a wonderful vitality, whence it is become a figure for youthful vigour. The palm and the phoenix have one name, and not without reason. The tree reviving as from the dead at the scent of water, which Job describes, is like that wondrous bird rising again from its own ashes (vid., on Job 29:18). Even when centuries have at last destroyed the palm—says Masius, in his beautiful and thoughtful studies of nature—thousands of inextricable fibres of parasites cling about the stem, and delude the traveller with an appearance of life.

10 But man dieth, he lieth there stretched out,
Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
11 The waters flow away from the sea,
And a stream decayeth and dryeth up:
12 So man lieth down and riseth not again;
Till the heavens pass away they wake not,
And are not aroused from their sleep.

Job 14:10–12. How much less favoured is the final lot of man! He dies, and then lies there completely broken down and melted away (חָלַשׁ, in the neuter signification, confectum esse, rendered in the Targum by אִתְּבַר and אִתְמַקְמַק). The fut. consec. continues the description of the cheerless results of death: He who has thus once fallen together is gone without leaving a trace of life. In vv. 11f. this vanishing away without hope and beyond recovery is contemplated under the figure of running water, or of water that is dried up and never returns again to its channel. Instead of אָזְלוּ Isaiah uses נִשְּׁתוּ (Is. 19:5) in the oracle on Egypt, a prophecy in which many passages borrowed from the book of Job are interwoven. The former means to flow away (related radically with נָזַל), the latter to dry up (transposed נִתַּשׁ, Jer. 18:14). But he also uses וְיֶחֱרַב, which signifies the drying in, and then וְיִבַּשׁ, which is the complete drying up which follows upon the drying in (vid., Genesis, S. 264). What is thus figuratively expressed is introduced by waw (v. 12a), similar to the waw adaequationis of the emblematic proverbs mentioned at Job 5:7, 11:12: so there is for man no rising (קוּם), no waking up (הָקִיץ), no ἐγείρεσθαι (נָעוֹר), and indeed not for ever; for what does not happen until the heavens are no more (comp. Ps. 72:7, till the moon is no more), never happens; because God has called the heavens and the stars with their laws into existence, לעולם לעד (Ps. 158:6), they never cease (Jer. 31:35f.), the days of heaven are eternal (Ps. 89:30). This is not opposed to declarations like Ps. 102:27, for the world's history, according to the teaching of Scripture, closes with a change in all these, but not their annihilation. What is affirmed in vv. 10–12b of mankind in general, is, by the change to the plural in v. 12c, affirmed of each individual of the race. Their sleep of death is עוֹלָם שְׁנַת (Jer. 51:39, 57). What Sheôl summons away from the world, the world never sees again. Oh that it were otherwise! How would the brighter future have comforted him with respect to the sorrowful present and the dark night of the grave!

13 Oh that Thou wouldst hide me in Sheôl,

That Thou wouldst conceal me till Thine anger change,

That Thou wouldst appoint me a time and then remember me!

14 If man dieth, shall he live again?

All the days of my warfare would I wait,

Until my change should come.

15 Thou wouldst call and I would answer,

Thou wouldst have a desire for the work of Thy hands—

16 For now thou numberest my steps,

And dost not restrain thyself over my sins.

Job 14:13–16. The optative יִתֵּן מִי introduces a wish that has reference to the future, and is therefore, as at Job 6:8, followed by futt.; comp. on the other hand, Job 23:3, utinam noverim. The language of the wish reminds one of such passages in the Psalms as Ps. 31:21, 27:5 (comp. Isa. 26:20): "In the day of trouble He hideth me in His pavilion, and in the secret of His tabernacle doth He conceal me." So Job wishes that Hades, into which the wrath of God now precipitates him for ever, may only be a temporary place of safety for him, until the wrath of God turn away (שׁוּב, comp. the causative, Job 9:13); that God would appoint to him, when there, a חֹק, i.e., a terminus ad quem (comp. v. 5), and when this limit should be reached, again remember him in mercy. This is a wish that Job marks out for himself. The reality is indeed different: "if (ἐὰν) a man dies, will he live again?" The answer which Job's consciousness, ignorant of anything better, alone can give, is: No, there is no life after death. It is, however, none the less a craving of his heart that gives rise to the wish; it is the most favourable thought,—a desirable possibility,—which, if it were but a reality, would comfort him under all present suffering: "all the days of my warfare would I wait until my change came." צָבָא is the name he gives to the whole of this toilsome and sorrowful interval between the present and the wished-for goal,—the life on earth, which he likens to the service of the soldier or of the hireling (Job 7:1), and which is subject to an inevitable

destiny (Job 5:7) of manifold suffering, together with the night of Hades, where this life is continued in its most shadowy and dismal phase. And חֲלִיפָה does not here signify destruction in the sense of death, as the Jewish expositors, by comparing Isa. 2:18 and Cant. 2:11, explain it; but (with reference to צבאי, comp. Job 10:17) the following after (Arab. chlîft, succession, successor, i.e., of Mohammed), relief, change (syn. תְּמוּרָה, exchange, barter), here of change of condition, as Ps. 55:20, of change of mind; Aquila, Theod., ἄλλαγμα. Oh that such a change awaited him! What a blessed future would it be if it should come to pass! Then would God call to him in the depth of Sheôl, and he, imprisoned until the appointed time of release, would answer Him from the deep. After His anger was spent, God would again yearn after the work of His hands (comp. Job 10:3), the natural loving relation between the Creator and His creature would again prevail, and it would become manifest that wrath is only a waning power (Isa. 54:8), and love His true and essential attribute. Schlottman well observes: "Job must have had a keen perception of the profound relation between the creature and his Maker in the past, to be able to give utterance to such an imaginative expectation respecting the future."

In v. 16, Job supports what is cheering in this prospect, with which he wishes he might be allowed to console himself, by the contrast of the present. עַתָּה כִּי is used here as in Job 6:21; כי is not, as elsewhere, where עתה כי introduces the conclusion, confirmatory (indeed now = then indeed), but assigns a reason (for now). Now God numbers his steps (Job 13:27), watching him as a criminal, and does not restrain himself over his sin. Most modern expositors (Ew., Hlgst, Hahn, Schlottm.) translate: Thou observest not my sins, i.e., whether they are to be so severely punished or not; but this is poor. Raschi: Thou waitest not over my sins, i.e., to punish them; instead of which Ralbag directly: Thou waitest not for my sins = repentance or punishment; but שׁמר is not supported in the meaning: to wait, by Gen. 37:11. Aben-Ezra: Thou lookest not except on my sins, by supplying רק, according to Eccles. 2:24 (where, however, probably משׁיאכל should be read, and ם after אדם, just as in Job 33:17, has fallen away). The most doubtful is, with Hirzel, to take the sentence as interrogative, in opposition to the parallelism: and dost Thou not keep watch over my sins? It seems to me that the sense intended must be derived from the phrase אַף שָׁמַר, which means to keep anger, and consequently to delay the manifestation of it (Amos 1:11). This phrase is here so applied, that we obtain the sense: Thou keepest not Thy wrath to thyself, but pourest it out entirely. Mercerus is substantially correct: non reservas nec differs peccati mei punitionem.

17 My transgression is sealed up in a bag,

And Thou hast devised additions to my iniquity.

18 But a falling mountain moveth indeed,

And a rock falleth from its place.

19 Water holloweth out stone,

Its overflowings carry away the dust of the earth,

And the hope of man—Thou destroyest.

Job 14:17–19. The meaning of v. 17 is, not that the judgment which pronounces him guilty lies in the sealed-up bag of the judge, so that it requires only to be handed over for execution (Hirz., Ew., Renan), for although פֶּשַׁע (though not exactly the punishment of sin, which it does not signify even in Dan. 9:24) can denote wickedness, as proved and recorded, and therefore metonomically the penal sentence, the figure is, however, taken not from the mode of preserving important documents, but from the mode of preserving collected articles of value in a sealed bag. The passage must be explained according to Hos. 13:12, Deut. 32:34, Rom. 2:5, comp. Jer. 17:1. The evil Job had formerly (Job 13:26) committed according to the sentence of God, God has gathered together as in a money bag, and carefully preserved, in order now to bring them home to him. And not this alone, however; He has devised still more against him than his actual misdeeds. Ewald translates: Thou hast sewed up my punishment;

but טָפַל (vid., on Job 13:4) signifies, not to sew up, but: to sew on, patch on, and gen. to add (טָפֵל, Rabb. accidens, a subordinate matter, opp. עִקָּר), after which the LXX translates ἐπεσημήνω (noted in addition), and Gecatilia Arab. ḥfṣt (added to in collecting). It is used here just as in the Aramaic phrase שְׁקָרָא טָפַל (to patch on falsehood, to invent scandal).

The idea of the figures which follow is questionable. Hahn maintains that they do not describe destruction, but change, and that consequently the relation of v. 19c to what precedes is not similarity, but contrast: stones are not so hard, that they are not at length hollowed out, and the firm land is not so firm that it cannot be carried away by the flood; but man's prospect is for ever a hopeless one, and only for him is there no prospect of his lot ever being changed. Thus I thought formerly it should be explained: considering the waw, v. 19c, as indicative not of comparison, but of contrast. But the assumption that the point of comparison is change, not destruction, cannot be maintained: the figures represent the slow but inevitable destruction wrought by the elements on the greatest mountains, on rocks, and on the solid earth. And if the poet had intended to contrast the slow but certain changes of nature with the hopelessness of man's lot, how many more appropriate illustrations, in which nature seems to come forth as with new life from the dead, were at his command! Raschi, who also considers the relation of the clauses to be antithetical, is guided by the right perception when he interprets: even a mountain that is cast down still brings forth fruit, and a rock removed from its place, even these are not without some signs of vitality in them, יְבוּל = (יִבּוֹל) בּוּל יעשׂה, which is indeed a linguistic impossibility. The majority of expositors are therefore right when they take the waw, v. 19c, similarly to Job 5:7, 11:12, 12:11, as waw adaequationis. With this interpretation also, the connection of the clause with what precedes by וְאוּלָם (which is used exactly as in Job 1:11, 11:5, 12:7, where it signifies verum enim vero or attamen) is unconstrained. The course of thought is as follows: With unsparing severity, and even beyond the measure of my guilt, hast Thou caused me to suffer punishment for my sins, but (nevertheless) Thou shouldst rather be gentle and forbearing towards me, since even that which is firmest, strongest, and most durable cannot withstand ultimate destruction; and entirely in accordance with the same law, weak, frail man (אֱנוֹשׁ) meets an early certain end, and at the same time Thou cuttest off from him every ground of hope of a continued existence. The waw, v. 19c, is consequently, according to the sense, more quanto magis than sic, placing the things to be contrasted over against each other. הַר־נוֹפֵל is a falling, not a fallen (Ralbag) mountain; and having once received the impetus, it continues gradually to give way; Renan: s'effondre peu à peu. Carey, better: "will decay," for נָבֵל (cogn. נבל) signifies, decrease from external loses; specially of the falling off of leaves, Isa. 34:4. The second figure, like Job 18:4, is to be explained according to Job 9:5: a rock removes (not as Jerome translates, transfertur, which would be יֵעָתֵק, and also not as LXX παλαιωθήσεται, Schlottm.: becomes old and crumbles away, although in itself admissible both as to language and fact; comp. on Job 21:7) from its place; it does not stand absolutely, immovably fast. In the third figure אֲבָנִים is a prominent object, as the accentuation with Mehupach legarmeh or (as it is found in correct Codd.) with Asla legarmeh rightly indicates שָׁחַק signifies exactly the same as Arab. sḥq, attere, conterere. In the fourth figure, ספיח must not be interpreted as meaning that which grows up spontaneously without re-sowing, although the Targum translates accordingly: it (the water) washes away its (i.e., the dust of the earth's) after-growth (כָּתָהָא), which Symm. follows (τὰ παραλελειμμένα). It is also impossible according to the expression; for it must have been הָאָרץ עפר. Jerome is essentially correct: et alluvione paullatim terra consumitur. It is true that ספח in Hebrew does not mean effundere in any other passage (on this point, vid., on Hab. 2:15), but here the meaning effusio or alluvio may be supposed without much hesitation; and in a book whose

language is so closely connected with the Arabic, we may even refer to סִפַּח = Arab. sfḥ (kindred to Arab. sfk, שִׁפֵּךְ), although the word may also (as Ralbag suggests), by comparison with סֹחֵף מָטָר, Prov. 28:3, and Arab. sḥîqt, a storm of rain, be regarded as transposed from סחיפיה, from סחף in Arab. to tear off, sweep away, Targ. to thrust away (= דחף), Syr., Talm. to overthrow, subvertere (whence s'chifto, a cancer or cancerous ulcer). The suffix refers to מַיִם, and תִּשְׁטֹף before a plural subject is quite according to rule, Ges. § 146, 3. ספיחיה is mostly marked with Mercha, but according to our interpretation Dechî, which is found here and there in the Codd., would be more correct.

The point of the four illustrations is not that not one of them is restored to its former condition (Oetinger, Hirz.), but that in spite of their stability they are overwhelmed by destruction, and that irrecoverably. Even the most durable things cannot defy decay, and now even as to mortal man—Thou hast brought his hope utterly to nought (הֶאֱבַדְתָּ with Pathach in pause as frequently; vid., Psalter ii. 468). The perf. is praegnans: all at once, suddenly—death, the germ of which he carries in him even from his birth, is to him an end without one ray of hope,—it is also the death of his hope.

20 Thou siezest him for ever, then he passeth away;

Thou changest his countenance and castest him forth.

21 If his sons come to honour, he knoweth it not;

Or to want, he observeth them not.

22 Only on his own account his flesh suffereth pain,

And on his own account is his soul conscious of grief.

Job 14:20–22. The old expositors thought that תִּתְקְפֵהוּ must be explained by ממנו תתקף (Thou provest thyself stronger than he, according to Ges. § 121, 4), because תָּקַף is intrans.; but it is also transitive in the sense of seizing forcibly and grasping, Job 15:24, Eccles. 4:12, as Talm. תְּקַף (otherwise commonly אַתְקֵף as החזיק), Arab. taqifa, comprehendere. The many sufferings which God inflicts on him in the course of his life are not meant; לָנֶצַח does not signify here: continually, without intermission, as most expositors explain, but as Job 4:20, 20:7, and throughout the book: for ever (Rosenm., Hahn, Welte). God gives him the death-stroke which puts an end to his life for ever, he passes away βαίνει οἴχεται (comp. Job 10:21); disfiguring his countenance, i.e., in the struggle of death and in death by the gradual working of decay, distorting and making him unlike himself, He thrusts him out of this life (שִׁלַּחְתּוֹ like Gen. 3:23). The waw consec. is used here as e.g., Ps. 118:27.

When he is descended into Hades he knows nothing more of the fortune of his children, for as Eccles. 9:6 says: the dead have absolutely no portion in anything that happens under the sun. In v. 21 Job does not think of his own children that have died, nor his grandchildren (Ewald); he speaks of mankind in general. כָּבֵד and רָצָע are not here placed in contrast in the sense of much and little, but, as in Jer. 30:19, in the wider sense of an important or a destitute position; כָּבֵד, to be honoured, to attain to honour, as Isa. 66:5. בִּין (to observe anything) is joined with לְ of the object, as in Ps. 73:17 (on the other hand, לָהּ, Job 13:1, was taken as dat. ethicus). He neither knows nor cares anything about the welfare of those who survive him: "Nothing but pain and sadness is the existence of the dead; and the pain of his own flesh, the sadness of his own soul, alone engage him. He has therefore no room for rejoicing, nor does the joyous or sorrowful estate of others, though his nearest ones, affect him" (Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. 495). This is certainly, as Ewald and Psychol. S. 444, the meaning of v. 22; but עָלָיו is hardly to be translated with Hofmann "in him," so that it gives the intensive force of ἴδιος to the suff. For it is improbable that in this connection,—where the indifference of the deceased respecting others, and the absolute reference to himself of the existence of pain on his own account, are contrasted,—עליו, v. 22b, is to be understood according to Job 30:16 (Psychol. S. 152), but rather objectively (over him). On the other hand, v. 22a is not to be

translated: over himself only does his flesh feel pain (Schlottm., Hirz., and others); for the flesh as inanimate may indeed be poetically, so to speak zeugmatically, represented as conscious of pain, but not as referring its pain to another, and consequently as self -conscious. On this account, עליו, v. 22a, is to be taken in the signification, over him = upon him, or as v. 22b (beyond him), which is doubtful; or it signifies, as we have sought to render it in our translation in both cases, propter eum. Only on his own account does his flesh suffer, i.e., only applying to himself, only on his own account does his soul mourn, i.e., only over his own condition. He has no knowledge and interest that extends beyond himself; only he himself is the object of that which takes place with his flesh in the grave, and of that on which his soul reflects below in the depths of Hades. According to this interpretation אַךְ belongs to עליו, after the hyperbaton described at p. 283 [Job 2:10], comp. Job 13:15, Isa. 34:15. And he ליוע, v. 22, implies the idea (which is clearly expressed in Isa. 66:24, and especially in Judith 16:17: δοῦναι πῦρ καὶ σκώληκας εἰς σάρκας αὐτῶν καὶ κλαύσονται ἐν αἰσθήσει ἕως αἰῶνος) that the process of the decomposition of the body is a source of pain and sorrow to the departed spirit,—a conception which proceeds from the supposition, right in itself, that a connection between body and soul is still continued beyond the grave,—a connection which is assumed by the resurrection, but which, as Job viewed it, only made the future still more sorrowful.

This speech of Job (Job 12–14), which closes here, falls into three parts, which correspond to the divisions into chapters. In the impassioned speech of Zophar, who treats Job as an empty and conceited babbler, the one-sided dogmatical standpoint of the friends was maintained with such arrogance and assumption, that Job is obliged to put forth all his power in self-defence. The first part of the speech (Job 12) triumphantly puts down this arrogance and assumption. Job replies that the wisdom, of which they profess to be the only possessors, is nothing remarkable, and the contempt with which they treat him is the common lot of the innocent, while the prosperity of the ungodly remains undisturbed. In order, however, to prove to them that what they say of the majesty of God, before which he should humble himself, can neither overawe nor help him, he refers them to creation, which in its varied works testifies to this majesty, this creative power of God, and the absolute dependence of every living thin on Him, and proves that he is not wanting in an appreciation of the truth contained in the sayings of the ancients by a description of the absolute majesty of God as it is manifested in the works of nature, and especially in the history of man, which excels everything that the three had said. This description is, however, throughout a gloomy picture of disasters which God brings about in the world, corresponding to the gloomy condition of mind in which Job is, and the disaster which is come upon himself.

As the friends have failed to solace him by their descriptions of God, so his own description is also utterly devoid of comfort. For the wisdom of God, of which he speaks, is not the wisdom that orders the world in which one can confide, and in which one has the surety of seeing every mystery of life sooner or later gloriously solved; but this wisdom is something purely negative, and repulsive rather than attractive, it is abstract exaltation over all created wisdom, whence it follows that he puts to shame the wisdom of the wise. Of the justice of God he does not speak at all, for in the narrow idea of the friends he cannot recognise its control; and of the love of God he speaks as little as the friends, for as the sight of the divine love is removed from them by the one-sidedness of their dogma, so is it from him by the feeling of the wrath of God which at present has possession of his whole being. Hegel has called the religion of the Old Testament the religion of sublimity (die Religion der Erhabenheit); and it is true that, so long as that manifestation of love, the incarnation of the Godhead, was not yet realized, God must have relatively transcended the religious consciousness. From the book of Job, however, this view can be

brought back to its right limits; for, according to the tendency of the book, neither the idea of God presented by the friends nor by Job is the pure undimmed notion of God that belongs to the Old Testament. The friends conceive of God as the absolute One, who acts only according to justice; Job conceives of Him as the absolute One, who acts according to the arbitrariness of His absolute power. According to the idea of the book, the former is dogmatic one- sidedness, the latter the conception of one passing through temptation. The God of the Old Testament consequently rules neither according to justice alone, nor according to a "sublime whim."

After having proved his superiority over the friends in perception of the majesty of God, Job tells them his decision, that he shall turn away from them. The sermon they address to him is to no purpose, and in fact produces an effect the reverse of that intended by them. And while it does Job no good, it injures them, because their very defence of the honour of God incriminates themselves in the eyes of God. Their aim is missed by them, for the thought of the absolute majesty of God has no power to impart comfort to any kind of sufferer; nor can the thought of His absolute justice give any solace to a sufferer who is conscious that he suffers innocently. By their confidence that Job's affliction is a decree of the justice of God, they certainly seem to defend the honour of God; but this defence is reversed as soon as it is manifest that there exists no such just ground for inflicting punishment on him. Job's self-consciousness, however, which cannot be shaken, gives no testimony to its justice; their advocacy of God is therefore an injustice to Job, and a miserable attempt at doing God service, which cannot escape the undisguised punishment of God. It is to be carefully noted that in Job 13:6–12 Job seriously warns the friends that God will punish them for their partiality, i.e., that they have endeavoured to defend Him at the expense of truth.

We see from this how sound Job's idea of God is, so far as it is not affected by the change which seems, according to the light which his temptation casts upon his affliction, to have taken place in his personal relationship to God. While above, Job 9, he did not acknowledge an objective right, and the rather evaded the thought, of God's dealing unjustly towards him, by the desperate assertion that what God does is in every case right because God does it, he here recognises an objective truth, which cannot be denied, even in favour of God, and the denial of which, even though it were a pientissima fraus, is strictly punished by God. God is the God of truth, and will therefore be neither defended nor honoured by any perverting of the truth. By such pious lies the friends involve themselves in guilt, since in opposition to their better knowledge they regard Job as unrighteous, and blind themselves to the incongruities of daily experience and the justice of God. Job will therefore have nothing more to do with them; and to whom does he now turn? Repelled by men, he feels all the more strongly drawn to God. He desires to carry his cause before God. He certainly considers God to be his enemy, but, like David, he thinks it is better to fall into the hands of God than into the hands of man (2 Sam. 24:14). He will plead his cause with God, and prove to Him his innocence: he will do it, even though he be obliged to expiate his boldness with his life; for he knows that morally he will not be overcome in the contest. He requires compliance with but two conditions: that God would grant a temporary alleviation of his pain, and that He would not overawe him with the display of His majesty. Job's disputing with God is as terrible as it is pitiable. It is terrible, because he uplifts himself, Titan-like, against God; and pitiable, because the God against which he fights is not the God he has known, but a God that he is unable to recognise,—the phantom which the temptation has presented before his dim vision instead of the true God. This phantom is still the real God to him, but in other respects in no way differing from the inexorable ruling fate of the Greek tragedy. As in this the hero of the drama seeks to maintain his personal freedom against the mysterious power that is crushing him with an

iron arm, so Job, even at the risk of sudden destruction, maintains the stedfast conviction of his innocence, in opposition to a God who has devoted him, as an evil-doer, to slow but certain destruction. The battle of freedom against necessity is the same as in the Greek tragedy. Accordingly one is obliged to regard it as an error, arising from simple ignorance, when it has been recently maintained that the boundless oriental imagination is not equal to such a truly exalted task as that of representing in art and poetry the power of the human spirit, and the maintenance of its dignity in the conflict with hostile powers, because a task that can only be accomplished by an imagination formed with a perception of the importance of recognising ascertained phenomena.112 In treating this subject, the book of Job not only attains to, but rises far above, the height attained by the Greek tragedy: for, on the one hand, it brings this conflict before us in all the fearful earnestness of a death-struggle; on the other, however, it does not leave us to the cheerless delusion that an absolute caprice moulds human destiny. This tragic conflict with the divine necessity is but the middle, not the beginning nor the end, of the book; for this god of fate is not the real God, but a delusion of Job's temptation. Human freedom does not succumb, but it comes forth from the battle, which is a refining fire to it, as conqueror. The dualism, which the Greek tragedy leaves unexplained, is here cleared up. The book certainly presents much which, from its tragic character, suggests this idea of destiny, but it is not its final aim—it goes far beyond: it does not end in the destruction of its hero by fate; but the end is the destruction of the idea of this fate itself.

We have seen in this speech (comp. Job 13:23, 26, 14:16f.), as often already, that Job is as little able as the friends to disconnect suffering from the idea of the punishment of sin. If Job were mistaken or were misled by the friends respecting his innocence, the history of his sufferings would be no material for a drama, because there would be no inner development. But it is just Job's stedfast conviction of his innocence, and his maintenance of it in spite of the power which this prejudice exercises over him, that makes the history of his affliction the history of the development of a new and grand idea, and makes him as the subject, on whom it is developed, a tragic character. In conformity with his prepossession, Job sees himself put down by his affliction as a great sinner; and his friends actually draw the conclusion from false premises that he is such. But he asserts the testimony of his conscience to his innocence; and because this contradicts those premises, the one-sidedness of which he does not discern, God himself appears to him to be unjust and unmerciful. And against this God, whom the temptation has distorted and transformed to the miserable image of a ruler, guided only by an absolute caprice, he struggles on, and places the truth and freedom of his moral self-consciousness over against the restraint of the condemnatory sentence, which seems to be pronounced over him in the suffering he has to endure. Such is the struggle against God which we behold in the second part of the speech (Job 13): ready to prove his innocence, he challenges God to trial; but since God does not appear, his confidence gives place to despondency, and his defiant tone to a tone of lamentation, which is continued in the third part of the speech (Job 14).

While he has raised his head towards heaven with the conscious pride of a תמים צדיק, first in opposition to the friends and then to God, he begins to complain as one who is thrust back, and yielding to the pressure of his affliction, begins to regard himself as a sinner. But he is still unable to satisfy himself respecting God's dealings by any such forcible self-persuasion. For how can God execute such strict judgment upon man, whose life is so short and full of care, and who, because he belongs to a sinful race, cannot possibly be pure from sin, without allowing him the comparative rest of a hireling? How can he thus harshly visit man, to whose life He has set an appointed bound, and who, when he once dies, returns to life no more for ever? The old expositors cannot at all understand this absolute denial of a new life after death. Brentius erroneously observes on

donec coelum transierit: ergo resurget; and Mercerus, whose exposition is free from all prejudice, cannot persuade himself that the elecus et sanctus Dei vir can have denied not merely a second earthly life, but also the eternal imperishable life after death. And yet it is so: Job does not indeed mean that man when he dies is annihilated, but he knows of no other life after death but the shadowy life in Sheôl, which is no life at all. His laments really harmonize with those in Moschos iii. 106ff.:

Αἰ αἰ ταὶ μαλάχαι μὲν ἐπὰν κατὰ κᾶπον ὄλωνται
῾Η τὰ χλωρὰ σέλινὰ τό τ᾽ εὐθαλὲς οὖλον ἄνηθον
῾Υστερον αὖ ζώοντι καὶ εἰς ἔτος ἄλλο φύοντι•
῾Αμμες δ᾽ οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρτεροὶ ἢ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες
῾Οππότε πρῶτα θάνωμες ἀνάκοοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλᾳ
Εὕδομες εὖ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον.

Alas! alas! the mallows, after they are withered in the garden,
Or the green parsley and the luxuriant curly dill,
Live again hereafter and sprout in future years;
But we men, the great and brave, or the wise,
When once we die, senseless in the bosom of the earth
We sleep a long, endless, and eternal sleep.

And with that of Horace, Od. iv. 7, 1:

Nos ubi decidimus
Quo pius Aeneas, quo dives Tullus et Ancus,
Pulvis et umbra sumus;

Or with that of the Jagur Weda: “While the tree that has fallen sprouts again from the root fresher than before, from what root does mortal man spring forth when he has fallen by the hand of death?”113 These laments echo through the ancient world from one end to the other, and even Job is without any superior knowledge respecting the future life. He denies a resurrection and eternal life, not as one who has a knowledge of them and will not however know anything about them, but he really knows nothing of them: our earthly life seems to him to flow on into the darkness of Sheôl, and onward beyond Sheôl man has no further existence.

We inquire here: Can we say that the poet knew nothing of a resurrection and judgment after death? If we look to the psalms of the time of David and Solomon, we must reply in the negative. Since, however, as the Grecian mysteries fostered and cherished ἠδυστέρας ἐλπίδας, the Israelitish Chokma also, by its constant struggles upwards and onwards, anticipated views of the future world which reached beyond the present (Psychol. S. 410): it may be assumed, and from the book of Job directly inferred, that the poet had a perception of the future world which went beyond the dim perception of the people, which was not yet lighted up by any revelation. For, on the one hand, he has reproduced for us a history of the patriarchal period, not merely according to its external, but also according to its internal working, with as strict historical faithfulness as delicate psychological tact; on the other, he has with a master hand described for us in the history of Job what was only possible from an advanced standpoint of knowledge,—how the hope of a life beyond the present, where there is no express word of promise to guide it, struggles forth from the heart of man as an undefined desire and longing, so that the word of promise is the fulfilment and seal of this desire and yearning. For when Job gives expression to the wish that God would hide him in Sheôl until His anger turn, and then, at an appointed time, yearning after the work of His hands, raise him again from Sheôl (Job 14:13–17), this wish it not to be understood other than that Sheôl might be only his temporary hiding-place from the divine anger, instead of being his eternal abode. He wishes himself in Sheôl, so far as he would thereby be removed for a time from the wrath of God, in order that, after an appointed season, he might again become an object of the divine favour. He cheers himself with the delightful thought, All the days of my warfare would I wait till my change should come, etc.; for then the warfare

of suffering would become easy to him, because favour, after wrath and deliverance from suffering and death, would be near at hand. We cannot say that Job here expresses the hope of a life after death; on the contrary, this hope is wanting to him, and all knowledge respecting the reasons that might warrant it. The hope exists only in imagination, as Ewald rightly observes, without becoming a certainty, since it is only the idea, How glorious it would be if it were so, that is followed up. But, on the one side, the poet shows us by this touching utterance of Job how totally different would be his endurance of suffering if he but knew that there was really a release from Hades; on the other side, he shows us, in the wish of Job, the incipient tendency of the growing hope that it might be so, for what a devout mind desires has a spiritual power which presses forward from the subjective to the objective reality. The hope of eternal life is a flower, says one of the old commentators, which grows on the verge of the abyss. The writer of the book of Job supports this. In the midst of this abyss of the feeling of divine wrath in which Job is sunk, this flower springs up to cheer him. In its growth, however, it is not hope, but only at first a longing. And this longing cannot expand into hope, because no light of promise shines forth in that night, by which Job's feeling is controlled, and which makes the conflict darker than it is in itself. Scarcely has Job feasted for a short space upon the idea of that which he would gladly hope for, when the thought of the reality of that which he has to fear overwhelms him. He seems to himself to be an evil-doer who is reserved for the execution of the sentence of death. If it is not possible in nature for mountains, rocks, stones, and the dust of the earth to resist the force of the elements, so is it an easy thing for God to destroy the hope of a mortal all at once. He forcibly thrust him hence from this life; and when he is descended to Hades, he knows nothing whatever of the lot of his own family in the world above. Of the life and knowledge of the living, nothing remains to him but the senseless pain of his dead body, which is gnawed away, and the dull sorrow of his soul, which continues but a shadowy life in Sheôl.

Thus the poet shows us, in the third part of Job's speech, a grand idea, which tries to force its way, but cannot. In the second part, Job desired to maintain his conviction of innocence before God: his confidence is repulsed by the idea of the God who is conceived of by him as an enemy and a capricious ruler, and changes to despair. In the third part, the desire for a life after death is maintained; but he is at once overwhelmed by the imagined inevitable and eternal darkness of Sheôl, but overwhelmed soon to appear again above the billows of temptation, until, in Job 19, the utterance of faith respecting a future life rises as a certain confidence over death and the grave: the γνῶσις which comes forth from the conflict of the πίστις anticipates that better hope which in the New Testament is established and ratified by the act of redemption wrought by the Conqueror of Hades.

JOB 15

The Second Course of the Controversy.—Ch. 15–21.

Eliphaz' Second Speech.—Ch. 15.

[Then began Eliphaz the Temanite, and said:]

2 Doth a wise man utter vain knowledge,
And fill his breast with the east wind?
3 Contending with words, that profit not,
And speeches, by which no good is done?
4 Moreover, thou makest void the fear of God,
And thou restrainest devotion before God;
5 For thy mouth exposeth thy misdeeds,
And thou choosest the language of the crafty.
6 Thine own mouth condemneth thee and not I,
And thine own lips testify against thee.

Job 15:2–6. The second course of the controversy is again opened by Eliphaz, the most respectable, most influential, and perhaps oldest of the friends. Job's detailed and bitter answers seem to him as empty words and

impassioned tirades, which ill become a wise man, such as he claims to be in assertions like Job 12:3, 13:2. הֲחָכָם with He interr., like הֲעָלֶה, Job 13:25. רוּחַ, wind, is the opposite of what is solid and sure; and קָדִים in the parallel (like Hos. 12:2) signifies what is worthless, with the additional notion of vehement action. If we translate בֶּטֶן by "belly," the meaning is apt to be misunderstood; it is not intended as the opposite of לֵב (Ewald), but it means, especially in the book of Job, not only that which feels, but also thinks and wills, the spiritually receptive and active inner nature of man (Psychol. S. 266); as also in Arabic, el-battin signifies that which is within, in the deepest mystical sense. Hirz. and Renan translate the inf. abs. הוֹכֵחַ, which follows in v. 3, as verb. fin.: se défend-il par des vaines paroles; but though the inf. abs. is so used in an historical clause (Job 15:35), it is not an interrogative. Ewald takes it as the subject: "to reprove with words—avails not, and speeches—whereby one does no good;" but though דָּבָר and מִלִּים might be used without any further defining, as in λογομαχεῖν (2 Tim. 2:14) and λογομαχία (1 Tim. 6:4), the form of v. 3b is opposed to such an explanation. The inf. abs. is connected as a gerund (redarguendo s. disputando) with the verbs in the question, v. 2; and the elliptical relative clause אֵין יִסְכֹּן is best, as referring to things, according to Job 35:3: sermone (דָּבָד from דָּבַר, as sermo from serere) qui non prodest; בָּם יוֹעִיל לֹא, on the other hand, to persons, verbis quibus nil utilitatis affert. Eliphaz does not censure Job for arguing, but for defending himself by such useless and purposeless utterances of his feeling. But still more than that: his speeches are not only unsatisfactory and unbecoming, אַף, accedit quod (cumulative like Job 14:3), they are moreover irreligious, since by doubting the justice of God they deprive religion of its fundamental assumption, and diminish the reverence due to God. יִרְאָה in such an objective sense as Ps. 19:10 almost corresponds to the idea of religion. לִפְנֵי־אֵל שִׂיחָה is to be understood, according to Ps. 102:1, 142:3 (comp. 64:2, 104:34): before God, and consequently customary devotional meditation, here of the disposition of mind indispensable to prayer, viz., devotion, and especially reverential awe, which Job depreciates (גָּרַע, detrahere). His speeches are mostly directed towards God; but they are violent and reproachful, therefore irreverent in form and substance.

Ver. 5. כִּי is not affirmative: forsooth (Hirz.), but, confirmatory and explicative. This opinion respecting him, which is so sharply and definitely expressed by אַתָּה, thrusts itself irresistibly forward, for it is not necessary to know his life more exactly, his own mouth, whence such words escape, reveals his sad state: docet (אִלֵּף only in the book of Job, from אָלַף, discere, a word which only occurs once in the Hebrew, Prov. 22:25) culpam tuam os tuum, not as Schlottm. explains, with Raschi: docet culpa tua os tuum, which, to avoid being misunderstood, must have been תאלף חטאתך, and is a though unsuited to the connection. אִלֵּף is certainly not directly equivalent to הגיד, Isa. 3:9; it signifies to teach, to explain, and this verb is just the one in the mouth of the censorious friend. What follows must not be translated: while thou choosest (Hirz.); ותבחר is not a circumstantial clause, but adds a second confirmatory clause to the first: he chooses the language of the crafty, since he pretends to be able to prove his innocence before God; and convinced that he is in the right, assumes the offensive (as Job 13:4ff.) against those who exhort him to humble himself. Thus by his evil words he becomes his own judge (ירשׁיעך) and accuser (בך יענו after the fem. שִׂפְתיך, like Prov. 5:2, 26:23). The knot of the controversy becomes constantly more entangled since Job strengthens the friends more and more in their false view by his speeches, which certainly are sinful in some parts (as Job 9:22).

7 Wast thou as the first one born as a man,
And hast thou been brought forth before the hills?

8 Hast thou attended to the counsel of Eloah,
And hast thou kept wisdom to thyself?

9 What dost thou know that we have not known?

Doest thou understand what we have not been acquainted with?

10 Both grey-haired and aged are among us,
Older in days than thy father.

Job 15:7–10. The question in v. 7a assumes that the first created man, because coming direct from the hand of God, had the most direct and profoundest insight into the mysteries of the world which came into existence at the same time as himself. Schlottman calls to mind an ironical proverbial expression of the Hindus: "Yea, indeed, he is the first man; no wonder that he is so wise" (Roberts, Orient. Illustr. p. 276). It is not to be translated: wast thou born as the first man, which is as inadmissible as the translation of מעט אחת, Hag. 2:6, by "a little" (vid., Köhler in loc.); rather ראישׁון (i.e., רִאְישׁוֹן, as Josh. 21:10, formed from רֵאשׁ, like the Arabic raîs, from ras, if it is not perhaps a mere incorrect amalgamation of the forms רִאשׁוֹן and רִישׁוֹן, Job 8:8) is in apposition with the subject, and אָדָם is to be regarded as predicate, according to Ges. § 139, 2. Raschi's translation is also impossible: wast thou born before Adam? for this Greek form of expression, πρῶτός μου, John 1:15, 30, 15:18 (comp. Odyss. xi. 481f., σεῖο μακάρτατος), is strange to the Hebrew. In the parallel question, v. 7b, Umbr., Schlottm., and Renan (following Ewald) see a play upon Prov. 8:24f.: art thou the demiurgic Wisdom itself? But the introductory proverbs (Prov. 1–9) are more recent than the book of Job (vid., supra, p. 24), and indeed probably, as we shall show elsewhere, belong to the time of Jehoshaphat. Consequently the more probable relation is that the writer of Prov. 8:24f. has adopted words from the book of Job in describing the pre-existence of the Chokma. Was Job, a higher spirit-nature, brought forth, i.e., as it were amidst the pangs of travail (חוּלַלְתָּ, Pulal from חיל, חול), before the hills? for the angels, according to Scripture, were created before man, and even before the visible universe (vid., Job 38:4ff.). Hirz., Ew., Schlottm., and others erroneously translate the futt. in the questions, v. 8, as praes. All the verbs in vv. 7, 8, are under the control of the retrospective character which is given to the verses by ראישׁון; comp. 10:10f., where זכר־נא has the same influence, and also Job 3:3, where the historical sense of אִוֶּלֶד depends not upon the syntax, but upon logical necessity. Translate therefore: didst thou attend in the secret council (סוֹד, like Jer. 23:18, comp. Ps. 89:8) of Eloah (according to the correct form of writing in Codd. and in Kimchi, Michlol 54a, הַבְּסוֹד, like v. 11 הַמְּעַט and Job 22:13 הַבְּעַד, with Beth raph. and without Gaja 114), and didst then acquire for thyself (גרע, here attrahere, like the Arabic, sorbere, to suck in) wisdom? by which one is reminded of Prometheus' fire stolen from heaven. Nay, Job can boast of no extraordinary wisdom. The friends—as Eliphaz, v. 9, says in their name—are his contemporaries; and if he desires to appeal to the teaching of his father, and of his ancestors generally, let them know that there are hoary-headed men among themselves, whose discernment is deeper by reason of their more advanced age. גַּם is inverted, like Job 2:10 (which see); and at the same time, since it is sued twice, it is correlative: etiam inter nos et cani et senes. Most modern expositors think that Eliphaz, "in modestly concealed language" (Ewald), refers to himself. But the reference would be obvious enough; and wherefore this modest concealing, which is so little suited to the character of Eliphaz? Moreover, v. 10a does not sound as if speaking merely of one, and in v. 10b Eliphaz would make himself older than he appears to be, for it is nowhere implied that Job is a young man in comparison with him. We therefore with Umbreit explain בָּנוּ: in our generation. Thus it sounds more like the Arabic, both in words (kebîr Arab., usual in the signif. grandaevus) and in substance. Eliphaz appeals to the source of reliable tradition, since they have even among their races and districts mature old men, and since, indeed, according to Job's own admission (Job 12:12), there is "wisdom among the ancient ones."

11 Are the consolations of God too small for thee,

And a word thus tenderly spoken with thee?

12 What overpowers thy hearts?

And why do thine eyes wink,

13 That thou turnest thy snorting against God,

And sendest forth such words from thy mouth?

Job 15:11–13. By the consolations of God, Eliphaz means the promises in accordance with the majesty and will of God, by which he and the other friends have sought to cheer him, of course presupposing a humble resignation to the just hand of God. By "a word (spoken) in gentleness to him," he means the gentle tone which they have maintained, while he has passionately opposed them. לָאַט, elsewhere לְאַט (e.g., Isa. 8:6, of the softly murmuring and gently flowing Siloah), from אַט (declined, אִטִּי), with the neutral, adverbial ָל (as לָבָטַח), signifies: with a soft step, gently, The word has no connection with לוּט, לָאַט, to cover over, and is not third praet. (as it is regarded by Raschi, after Chajug): which he has gently said to you, or that which has gently befallen you; in which, as in Fürst's Handwörterbuch, the notions secrete (Judg. 4:21, Targ. בְּרָז, in secret) and leniter are referred to one root. Are these divine consolations, and these so gentle addresses, too small for thee (ממך מעט, opp. 1 Kings 19:7), i.e., beneath thy dignity, and unworthy of they notice? What takes away (לקח, auferre, abripere, as frequently) thy heart (here of wounded pride), and why do thine eyes gleam, that thou turnest (הֵשִׁיב, not revertere, but vertere, as freq.) thy ill-humour towards God, and utterest מִלִּין (so here, not מִלִּים) words, which, because they are without meaning and intelligence, are nothing but words? רָזַם, ἅπ. γεγρ., is transposed from רָמַז, to wink, i.e., to make known by gestures and grimaces,—a word which does not occur in biblical, but is very common in post-biblical, Hebrew (e.g., חרשׁ ונרמז רומז, a deaf and dumb person expresses himself and is answered by a language of signs). Modern expositors arbitrarily understand a rolling of the eyes; it is more natural to think of the vibration of the eye-lashes or eye-brows. רוּחַ, v. 13, is as in Judg. 8:3, Isa. 25:4, comp. 13:11, and freq. used of passionate excitement, which is thus expressed because it manifests itself in πνέειν (Acts 9:1), and has its rise in the πνεῦμα (Eccl. 7:9). Job ought to control this angry spirit, θυμός (Psychol. S. 198); but he allows it to burst forth, and makes even God the object on which he vents his anger in impetuous language. How much better it would be for him, if he would search within himself (Lam. 3:39) for the reason of those sufferings which so deprive him of his self-control!

14 What is mortal man that he should be pure,

And that he who is born of woman should be righteous?

15 He trusteth not His holy ones,

And the heavens are not pure in His eyes:

16 How much less the abominable and corrupt,

Man, who drinketh iniquity as water!

Job 15:14–16. The exclamation in v. 14 is like the utterance: mortal man and man born flesh of flesh cannot be entirely sinless. Even "the holy ones" and "the heavens" are not. The former are, as in Job 5:1, according to 4:18, the angels as beings of light (whether קָדַשׁ signifies to be light from the very first, spotlessly pure, or, vid., Psalter, i. 588f., to be separated, distinct, and hence exalted above what is common); the latter is not another expression for the מְרוֹמָא אַנְגְּלֵי (Targ.), the "angels of the heights," but שָׁמַיִם is the word used for the highest spheres in which they dwell (comp. Job 25:5); for the angels are certainly not corporeal, but, like all created things, in space, and the Scriptures everywhere speak of angels and the starry heavens together. Hence the angels are called the morning stars in Job 38:7, and hence both stars and angels are called הַשׁמים צְבָא and צְבָאוֹת (vid., Genesis. S. 128). Even the angels and the heavens are finite, and consequently are not of a nature absolutely raised above the possibility of sin and contamination.

Eliphaz repeats here what he has already said, Job 4:18f.; but he does it intentionally, since he wishes still more terribly to describe human uncleanness to Job (Oetinger). In that passage

אַף was merely the sign of an anti-climax, here כִּי אַף is quanto minus. Eliphaz refers to the hereditary infirmity and sin of human nature in v. 14, here (v. 16) to man's own free choice of that which works his destruction. He uses the strongest imaginable words to describe one actualiter and originaliter corrupted. נִתְעָב denotes one who is become an abomination, or the abominated = abominable (Ges. § 134, 1); נָאֱלָח, one thoroughly corrupted (Arabic alacha, in the medial VIII conjugation: to become sour, which reminds one of ζύμη, Rabb. שְׁאֹר שֶׁבְּעִסָּה, as an image of evil, and especially of evil desire). It is further said of him (an expression which Elihu adopts, Job 34:7), that he drinks up evil like water. The figure is like Prov. 26:6, comp. on Ps. 73:10, and implies that he lusts after sin, and that it is become a necessity of his nature, and is to his nature what water is to the thirsty. Even Job does not deny this corruption of man (Job 14:4), but the inferences which the friends draw in reference to him he cannot acknowledge. The continuation of Eliphaz' speech shows how they render this acknowledgment impossible to him.

17 I will inform thee, hear me!
And what I have myself seen that I will declare,
18 Things which wise men declare
Without concealment from their fathers—
19 To them alone was the land given over,
And no stranger had passed in their midst—:

Job 15:17–19. Eliphaz, as in his first speech, introduces the dogma with which he confronts Job with a solemn preface: in the former case it had its rise in a revelation, here it is supported by his own experience and reliable tradition; for חזיתי is not intended as meaning ecstatic vision (Schlottm.). The poet uses חזה also of sensuous vision, Job 8:17; and of observation and knowledge by means of the senses, not only the more exalted, as Job 19:26f., but of any kind (Job 23:9, 24:1, 27:12, comp. 36:25, 34:32), in the widest sense. זֶה is used as neuter, Gen. 6:15, Ex. 13:8, 30:13, Lev. 11:4, and freq.115 (comp. the neuter הוּא, Job 13:16, and often), and זה־חזיתי is a relative clause (Ges. § 122, 2): quod conspexi, as Job 19:19 quos amo, and Ps. 74:2 in quo habitas, comp. Ps. 104:8, 26, Prov. 23:22, where the punctuation throughout proceeds from the correct knowledge of the syntax. The waw of ואספרה is the waw apodosis, which is customary (Nägelsbach, § 111, 1, b) after relative clauses (e.g., Num. 23:3), or what is the same thing, participles (e.g., Prov. 23:24): et narrabo = ea narrabo. In v. 18 כחדו ולא is, logically at least, subordinate to יגידו, as in Isa. 3:9, 116 as the Targum of the Antwerp Polyglott well translates: "what wise men declare, without concealing (מכדבין ולא), from the tradition of their fathers;" whereas all the other old translations, including Luther's, have missed the right meaning. These fathers to whom this doctrine respecting the fate of evil-doers is referred, lived, as Eliphaz says in v. 19, in the land of their birth, and did not mingle themselves with strangers, consequently their manner of viewing things, and their opinions, have in their favour the advantage of independence, of being derived from their own experience, and also of a healthy development undisturbed by any foreign influences, and their teaching may be accounted pure and unalloyed.

Eliphaz thus indirectly says, that the present is not free from such influences, and Ewald is consequently of opinion that the individuality of the Israelitish poet peeps out here, and a state of things is indicated like that which came about after the fall of Samaria in the reign of Manasseh. Hirzel also infers from Eliphaz' words, that at the time when the book was written the poet's fatherland was desecrated by some foreign rule, and considers it an indication for determining the time at which the book was composed. But how groundless and deceptive this is! The way in which Eliphaz commends ancient traditional lore is so genuinely Arabian, that there is but the faintest semblance of a reason for supposing the poet to have thrown his own history and national peculiarity so vividly into the working up of the rôle of another. Purity of race was, from the

earliest times, considered by "the sons of the East" as a sign of highest nobility, and hence Eliphaz traces back his teaching to a time when his race could boast of the greatest freedom from intermixture with any other. Schlottmann prefers to interpret v. 19 as referring to the "nobler primeval races of man" (without, however, referring to Job 8:8), but הָאָרֶץ does not signify the earth here, but: country, as in Job 30:8, 22:8, and elsewhere, and v. 19b seems to refer to nations: זָר = barbarus (perhaps Semitic: בַּרְבַּר, ὁ ἔξω). Nevertheless it is unnecessary to suppose that Eliphaz' time was one of foreign domination, as the Assyrian-Chaldean time was for Israel: it is sufficient to imagine it as a time when the tribes of the desert were becoming intermixed, from migration, commerce, and feud.

Now follows the doctrine of the wise men, which springs from a venerable primitive age, an age as yet undisturbed by any strange way of thinking (modern enlightenment and free thinking, as we should say), and is supported by Eliphaz' own experience.117

20 So long as the ungodly liveth he suffereth,

And numbered years are reserved for the tyrant.

21 Terrors sound in his ears;

In time of peace the destroyer cometh upon him.

22 He believeth not in a return from darkness,

And he is selected for the sword.

23 He roameth about after bread: "Ah! where is it?"

He knoweth that a dark day is near at hand for him.

24 Trouble and anguish terrify him;

They seize him as a king ready to the battle.

Job 15:20–24. All the days of the ungodly he (the ungodly) is sensible of pain. רָשָׁע stands, like Elohim in Gen. 9:6, by the closer definition; here however so, that this defining ends after the manner of a premiss, and is begun by הוּא after the manner of a conclusion. מִתְחוֹלֵל, he writhes, i.e., suffers inward anxiety and distress in the midst of all outward appearance of happiness. Most expositors translate the next line: and throughout the number of the years, which are reserved to the tyrant. But (1) this parallel definition of time appended by waw makes the sense drawling; (2) the change of עָרִיץ (oppressor, tyrant) for רשׁע leads one to expect a fresh affirmation, hence it is translated by the LXX: ἔτη δὲ ἀριθμητὰ δεδομένα δυνάστῃ. The predicate is, then, like Job 32:7, comp. 29:10, 1 Sam. 2:4 (Ges. § 148), per attractionem in the plur. instead of in the sing., and especially with מִסְפַּר followed by gen. plur.; this attraction is adopted by our author, Job 21:21, 38:21. The meaning is not, that numbered, i.e., few, years are secretly appointed to the tyrant, which must have been sh'nôth mispâr, a reversed position of the words, as Job 16:22, Num. 9:20 (vid., Gesenius' Thes.); but a (limited, appointed) number of years is reserved to the tyrant (צפן as Job 24:1, 21:19, comp. טמן, Job 20:26; Mercerus: occulto decreto definiti), after the expiration of which his punishment begins. The thought expressed by the Targ., Syr., and Jerome would be suitable: and the number of the years (that he has to live unpunished) is hidden from the tyrant; but if this were the poet's meaning, he would have written שָׁנָיו, and must have written מִן־הָעָרִיץ.

With regard to the following vv. 21–24, it is doubtful whether only the evil-doer's anxiety of spirit is described in amplification of מתחולל הוא, or also how the terrible images from which he suffers in his conscience are realized, and how he at length helplessly succumbs to the destruction which his imagination had long foreboded. A satisfactory and decisive answer to this question is hardly possible; but considering that the real crisis is brought on by Eliphaz later, and fully described, it seems more probable that what has an objective tone in vv. 21–24 is controlled by what has been affirmed respecting the evil conscience of the ungodly, and is to be understood accordingly. The sound of terrible things (startling dangers) rings in his ears; the devastator comes upon him (בוא seq. acc. as Job 20:22, Prov. 28:22; comp. Isa. 28:15) in the midst of his prosperity. He anticipates it

ere it happens. From the darkness by which he feels himself menaced, he believes not (הֶאֱמִין seq. infin. as Ps. 27:13, לראות, of confident hope) to return; i.e., overwhelmed with a consciousness of his guilt, he cannot, in the presence of this darkness which threatens him, raise to the hope of rescue from it, and he is really—as his consciousness tells him—צָפוּי (like עָשׂוּ, Job 41:25; Ges. § 75, rem. 5; Keri צפוי, which is omitted in our printed copies, contrary to the testimony of the Masora and the authority of correct MSS), spied out for, appointed to the sword, i.e., of God (Job 19:29; Isa. 31:8), or decreed by God. In the midst of abundance he is harassed by the thought of becoming poor; he wanders about in search of bread, anxiously looking out and asking where? (abrupt, like הנה, Job 9:19), i.e., where is any to be found, whence can I obtain it? The LXX translates contrary to the connection, and with a strange misunderstanding of the passage: κατατέτακται δὲ είς σῖτα γυψίν (אַיֵּה לֶחֶם, food for the vulture). He sees himself in the mirror of the future thus reduced to beggary; he knows that a day of darkness stands in readiness (נכון, like Job 18:12), is at his hand, i.e., close upon him (בְּיָדוֹ, elsewhere in this sense לְיַד, Ps. 140:6, 1 Sam. 19:3, and עַל־יְדֵי, Job 1:14).

In accordance with the previous exposition, we shall now interpret וּמְצוּקָה צַר, v. 24, not of need and distress, but subjectively of fear and oppression. They come upon him suddenly and irresistibly; it seizes or overpowers him (תִּתְקְפֵהוּ with neutral subject; an unknown something, a dismal power) as a king לַכִּידוֹר עָתִיד. LXX ὥσπερ στρατηγὸς πρωτοστάτης πίπτων, like a leader falling in the first line of the battle, which is an imaginary interpretation of the text. The translation of the Targum also, sicut regem qui paratus est ad scabellum (to serve the conqueror as a footstool), furnishes no explanation. Another Targum translation (in Nachmani and elsewhere) is: sicut rex qui paratus est circumdare se legionibus. According to this, כידור comes from כָּדַר, to surround, be round (comp. כָּתַר, whence כֶּתֶר, Assyr. cudar, κίδαρις, perhaps also חָזַר, Syr. חדר, whence chedor, a circle, round about); and it is assumed, that as כַּדּוּר signifies a ball (not only in Talmudic, but also in Isa. 22:18, which is to be translated: rolling he rolleth thee into a ball, a ball in a spacious land), so כִּידוֹר, a round encampment, an army encamped in a circle, synon. of מַעְגָּל. In the first signification the word certainly furnishes no suitable sense in connection with עתיד; but one may, with Kimchi, suppose that כידור, like the Italian torniamento, denotes the circle as well as the tournament, or the round of conflict, i.e., the conflict which moves round about, like tumult of battle, which last is a suitable meaning here. The same appropriate meaning is attained, however, if the root is taken, like the Arabic kdr, in the signification turbidum esse (comp. קָדַר, Job 6:16), which is adopted of misfortunes as troubled experiences of life (according to which Schultens translates: destinatus est ad turbulentissimas fortunas, beginning a new thought with עתיד, which is not possible, since כמלך by itself is no complete figure), and may perhaps also be referred to the tumult of battle, tumultus bellici conturbatio (Rosenm.); or of, with Fleischer, one starts from another turn of the idea of the root, viz., to be compressed, solid, thick, which is a more certain way gives the meaning of a dense crowd.118 Since, therefore, a suitable meaning is obtained in two ways, the natural conjecture, which is commended by Prov. 6:11, לַכִּידוֹן עתיד, paratus ad hastam = peritus hastae (Hupf.), according to Job 3:8) where עֹרֵר = לְעֹרֵר), may be abandoned. The signification circuitus has the most support, according to which Saadia and Parchon also explain, and we have preferred to translate round of battle rather than tumult of conflict; Jerome's translation, qui praeparatur ad praelium, seems also to be gained in the same manner.

25 Because he stretched out his hand against God,
And was insolent towards the Almighty;
26 He assailed Him with a stiff neck,
With the thick bosses of his shield;
27 Because he covered his face with his fatness,

And addeth fat to his loins,

28 And inhabited desolated cities,

Houses which should not be inhabited,

Which were appointed to be ruins.

29 He shall not be rich, and his substance shall not continue

And their substance boweth not to the ground.

30 He escapeth not darkness;

The flame withereth his shoots;

And he perisheth in the breath of His mouth.

Job 15:25–30. This strophe has periodic members: vv. 25–28 an antecedent clause with a double beginning (כִּי־נָטָה because he has stretched out, כִּי־כִסָּה because he has covered; whereas יָרוּץ may be taken as more independent, but under the government of the כי that stands at the commencement of the sentence); vv. 29, 30, is the conclusion. Two chief sins are mentioned as the cause of the final destiny that comes upon the evil-doer: (1) his arrogant opposition to God, and (2) his contentment on the ruins of another's prosperity. The first of these sins is described vv. 25–27. The fut. consec. is once used instead of the perf., and the simple fut. is twice used with the signification of an imperf. (as Job 4:3 and freq.). The Hithpa. הִתְגַּבֵּר signifies here to maintain a heroic bearing, to play the hero; הִתְעַשֵּׁר to make one's self rich, to play the part of a rich man, Prov. 13:7. And בְּצַוָּאר expresses the special prominence of the neck in his assailing God אֶל רוּץ, as Dan. 8:6, comp. עַל, Job 16:14); it is equivalent to erecto collo (Vulg.), and in meaning equivalent to ὕβρει (LXX). Also in Ps. 75:6, בצואר (with Munach, which there represents a distinctive119) is absolute, in the sense of stiff-necked or hard-headed; for the parallels, as Ps. 31:19, 94:4, and especially the primary passage, 1 Sam. 2:3, show that עתק is to be taken as an accusative of the object. The proud defiance with which he challengingly assails God, and renders himself insensible to the dispensations of God, which might bring him to a right way of thinking, is symbolized by the additional clause: with the thickness (עָבְיִ cognate form to עָבִי) of the bosses of his shields. גַּב is the back (Arab. ḍhr) or boss (umbo) of the shield; the plurality of shields has reference to the diversified means by which he hardens himself. V. 27, similarly to Ps. 73:4–7, pictures this impregnable carnal security against all unrest and pain, to which, on account of his own sinfulness and the distress of others, the nobler-minded man is so sensitive: he has covered his face with his fat, so that by the accumulation of fat, for which he anxiously labours, it becomes a gross material lump of flesh, devoid of mind and soul, and made fat, i.e., added fat, caused it to accumulate, upon his loins (כֶּסֶל for לְיוּכְסָ); עָשָׂה (which has nothing to do with Arab. gšâ, to cover) is used as in Job 14:9, and in the phrase corpus facere (in Justin), in the sense of producing outwardly something from within. פִּימָה reminds one of πιμ-ελή (as Aquila and Symmachus translate here), o-pim-us, and of the Sanscrit piai, to be fat (whence adj. pîvan, pîvara, πιαρός, part. pîna, subst. according to Roth pîvas); the Arabic renders it probable that it is a contraction of פְּאִימָה (Olsh. § 171, b). The Jewish expositors explain it according to the misunderstood פִּים, 1 Sam. 13:21, of the furrows or wrinkles which are formed in flabby flesh, as if the ah were paragogic.

Ver. 28 describes the second capital sin of the evil-doer. The desolated cities that he dwells in are not cities that he himself has laid waste; 28c distinctly refers to a divinely appointed punishment, for הִתְעַתְּדוּ does not signify: which they (evil-doers) have made ruins (Hahn), which is neither probable from the change of number, nor accords with the meaning of the verb, which signifies "to appoint to something in the future." Hirzel, by referring to the law, Deut. 13:13–19 (comp. 1 Kings 16:34), which forbids the rebuilding of such cities as are laid under the curse, explains it to a certain extent more correctly. But such a play upon the requirements of the Mosaic law is in itself not probable in the book of Job, and here, as Löwenthal rightly remarks, is the less indicated, since it is not the dwelling in such cities that is

forbidden, but only the rebuilding of them, so far as they had been destroyed; here, however, the reference is only to dwelling, not to rebuilding. The expression must therefore be understood more generally thus, that the powerful man settles down carelessly and indolently, without any fear of the judgments of God or respect for the manifestations of His judicial authority, in places in which the marks of a just divine retribution are still visible, and which are appointed to be perpetual monuments of the execution of divine judgments.120 Only by this rendering is the form of expression of the elliptical clause לָמוֹ לֹא־יֵשְׁבוּ בָּתִּים explained. Hirz. refers למו to בתים: in which they do not dwell; but יָשַׁב לְ does not signify: to dwell in a place, but: to settle down in a place; Schlottm. refers למו to the inhabitants: therein they dwell not themselves, i.e., where no one dwelt; but the אשׁר which would be required in this case as acc. localis could not be omitted. One might more readily, with Hahn, explain: those to whom they belong do not inhabit them; but it is linguistically impossible for למו to stand alone as the expression of this subject (the possessors). The most natural, and also an admissible explanation, is, that ישׁבו refers to the houses, and that למו, which can be used not only of persons, but also of things, is dat. ethicus. The meaning, however, is not: which are uninhabited, which would not be expressed as future, but rather by יושׁב בהם אין or similarly, but: which shall not inhabit, i.e., shall not be inhabited to them (יָשַׁב to dwell = to have inhabitants, as Isa. 13:10, Jer. 50:13, 39, and freq.), or, as we should express it, which ought to remain uninhabited.

Ver. 29 begins the conclusion: (because he has acted thus) he shall not be rich (with a personal subject as Hos. 12:9, and יֶעְשַׁר to be written with a sharpened שׁ, like יַעְצֹר above, Job 12:15), and his substance shall not endure (קוּם, to take place, Isa. 7:7; to endure, 1 Sam. 13:14; and hold fast, Job 41:18), and מִנְלָם shall not incline itself to the earth. The interpretation of the older expositors, non extendet se in terra, is impossible—that must be בָּאָרֶץ יִנָּטֶה; whereas Kal is commonly used in the intransitive sense to bow down, bend one's self or incline (Ges. § 53, 2). But what is the meaning of the subject מנלם? We may put out of consideration those interpretations that condemn themselves: לָם מִן, ex iis (Targ.), or לָם מַן, quod iis, what belongs to them (Saad.), or מִלָּם, their word (Syr. and Gecatilia), and such substitutions as σκιάν (צלם or צללם) of the LXX, and radicem of Jerome (which seems only to be a guess). Certainly that which throws most light on the signification of the word is כְּהַנְלֹתְךָ (for כְּהַנָּלֹתְךָ with Dag. dirimens, as Job 17:2), which occurs in Isa. 33:1. The oldest Jewish lexicographers take this הִנָּלָה (parall. הֻתַּם) as a synonym of כָּלָה in the signification, to bring to an end; on the other hand, Ges., Knobel, and others, consider כְּכַלֹּתְךָ to be the original reading, because the meaning perficere is not furnished for נלה from the Arab. nâl, and because נל, standing thus together, is in Arabic an incompatible root combination (Olsh. § 9, 4). This union of consonants certainly does not occur in any Semitic root, but the Arab. nâla (the long a of which can in the inflection become a short changeable bowel) furnishes sufficient protection for this one exception; and the meaning consequi, which belongs to the Arab. nâla, fut. janîlu, is perfectly suited to Isa. 33:1: if thou hast fully attained (Hiph. as intensive of the transitive Kal, like הִקְנָה, הִזְעִיק) to plundering. If, however, the verb נָלָה is established, there is no need for any conjecture in the passage before us, especially since the improvement nearest at hand, מִכְלָם (Hupf. מִכְלָה), produces a sentence (non figet in terra caulam) which could not be flatter and tamer; whereas the thought that is gained by Olshausen's more sensible conjecture, מַגָּלָם (their sickle does not sink to the earth, is not pressed down by the richness of the produce of the field), goes to the other extreme.121

Juda b. Karisch (Kureisch) has explained the word correctly by Arab. mnâlhm: that which they have offered (from nâla, janûlu) or attained (nâla, janîlu), i.e., their possession122 (not: their perfection, as it is chiefly explained by the Jewish expositors, according to נלה = כלה). When the poet says, "their prosperity inclines

not to the ground," he denies to it the likeness to a field of corn, which from the weight of the ears bows itself towards the ground, or to a tree, whose richly laden branches bend to the ground. We may be satisfied with this explanation (Hirz., Ew., Stickel, and most others): מְנֻלָּם from מְנֻלָּה (with which Kimchi compares מְכֻרָם, Num. 20:19, which however is derived not from מְכֻרָה, but from מָכָר), similar in meaning to the post-biblical מָמוֹן, μαμωνᾶς; the suff., according to the same change of number as in v. 35, Job 20:23, and freq., refers to רשׁעים.

In v. 30, also, a figure taken from a plant is interwoven with what is said of the person of the ungodly: the flame withers up his tender branch without its bearing fruit, and he himself does not escape darkness, but rather perishes by the breath of His mouth, i.e., God's mouth (Job 4:9, not of his own, after Isa. 33:11). The repetition of יָסוּר ("he escapes not," as Prov. 13:14; "he must yield to," as 1 Kings 15:14, and freq.) is an impressive play upon words.

31 Let him not trust in evil—he is deceived,
For evil shall be his possession.

32 His day is not yet, then it is accomplished,
And his palm-branch loseth its freshness.

33 He teareth off as a vine his young grapes,
And He casteth down as an olive-tree his flower.

34 The company of the hypocrite is rigid,
And fire consumeth the tents of bribery.

35 They conceive sorrow and bring forth iniquity,
And their inward part worketh self-deceit.

Job 15:31–35. אַל does not merely introduce a declaration respecting the future (Luther: he will not continue, which moreover must have been expressed by the Niph.), but is admonitory: may he only not trust in vanity (Munach here instead of Dechî, according to the rule of transformation, Psalter, ii. 504, § 4)—he falls, so far as he does it, into error, or brings himself into error (נִתְעָה, 3 praet., not part., and Niph. like Isa. 19:14, where it signifies to be thrust backwards and forwards, or to reel about helplessly),—a thought one might expect after the admonition (Olsh. conjectures נִתְעָב, one who is detestable): this trusting in evil is self-delusion, for evil becomes his exchange (תְּמוּרָה not compensatio, but permutatio, acquisitio). We have translated שָׁוְא by "evil" (Unheil), by which we have sought elsewhere to render אָוֶן, in order that we might preserve the same word in both members of the verse. In v. 31a, שָׁוְא (in form = אשָׁוְא from שׁוא, in the Chethib שָׁו, the Aleph being cast away, like the Arabic sû', wickedness, form the v. cavum hamzatum sâ-'a = sawu'a) is waste and empty in mind, in 31b (comp. Hos. 12:12) waste and empty in fortune; or, to go further from the primary root, in the former case apparent goodness, in the latter apparent prosperity—delusion, and being undeceived ["evil" in the sense of wickedness, and of calamity]. תִּמָּלֵא, which follows, refers to the exchange, or neutrally to the evil that is exchanged: the one or the other fulfils itself, i.e., either: is realized (passive of מָלֵא, 1 Kings 8:15), or: becomes complete, which means the measure of the punishment of his immorality becomes full, before his natural day, i.e., the day of death, is come (comp. for expression, Job 22:16, Eccles. 7:17). The translation: then it is over with him (Ges., Schlottm., and others), is contrary to the usage of the language; and that given by the Jewish expositors, תִּמָּלֵא = תִּמָּלֵל (abscinditur or conteritur), is a needlessly bold suggestion.—V. 32b. It is to be observed that רַעֲנָנָה is Milel, and consequently 3 praet., not as in Cant. 1:16 Milra, and consequently adj. כְּפָה is not the branches generally (Luzzatto, with Raschi: branchage), but, as the proverbial expression for the high and low, Isa. 9:13, 19:15 (vid., Dietrich, Abhandlung zur hebr. Gramm. S. 209), shows, the palm-branch bent downwards (comp. Targ. Esth. 1:5, where כְּפִין signifies seats and walks covered with foliage). "His palm-branch does not become green, or does not remain green" (which Symm. well renders: οὐκ εὐθαλήσει), means that as he himself, the palm-trunk, so also his family, withers away. In v. 33 it is represented as בֶּסֶר (= בֹּסֶר), wild grapes, or even unripe grapes of a vine, and as נִצָּה, flowers of an olive.123 In v. 32b the godless man

himself might be the subject: he casts down, like an olive-tree, his flowers, but in v. 32a this is inadmissible; if we interpret: "he shakes off (Targ. יִתַּר, excutiet), like a vine-stock, his young grapes," this (apart from the far-fetched meaning in יַחְמֹס) is a figure that is untrue to nature, since the grapes sit firmer the more unripe they are; and if one takes the first meaning of חמס, "he acts unjustly, as a vine, to his omphax" (e.g., Hupf.), whether it means that he does not let it ripen, or that he does not share with it any of the sweet sap, one has not only an indistinct figure, but also (since what God ordains for the godless is described as in operation) an awkward comparison. The subject of both verbs is therefore other than the vine and olive themselves. But why only an impersonal "one"? In v. 30 פיו רוח was referred to God, who is not expressly mentioned. God is also the subject here, and יחמס, which signifies to act with violence to one's self, is modified here to the sense of tearing away, as Lam. 2:6 (which Aben-Ezra has compared), of tearing out; כגפן, כזית, prop. as a vine-stock, as an olive-tree, is equivalent to even as such an one.

Ver. 34 declares the lot of the family of the ungodly, which has been thus figuratively described, without figure: the congregation (i.e., here: family-circle) of the ungodly (חָנֵף according to its etymon inclinans, propensus ad malum, vid., on Job 13:16) is (as it is expressed from the standpoint of the judgment that is executed) גַּלְמוּד, a hard, lifeless, stony mass (in the substantival sense of the Arabic galmûd instead of the adject. גלמודה, Isa. 49:21), i.e., stark dead (LXX θάνατος; Aq., Symm., Theod., ἄκαρπος), and fire has devoured the tents of bribery (after Ralbag: those built by bribery; or even after the LXX: οἴκους δωροδεκτῶν). The ejaculatory conclusion, v. 35, gives the briefest expression to that which has been already described. The figurative language, v. 35a, is like Ps. 7:15, Isa. 59:4 (comp. supra, p. 257); in the latter passage similar vividly descriptive infinitives are found (Ges. § 131, 4, b). They hatch the burdens or sorrow of others, and what comes from it is evil for themselves. What therefore their בֶּטֶן, i.e., their inward part, with the intermingled feelings, thoughts, and strugglings (Olympiodorus: κοιλίαν ὅλον τὸ ἐντὸς χωρίον φησὶ καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχήν), prepares or accomplishes (יָכִין similar to Job 27:17, 38:41), that on which it works, is מִרְמָה, deceit, with which they deceive others, and before all, themselves (New Test. ἀπάτη).

With the speech of Eliphaz, the eldest among the friends, who gives a tone to their speeches, the controversy enters upon a second stage. In his last speech Job has turned from the friends and called upon them to be silent; he turned to God, and therein a sure confidence, but at the same time a challenging tone of irreverent defiance, is manifested. God does not enter into the controversy which Job desires; and the consequence is, that that flickering confidence is again extinguished, and the tone of defiance is changed into despair and complaint. Instead of listening to the voice of God, Job is obliged to content himself again with that of the friends, for they believe the continuance of the contest to be just as binding upon them as upon Job. They cannot consider themselves overcome, for their dogma has grown up in such inseparable connection with their idea of God, and therefore is so much raised above human contradiction, that nothing but a divine fact can break through it. And they are too closely connected with Job by their friendship to leave him to himself as a heretic; they regard Job as one who is self-deluded, and have really the good intention of converting their friend.

Eliphaz' speech, however, also shows that they become still more and more incapable of producing a salutary impression on Job. For, on the one hand, in this second stage of the controversy also they turn about everywhere only in the circle of their old syllogism: suffering is the punishment of sin, Job suffers, therefore he is a sinner who has to make atonement for his sin; on the other hand, instead of being disconcerted by an unconditioned acceptation of this maxim, they are strengthened in it. For while at the beginning the conclusio was urged upon them only by premises raised above any proof, so

that they take for granted sins of Job which were not otherwise known to them; now, as they think, Job has himself furnished them with proof that he is a sinner who has merited such severe suffering. For whoever can speak so thoughtlessly and passionately, so vexatiously and irreverently, as Job has done, is, in their opinion, his own accuser and judge. It remains unperceived by them that Job's mind has lost its balance by reason of the fierceness of his temptation, and that in it nature and grace have fallen into a wild, confused conflict. In those speeches they see the true state of Job's spirit revealed. What, before his affliction, was the determining principle of his inner life, seems to them now to be brought to light in the words of the sufferer. Job is a godless one; and if he does affirm his innocence so solemnly and strongly, and challenges the decision of God, this assurance is only hypocritical, and put on against his better knowledge and conscience, in order to disconcert his accusers, and to evade their admonitions to repentance. It is לשׁון ערומים, a mere stratagem, like that of one who is guilty, who thinks he can overthrow the accusations brought against him by assuming the bold bearing of the accuser. Seb. Schmid counts up quinque vitia, with which Eliphaz in the introduction to his speech (Job 15:1–13) reproaches Job: vexatious impious words, a crafty perversion of the matter, blind assumption of wisdom, contempt of the divine word, and defiance against God. Of these reproaches the first and last are well-grounded; Job does really sin in his language and attitude towards God. With respect to the reproach of assumed wisdom, Eliphaz pays Job in the same coin; and when he reproaches Job with despising the divine consolations and gentle admonitions they have addressed to him, we must not blame the friends, since their intention is good. If, however, Eliphaz reproaches Job with calculating craftiness, and thus regards his affirmation of his innocence as a mere artifice, the charge cannot be more unjust, and must certainly produce the extremest alienation between them. It is indeed hard that Eliphaz regards the testimony of Job's conscience as self-delusion; he goes still further, and pronounces it a fine-spun lie, and denies not only its objective but also its subjective truth. Thus the breach between Job and the friends widens, the entanglement of the controversy becomes more complicated, and the poet allows the solution of the enigma to ripen, by its becoming increasingly enigmatical and entangled.

In this second round of the friends' speeches we meet with no new thoughts whatever; only "in the second circle of the dispute everything is more fiery than in the first" (Oetinger): the only new thing is the harsher and more decided tone of their maintenance of the doctrine of punishment, with which they confront Job. They cannot go beyond the narrow limits of their dogma of retribution, and confine themselves now to even the half of that narrowness; for since Job contemns the consolations of God with which they have hitherto closed their speeches, they now exclusively bring forward the terrible and gloomy phase of their dogma in opposition to him. After Eliphaz has again given prominence to the universal sinfulness of mankind, which Job does not at all deny, he sketches from his own experience and the tradition of his ancestors, which demands respect by reason of their freedom from all foreign influence, with brilliant lines, a picture of the evil-doer, who, being tortured by the horrors of an evil conscience, is overwhelmed by the wrath of God in the midst of his prosperity; and his possessions, children, and whole household are involved in his ruin. The picture is so drawn, that in it, as in a mirror, Job shall behold himself and his fate, both what he has already endured and what yet awaits him. מרמה is the final word of the admonitory conclusion of his speech: Job is to know that that which satisfies his inward nature is a fearful lie.

But what Job affirms of himself as the righteous one, is not מרמה. He knows that he is מטמא טמא (Job 14:4), but he also knows that he is as צדיק תמים (Job 12:4). He is conscious of the righteousness of his endeavour, which rests on

the groundwork of a mind turned to the God of salvation, therefore a believing mind,—a righteousness which is also accepted of God. The friends know nothing whatever of this righteousness which is available before God. Fateor quidem, says Calvin in his Institutiones, iii. 12, in libro Iob mentionem fieri justitiae, quae excelsior est observatione legis; et hanc distinctionem tenere operae pretium est, quia etiamsi quis legi satisfaceret, ne sic quidem staret ad examen illius justitiae, quae sensus omnes exsuperat. Mercier rightly observes: Eliphas perstringit hominis naturam, quae tamen per fidem pura redditur. In man Eliphaz sees only the life of nature and not the life of grace, which, because it is the word of God, makes man irreproachable before God. He sees in Job only the rough shell, and not the kernel; only the hard shell, and not the pearl. We know, however, from the prologue, that Jehovah acknowledged Job as His servant when he decreed suffering for him; and this sufferer, whom the friends regard as one smitten of God, is and remains, as this truly evangelical book will show to us, the servant of Jehovah.

JOB 16

Job's First Answer.—Ch. 16–17.

[Then began Job, and said:]

2 *I have now heard such things in abundance,*
Troublesome comforters are ye all!
3 *Are windy words now at an end,*
Or what goadeth thee that thou answerest?
4 *I also would speak like you,*
If only your soul were in my soul's stead.
I would weave words against you,
And shake my head at you;
5 *I would encourage you with my mouth,*
And the solace of my lips should soothe you.

Job 16:2–5. The speech of Eliphaz, as of the other two, is meant to be comforting. It is, however, primarily an accusation; it wounds instead of soothing. Of this kind of speech, says Job, one has now heard רַבּוֹת, much, i.e., (in a pregnant sense) amply sufficient, although the word might signify elliptically (Ps. 106:43; comp. Neh. 9:28) many times (Jer. *frequenter*); *multa* (as Job 23:14) is, however, equally suitable, and therefore is to be preferred as the more natural. V. 2*b* shows how כְּאֵלֶּה is intended; they are altogether מְנַחֲמֵי עָמָל, *consolatores onerosi* (Jer.), such as, instead of alleviating, only cause עמל, *molestiam* (comp. on Job 13:4). In v. 3*a* Job returns their reproach of being windy, i.e., one without any purpose and substance, which they brought against him, Job 15:2f.: have windy words an end, or (לוֹ *vel* = אִם in a disjunctive question, Ges. § 155, 2, *b*) if not, what goads thee on to reply? מרץ has been already discussed on Job 6:25. The Targ. takes it in the sense of מלץ: what makes it sweet to thee, etc.; the Jewish interpreters give it, without any proof, the signification, to be strong; the LXX transl. παρενοχλήσει, which is not transparent. Hirz., Ew., Schlottm., and others, call in the help of the Arabic *mariḍa* (Aramaic מְרַע), to be sick, the IV. form of which signifies "to make sick," not "to injure."[124] We keep to the primary meaning, to pierce, penetrate; *Hiph.* to goad, bring out, *lacessere:* what incites thee, that (כִּי as Job 6:11, *quod* not *quum*) thou repliest again? The collective thought of what follows is not that he also, if they were in his place, could do as they have done; that he, however, would not so act (thus e.g., Blumenfeld: with reasons for comfort I would overwhelm you, and sympathizingly shake my head over you, etc.). This rendering is destroyed by the shaking of the head, which is never a gesture of pure compassion, but always of malignant joy, Sir. 12:18; or of mockery at another's fall, Isa. 37:22; and misfortune, Ps. 22:8, Jer. 18:16, Matt. 27:39. Hence Merc. considers the antithesis to begin with v. 5, where, however, there is nothing to indicate it: *minime id facerem, quin potius vos confirmarem ore meo*—rather: that he also could display the same miserable consolation; he represents to them a change of their respective positions, in order that, as in a mirror, they may recognise the hatefulness of

their conduct. The negative antecedent clause *si essem* (with לוּ, according to Ges. § 155, 2, *f*) is surrounded by cohortatives, which (since the interrogative form of interpretation is inadmissible) signify not only *loquerer,* but *loqui possem,* or rather *loqui vellem* (comp. e.g., Ps. 51:18, *dare vellem*). When he says: I would range together, etc. (Carey: I would combine), he gives them to understand that their speeches are more artificial than natural, more declamations than the outgushings of the heart; instead of מִלִּים, it is בְּמִלִּים, since the object of the action is thought is as the means, as in v. 4 בְּמוֹ רֹאשִׁי, *capite meo* (for *caput meum,* Ps. 22:8), and בְּפִיהֶם, v. 10, for פִּיהֶם, comp. Jer. 18:16, Lam. 1:17, Ges. § 138†; Ew. takes החביר by comparison of the Arabic *chbr,* to know (the IV. form of which, *achbara,* however, signifies to cause to know, announce), in a sense that belongs neither to the Heb. nor to the Arab.: to affect wisdom. In v. 5 the chief stress is upon "with my mouth," without the heart being there, so also on the word "my lips," solace (נִיד ἅπ. λεγ., recalling Isa. 57:19, נִיב שִׂפתַיִם, offspring or fruit of the lips) of my lips, i.e., dwelling only on the lips, and not coming from the heart. In אאמצכם (*Piel,* not *Hiph.*) the *Ssere* is shortened to *Chirek* (Ges. § 60, rem. 4). According to v. 6, כאבכם is to be supplied to יַחְשׂךְ. He also could offer such superficial condolence without the sympathy which places itself in the condition and mood of the sufferer, and desires to afford that relief which it cannot. And yet how urgently did he need right and effectual consolation! He is not able to console himself, as the next strophe says: neither by words nor by silence is his pain assuaged.

6 *If I speak, my pain is not soothed;*
And if I forbear, what alleviation do I experience?

7 *Nevertheless now hath He exhausted me;*
Thou hast desolated all my household,

8 *And Thou filledst me with wrinkles—for a witness was it,*
And my leanness rose up against me
Complaining to my face.

9 *His wrath tore me, and made war upon me;*
He hath gnashed upon me with His teeth,
As mine enemy He sharpeneth His eyes against me.

Job 16:6–9. אִם stands with the cohortative in the hypothetical antecedent clause v. 6*a,* and in 6*b* the cohortative stands alone as Job 11:17, Ps. 73:16, 139:8, which is more usual, and more in accordance with the meaning which the cohortative has in itself, Nägelsbach, § 89, 3. The interrogative, What goes from me? is equivalent to, what (= nothing) of pain forsakes me. The subject of the assertion which follows (v. 7) is not the pain—Aben-Ezra thinks even that this is addressed in v. 7*b*—still less Eliphaz, whom some think, particularly on account of the sharp expressions which follow, must be understood (vid., on the other hand, p. 133), but God, whose wrath Job regards as the cause of his suffering, and feels as the most intolerable part of it. A strained connection is obtained by taking אַךְ either in an affirmative sense (Ew.: surely), as Job 18:21, or in a restrictive sense: only (= entirely) He has now exhausted me (Hirz., Hahn, also Schlottm.: only I feel myself oppressed, at least to express this), by which interpretation the עַתָּה, which stands between אַךְ and the verb, is in the way. We render it therefore in the adversative signification: nevertheless (*verum tamen*) now he seeks neither by speaking to alleviate his pain, nor by silence to control himself; God has placed him in a condition in which all his strength is exhausted. He is absolutely incapable of offering any resistance to his pain, and care has also been taken that no solacing word shall come to him from any quarter: Thou hast made all my society desolate (Carey: all my clan); עֵדָה of the household, as in Job 15:34. Jerome: *in nihilum redacti sunt omnes artus mei* (כל אברי, as explained by the Jewish expositors, e.g.,

Ralbag), as though the human organism could be called עֵדָה. Hahn: Thou hast destroyed all my testimony, which must have been עֵדָתִי (from עוּד, whereas עֵדָה, from וָעַד, has a changeable *Ssere*). He means to say that he stands entirely alone, and neither sees nor hears anything consolatory, for he does not count his wife. He is therefore completely shut up to himself; God has shrivelled him up; and this suffering form to which God has reduced him, is become an evidence, i.e., for himself and for others, as the three friends, an accusation *de facto,* which puts him down as a sinner, although his self-consciousness testifies the opposite to him.

Ver. 8. The verb קָמַט (Aram. קְמַט), which occurs only once beside (Job 22:16), has, like Arab. *qmṭ* (in Gecatilia's transl.), the primary meaning of binding and grasping firmly (LXX ἐπελάβου, Symm. κατέδησας, Targ. for לָכַד, תְּמַךְ, lengthened to a quadriliteral in Arab. *qmṭr,* cogn. קָמַץ[125]), *constringere,* from which the significations *comprehendere* and *corrugare* have branched off; the signification, to wrinkle (make wrinkled), to shrivel up, is the most common, and the reference which follows, to his emaciation, and the lines which occur further on from the picture of one sick with elephantiasis, show that the poet here has this in his mind. Ewald's conjecture, which changes הָיָה into הַיָּה, Job 6:2, 30:13 = הַוָּה, as subject to ותקמטני (calamity seizes me as a witness), deprives the thought contained in לְעֵד, which renders the inferential clause לעד הָיָה prominent, of much of its force and emphasis. In v. 8*bc* this thought is continued: כַּחַשׁ signifies here, according to Ps. 109:24 (which see), a wasting away; the verb-group כחשׁ, כחד, Arab. *jḥd, kḥt, qḥṭ,* etc., has the primary meaning of taking away and decrease: he becomes thin from whom the fat begins to fail; to disown is equivalent to holding back recognition and admission; the metaphor, water that deceives = dries up, is similar. His wasted, emaciated appearance, since God has thus shrivelled him up, came forth against him, told him to his face, i.e., accused him not merely behind his back, but boldly and directly, as a convicted criminal. God has changed himself in relation to him into an enraged enemy. Schlottm. wrongly translates: one tears and tortures me fiercely; Raschi erroneously understands Satan by צָרִי. In general, it is the wrath of God whence Job thinks his suffering proceeds. It was the wrath of God which tore him so (like Hos. 6:1, comp. Amos 1:11), and pursued him hostilely (as he says with the same word in Job 30:21); God has gnashed against him with His teeth; God drew or sharpened (Aq., Symm., Theod., ὥξυνεν לָטַשׁ like Ps. 7:13). His eyes or looks like swords (Targ. as a sharp knife, אִזְמֵל, σμίλη) for him, i.e., to pierce him through. Observe the *aorr.* interchanging with *perff.* and *imperff.* He describes the final calamity which has made him such a piteous form with the mark of the criminal. His present suffering is only the continuation of the decree of wrath which is gone forth concerning him.

10 *They have gaped against me with their mouth,*
In contempt they smite my cheeks;
They conspire together against me.
11 *God left me to the mercy of the ungodly,*
And cast me into the hands of the evil-doer.

Job 16:10, 11. He does not mean the friends by those who mock and vex him with their contemptuous words, but the men around him who envied his prosperity and now rejoice at his misfortune; those to whom his uprightness was a burden, and who now consider themselves disencumbered of their liege lord, the over-righteous, censorious, godly man. The perfects here also have not a present signification; he depicts his suffering according to the change it has wrought since it came upon him. The verb פָּעַר is used with the instrumental *Beth* instead of with the acc., as Job 29:23 (comp. on במלים, v. 4): they make an opening with their mouth (similar to Ps. 22:8, they make an opening with the lips, for *diducunt labia*).

Smiting on the cheeks is in itself an insult (Lam. 3:30); the additional בְּחֶרְפָּה will therefore refer to insulting words which accompany the act. The *Hithpa.* הִתְמַלֵּא, which occurs only here, signifies not only to gather together a מְלֹא in general, Isa. 31:4, but (after the Arab. *tamâla'a 'ala,* to conspire against any one[126]) to complete one's self, to strengthen one's self (for a like hostile purpose): Reiske correctly: *sibi invicem mutuam et auxiliatricem operam contra me simul omnes ferunt.* [127] The meaning of עָוִיל is manifest from Job 21:11; from עוּל, to suckle, *alere* (Arab. *'âl med. Wau,* whence the inf. *'aul, 'uwûl,* and *'ijâle*), it signifies boys, knaves; and it is as unnecessary to suppose two forms, עָוִיל and עֲוִיל, as two meanings, *puer* and *pravus,* since the language and particularly the book of Job has coined עָוֹל for the latter signification: it signifies in all three passages (here and Job 19:18, 21:11) boys, or the boyish, childish, knavish. The Arabic *warratta* leaves no doubt as to the derivation and meaning of יְרֻטֵנִי; it signifies to cast down to destruction (*warttah,* a precipice, ruin, danger), and so here the *fut. Kal* יִרְטֵנִי for יְיִרְטֵנִי (Ges. § 69, rem. 3), *praecipitem me dabat* (LXX ἔῤῥιψε, Symm. ἐνέβαλε), as the *praet. Kal,* Num. 22:32: *praeceps = exitiosa est via.* The preformative *Jod* has *Metheg* in correct texts, so that we need not suppose, with Ralbag, a רָטָה, similar in meaning to יָרַט.

12 *I was at ease, but He hath broken me in pieces;*
And He hath taken me by the neck and shaken me to pieces,
And set me up for a mark for himself.
13 *His arrows whistled about me;*
He pierced my reins without sparing;
He poured out my gall upon the ground.
14 *He brake through me breach upon breach,*
He ran upon me like a mighty warrior.

Job 16:12–14. He was prosperous and contented, when all at once God began to be enraged against him; the intensive form פַּרְפֵּר (Arab. *farfara*) signifies to break up entirely, crush, crumble in pieces (*Hithpo.* to become fragile, Isa. 24:19); the corresponding intensive form פִּצְפֵּץ (from פָּצַץ, Arab. *fḍḍ,* cogn. נָפַץ), to beat in pieces (*Polel* of a hammer, Jer. 23:29), to dash to pieces: taking him by the neck, God raised him on high in order to dash him to the ground with all His might. מַטָּרָה (from נָטַר, τηρεῖν, like σκοπός from σκέπτεσθαι) is the target, as in the similar passage, Lam. 3:12, distinct from מִפְגָּע, Job 7:20, object of attack and point of attack: God has set me up for a target for himself, in order as it were to try what He and His arrows can do. Accordingly רַבָּיו (from רָבַב = רָבָה, רָמָה, *jacere*) signifies not: His archers (although this figure would be admissible after Job 10:17, 19:12, and the form after the analogy of רַב, רַע, etc., is naturally taken as a substantival adj.), but, especially since God appears directly as the actor: His arrows (= חִצָּיו, Job 6:4), from רַב, formed after the analogy of בַּז, מַס, etc., according to which it is translated by LXX, Targ., Jer., while most of the Jewish expositors, referring to Jer. 50:29 (where we need not, with Böttch., point רֹבִים, and here רֹבָיו), interpret by מורי החצים. On all sides, whichever way he might turn himself, the arrows of God flew about him, mercilessly piercing his reins, so that his gall-bladder became empty (comp. Lam. 2:11, and vid., *Psychol.* S. 268). It is difficult to conceive what is here said;[128] it is, moreover, not meant to be understood strictly according to the sense: the divine arrows, which are only an image for divinely decreed sufferings, pressed into his inward parts, and wounded the noblest organs of his nature. In v. 14 follows another figure. He was as a wall which was again and again broken through by the missiles or battering-rams of God, and against which He ran after the manner of besiegers when storming. פֶּרֶץ is the proper word for such breaches and holes in a wall generally; here it is connected as obj. with its

own verb, according to Ges. § 138, rem. 1. The second פרץ (פָּרֶץ with *Kametz*) has *Ssade minusculum,* for some reason unknown to us.

The next strophe says what change took place in his own conduct in consequence of this incomprehensible wrathful disposition of God which had vented itself on him.

15 *I sewed sackcloth upon my skin,*
And defiled my horn with dust.
16 *My face is exceeding red with weeping,*
And on mine eyelids is the shadow of death,
17 *Although there is no wrong in my hand,*
And my prayer is pure.

Job 16:15–17. Coarse-haired cloth is the recognised clothing which the deeply sorrowful puts on, ἱμάτιον στενοχωρίας καὶ πένθους, as the Greek expositors remark. Job does not say of it that he put it on or slung it round him, but that he sewed it upon his naked body; and this is to be attributed to the hideous distortion of the body by elephantiasis, which will not admit of the use of the ordinary form of clothes. For the same reason he also uses, not עוֹרִי, but גִּלְדִּי, which signifies either the scurfy scaly surface (as גֶּלֶד and הִגְלִיד in Talmudic of the scab of a healing wound, but also occurring e.g., of the bedaggled edge of clothes when it has become dry), or scornfully describes the skin as already almost dead; for the healthy skin is called עוֹר, גֶּלֶד, on the other hand, βύρσα (LXX), hide (esp. when removed from the body), Talm. e.g., sole-leather. We prefer the former interpretation (adopted by Raschi and others): The crust in which the terrible *lepra* has clothed his skin (vid., on Job 7:5, 30:18, 19, 30) is intended. עִלַּלְתִּי in v. 15*b* is referred by Rosenm., Hirz., Ges., and others (as indeed by Saad. and Gecat., who transl. "I digged into"), to עָלַל (Arab. *gll*), to enter, penetrate: "I stuck my horn in the dust;" but this signification of the Hebrew עָלַל is unknown, it signifies rather to inflict pain, or scorn (e.g., Lam. 3:51, mine eye causeth pain to my soul), generally with לְ, here with the accusative: I have misused, i.e., injured or defiled (as the Jewish expositors explain), my horn with dust. This is not equivalent to my head (as in the Syr. version), but he calls everything that was hitherto his power and pride קַרְנִי (LXX, Targ.); all this he has together at the same time injured, i.e., represented as come to destruction, by covering his head with dust and ashes.

Ver. 16*a.* The construction of the *Chethib* is like 1 Sam. 4:15, of the *Keri* on the other hand like Lam. 1:20, 2:11 (where the same is said of מֵעַי, *viscera mea*); חֲמַרְמַר is a passive intensive form (Ges. § 55, 3), not in the signification: they are completely kindled (LXX συγκέκαυται, Jer. *intumuit,* from the חָמַר, Arab. *chmr,* which signifies to ferment), but: they are red all over (from חָמַר, Arab. *ḥmr,* whence the Alhambra, as a red building, takes its name), reddened, i.e., from weeping; and this has so weakened them, that the shadow of death (vid., on Job 10:21f.) seems to rest upon his eyelids; they are therefore sad even to the deepest gloom. Thus exceedingly miserable is his state and appearance, although he is no disguised hypocrite, who might need to do penance in sackcloth and ashes, and shed tears of penitence without any solace. Hirz. explains עַל as a preposition: by the absence of evil in my hands; but v. 17*a* and 17*b* are substantival clauses, and על is therefore just, like Isa. 53:9, a conjunction (= על־אשׁר). His hands are clean from wrong-doing, free from violence and oppression; his prayer is pure, *pura;* as Merc. observes, *ex puritate cordis et fidei.* From the feeling of the strong contrast between his piety and his being stigmatized as an evil-doer by such terrible suffering,—from this extreme contrast which has risen now to its highest in his consciousness of patient endurance of suffering, the lofty thoughts of the next strophe take their rise.

18 *Oh earth, cover thou not my blood,*
And let my cry find no resting-place!!—

19 *Even now behold in heaven is my Witness,*
And One who acknowledgeth me is in the heights!
20 *Though the mockers of me are my friends—*
To Eloah mine eyes pour forth tears,
21 *That He may decide for man against Eloah,*
And for the son of man against his friend.
22 *For the years that may be numbered are coming on,*
And I shall go a way without return.

Job 16:18–22. Blood that is not covered up cries for vengeance, Ezek. 24:7f.; so also blood still unavenged is laid bare that it may find vengeance, Isa. 26:21. According to this idea, in the lofty consciousness of his innocence, Job calls upon the earth not to suck in his blood as of one innocently slain, but to let it lie bare, thereby showing that it must be first of all avenged ere the earth can take it up;[129] and for his cry, i.e., the cry (זַעֲקָתִי to be explained according to Gen. 4:10) proceeding from his blood as from his poured-out soul, he desires that it may urge its way unhindered and unstilled towards heaven without finding a place of rest (Symm. στάσις). Therefore, in the very God who appears to him to be a blood-thirsty enemy in pursuit of him, Job nevertheless hopes to find a witness of his innocence: He will acknowledge his blood, like that of Abel, to be the blood of an innocent man. It is an inward irresistible demand made by his faith which here brings together two opposite principles—principles which the understanding cannot unite—with bewildering boldness. Job believes that God will even finally avenge the blood which His wrath has shed, as blood that has been innocently shed. This faith, which sends forth beyond death itself the word of absolute command contained in v. 18, in v. 19 brightens and becomes a certain confidence, which draws from the future into the present that acknowledgment which God afterwards makes of him as innocent. The thought of what is unmerited in that decree of wrath which delivers him over to death, is here forced into the background, and in the front stands only the thought of the exaltation of the God in heaven above human short-sightedness, and the thought that no one else but He is the final refuge of the oppressed: even now (i.e., this side of death)[130] behold in heaven is my witness (הִנֵּה an expression of the *actus directus fidei*) and my confessor (שְׂהֵדִי a poetic Aramaism, similar in meaning to עֵד, LXX ὁ συνίστωρ μου) in the heights. To whom should he flee from the mockery of his friends, who consider his appeal to the testimony of his conscience as the stratagem of a hypocrite! מְלִיצַי from הֵלִיץ, Ps. 119:51, my mockers, i.e., those mocking me, *lascivientes in me* (vid., *Gesch. der jüd. Poesie,* S. 200. The short clause, v. 20*a,* is, logically at least, like a disjunctive clause with כי or גם־כי, Ewald, § 362, *b:* if his friends mock him-to Eloah, who is after all the best of friends, his eyes pour forth tears (דָּלְפָה, *stillat,* comp. דַּלּוּ of languishing, Isa. 38:14), that He may decide (וְיוֹכַח voluntative in a final signification, as Job 9:33) for man (לְ here, as Isa. 11:4, 2:4, of the client) against (עִם, as Ps. 55:19, 94:16, of an opponent) Eloah, and for the son of man (לְ to be supplied here in a similar sense to v. 21*a,* comp. Job 15:3) in relation to (לְ as it is used in בֵּין … לְ, e.g., Ezek. 34:22) his friend. Job longs and hopes for two things from God: (1) that He would finally decide in favour of גבר, i.e., just himself, the patient sufferer, in opposition to God, that therefore God would acknowledge that Job is not a criminal, nor his suffering a merited punishment; (2) that He would decide in favour of בן־אדם, i.e., himself, who is become an *Ecce homo,* in relation to his human opponent (רֵעֵהוּ, not collective, but individualizing or distributive instead of רֵעָיו), who regards him as a sinner undergoing punishment, and preaches to him the penitence that becomes one who has fallen. ויוכח is purposely only used once, and the expression v. 21*b* is contracted in comparison with 21*a:* the

one decision includes the other; for when God himself destroys the idea of his lot being merited punishment, He also at the same time delivers judgment against the friends who have zealously defended Him against Job as a just judge.

Olsh. approves Ewald's translation: "That He allows man to be in the right rather than God, and that He judges man against his friend:" but granted even that הוֹכִיחַ, like שָׂפַט followed by an acc., may be used in the signification: to grant any one to be in the right (although, with such a construction, it everywhere signifies ἐλέγχειν), this rendering would still not commend itself, on account of the specific gravity of the hope which is here struggling through the darkness of conflict. Job appeals from God to God; he hopes that truth and love will finally decide against wrath. The meaning of הוכיח has reference to the duty of an arbitrator, as in Job 9:33. Schlottm. aptly recalls the saying of the philosophers, which applies here in a different sense from that in which it is meant, *nemo contra Deum, nisi Deus ipse.* In v. 22 Job now establishes the fact that the heavenly witness will not allow him to die a death that he and others would regard as the death of a sinner, from the brevity of the term of life yet granted him, and the hopelessness of man when he is once dead. שְׁנוֹת מִסְפָּר are years of number = few years (LXX ἔτη ἀριθμητά); comp. the position of the words as they are to be differently understood, Job 15:20. On the inflexion *jeethâju,* vid., on Job 12:6. Jerome transl. *transeunt,* but אתה cannot signify this in any Semitic dialect. But even that Job (though certainly the course of elephantiasis can continue for years) is intended to refer to the prospect of some, although few, years of life (Hirz. and others: the few years which I can still look forward to, are drawing on), does not altogether suit the tragic picture. The approach of the years that can be numbered is rather thought of as the approach of their end; and the few years are not those which still remain, but in general the but short span of life allotted to him (Hahn). The arrangement of the words in v. 22*b* also agrees with this, as not having the form of a conclusion (then shall I go, etc.), but that of an independent co-ordinate clause: and a path, there (whence) I come not back (an attributive relative clause according to Ges. § 123, 3, *b*) I shall go (אֶהֱלֹךְ poetic, and in order to gain a rhythmical fall at the close, for אֵלֵךְ). Now follow, in the next strophe, short ejaculatory clauses: as Oetinger observes, Job chants his own requiem while living.

JOB 17

1 *My breath is corrupt,*
My days are extinct,
The graves are ready for me.
2 *Truly mockery surrounds me,*
And mine eye shall loiter over their disputings.

Job 17:1, 2. Hirz., Hlgst., and others, wrongly consider the division of the chapter here to be incorrect. The thought in Job 16:22 is really a concluding thought, like Job 10:20ff., 7:21. Then in Job 17:1 another strain is taken up; and as Job 16:22 is related, as a confirmation, to the request expressed in 16:19–21, so 17:1, 2 are related to that expressed in 17:3. The connection with the conclusion of Job 16 is none the less close: the thoughts move on somewhat crosswise (*chiastisch*). We do not translate with Ewald: "My spirit is destroyed," because חָבַל (here and Isa. 10:27) signifies not, to be destroyed, but, to be corrupted, disturbed, troubled; not the spirit (after Arab. *chbl,* usually of disturbance of spirit), but the breath is generally meant, which is become short (Job 7:15) and offensive (Job 19:17), announcing suffocation and decay as no longer far distant. In v. 1*b* the ἅπ. γεγρ. נִזְעָכוּ is equivalent to נדעכו, found elsewhere. In v. 1*c* קִבְרִים is used as if the dead were called, Arab. *ssâchib el-kubûr,* grave-companions. He is indeed one who is dying, from whom the grave is but a step distant, and still the friends promise him long life if he will only repent! This is the mockery which is with

him, i.e., surrounds him, as he affirms, v. 2*a.* A secondary verb, הָתַל, is formed from the *Hiph.* הֵתֵל (of which we had the non-syncopated form of the *fut.* in Job 13:9), the *Piel* of which occurs in 1 Kings 18:27 of Elijah's derision of the priests of Baal, and from this is formed the *pluralet.* הַתֻּלִים (or, according to another reading, הַתֻּלִּים, with the same doubling of the ל as in מֻהַתַּלּוֹת, deceitful things, Isa. 30:10; comp. the same thing in Job 33:7, אראלם, their lions of God = heroes), which has the meaning foolery,—a meaning questioned by Hirz. without right,—in which the idea of deceit and mockery are united. Gecatilia and Ralbag take it as a *part.:* mockers; Stick., Wolfson, Hahn: deluded; but the analogy of שׁעשׁעים, תעלולים, and the like, speaks in favour of taking it as a substantive. אִם־לֹא is affirmative (Ges. § 155, 2, *f*). Ewald renders it as expressive of desire: if only not (Hlgst.: *dummodo ne*); but this signification (Ew. § 329, *b*) cannot be supported. On the other hand, it might be intended interrogatively (as Job 30:25): *annon illusiones mecum* (Rosenm.); but this אם־לא, corresponding to the second member of a disjunctive question, has no right connection in the preceding. We therefore prefer the affirmative meaning, and explain it like Job 22:20, 31:36, comp. 2:5. Truly what he continually hears, i.e., from the side of the friends, is only false and delusive utterances, which consequently sound to him like jesting and mockery. The suff. in v. 2*b* refers to them. הַמְּרוֹת (with *Dag. dirimens,* which renders the sound of the word more pathetic, as Job 9:18, Joel 1:17, and in the *Hiph.* form כנלתך, Isa. 33:1), elsewhere generally (Josh. 1:18 only excepted) of rebellion against God, denotes here the contradictory, quarrelsome bearing of the friends, not the dispute in itself (comp. Arab. *mry,* III. to attack, VI. to contend with another), but coming forward controversially; only to this is תְּלַן עֵינִי suitable. הֵלִין must not be taken as = הִלִּין here; Ewald's translation, "only let not mine eye come against their irritation," forces upon this verb, which always signifies to murmur, γογγύζειν, a meaning foreign to it, and one that does not well suit it here. The voluntative form תְּלַן = תָּלֵן (here not the pausal form, as Judg. 19:20, comp. 2 Sam. 17:16) quite accords with the sense: mine eye shall linger on their janglings; it shall not look on anything that is cheering, but be held fast by this cheerless spectacle, which increases his bodily suffering and his inward pain. From these comforters, who are become his adversaries, Job turns in supplication to God.

3 *Lay down now, be bondsman for me with Thyself;*
Who else should furnish surety to me?!
4 *For Thou hast closed their heart from understanding,*
Therefore wilt Thou not give authority to them.
5 *He who giveth his friends for spoil,*
The eyes of his children shall languish.

Job 17:3–5. It is unnecessary, with Reiske and Olsh., to read עֵרְבֵנִי (*pone quaeso arrhabonem meum = pro me*) in order that שִׂימָה may not stand without an object; שׂימה has this meaning included in it, and the אָרְבֵּנִי which follows shows that neither לבך (Ralbag) nor ידך (Carey) is to be supplied; accordingly שׂים here, like Arab. *wḍ'* (*wâḍ'*), and in the classics both τιθέναι and *ponere,* signifies alone the laying down of a pledge. Treated by the friends as a criminal justly undergoing punishment, he seeks his refuge in God, who has set the mark of a horrible disease upon him contrary to his desert, as though he were guilty, and implores Him to confirm the reality of his innocence in some way or other by laying down a pledge for him (ὑποθήκη). The further prayer is עָרְבֵנִי, as word of entreaty which occurs also in Hezekiah's psalm, Isa. 38:14, and Ps. 119:122; עָרַב *seq. acc.* signifies, as noted on the latter passage, to furnish surety for any one, and gen.

to take the place of a mediator (comp. also on Heb. 7:22, where ἔγγυος is a synon. of μεσίτης). Here, however, the significant עִמָּךְ is added: furnish security for me with Thyself; elsewhere the form is עָרַב לְ, to furnish security for (Prov. 6:1), or לִפְנֵי before, any one, here with עִם of the person by whom the security is to be accepted. The thought already expressed in Job 16:21*a* receives a still stronger expression here: God is conceived of as two persons, on the one side as a judge who treats Job as one deserving of punishment, on the other side as a bondsman who pledges himself for the innocence of the sufferer before the judge, and stands as it were as surety against the future. In the question, v. 3*b,* the representation is again somewhat changed: Job appears here as the one to whom surety is given. נִתְקַע, described by expositors as reciprocal, is rather reflexive: to give one's hand (the only instance of the *med.* form of תָּקַע כַּף) = to give surety by striking hands, *dextera data sponsionem in se recipere* (Hlgst.). And לְיָדִי is not to be explained after the analogy of the passive, as the usual לְ of the agents: who would allow himself to be struck by my hand, i.e., who would accept the surety from me (Wolfson), which is unnatural both in representation and expression; but it is, according to Prov. 6:1 (vid., Bertheau), intended of the hand of him who receives the stroke of the hand of him who gives the pledge. This is therefore the meaning of the question: who else (מִי הוּא), if not God himself, should strike (his hand) to my hand, i.e., should furnish to me a pledge (viz., of my innocence) by joining hands? There is none but God alone who can intercede for him, as a guarantee of his innocence before himself and others. This negative answer: None but Thou alone, is established in v. 4. God has closed the heart of the friends against understanding, prop. concealed, i.e., He has fixed a curtain, a wall of partition, between their hearts and the right understanding of the matter; He has smitten them with blindness, therefore He will not (since they are suffering from a want of perception which He has ordained, and which is consequently known to Him) allow them to be exalted, i.e., to conquer and triumph. "The exaltation of the friends," observes Hirzel rightly, "would be, that God should openly justify their assertion of Job's guilt." Löwenthal translates: therefore art thou not honoured; but it is not pointed תֵּרֹמֵם = תִּתְרֹמֵם, but תְּרֹמֵם, whether it be that אֹתָם is to be supplied, or that it is equivalent to תְּרֹמְמֵם (Ew. § 62, *a,* who, however, prefers to take is as *n. Hithpa.* like תְּקֹמֵם in the unimproved signification: improvement, since he maintains this affords no right idea), according to the analogy of similar verb-forms (Job 31:15, Isa. 64:6), by a resolving of the two similar consonants which occur together.

The hope thus expressed Job establishes (v. 5) by a principle from general experience, that he who offers his friends as spoil for distribution will be punished most severely for the same upon his children: he shall not escape the divine retribution which visits him, upon his own children, for the wrong done to his friends. Almost all modern expositors are agreed in this rendering of לְחֵלֶק as regards v. 5*a;* but חלק must not be translated "lot" (Ewald), which it never means; it signifies a share of spoil, as e.g., Num. 31:36 (Jerome *praedam*), or even with a verbal force: plundering (from חָלַק, 2 Chron. 28:21), or even in antithesis to entering into bond for a friend with all that one possesses (Stick., Schlottm.), a dividing (of one's property) = distraining, as a result of the surrender to the creditor, to which the verb הִגִּיד is appropriate, which would then denote denouncing before a court of justice, as Jer. 20:10, not merely proclaiming openly, as Isa. 3:9. We have translated "spoil," which admits of all these modifications and excludes none; the general meaning is certainly: one deserts (instead of shielding as an intercessor) his friends and delivers them up; יַגִּיד with a general subj., as Job 4:2 (if any one attempts), 15:3, 27:23. With respect to the other half of the verse, 5*b,* the

optative rendering: may they languish (Vaih.), to the adoption of which the old expositors have been misled by parallels like Ps. 109:9f., is to be rejected; it is contrary to the character of Job (Job 31:30). We agree with Mercerus: *Nequaquam hoc per imprecationem, sed ut consequentis justissimae poenae denunciationem ab Iobo dictum putamus.* For v. 5*b* is also not to be taken as a circumstantial clause: even if the eyes of his children languish (Ew., Hlgst. Stick., Hahn, Schl.). It is not רֵעֵהוּ, but רֵעִים; and before supposing here a *Synallage num.* so liable to be misunderstood, one must try to get over the difficulty without it, which is here easy enough. Hence Job is made, in the intended application of the general principle, to allude to his own children, and Ewald really considers him the father of infant children, which, however, as may be seen from the prologue, is nothing but an invention unsupported by the history. Since it is בניו and not בניהם, we refer the suff. to the subj. of יגיד. The *Waw* of וְעֵינִי Mich. calls *Waw consecutivum;* it, however, rather combines things that are inseparable (certainly as cause and effect, sin and punishment). And it is יגיד, not הגיד, because the *perf.* would describe the fact as past, while the *fut.* places us in the midst of this faithless conduct. Job says God cannot possibly allow these, his three friends, the upper hand. One proclaims his friends as spoil (comp. Job 6:27), and the eyes of his children languish (comp. Job 11:20), i.e., he who so faithlessly disowns the claims of affection, is punished for it on that which he holds most dear. But this uncharitableness which he experiences is also a visitation of God. In the next strophe he refers all that he meets with from man to Him as the final cause, but not without a presage of the purpose for which it is designed.

6 *And He hath made me a proverb to the world,*

And I became as one in whose face they spit.

7 *Then mine eye became dim with grief,*

And all my members were like a shadow.

8 *The upright were astonished at it,*

And the innocent is stirred up over the godless;

9 *Nevertheless the righteous holdeth fast on his way,*

And he that hath clean hands waxeth stronger and stronger.

Job 17:6–9. Without a question, the subj. of v. 6*a* is God. It is the same thing whether מְשֹׁל is taken as *inf.* followed by the subject in the nominative (Ges. § 133, 2), or as a subst. (LXX θρύλλημα; Aq., Symm., Theod., παραβολήν), like שְׂחוֹק, Job 12:4, followed by the *gen. subjectivus.* מָשַׁל is the usual word for ridicule, expressed in parables of a satirical character, e.g., Joel 2:17 (according to which, if מְשֹׁל were intended as *inf.,* מְשֹׁל־בִּי עַמִּים might have been expected); עַמִּים signifies both nations and races, and tribes or people, i.e., members of this and that nation, or in gen. of mankind (Job 12:2). We have intentionally chosen an ambiguous expression in the translation, for what Job says can be meant of a wide range of people (comp. on Job 2:11 *ad fin.*), as well as of those in the immediate neighbourhood; the friends themselves represent different tribes; and a perishable gipsy-like troglodyte race, to whom Job is become a derision, is specially described further on (Job 24, 30).

Ver. 6*b.* By תֹּפֶת (translated by Jer. *exemplum,* and consequently mistaken for מופת) the older expositors are reminded of the name of the place where the sacrifices were offered to Moloch in the valley of the sons of Hinnom (whence גֵּיהִנֹּם, γέεννα, hell), since they explain it by "the fire of hell," but only from want of a right perception; the לְפָנִים standing with it, which nowhere signifies *palam,* and cannot here (where אהיה, although in the signification ἐγενόμην, follows) signify *a multo tempore,* shows that תפת here is to be derived from תוף, to spit out (as נֹפֶת, gum, from נוף). This verb

certainly cannot be supported in Hebr. and Aram. (since רקק is the commoner word), except two passages in the Talmud (*Nidda* 42*a,* comp. *Sabbath* 99*b,* and *Chethuboth* 61*b*); but it is confirmed by the Aethiopic and Coptic and an onomatopoetic origin, as the words πτύειν ψύειν, *spuere,* Germ. *speien,* etc., show.[131] Cognate is the Arabic *taffafa,* to treat with contempt, and the interjection *tuffan,* fie upon thee,[132] e.g., in the proverb (quoted by Umbreit): *'aini fihi watuffan 'aleihi,* my eye rests on it wishfully, and yet I feel disgust at it. Therefore לְפנים (spitting upon the face) is equivalent to בפנים, Num. 12:14, Deut. 25:9 (to spit in the face). In consequence of this deep debasement of the object of scorn and spitting, the brightness and vision of his eye (sense of sight) are become dim (comp. Ps. 6:8, 31:10) מִכַּעַשׂ (always written with שׂ, not ס, in the book of Job), from grief, and his frames, i.e., bodily frame = members (Jer. *membra,* Targ. incorrectly: features), are become like a shadow all of them, as fleshless and powerless as a shadow, which is only appearance without substance. His suffering, his miserable form (זֹאת), is of such a kind that the upright are astonished (שָׁמֵם, to become desolate, silent), and the guiltless (like himself and other innocent sufferers) become excited (here with vexation as in Ps. 37:1, as in Job 31:29 with joy) over the godless (who is none the less prosperous); but the righteous holds firm (without allowing himself to be disconcerted by this anomalous condition of things, though impenetrably mysterious) on his way (the way of good to which he has pledged himself), and the pure of hands (וּטְהָר־ as Prov. 22:11, according to another mode of writing וּטֶהָר־ with *Chateph-Kametz* under the ט and *Gaja* under the ו; comp. Isa. 54:9, where the form of writing וּמִגֶּעָר־ *umigg°or* is well authorized) increases (יוֹסִיף, of inward increase, as Eccles. 1:18) in strength (אֹמֶץ only here in the book of Job); i.e., far from allowing suffering to draw him from God to the side of the godless, he gathers strength thereby only still more perseveringly to pursue righteousness of life and purity of conduct, since suffering, especially in connection with such experiences as Job now has with the three friends, drives him to God and makes his communion with Him closer and firmer. These words of Job (if we may be allowed the figure) are like a rocket which shoots above the tragic darkness of the book, lighting it up suddenly, although only for a short time. The confession which breaks through in lyric form in Ps. 73 here finds expression of a more brief, sententious kind. The point of Eliphaz' reproach (Job 15:4), that Job makes void the fear of God, and depreciates communion with God, is destroyed by this confession, and the assurance of Satan (Job 2:5) is confronted by a fact of experience, which, if it should also become manifest in the case of Job, puts to shame and makes void the hope of the evil spirit.

10 *But only come again all of you!*
I shall not find a wise man among you.—
11 *My days are past,*
My purposes cut off,
The cherished thoughts of my heart,—
12 *Ye explain night as day,*
Light is near when darkness sets in.

Job 17:10–12. The truly righteous man, even if in the midst of his affliction he should see destruction before him, does not however forsake God. But (nevertheless) ye—he exclaims to the friends, who promise him a long and prosperous life if he will only humble himself as a sinner who is receiving punishment—repeat again and again your hortatory words on penitence! a wise man who might be able to see into my real condition, I shall not find among you. He means that they deceive themselves concerning the actual state of the case before them; for in reality he is meeting death without being deceived, or allowing himself to be deceived, about the matter. His appeal is similar to Job 6:29. Carey translates correctly: Attack me again with

another round of arguments, etc. Instead of וְאוּלָם, as it is written everywhere else (generally when the speech is drawing to a close), we find וְאֻלָּם (as the form of writing אֻלָּם, אֻלָּם occurs also in the subst. אוּלָם), perh. in order to harmonize with כֻּלָּם, which is here according to rule instead of כֻּלְּכֶם, which corresponds more to our form of a vocative clause, just as in 1 Kings 22:28, Mic. 1:2 (Ewald, § 327, *a*).[133] In תָּשׁוּבוּ וּבֹאוּ the jussive and imper. (for the *Chethib* יבאו, which occurs in some Codd. and editions, is meaningless) are united, the former being occasioned by the arrangement of the words, which is unfavourable to the imper. (comp. Ew. § 229); moreover, the first verb gives the adverbial notion *iterum, denuo* to the second, according to Ges. § 142, 3, *a.*

What follows, v. 11, is the confirmation of the fact that there is no wise man among them who might be able to give him efficient solace by a right estimate of the magnitude and undeservedness of his suffering. His life is indeed run out; and the most cherished plans and hopes which he had hedged in and fostered for the future in his heart, he has utterly and long since given up. The *plur.* (occurring only here) of זִמָּה, which occurs also *sensu malo,* signifies projects, as מזמות, Job 21:27, 42:2, from זמם, to tie; Aben-Ezra refers to the Arab. *zamâm* (a thread, band, esp. a rein). These plans which are now become useless, these cherished thoughts, he calls מוֹרָשֵׁי, *peculia* (from ירשׁ, to take possession of) of his heart. Thus, after Obad. v. 17, Gecatilia (in Aben-Ezra) also explains, while, according to Ewald, *Beiträge,* S. 98, he understands the heart-strings, i.e., the trunks of the arteries (for thus is Arab. *nî'ṭ* to be explained), and consequently, as Ewald himself, and even Farisol, most improbably combines מוֹרָשׁ with מוֹתַר (יֶתֶר). Similarly the LXX τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς καρδίας, as though the joints (instead of the valves) of the heart were intended; probably with Middeldorpf, after the Syriac Hexapla, ἄκρα is to be read instead of ἄρθρα; this, however, rests upon a mistaking of מורשׁי for ראשׁי. While he is now almost dead, and his life-plans of the future are torn away (נִתְּקוּ), the friends turn night into day (שׂים, as Isa. 5:20); light is (i.e., according to their opinion) nearer than the face of darkness, i.e., than the darkness which is in reality turned to him, and which is as though it stared at him from the immediate future. Thus Nolde explains it as comparative, but connecting v. 12*b* with ישׂימו, and considering פני (which is impossible by this compar. rendering) as meaningless: *lucem magis propinquam quam tenebras.* It is however possible that מפני is used the same as in Job 23:17: light is, as they think near before darkness, i.e., while darkness sets in (*ingruentibus tenebris*), according to which we have translated. If we understand v. 12*b* from Job's standpoint, and not from that of the friends, קרוב מן is to be explained according to the Arab. *qrîb mn, prope abest ab,* as the LXX even translates: φῶς ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου σκότους, which Olympiodorus interprets by οὐ μακρὰν σκότους. But by this rendering פני makes the expression, which really needs investigation, only still lamer. Renderings, however, like Renan's *Ah! votre lumière resemble aux tenèbres,* are removed from all criticism. The subjective rendering, by which v. 12*b* is under the government of ישׂימו, is after all the most natural. That he has darkness before him, while the friends present to him the approach of light on condition of penitence, is the thought that is developed in the next strophe.

13 *If I hope, it is for Sheôl as my house,*
In darkness I make my bed.
14 *I cry to corruption: Thou art my father!—*
To the worm: Thou art my mother and sister!
15 *Where now therefore is my hope?*
And my hope, who seeth it?
16 *To the bars of Sheôl it descends,*

When at the same time there is rest in the dust.

Job 17:13–16. All modern expositors transl.: If I hope (wait) for *Sheôl* as my house, etc., since they regard vv. 13f. as a hypothetical antecedent clause to v. 15, consisting of four members, where the conclusion should begin with וְאַיֵּה, and should be indicated by *Waw apodosis.* There is no objection to this explanation so far as the syntax is concerned, but there will then be weighty thoughts which are also expressed in the form of fresh thoughts, for which independent clauses seem more appropriate, under the government of אִם, as if they were presuppositions. The transition from the preceding strophe to this becomes also easier, if we take vv. 13f. as independent clauses from which, in v. 15, an inference is drawn, with *Waw* indicative of the train of thought (Ew. § 348). Accordingly, we regard אם־אקוה in v. 13 as antecedent (denoted by *Dechî,* i.e., *Tiphcha anterius,* just as Ps. 139:8*a*) and שׁאול ביתי as conclusion; the *Waw apod.* is wanting, as e.g., Job 9:27f., and the structure of the sentence is similar to Job 9:19. If I hope, says Job, "*Sheôl* is my house" = this is the substance of my hope, that *Sheôl* will be my house. In darkness he has (i.e., in his consciousness, which anticipates that which is before him as near and inevitable) fixed his resting-place (poet. *strata,* as Ps. 132:3). To corruption and the worm he already cries, father! and, mother! sister! It is, as it seems, that bold figure which is indicated in the Job-like Ps. 88:19 ("my acquaintances are the realms of darkness"), which is here (comp. Job 30:29) worked out; and, differently applied, perhaps Prov. 7:4 echoes it. Since the *fem.* רִמָּה is used as the object addressed by אמי and אחותי, which is besides, on account of its always collective meaning (in distinction from תולעת), well suited for this double apostrophe, we may assume that the poet will have used a *masc.* object for אבי; and there is really no reason against שַׁחַת here being, with Ramban, Rosenm., Schlottm., Böttcher (*de inferis,* § 179), derived not from שׁוּחַ (as נַחַת, v. 16*b,* from נוח), but from שָׁחַת (as נַחַת, Isa. 30:30, from נחת), especially since the old versions transl. שׁחת also elsewhere διαφθορά (*putredo*), and thereby prove that both derivations accord with the structure of the language. Now already conscious of his belonging to corruption and the worm as by the closest ties of relationship, he asks: *Itaque ubi tandem spes mea?*

The accentuation connects אֵפוֹ to the following word, instead of uniting it with אַיֵּה, just as in Isa. 19:12; Luzzatto (on Isa. 19:12) considers this as a mistake in the Codd., and certainly the accentuation Judg. 9:38 (איה *Kadma,* אפוא *Mercha*) is not according to our model, and even in this passage another arrangement of the accents is found, e.g., in the edition of Brescia.[134] No other hope, in Job's opinion, but speedy death is before him; no human eye is capable of seeing, i.e., of discovering (so e.g., Hahn), any other hope than just this. Somewhat differently Hirz. and others: and my hope, viz., of my recovery, who will it see in process of fulfilment? Certainly תקותי is in both instances equivalent to a hope which he dared to harbour; and the meaning is, that beside the one hope which he has, and which is a hope only *per antiphrasin,* there is no room for another hope; there is none such (v. 15*a*), and no one will attain a sight of such, be it visible in the distance or experienced as near at hand (v. 15*b*). The subj. of v. 16*a* is not the hope of recovery which the friends present to him (so e.g., Ew.), but his only real hope: this, avoiding human ken, descends to the lower world, for it is the hope of death, and consequently the death of hope. בַּדֵּי signifies bars, bolts, which Hahn denies, although he says himself that בדים signifies beams of wood among other things; "bolts" is not here intended to imply such as are now used in locks, but the cross bars and beams of wood of any size that serve as a fastening to a

door; *vectis* in exactly the same manner combines the meanings, a carrying-pole and a bar, in which signification בַּד is the synon. of בְּרִיחַ.[135] The meanings assigned to the word, wastes (Schnurrer and others), bounds (Hahn), clefts (Böttch.), and the like, are fanciful and superfluous. On תִּרְדְּנָה, instead of תֵּרֵד, vid., Caspari on Obad. v. 13, Ges. § 47, rem. 3. It is *sing.,* not *plur.* (Böttch.), for v. 15 does not speak of two hopes, not even if, as it seems according to the ancient versions, another word of cognate meaning had stood in the place of the second תקותי originally. His hope goes down to the regions of the dead, when altogether there is rest in the dust. This "together, יַחַד," Hahn explains: to me and it, to this hope; but that would be pursuing the figure to an inadmissible length, extending far beyond Job 20:11, and must then be expressed לָנוּ יַחַד. Others (e.g., Hirz., Ew.) explain: if at the same time, i.e., simultaneously with this descent of my hope, there is rest to me in the dust. Considering the use of יחד in itself, it might be explained: if altogether [entirely] there is rest in the dust; but this meaning *integer, totus quantus,* the word has elsewhere always in connection with a subj. or obj. to which it is referable, e.g., Job 10:8, Ps. 33:15; and, moreover, it may be rendered also in the like passages by "all together," as Job 3:18, 21:26, 40:13, instead of "altogether, entirely." Since, on the other hand, the signification "at the same time" can at least with probability be supported by Ps. 141:10, and since אם, which is certainly used temporally, brings contemporary things together, we prefer the translation: "when at the same time in the dust there is rest." The descent of his hope to the bars of Hades is at the same time his own, who hopes for nothing but this. When the death of his hope becomes a reality, then at the same time his turmoil of suffering will pass over to the rest of the grave.

As from the first speech of Eliphaz, so also from this first speech of Job, it may be seen that the controversy takes a fresh turn, which brings it nearer to the maturity of decision. From Eliphaz' speech Job has seen that no assertion of his innocence can avail to convince the friends, and that the more strongly he maintains his innocence, even before God, he only confirms them in the opinion that he is suffering the punishment of his godlessness, which now comes to light, like a wrong that has been hitherto concealed. Job thus perceives that he is incapable of convincing the friends; for whatever he may say only tends to confirm them in the false judgment, which they first of all inferred from their false premises, but now from his own words and conduct. He is accounted by them as one who is punished of God, whom they address as the preachers of repentance; now, however, they address him so that the chief point of their sermon is no longer bright promises descriptive of the glorious future of the penitent, but fearful descriptions of the desolating judgment which comes upon the impenitent sinner. This zealous solicitude for his welfare seems to be clever and to the point, according to their view; it is, however, only a vexatious method of treating their friend's case; it is only roughly and superficially moulded according to the order of redemption, but without an insight into the spiritual experience and condition of him with whom they have here to do. Their *prudentia pastoralis* is carnal and legal; they know nothing of a righteousness which avails before God, and nothing of a state of grace which frees from the divine vengeance; they know not how to deal with one who is passing through the fierce conflict of temptation, and understand not the mystery of the cross.

Can we wonder, then, that Job is compelled to regard their words as nothing more than דברי רוח, as they regarded his? In the words of Job they miss their certainly compact dogma, in which they believe they possess the philosopher's stone, by means of which all earthly suffering is to be changed into earthly prosperity. Job, however, can find nothing in their words that reminds him of anything he ought to know in his present position, or that

teaches him anything respecting it. He is compelled to regard them as מנחמי עמל, who make the burden of his suffering only more grievous, instead of lightening it for him. For their consolation rests upon an unjust judgment of himself, against which his moral consciousness rebels, and upon a one-sided notion of God, which is contradicted by his experience. Their speeches exhibit skill as to their form, but the sympathy of the heart is wanting. Instead of plunging with Job into the profound mystery of God's providence, which appoints such a hard lot for the righteous man to endure, they shake their heads, and think: What a great sinner Job must be, that God should visit him with so severe a punishment! It is the same shaking of the head of which David complains Ps. 22:8 and 109:25, and which the incomparably righteous One experienced from those who passed by His cross, Matt. 27:39, Mark 15:29. These comparisons give us the opportunity of noting the remarkable coincidence of these pictures of suffering, in outline and expression; the agreement of Job 16:8 with Ps. 109:24, comp. 109:23 with Job 17:7, puts it beyond a doubt, that there is a mutual relation between Job 16:4 and Ps. 109:25 which is not merely accidental.

By such unjust and uncharitable treatment from the friends, Job's sufferings stand forth before him in increased magnitude. He exceeds himself in the most terrible figures, in order to depict the sudden change which the divine dispensation of suffering has brought upon him. The figures are so terrible, for Job sees behind his sufferings a hostile hideous God as their author; they are the outburst of His anger, His quivering looks, His piercing darts, His shattering missiles. His sufferings are a witness *de facto* against him, the sufferer; but they are this not merely in themselves, but also in the eyes of the people around him. To the sufferings which he has directly to endure in body and soul there is added, as it were, as their other equally painful part, misconstruction and scorn, which he has to suffer from without. Not only does he experience the wrath of God contrary to the testimony to his righteousness which is consciousness gives him, but also the scoff of the ungodly, who now deridingly triumph over him. Therefore he clothes himself in mourning, and lies with his former majesty in the dust; his face is red with weeping, and his eyes are become almost blind, although there is no wrong in his hand, and his prayer is free from hypocrisy. Who does not here think of the servant of Jehovah, of whom Isaiah, Is. 53:9 (in similar words to those which Job uses of himself, Job 16:16), says, that he is buried among the godless על לא־חמס עשׂה ולא מרמה בפיו? All that Job says here of the scorn that he has to endure by being regarded as one who is punished of God and tormented, agrees exactly with the description of the sufferings of the servant of Jehovah in the Psalms and the second part of Isaiah. Job says: they gape at me with their mouth; and in Ps. 22:8 (comp. 35:21) it is: all they that see me laugh me to scorn, they open wide the lips, they shake the head. Job says: they smite my cheeks in contempt; and the servant of Jehovah, Isa. 50:6, is compelled to confess: I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that pluck off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting. Like Job, the servant of Jehovah in the Psalms and in Isaiah II. is delivered over into the hands of the unrighteous, and reckoned among evil-doers, although he is the servant of Jehovah, and knows himself to be Jehovah's servant. The same hope that he expresses in Isa. 50:8f. in the words: he is near who justifieth me, who will condemn me!—the same hope in Job breaks through the night of conflict, with which his direct and indirect suffering has surrounded him.

Just when Job becomes conscious of his doubled affliction in all its heaviness, when he feels himself equally rejected of men as of God, must this hope break forth. For there is only a twofold possibility for a man who thinks God has become his enemy, and that he has not a friend among men: either he sinks into the abyss of despair; or if faith still exists, he struggles upwards through his desertion by

God and man to the love that lies deep in the heart of God, which in spite of hostile manifestation cannot abandon the righteous. Whither shall Job turn when God seems to him as an enemy, and when he nevertheless will not renounce God? He can only turn from the hostile God to the God who is differently disposed towards him, and that is equivalent to saying from the imaginary to the real God, to whom faith clings throughout every outward manifestation of wrath and wrathful feeling.[136] Since both, however, is one God, who only seems to be other than He is, that bold grasp of faith is the exchange of the phantom-god of the conflict of temptation for the true God. Faith, which in its essence is a perception capable of taking root, seizes the real existence behind the appearance, the heart behind the countenance, that which remains the same behind the change, and defies a thousand contradictions with the saintly Nevertheless: God *nevertheless* does not belie himself.

Job challenges the earth not to hide his blood; unceasingly without restraint shall the cry of his blood rise up. What he says in Job 16:18 is to be taken not so much as the expression of a desire as of a demand, and better still as a command; for even in case he should succumb to his sufferings, and consequently in the eyes of men die the death of a sinner, his clear consciousness of innocence does not allow him to renounce his claim to a public declaration that he has died guiltless. But to whom shall the blood of the slain cry out? To whom else but God; and yet it is God who has slain him? We see distinctly here how Job's idea of God is lighted up by the prospect of a decisive trial of his cause. The God who abandons Job to death as guilty, and the God who cannot (and though it should be even after death) leave him unvindicated, come forth distinct and separate as darkness from light from the chaos of the conflict of temptation. Since, however, the thought of a vindication after death for Job, which knows only of a seeming life after death, according to the notion that rules him, and which is here not yet broken through, is only the extreme demanded by his moral consciousness, he is compelled to believe in a vindication in this world; and he expresses this faith (Job 16:19) in these words: "Even now, behold, my Witness is in heaven, and One who acknowledgeth me is in the heights." He pours forth tears to this God that He would decide between God and him, between his friends and him. He longs for this decision now, for he will now soon be gone beyond return. Thus Job becomes here the prophet of the issue of his own course of suffering; and over his relation to Eloah and to the friends, of whom the former abandons him to the sinner's death, and the latter declare him to be guilty, hovers the form of the God of the future, which now breaks through the darkness, from whom Job believingly awaits and implores what the God of the present withholds from him.[137]

What Job (Job 16:20f.), by reason of that confident "Behold, my Witness is in heaven," had expressed as the end of his longing,—that God would vindicate him both before Himself, and before the friends and the world,—urges him onward, when he reflects upon his twofold affliction, that he is sick unto death and one who is misjudged even to mockery, to the importunate request: Lay down now (a pledge), be surety for me with Thyself; for who else should strike his hand into mine, i.e., in order to become bondsman to me, that Thou dost not regard me as an unrighteous person? The friends are far from furnishing a guarantee of this; for they, on the contrary, are desirous of persuading him, that, if he would only let his conscience speak, he must regard himself as an unrighteous one, and that he is regarded as such by God. Therefore God cannot give them the victory; on the contrary, he who so uncompassionately abandons his friends, must on his own children experience similar suffering to that which he made heavier for his friend, instead of making it lighter to him. The three have no insight into the affliction of the righteous one; they dispose of him mercilessly, as of spoil or property that has fallen into the hands of the creditor; therefore he cannot hope to obtain justice unless God become surety for him with himself,—a thought so extraordinary

and bold, that one cannot wonder that the old expositors were misled by it: God was in Christ, and reconciled the world with Himself, 2 Cor. 5:19. The God of holy love has reconciled the world with himself, the God of righteous anger, as Job here prays that the God of truth may become surety for him with the God of absolute sovereignty.

When Job then complains of the misconstruction of his character, and tracing it to God, says: He hath made me לְמָשָׁל עמים, one is reminded, in connection with this extravagant expression, of complaints of a like tone in the mouth of the true people of Israel, Ps. 44:15, and of the great sufferer, Ps. 69:12. When we further read, that, according to Job's affirmation, the godly are scared at his affliction, the parallel Isa. 52:14 forces itself upon us, where it is said of the servant of Jehovah, "How were many astonied at thee." And when, with reference to himself, Job says that the suffering of the righteous must at length prove a gain to him that hath clean hands, who does not call to mind the fact that the glorious issue of the suffering of the servant of Jehovah which the Old Testament evangelist sets before us,—that servant of Jehovah who, once himself a prey to oppression and mocking, now divides the spoil among the mighty,—tends to the reviving, strengthening, and exaltation of Israel? All these parallels cannot and are not intended to prove that the book of Job is an allegorical poem; but they prove that the book of Job stands in the closest connection, both retrospective and prospective, with the literature of Israel; that the poet, by the relation to the passion-psalms stamped on the picture of the affliction of Job, has marked Job, whether consciously or unconsciously, as a typical person; that, by taking up, probably not unintentionally, many national traits, he has made it natural to interpret Job as a *Mashal* of Israel; and that Isaiah himself confirms this typical relation, by borrowing some Job-like expressions in the figure of the עבד יהוה, who is a personification of the true Israel. The book of Job has proved itself a mirror of consolation for the people, faithful to God, who had cause to complain, as in Ps. 44, and a mirror of warning to their scoffers and persecutors, who had neither true sympathy with the miserable state of God's people, nor a true perception of God's dealings. At the same time, however, Job appears in the light which the New Testament history, by the fulfilment of the prophecies of suffering in the Psalms, Isaiah, and also Zechariah, throws upon him, as a type of Him who suffers in like manner, in order that Satan may have his deserts, and thereby by confounded; who also has an affliction to bear which in itself has the nature and form of wrath, but has its motive and end in the love of God; who is just so misjudged and scorned of men, in order at length to be exalted, and to enter in as intercessor for those who despised and rejected Him. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that there remains an infinite distance between the type and antitype, which, however, must be in the very nature of a type, and does not annul the typical relation, which exists only *exceptis excipiendis.* Who could fail to recognise the involuntary picture of the three friends in the penitent ones of Isa. 53, who esteemed the servant of Jehovah as one smitten of God, for whom, however, at last His sacrifice and intercession avail?

Job at last considers his friends as devoid of wisdom, because they try to comfort him with the nearness of light, while darkness is before him; because they give him the hope of a bodily restoration, while he has nothing to expect but death, and earnestly longs for the rest of death. It is surprising that the speech of Job plunges again into complete hopelessness, after he has risen to the prospect of being vindicated in this life. He certainly does not again put forth that prospect, but he does not even venture to hope that it can be realized by a blessing in this life after a seeming curse. It is in this hopelessness that the true greatness of Job's faith becomes manifest. He meets death, and to every appearance so overwhelmed by death, as a sinner, while he is still conscious that he is righteous. Is it not faith in and fidelity to God, then, that, without praying for recovery, he is

satisfied with this one thing, that God acknowledges him? The promises of the friends ought to have rested on a different foundation, if he was to have the joy of appropriating them to himself. He feels himself to be inevitably given up as a prey to death, and as from the depth of Hades, into which he is sinking, he stretches out his hands to God, not that He would sustain him in life, but that He would acknowledge him before the world as His. If he is to die even, he desires only that he may not die the death of a criminal. And is this intended at the same time for the rescue of his honour? No, after all, for the honour of God, who cannot possibly destroy as an evil-doer one who is in everything faithful to Him. When, then, the issue of the history is that God acknowledges Job as His servant, and after he is proved and refined by the temptation, preserves to him a doubly rich and prosperous life, Job receives beyond his prayer and comprehension; and after he has learned from his own experience that God brings to Hades and out again, he has for ever conquered all fear of death, and the germs of a hope of a future life, which in the midst of his affliction have broken through his consciousness, can joyously expand. For Job appears to himself as one who is risen from the dead, and is a pledge to himself of the resurrection from the dead.

JOB 18

Bildad's Second Speech.—Ch. 18.

Schema: 4. 9. 8. 8. 8. 4.

[Then began Bildad the Shuhite, and said:]

2 How long will ye hunt for words?!
Attend, and afterwards we will speak.
3 Wherefore are we accounted as beasts,
And narrow-minded in your eyes?

Job 18:2, 3. Job's speeches are long, and certainly are a trial of patience to the three, and the heaviest trial to Bildad, whose turn now comes on, because he is at pains throughout to be brief. Hence the reproach of endless babbling with which he begins here, as at Job 8:2, when he at last has an opportunity of speaking; in connection with which it must, however, not be forgotten that Job also, Job 16:3, satirically calls upon them to cease. He is indeed more entitled than his opponents to the entreaty not to weary him with long speeches. The question, v. 2a, if קִנְצֵי six derived from קֵץ, furnishes no sense, unless perhaps it is, with Ralbag, explained: how long do you make close upon close in order, when you seem to have come to an end, to begin continually anew? For to give the thought: how long do you make no end of speaking, it must have been לֹא אָנָהעַד־, as the LXX (μέχρι τίνος ου᾽ παύσῃ:) involuntarily inserts the negative. And what should the plur. mean by this rendering? The form קִנְצֵי = קִצֵּי would not cause doubt; for though קִצִּים does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, it is nevertheless sufficient that it is good Aramaic (קִצִּין), and that another Hebr. plural, as קִצֵי, קִצָוֵי, קִצָוֹות, would have been hardly in accordance with the usage of the language. But the plural would not be suitable here generally, the over-delicate explanation of Ralbag perhaps excepted. Since the book of Job abounds in Arabisms, and in Arabic qanaṣa (as synon. of ṣâd) signifies venari, venando capere, and qanṣun (maqnaṣun) cassis, rete venatorium; since, further, קִנְצִים שִׂים (comp. אֹרֵב שִׂים, Jer. 9:7) is an incontrovertible reading, and all the difficulties in connection with the reference to קֵץ lying in the עד־אנה for לא עד־אנה and in the plur. vanish, we translate with Castell., Schultens, J. D. Mich., and most modern expositors: how long (here not different from Job 8:2, 19:2) will ye lay snares (construction, as also by the other rendering, like Job 24:5, 36:16, according to Ges. § 116, 1) for words; which, however, is not equivalent to hunt for words in order to contradict, but in order to talk on continually.138 Job is the person addressed, for Bildad agrees with the two others. It is remarkable, however, that he addresses Job with "you." Some say that he thinks of Job as one of a number; Ewald observes that the controversy becomes more wide and general; and Schlottm. conjectures that Bildad fixes his eye on individuals of his hearers, on whose countenances he believed he

saw a certain inclination to side with Job. This conjecture we will leave to itself; but the remark which Schlottm. also makes, that Bildad regards Job as a type of a whole class, is correct, only one must also add, this address in the plur. is a reply to Job's sarcasm by a similar one. As Job has told the friends that they act as if they were mankind in general, and all wisdom were concentrated in them, so Bildad has taken it amiss that Job connects himself with the whole of the truly upright, righteous, and pure; and he addresses him in the plural, because he, the unit, has puffed himself up as such a collective whole. This wrangler—he means—with such a train behind him, cannot accomplish anything: Oh that you would understand (הֵבִין, as e.g., Job 42:3, not causative, as 6:24), i.e., come to your senses, and afterward we will speak, i.e., it is only then possible to walk in the way of understanding. That is not now possible, when he, as one who plays the part of their many, treats them, the three who are agreed in opposition to him, as totally void of understanding, and each one of them unwise, in expressions like Job 17:4, 10. Looking to Ps. 49:13, 21, one might be tempted to regard נִטְמִינוּ (on the vowel î instead of ê, vid., Ges. § 75, rem. 7) as an interchange of consonants from נדמינו: be silent, make an end, ye profligati; but the supposition of this interchange of consonants would be arbitrary. On the other hand, there is no suitable thought in "why are we accounted unclean?" (Vulg. sorduimus), from טָמָה = טָמֵא, Lev. 11:43 (Ges. § 75, vi.); the complaint would have no right connection, except it were a very slight one, with Job 17:9. On the contrary, if we suppose a verb טָמָה in the signification opplere, obturare, which is peculiar to this consonant-combination in the whole range of the Semitic languages (comp. אָ־טַם, Arab. 'ṭm, obstruere, Aram. טַמָּם, טַמְטֵם, Arab. ṭmm, e.g., Talm.: transgression stoppeth up, מטמטמת, man's heart), and after which this טמה has been explained by the Jewish expositors (Raschi: טמומים נחשבנו), and is interpreted by סתם (Parchon: דעתנו נסתמה), we gain a sense which corresponds both with previous reproaches of Job and the parallelism, and we decide in its favour with the majority of modern expositors. With the interrogative Wherefore, Bildad appeals to Job's conscience. These invectives proceed from an impassioned self-delusion towards the truth, which he wards off from himself, but cannot however alter.

4 Thou art he who teareth himself in his anger:
Shall the earth become desolate for thy sake,
And a rock remove from its place?
5 Notwithstanding, the light of the wicked shall be put out,
And the glow of his fire shineth not;
6 The light becometh dark in his tent,
And his lamp above him is extinguished;
7 His vigorous steps are straitened,
And his own counsel casteth him down.

Job 18:4–7. The meaning of the strophe is this: Dost thou imagine that, by thy vehement conduct, by which thou art become enraged against thyself, thou canst effect any change in the established divine order of the world? It is a divine law, that sufferings are the punishment of sin; thou canst no more alter this, than that at thy command, or for thy sake, the earth, which is appointed to be the habitation of man (Isa. 45:18), will become desolate (tê'âzab with the tone drawn back, according to Ges. § 29, 3, b, Arab. with similar signification in intrans. Kal t'azibu), or a rock remove from its place (on יֵעָתֵק, vid., Job 14:18). Bildad here lays to Job's charge what Job, in Job 16:9, has said of God's anger, that it tears him: he himself tears himself in his rage at the inevitable lot under which he ought penitently to bow. The address, v. 4a, as apud Arabes ubique fere (Schult.), is put objectively (not: Oh thou, who); comp. what is said on כֻּלָּם, Job 17:10, which is influenced by the same syntactic custom. The LXX transl. v. 4b: Why! will Hades be tenantless if thou diest (ἐὰν σὺ ἀποθάνῃς)? after which Rosenm. explains: tuâ causâ h. e. te cadente. But that ought to be הַבְמוֹתְךָ. The peopling of the earth is only an example of the arrangements of divine omnipotence and wisdom, the continuance of

which is exalted over the human power of volition, and does not in the least yield to human self-will, as (v. 4c) the rock is an example, and at the same time an emblem, of what God has fixed and rendered immoveable. That of which he here treats as fixed by God is the law of retribution. However much Job may rage, this law is and remains the unavoidable power that rules over the evil-doer.

Ver. 5. גַּם is here equivalent to nevertheless, or prop. even, ὅμως, as e.g., Ps. 129:2 (Ew. § 354, a). The light of the evil-doer goes out, and the comfortable brightness and warmth which the blaze (שְׁבִיב, only here as a Hebr. word; according to Raschi and others, étincelle, a spark; but according to LXX, Theod., Syr., Jer., a flame; Targ. the brightness of light) of his fire in his dwelling throws out, comes to an end. In one word, as the praet. חָשַׁךְ implies, the light in his tent is changed into darkness; and his lamp above him, i.e., the lamp hanging from the covering of his tent (Job 29:3, comp. 21:17), goes out. When misfortune breaks in upon him, the Arab says: ed-dahru attfaa es-sirâgi, fate has put out my lamp; this figure of the decline of prosperity receives here a fourfold application. The figure of straitening one's steps is just as Arabic as it is biblical; אוֹנוֹ צַעֲדֵי, the steps of his strength (אוֹן synon. of כֹּחַ, Job 40:16) become narrow (comp. Prov. 4:12, Arab. takâssarat), by the wide space which he could pass over with a self-confident feeling of power becoming more and more contracted; and the purpose formed selfishly and without any recognition of God, the success of which he considered infallible, becomes his overthrow.

8 For he is driven into the net by his own feet,
And he walketh over a snare.
9 The trap holdeth his heel fast,
The noose bindeth him.
10 His snare lieth hidden in the earth,
His nets upon the path;
11 Terrors affright him on every side,
And scare him at every step.

Job 18:8–11. The Pual שֻׁלַּח signifies not merely to be betrayed into, but driven into, like the Piel, Job 30:12, to drive away, and as it is to be translated in the similar passage in the song of Deborah, Judg. 5:15: "And as Issachar, Barak was driven (i.e., with desire for fighting) behind him down into the valley (the place of meeting under Mount Tabor);" בְּרַגְלָיו, which there signifies, according to Judg. 4:10, 8:5, "upon his feet = close behind him," is here intended of the intermediate cause: by his own feet he is hurried into the net, i.e., against his will, and yet with his own feet he runs into destruction. The same thing is said in v. 8b; the way on which he complacently wanders up and down (which the Hithp. signifies here) is שְׂבָכָה, lattice-work, here a snare (Arab. schabacah, a net, from שָׂבַךְ, schabaca, to intertwine, weave), and consequently will suddenly break in and bring him to ruin. This fact of delivering himself over to destruction is established in apocopated futt. (v. 9) used as praes., and without the voluntative signification in accordance with the poetic licence: a trap catches a heel (poetic brevity for: the trap catches his heel), a noose seizes upon him, עָלָיו (but with the accompanying notion of overpowering him, which the translation "bind" is intended to express). Such is the meaning of צַמִּים here, which is not plur., but sing., from צָמַם (Arab. ḍmm), to tie, and it unites in itself the meanings of snare-layer (Job 5:5) and of snare; the form (as אַבִּיר, אַדִּיר) corresponds more to the former, but does not, however, exclude the latter, as תַּנִּין and לַפִּיד (λαμπάς) show.

The continuation in v. 10 of the figure of the fowler affirms that that issue of his life (v. 9) has been preparing long beforehand; the prosperity of the evil-doer from the beginning tends towards ruin. Instead of חֶבְלוֹ we have the pointing חַבְלוֹ, as it would be in Arab. in a similar sense hhabluhu (from hhabl, a cord, a net). The nearer destruction is now to him, the stronger is the hold which his foreboding has over him, since, as v. 11 adds, terrible thoughts (בַּלָּהוֹת) and terrible apparitions fill him with dismay, and haunt him, following upon his feet. לְרַגְלָיו, close behind him, as Gen. 30:30, 1 Sam. 25:42, Isa. 41:2, Hab. 3:5. The best authorized pointing of the verb is וֶהֱפִיצֻהוּ, with Segol (Ges. § 104, 2,

c), Chateph-Segol, and Kibbutz. Except in Hab. 3:14, where the prophet includes himself with his people, הֻפִּיץ, diffundere, dissipare (vid., Job 37:11, 40:11), never has a person as its obj. elsewhere. It would also probably not be used, but for the idea that the spectres of terror pursue him at every step, and are now here, now there, and his person is as it were multiplied.

12 His calamity looketh hunger-bitten,
And misfortune is ready for his fall.
13 It devoureth the members of his skin;
The first-born of death devoureth his members.
14 That in which he trusted is torn away out of his tent,
And he must march on to the king of terrors.
15 Beings strange to him dwell in his tent;
Brimstone is strewn over his habitation.

Job 18:12–15. The description of the actual and total destruction of the evil-doer now begins with יְהִי (as Job 24:14, after the manner of the voluntative forms already used in v. 9). Step by step it traces his course to the total destruction, which leaves no trace of him, but still bears evident marks of being the fulfilment of the curse pronounced upon him. In opposition to this explanation, Targ., Raschi, and others, explain אֹנוֹ according to Gen. 49:3: the son of his manhood's strength becomes hungry, which sounds comical rather than tragic; another Targ. transl.: he becomes hungry in his mourning, which is indeed inadmissible, because the signif. planctus, luctus, belongs to the derivatives of אנה, אנן, but not to און. But even the translation recently adopted by Ew., Stick., and Schlottm., "his strength becomes hungry," is unsatisfactory; for it is in itself no misfortune to be hungry, and רָעֵב does not in itself signify "exhausted with hunger." It is also an odd metaphor, that strength becomes hungry; we would then rather read with Reiske, באנו רעב, famelicus in media potentia sua. But as אוֹן signifies strength (Job 18:7), so אָוֶן (root אן, to breathe and pant) signifies both wickedness and evil (the latter either as evil = calamity, or as anhelitus, sorrow, Arab. ain); and the thought that his (i.e., appointed to the evil-doer) calamity is hungry to swallow him up (Syr., Hirz., Hahn, and others), suits the parallelism perfectly: "and misfortune stands ready for his fall."[139] אֵיד signifies prop. a weight, burden, then a load of suffering, and gen. calamity (root אד, Arab. âda, e.g., Sur. 2, 256, la jaûduhu, it is not difficult for him, and adda, comp. on Ps. 31:12); and לְצַלְעוֹ not: at his side (Ges., Ew., Schlottm., Hahn), but, according to Ps. 35:15, 38:18: for his fall (LXX freely, but correctly: ἐξαίσιον); for instead of "at the side" (Arab. ila ganbi), they no more say in Hebrew than in Germ. "at the ribs."

Ver. 13 figuratively describes how calamity takes possession of him. The members, which are called יְצֻרִים in Job 17:7, as parts of the form of the body, are here called בַּדִּים, as the parts into which the body branches out, or rather, since the word originally signifies a part, as that which is actually split off (vid., on Job 17:16, where it denotes "cross-bars"), or according to appearance that which rises up, and from this primary signification applied to the body and plants, the members (not merely as Farisol interprets: the veins) of which the body consists and into which it is distributed. עוֹר (distinct from גֶּלֶד, Job 16:15, similar in meaning to Arab. baschar, but also to the Arab. gild, of which the former signifies rather the epidermis, the latter the skin in the widest sense) is the soluble surface of the naked animal body. בְּכוֹר מָוֶת devours this, and indeed, as the repetition implies, gradually, but surely and entirely. "The first-born of the poor," Isa. 14:30, are those not merely who belong (בְּנֵי) to the race of the poor, but the poor in the highest sense and first rank. So here diseases are conceived of as children of death, as in the Arabic malignant fevers are called benât el-menîjeh, daughters of fate or death; that disease which Bildad has in his mind, as the one more terrible and dangerous than all others, he calls the "first-born of death," as that in which the whole destroying power of death is contained, as in the first-born the whole strength of his parent.[140] The Targ.

understands the figure similarly, since it transl. מַלְאַךְ מוֹתָא (angel of death); another Targ. has instead מוֹתָא שֵׁרוּי, the firstling of death, which is intended in the sense of the primogenita (= praematura) mors of Jerome. Least of all is it to be understood with Ewald as an intensive expression for בן־מות, 1 Sam. 20:31, of the evil-doer as liable to death. While now disease in the most fearful form consumes the body of the evil-doer, מִבְטַחוֹ (with Dag.f. impl., as Job 8:14, 31:24, Olsh. § 198, b) (a collective word, which signifies everything in which he trusted) is torn away out of his tent; thus also Rosenm., Ew., and Umbr. explain, while Hirz., Hlgst., Schlottm., and Hahn regard מבטחו as in apposition to אהלו, in favour of which Job 8:14 is only a seemingly suitable parallel. It means everything that made the ungodly man happy as head of a household, and gave him the brightest hopes of the future. This is torn away (evellitur) from his household, so that he, who is dying off, alone survives. Thus, therefore, v. 14b describes how he also himself dies at last. Several modern expositors, especially Stickel, after the example of Jerome (et calcet super eum quasi rex interitus), and of the Syr. (praecipitem eum reddent terrores regis), take בַּלָּהוֹת as subj., which is syntactically possible (vid., Job 27:20, 30:15): and destruction causes him to march towards itself (Ges.: fugant eum) like a military leader; but since הִצְעִיד signifies to cause to approach, and since no אֵלָיו (to itself) stands with it, לְמֶלֶךְ is to be considered as denoting the goal, especially as לְ never directly signifies instar. In the passage advanced in its favour it denotes that which anything becomes, that which one makes a thing by the mode of treatment (Job 39:16), or whither anything extends (e.g., in Schultens on Job 13:12: they had claws li-machâlîbi, i.e., “approaching to the claws” of wild beasts).141 One falls into these strange interpretations when one departs from the accentuation, which unites בלהות מלך quite correctly by Munach.

Death itself is called “the king of terrors,” in distinction from the terrible disease which is called its first-born. Death is also personified elsewhere, as Isa. 28:15, and esp. Ps. 49:15, where it appears as a רֹעֶה, ruler in Hades, as in the Indian mythology the name of the infernal king Jamas signifies the tyrant or the tamer. The biblical representation does not recognise a king of Hades, as Jamas and Pluto: the judicial power of death is allotted to angels, of whom one, the angel of the abyss, is called Abaddon (אבדון), Apoc. 9:11; and the chief possessor of this judicial power, ὁ τὸ κράτος ἔχων τοῦ θανάτου, is, according to Heb. 2:14, the angel-prince, who, according to the prologue of our book, has also brought a fatal disease upon Job, without, however, in this instance being able to go further than to bring him to the brink of the abyss. It would therefore not be contrary to the spirit of the book if we were to understand Satan by the king of terrors, who, among other appellations in Jewish theology, is called שַׂר על־התהו, because he has his existence in the Thohu, and seeks to hurl back every living being into the Thohu. But since the prologue casts a veil over that which remains unknown in this world in the midst of tragic woes, and since a reference to Satan is found nowhere else in the book—on the contrary, Job himself and the friends trace back directly to God that mysterious affliction which forms the dramatic knot—we understand (which is perfectly sufficient) by the king of terrors death itself, and with Hirz., Ew., and most expositors, transl.: “and it causes him to march onward to the king of terrors.” The “it” is a secret power, as also elsewhere the fem. is used as neut. to denote the “dark power” (Ewald, § 294, b) of natural and supernatural events, although sometimes, e.g., Job 4:16, Isa. 14:9, the masc. is also so applied. After the evil-doer is tormented for a while with temporary בלהות, and made tender, and reduced to ripeness for death by the first-born of death, he falls into the possession of the king of בלהות himself; slowly and solemnly, but surely and inevitably (as תצעיד implies, with which is combined the idea of the march of a criminal to the place of execution), he is led to this king by an unseen arm.

In v. 15 the description advances another step deeper into the calamity of the evil-doer’s

habitation, which is now become completely desolate. Since v. 15b says that brimstone (from heaven, Gen. 19:24, Ps. 11:6) is strewn over the evil-doer's habitation, i.e., in order to mark it as a place that, having been visited with the fulfilment of the curse, shall not henceforth be rebuilt and inhabited (vid., Deut. 29:22f., and supra, on Job 15:28), v. 15a cannot be intended to affirm that a company of men strange to him take up their abode in his tent. But we shall not, however, on that account take בלהות as the subj. of תִּשְׁכֹּון. The only natural translation is: what does not belong to him dwells in his tent (Ew. § 294, b); מִבְּלִי, elsewhere praepos. (Job 4:11, 20, 24:7f.), is here an adverb of negation, as which it is often used as an intensive of אֵין, e.g., Ex. 14:11. It is unnecessary to take the מ as partitive (Hirz.), although it can have a special signification, as Deut. 28:55 (because not), by being separated from בלי. The neutral fem. תשכון refers to such inhabitants as are described in Isa. 13:20ff., 27:10f., 34:11ff., Zeph. 2:9, and in other descriptions of desolation. Creatures and things which are strange to the deceased rich man, as jackals and nettles, inhabit his domain, which is appointed to eternal unfruitfulness; neither children nor possessions survive him to keep up his name. What does dwell in his tent serves only to keep up the recollection of the curse which has overtaken him.142

16 His roots wither beneath,

And above his branch is lopped off.

17 His remembrance is vanished from the land,

And he hath no name far and wide on the plain;

18 They drive him from light into darkness,

And chase him out of the world.

19 He hath neither offspring nor descendant among his people,

Nor is there an escaped one in his dwellings.

Job 18:16–19. The evil-doer is represented under the figure of a plant, v. 16, as we have had similar figures already, Job 8:16f., 15:30, 32f.;143 his complete extirpation is like the dying off of the root and of the branch, as Amos 2:9, Isa. 5:24, and "let him not have a root below and a branch above" in the inscription on the sarcophagus of Eschmunazar. Here we again meet with יִמַּל, the proper meaning of which is so disputed; it is translated by the Targ. (as by us) as Niph. יִתְמוֹלֵל, but the meaning "to wither" is near at hand, which, as we said on Job 14:2, may be gained as well from the primary notion "to fall to pieces" (whence LXX ἐπιπεσεῖται), as from the primary notion "to parch, dry." אָמַל (whence אֲמֻלַּל, formed after the manner of the Arabic IX. form, usually of failing; vid., Caspari, § 59) offers a third possible explanation; it signifies originally to be long and lax, to let anything hang down, and thence in Arab. (amala) to hope, i.e., to look out into the distance. Not the evil-doer's family alone is rooted out, but also his memory. With חוּץ, a very relative notion, both the street outside in front of the house (Job 31:32), and the pasture beyond the dwelling (Job 5:10), are described; here it is to be explained according to Prov. 8:26 (וחוצות ארץ), where Hitz. remarks: "The LXX translates correctly ἀοικήτους. The districts beyond each persons' land, which also belong to no one else, the desert, whither one goes forth, is meant." So ארץ seems also here (comp. Job 30:8) to denote the land that is regularly inhabited—Job himself is a large proprietor within the range of a city (Job 29:7)—and חוץ the steppe traversed by the wandering tribes which lies out beyond. Thus also the Syr. version transl. 'al apai barito, over the plain of the desert, after which the Arabic version is el-barrîje (the synon. of bedw, bâdije, whence the name of the Beduin144). What is directly said in v. 17 is repeated figuratively in v. 18; as also what has been figuratively expressed in v. 16 is repeated in v. 19 without figure. The subj. of the verbs in v. 18 remains in the background, as Job 4:19, Ps. 63:11, Luke 12:20: they thrust him out of the light (of life, prosperity, and fame) into the darkness (of misfortune, death, and oblivion); so that the illustris becomes not merely ignobilis, but totally ignotus, and they hunt him forth (יְנַדֶּהוּ from the Hiph. הֵנֵד of the verb נדד, instead of which it might also be ינדהו from נָדָה, they banish him) out of the habitable

world (for this is the signification of תֵּבֵל, the earth as built upon and inhabited). There remains to him in his race neither sprout nor shoot; thus the rhyming alliteration נִין and נֶכֶד (according to Luzzatto on Isa. 14:22, used only of the descendants of persons in high rank, and certainly a nobler expression than our rhyming pairs: Germ. Stumpf und Stiel, Mann und Maus, Kind und Kegel). And there is no escaped one (as Deut. 2:34 and freq., Arab. shârid, one fleeing; sharûd, a fugitive) in his abodes (מָגוּר, as only besides Ps. 55:16). Thus to die away without descendant and remembrance is still at the present day among the Arab races that profess Dîn Ibrâhîm (the religion of Abraham) the most unhappy thought, for the point of gravitation of continuance beyond the grave is transferred by them to the immortality of the righteous in the continuance of his posterity and works in this world (vid., supra, p. 386); and where else should it be at the time of Job, since no revelation had as yet drawn the curtain aside from the future world? Now follows the declamatory conclusion of the speech.

20 Those who dwell in the west are astonished at his day,

And trembling seizeth those who dwell in the east;

21 Surely thus it befalleth the dwellings of the unrighteous,

And thus the place of him that knew not God.

Job 18:20, 21. It is as much in accordance with the usage of Arabic as it is biblical, to call the day of a man's doom "his day," the day of a battle at a place "the day of that place." Who are the אַחֲרֹנִים who are astonished at it, and the קַדְמֹנִים whom terror (עָרַשׂ as twice besides in this sense in Ezek.) seizes, or as it is properly, who seize terror, i.e., of themselves, without being able to do otherwise than yield to the emotion (as Job 21:6, Isa. 13:8; comp. on the contrary Ex. 15:14f.)? Hirz., Schlottm., Hahn, and others, understand posterity by אחרנים, and by קדמנים their ancestors, therefore Job's contemporaries. But the return from the posterity to those then living is strange, and the usage of the language is opposed to it; for קדמנים is elsewhere always what belongs to the previous age in relation to the speaker (e.g., 1 Sam. 24:14, comp. Eccles. 4:16). Since, then, קדמני is used in the signification eastern (e.g., הקדמוני הים, the eastern sea = the Dead Sea), and אחרון in the signification western (e.g., האחרון הים, the western sea = the Mediterranean), it is much more suited both to the order of the words and the usage of the language to understand, with Schult., Oetinger, Umbr., and Ew., the former of those dwelling in the west, and the latter of those dwelling in the east. In the summarizing v. 21, the retrospective pronouns are also praegn., like Job 8:19, 20:29, comp. 26:14: Thus is it, viz., according to their fate, i.e., thus it befalls them; and אַךְ here retains its original affirmative signification (as in the concluding verse of Ps. 58), although in Hebrew this is blended with the restrictive. וְזֶה has Rebia mugrasch instead of great Schalscheleth, 145 and מָקוֹם has in correct texts Legarme, which must be followed by לֹא־יָדַע with Illuj on the penult. On the relative clause אֵל לֹא־יָדַע without אֲשֶׁר, comp. e.g., Job 29:16; and on this use of the st. constr., vid., Ges. § 116, 3. The last verse is as though those mentioned in v. 20 pointed with the finger to the example of punishment in the "desolated" dwellings which have been visited by the curse.

This second speech of Bildad begins, like the first (Job 8:2), with the reproach of endless babbling; but it does not end like the first (Job 8:22). The first closed with the words: "Thy haters shall be clothed with shame, and the tent of the godless is no more;" the second is only an amplification of the second half of this conclusion, without taking up again anywhere the tone of promise, which there also embraces the threatening.

It is manifest also from this speech, that the friends, to express it in the words of the old commentators, know nothing of evangelical but only of legal suffering, and also only of legal, nothing of evangelical, righteousness. For the righteousness of which Job boasts is not the

righteousness of single works of the law, but of a disposition directed to God, of conduct proceeding from faith, or (as the Old Testament generally says) from trust in God's mercy, the weaknesses of which are forgiven because they are exonerated by the habitual disposition of the man and the primary aim of his actions. The fact that the principle, "suffering is the consequence of human unrighteousness," is accounted by Bildad as the formula of an inviolable law of the moral order of the world, is closely connected with that outward aspect of human righteousness. One can only thus judge when one regards human righteousness and human destiny from the purely legal point of view. A man, as soon as we conceive him in faith, and therefore under grace, is no longer under that supposed exclusive fundamental law of the divine dealing. Brentius is quite right when he observes that the sentence of the law certainly is modified for the sake of the godly who have the word of promise. Bildad knows nothing of the worth and power which a man attains by a righteous heart. By faith he is removed from the domain of God's justice, which recompenses according to the law of works; and before the power of faith even rocks move from their place.

Bildad then goes off into a detailed description of the total destruction into which the evil-doer, after going about for a time oppressed with the terrors of his conscience as one walking over snares, at last sinks beneath a painful sickness. The description is terribly brilliant, solemn, and pathetic, as becomes the stern preacher of repentance with haughty mien and pharisaic self-confidence; it is none the less beautiful, and, considered in itself, also true—a masterpiece of the poet's skill in poetic idealizing, and in apportioning out the truth in dramatic form. The speech only becomes untrue through the application of the truth advanced, and this untruthfulness the poet has most delicately presented in it. For with a view of terrifying Job, Bildad interweaves distinct references to Job in his description; he knows, however, also how to conceal them under the rich drapery of diversified figures. The first-born of death, that hands the ungodly over to death itself, the king of terrors, by consuming the limbs of the ungodly, is the Arabian leprosy, which slowly destroys the body. The brimstone indicates the fire of God, which, having fallen from heaven, has burned up one part of the herds and servants of Job; the withering of the branch, the death of Job's children, whom he himself, as a drying-up root that will also soon die off, has survived. Job is the ungodly man, who, with wealth, children, name, and all that he possessed, is being destroyed as an example of punishment for posterity both far and near.

But, in reality, Job is not an example of punishment, but an example for consolation to posterity; and what posterity has to relate is not Job's ruin, but his wondrous deliverance (Ps. 22:31f.). He is no עַוָּל, but a righteous man; not one who יָדַע־אֵל לֹא, but he knows God better than the friends, although he contends with Him, and they defend Him. It is with him as with the righteous One, who complains, Ps. 69:21: "Contempt hath broken my heart, and I became sick: I hoped for sympathy, but in vain; for comforters, and found none;" and Ps. 38:12 (comp. 31:12, 55:13–15, 69:9, 88:9, 19): "My lovers and my friends stand aloof from my stroke, and my kinsmen stand afar off." Not without a deep purpose does the poet make Bildad to address Job in the plural. The address is first directed to Job alone; nevertheless it is so put, that what Bildad says to Job is also intended to be said to others of a like way of thinking, therefore to a whole party of the opposite opinion to himself. Who are these like-minded? Hirzel rightly refers to Job 17:8f. Job is the representative of the suffering and misjudged righteous, in other words: of the "congregation," whose blessedness is hidden beneath an outward form of suffering. One is hereby reminded that in the second part of Isaiah the יהוה עבד is also at one time spoken of in the sing., and at another time in the plur.; since this idea, by a remarkable contraction and expansion of expression (systole and diastole), at one time describes the one servant of Jehovah, and at another the congregation of the servants of Jehovah, which has its head in Him.

Thus we again have a trace of the fact that the poet is narrating a history that is of universal significance, and that, although Job is no mere personification, he has in him brought forth to view an idea connected with the history of redemption. The ancient interpreters were on the track of this idea when they said in their way, that in Job we behold the image of Christ, and the figure of His church. Christi personam figuraliter gessit, says Beda; and Gregory, after having stated and explained that there is not in the Old Testament a righteous man who does not typically point to Christ, says: Beatus Iob venturi cum suo corpore typum redemtoris insinuat.

Job 19

Job's Second Answer.—Ch. 19.

[Then began Job, and said:]

2 How long will ye vex my soul,
And crush me with your words?
3 These ten times have ye reproached me;
Without being ashamed ye astound me.
4 And if I have really erred,
My error rests with myself.
5 If ye will really magnify yourselves against me,
And prove my reproach to me:
6 Know then that Eloah hath wronged me,
And hath compassed me with His net.

Job 19:2–6. This controversy is torture to Job's spirit; enduring in himself unutterable agony, both bodily and spiritually, and in addition stretched upon the rack by the three friends with their united strength, he begins his answer with a well-justified quousque tandem. תּוֹגְיוּן (Norzi: תּוֹגִיוּן) is fut. energicum from הוּגָה (יָגָה), with the retention of the third radical., Ges. § 75, rem. 16. And in וּתְדַכְּאוּנַנְנִי (Norzi: וּתְדַכְּאוּנַנְנִי with quiescent Aleph) the suff. is attached to the ûn of the fut. energicum, Ges. § 60, rem. 3; the connecting vowel is a, and the suff. is ani, without epenthesis, not anni or aneni, Ges. § 58, 5. In v. 3 Job establishes his How long? Ten times is not to be taken strictly (Saad.), but it is a round number; ten, from being the number of the fingers on the human hand, is the number of human possibility, and from its position at the end of the row of numbers (in the decimal system) is the number of that which is perfected (vid., Genesis, S. 640f.); as not only the Sanskrit da□an is traceable to the radical notion "to seize, embrace," but also the Semitic עשׂר is traceable to the radical notion "to bind, gather together" (cogn. קשׂר). They have already exhausted what is possible in reproaches, they have done their utmost. Renan, in accordance with the Hebr. expression, transl.: Voilà (זֶה, as e.g., Gen. 27:36) la dixième fois que vous m'insultez. The ἅπ. γεγρ. תַּהְכְּרוּ is connected by the Targ. with הְכִּיר (of respect of persons = partiality), by the Syr. with כְּרָא (to pain, of crêvecoeur), by Raschi and Parchon with נָכַר (to mistake) or הִתְנַכֵּר (to alienate one's self), by Saadia (vid., Ewald's Beitr. S. 99) with עָכַר (to dim, grieve146); he, however, compares the Arab. hkr, stupere (which he erroneously regards as differing only in sound from Arab. qhr, to overpower, oppress); and Abulwalid (vid., Rödiger in Thes. p. 84 suppl.) explains Arab. thkrûn mn-nî, ye gaze at me, since at the same time he mentions as possible that הכר may be = Arab. khr, to treat indignantly, insultingly (which is only a different shade in sound of Arab. hkr, 147 and therefore refers to Saadia's interpretation). David Kimchi interprets according to Abulwalid, לו תתמהו; he however remarks at the same time, that his father Jos. Kimchi interprets after the Arab. הכר, which also signifies "shamelessness," לי פניכם תעיזו. Since the idea of dark wild looks is connected with Arab. hkr, he has undoubtedly this verb in his mind, not that compared by Ewald (who translates, "ye are devoid of feeling towards me"), and especially Arab. ḫkr, to deal unfairly, used of usurious trade in corn (which may also have been thought of by the LXX ἐπίκεισθέ μοι, and Jerome opprimentes), which signifies as intrans. to be obstinate about anything, pertinacious. Gesenius also, Thes. p. 84, suppl., suggests whether תַּחְכְּרוּ may not perhaps be the reading. But the comparison with Arab. hkr is certainly safer, and gives a perfectly

satisfactory meaning, only תַּהְכְּרוּ must not be regarded as fut. Kal (as יַהֲלֹם, Ps. 74:6, according to the received text), but as fut. Hiph. for תַּהְכִּירוּ, according to Ges. § 53, rem. 4, 5, after which Schultens transl.: quod me ad stuporem redigatis. The connection of the two verbs in v. 3b is to be judged of according to Ges. § 142, 3, a: ye shamelessly cause me astonishment (by the assurance of your accusations). One need not hesitate because it is תהכרו־לי instead of תהכרוני; this indication of the obj. by לְ, which is become a rule in Arabic with the inf. and part.) whence e.g., it would here be muhkerina li), and is still more extended in Aramaic, is also frequent in Hebrew (e.g., Isa. 53:11, Ps. 116:16, 129:3, and 2 Chron. 32:17, חֵרֵף, after which Olsh. proposes to read תחרפו־לי in the passage before us).

Much depends upon the correct perception of the structure of the clauses in v. 4. The rendering, e.g., of Olshausen, gained by taking the two halves of the verse as independent clauses, "yea certainly I have erred, I am fully conscious of my error," puts a confession into Job's mouth, which is at present neither mature nor valid. Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm., rightly take v. 4a as a hypothetical antecedent clause (comp. Job 7:20, 11:18): and if I have really erred (אַף־אָמְנָם, as Job 34:12, yea truly; Gen. 18:13, and if I should really), my error remains with me, i.e., I shall have to expiate it, without your having on this account any right to take upon yourselves the office of God and to treat me uncharitably; or what still better corresponds with תָּלִין אִתִּי: my transgression remains with me, without being communicated to another, i.e., without having any influence over you or others to lead you astray or involve you in participation of the guilt. V. 6 stands in a similar relation to v. 5. Hirz., Ew., and Hahn take v. 5 as a double question: "or will ye really boast against me, and prove to me my fault?" Schlottm., on the contrary, takes אִם conditionally, and begins the conclusion with v. 5b: "if ye will really look proudly down upon me, it rests with you at least, to prove to me by valid reasons, the contempt which ye attach to me." But by both of these interpretations, especially by the latter, v. 6 comes in abruptly. Even אֲפוֹ (written thus in three other passages besides this) indicates in v. 5 the conditional antecedent clause (comp. 9:24, 24:25) of the expressive γνῶστε οὖν (δή): if ye really boast yourselves against me (vid., Ps. 55:13f., comp. 35:26, 38:17), and prove upon me, i.e., in a way of punishment (as ye think), my shame, i.e., the sins which put me to shame (not: the right of shame, which has come upon me on account of my sins, an interpretation which the conclusion does not justify), therefore: if ye really continue (which is implied by the futt.) to do this, then know, etc. If they really maintain that he is suffering on account of flagrant sins, he meets them on the ground of this assumption with the assertion that God has wronged him (עִוָּתָנִי short for מִשְׁפָּטִי עִוֵּת, Job 8:3, 34:12, as Lam. 3:36), and has cast His net (מְצוּדוֹ, with the change of the ô of מָצוֹד from צוּד, to search, hunt, into the deeper û in inflexion, as מְנוּסִי from מָנוֹס, מְצוּרֶךָ, Ezek. 4:8, from מָצוֹר) over him, together with his right and his freedom, so that he is indeed obliged to endure punishment. In other words: if his suffering is really not to be regarded otherwise than as the punishment of sin, as they would uncharitably and censoriously persuade him, it urges on his self-consciousness, which rebels against it, to the conclusion which he hurls into their face as one which they themselves have provoked.

7 Behold I cry violence, and I am not heard;
I cry for help, and there is no justice.
8 My way He hath fenced round, that I cannot pass over,
And He hath set darkness on my paths.
9 He hath stripped me of mine honour,
And taken away the crown from my head.
10 He destroyed me on every side, then I perished,
And lifted out as a tree my hope.
11 He kindled His wrath against me,
And He regarded me as one of His foes.

Job 19:7–11. He cries aloud חָמָס (that which is called out regarded as accusa. or as an

interjection, vid., on Hab. 1:2), i.e., that illegal force is exercised over him. He finds, however, neither with God nor among men any response of sympathy and help; he cries for help (which שָׁוְעִ, perhaps connected with יָשַׁע, Arab. s't, from ישׁע, Arab. ws', seems to signify), without justice, i.e., the right of an impartial hearing and verdict, being attainable by him. He is like a prisoner who is confined to a narrow space (comp. Job 3:23, 13:27) and has no way out, since darkness is laid upon him wherever he may go. One is here reminded of Lam. 3:7–9; and, in fact, this speech generally stands in no accidental mutual relation to the lamentations of Jeremiah. The "crown of my head" has also its parallel in Lam. 5:16; that which was Job's greatest ornament and most costly jewel is meant. According to Job 29:14, צדק and מִשְׁפָּט were his robe and diadem. These robes of honour God has stripped from him, this adornment more precious than a regal diadem He has taken from him since, i.e., his affliction puts him down as a transgressor, and abandons him to the insult of those around him. God destroyed him roundabout (destruxit), as a house that is broken down on all sides, and lifted out as a tree his hope. הִסִּיעַ does not in itself signify to root out, but only to lift out (Job 4:21, of the tent-cord, and with it the tent-pin) of a plant: to remove it from the ground in which it has grown, either to plant it elsewhere, as Ps. 80:9, or as here, to put it aside. The ground was taken away from his hope, so that its greenness faded away like that of a tree that is rooted up. The fut. consec. is here to be translated: then I perished (different from Job 14:20: and consequently he perishes); he is now already one who is passed away, his existence is only the shadow of life. God has caused, fut. Hiph. apoc. וַיַּחַר, His wrath to kindle against him, and regarded him in relation to Himself as His opponents, therefore as one of them. Perhaps, however, the expression is intentionally intensified here, in contrast with Job 13:24: he, the one, is accounted by God as the host of His foes; He treats him as if all hostility to God were concentrated in him.

12 His troops came together,
And threw up their way against me,
And encamped round about my tent.
13 My brethren hath He removed far from me,
And my acquaintance are quite estranged from me.
14 My kinsfolk fail,
And those that knew me have forgotten me.
15 The slaves of my house and my maidens,
They regard me as a stranger,
I am become a perfect stranger in their eyes.

Job 19:12–15. It may seem strange that we do not connect v. 12 with the preceding strophe or group of verses; but between vv. 7 and 21 there are thirty στίχοι, which, in connection with the arrangement of the rest of this speech in decastichs (accidentally coinciding remarkably with the prominence given to the number ten in v. 3a), seem intended to be divided into three decastichs, and can be so divided without doing violence to the connection. While in v. 12, in connection with v. 11, Job describes the course of the wrath, which he has to withstand as if he were an enemy of God, in vv. 13ff. he refers back to the degradation complained of in v. 9. In v. 12 he compares himself to a besieged (perhaps on account of revolt) city. God's גְּדוּדִים (not: bands of marauders, as Dietr. interprets, but: troops, i.e., of regular soldiers, synon. of צבא, Job 10:17, comp. 25:3, 29:25, from the root גד, to unite, join, therefore prop. the assembled, a heap; vid., Fürst's Handwörterbuch) are the bands of outwards and inward sufferings sent forth against him for a combined attack (יַחַד). Heaping up a way, i.e., by filling up the ramparts, is for the purpose of making the attack upon the city with battering-rams (Job 16:14) and javelins, and then the storm, more effective (on this erection of offensive ramparts (approches), called elsewhere סֹלְלָה שָׁפָךְ, vid., Keil's Archäologie, § 159). One result of this condition of siege in which God's wrath has placed him is that he is avoided and despised as one smitten of God: neither love and fidelity, nor obedience and dependence, meet him from any quarter. What he has said in Job 17:6, that

he is become a byword and an abomination (an object to spit upon), he here describes in detail. There is no ground for understanding אַחַי in the wider sense of relations; brethren is meant here, as in Ps. 69:9. He calls his relations קְרוֹבַי, as Ps. 38:12. יְדֻעַי are (in accordance with the pregnant biblical use of this word in the sense of nosse cum affectu et effectu) those who know him intimately (with objective suff. as Ps. 87:4), and מְיֻדָּעַי, as Ps. 31:12, and freq., those intimately known to him; both, therefore, so-called heart- or bosom-friends. בֵּיתִי גָּרַי Jer. well translates inquilinin domus meae; they are, in distinction from those who by birth belong to the nearer and wider circle of the family, persons who are received into this circle as servants, as vassals (comp. Ex. 3:22, and Arabic jâr, an associate, one sojourning in a strange country under the protection of its government, a neighbour), here espec. the domestics. The verb תַּחְשְׁבוּנִי (Ges. § 60) is construed with the nearest feminine subject. These people, who ought to thank him for taking them into his house, regard him as one who does not belong to it (זָר); he is looked upon by them as a perfect stranger (נָכְרִי), as an intruder from another country.

16 I call to my servant and he answereth not,
I am obliged to entreat him with my mouth.
17 My breath is offensive to my wife,
And my stench to my own brethren.
18 Even boys act contemptuously towards me;
If I will rise up, they speak against me.
19 All my confidential friends abhor me,
And those whom I loved have turned against me.
20 My bone cleaveth to my skin and flesh,
And I am escaped only with the skin of my teeth.

Job 19:16–20. His servant, who otherwise saw every command in his eyes, and was attent upon his wink, now not only does not come at his call, but does not return him any answer. The one of the home-born slaves (vid., on Gen. 14:14148), who stood in the same near connection to Job as Eliezer to Abraham, is intended here, in distinction from בֵּיתִי גָּרַי, v. 15. If he, his master, now in such need of assistance, desires any service from him, he is obliged (fut. with the sense of being compelled, as e.g., Job 15:30b, 17:2) to entreat him with his mouth. הִתְחַנֵּן, to beg חֵן of any one for one's self (vid., supra, p. 365), therefore to implore, supplicare; and בְּמוֹ־פִי here (as Ps. 89:2, 109:30) as a more significant expression of that which is loud and intentional (not as Job 16:5, in contrast to that which proceeds from the heart). In v. 17a, רוּחִי signifies neither my vexation (Hirz.) nor my spirit = I (Umbr., Hahn, with the Syr.), for רוח in the sense of angry humour (as Job 15:13) does not properly suit the predicate, and Arab. rûḥy in the signification ipse may certainly be used in Arabic, where rûḥ (perhaps under the influence of the philosophical usage of the language) signifies the animal spirit-life (Psychol. S. 154), not however in Hebrew, where נפשׁי is the stereotype form in that sense. If one considers that the elephantiasis, although its proper pathological symptom consists in an enormous hypertrophy of the cellular tissue of single distinct portions of the body, still easily, if the bronchia are drawn into sympathy, or if (what is still more natural) putrefaction of the blood with a scorbutic ulcerous formation in the mouth comes on, has difficulty of breathing (Job 7:15) and stinking breath as its result, as also a stinking exhalation and the discharge of a stinking fluid from the decaying limbs is connected with it (vid., the testimony of the Arabian physicians in Stickel, S. 169f.), it cannot be doubted that Jer. has lighted upon the correct thing when he transl. halitum meum exhorruit uxor mea. רוחי is intended as in Job 17:1, and it is unnecessary to derive זרה from a special verb זִיר, although in Arab. the notions which are united in the Hebr. זוּר, deflectere and abhorrere (to turn one's self away from what is disgusting or horrible), are divided between Arab. zâr med. Wau and Arab. dâr med. Je (vid., Fürst's Handwörterbuch).

In v. 17 the meaning of תְּחַנּוֹ is specially questionable. In Ps. 77:10, חַנּוֹת is, like שַׁמּוֹת,

Ezek. 36:3, an infinitive from חָנַן, formed after the manner of the Lamed He verbs. Ges. and Olsh. indeed prefer to regard these forms as plurals of substantives (חַנָּה, שַׁמָּה), but the respective passages, regarded syntactically and logically, require infinitives. As regards the accentuation, according to which וחנותי is accented by Rebia mugrasch on the ultima, this does not necessarily decide in favour of its being infin., since in the 1 praet. סַבּוֹתִי, which, according to rule, has the tone on the penultima, the ultima is also sometimes (apart from the perf. consec.) found accented (on this, vid., on Ps. 17:3, and Ew. § 197, a), as סַבּוּ, קוּמָה, קוּמִי, also admit of both accentuations.149 If וחנותי is infin., the clause is a nominal clause, or a verbal one, that is to be supplemented by the v. fin. זָרָה; if it is first pers. praet., we have a verbal clause. It must be determined from the matter and the connection which of these explanations, both of which are in form and syntax possible, is the correct one.

The translation, "I entreat (groan to) the sons of my body," is not a thought that accords with the context, as would be obtained by the infin. explanation: my entreating (is offensive); this signif. (prop. to Hithp. as above) assigned to Kal by von Hofmann (Schriftbew. ii. 2, 612) is at least not to be derived from the derivative חֵן; it might be more easily deduced from נֵחָנָתִי, Jer. 22:23, which appears to be a Niph. like נֶאֱנַח, נֶאֱנָחָה, from חָנַן, but might also be derived from נֵנַחְתִּי = נֶאֱנַחְתִּי by means of a transposition (vid., Hitz.). In the present passage one might certainly compare Arab. ḥnn, the usual word for the utterance and emotion of longing and sympathy, or also Arab. chnn, fut. i (with the infin. noun chanîn), which occurs in the signifn. of weeping, and transl.: my imploring, groaning, weeping, is offensive, etc. Since, however, the X. form of the Arab. chnn (istachanna) signifies to give forth an offensive smell (esp. of the stinking refuse of a well that is dried up); and besides, since the significatn. foetere is supported for the root חן (comp. צָחַן) by the Syriac chanîno (e.g., meshcho chanîno, rancid oil), we may also translate: "My stinking is offensive," etc., or: "I stink to the children of my body" (Rosenm., Ew., Hahn, Schlottm.); and this translation is not only not hazardous in a book that so abounds in derivations from the dialects, but it furnishes a thought that is as closely as possible connected with v. 17a. 150

The further question now arises, who are meant by בְּטֶנִי לִבְנֵי. Perhaps his children? But in the prologue these have utterly perished. Are we to suppose, with Eichhorn and Olshausen, that the poet, in the heat of discourse, forgets what he has laid down in the prologue? When we consider that this poet, within the compass of his work,—a work into which he has thrown his whole soul,—has allowed no anachronism, and no reference to anything Israelitish that is contradictory to its extra-Israelitish character, to escape him, such forgetfulness is very improbable; and when we, moreover, bear in mind that he often makes the friends refer to the destruction of Job's children (as Job 8:4, 15:30, 18:16), it is altogether inconceivable. Hence Schröring has proposed the following explanation: "My soul [a substitution of which Hahn is also guilty] is strange to my wife; my entreaty does not even penetrate to the sons of my body, it cannot reach their ear, for they are long since in Sheôl." But he himself thinks this interpretation very hazardous and insecure; and, in fact, it is improbable that in the division, vv. 13–19, where Job complains of the neglect and indifference which he now experiences from those around him, בטני בני should be the only dead ones among the living, in which case it would moreover be better, after the Arabic version, to translate: "My longing is for, or: I yearn after, the children of my body." Grandchildren (Hirz., Ew., Hlgst. Hahn) might be more readily thought of; but it is not even probable, that after having introduced the ruin of all of Job's children, the poet would represent their children as still living, some mention of whom might then at least be expected in the epilogue. Others, again (Rosenm. Justi, Gleiss), after the precedent of the LXX (υἱοὶ παλλακίδων μου), understand the sons of concubines (slaves). Where, however, should a trace be found of the poet having conceived of

his hero as a polygamist,—a hero who is even a model of chastity and continence (Job 31:1)?

But must בטני בני really signify his sons or grandsons? Children certainly are frequently called, in relation to the father, בטנו פרי (e.g., Deut. 7:13), and the father himself can call them בטני פרי (Mic. 6:7); but בטן in this reference is not the body of the father, but the mother's womb, whence, begotten by him, the children issue forth. Hence "son of my body" occurs only once (Prov. 31:2) in the mother's mouth. In the mouth of Job even (where the first origin of man is spoken of), בטני signifies not Job's body, but the womb that conceived him (vid., Job 3:10); and thus, therefore, it is not merely possible, but it is natural, with Stuhlm., Ges., Umbr., and Schlottm., to understand בטני בני of the sons of his mother's womb, i.e., of her who bare him; consequently, as אִמִּי בני, Ps. 69:9, of natural brethren (brothers and sisters, sorores uterinae), in which sense, regarding וחנותי according to the most natural influence of the tone as infin., we transl.: "and my stinking is offensive (supply זרה) to the children of my mother's womb." It is also possible that the expression, as the words seem to be taken by Symmachus (υἱοὺς παιδῶν μου, my slaves' children), and as they are taken by Kosegarten, in comparison with the Arab. bṭn in the signification race, subdivision (in the downward gradation, the third) of a greater tribe, may denote those who with him belong in a wider sense to one mother's bosom, i.e., to the same clan, although the mention of בטני בני in close connection with אִשְׁתִּי is not favourable to this extension of the idea. The circle of observation is certainly widened in v. 18, where עֲוִילִים are not Job's grandchildren (Hahn), but the children of neighbouring families and tribes; עֲוִיל (vid., Job 16:11) is a boy, and especially (perh. on account of the similarity in sound between מְעַוֵּל and עַוָּל) a rude, frolicsome, mischievous boy. Even such make him feel their contempt; and if with difficulty, and under the influence of pain which distorts his countenance, he attempts to raise himself (אָקוּמָה, LXX ὅταν ἀναστῶ, hypothetical cohortative, as Job 11:17, 16:6), they make him the butt of their jesting talk (בְּ דִבֵּר, as Ps. 50:20).

Ver. 19. סוֹדִי מָתַי is the name he gives those to whom he confides his most secret affairs; סוֹד (vid., on Ps. 25:14) signifies either with a verbal notion, secret speaking (Arab. sâwada, III. form from sâda, to press one's self close upon, esp. as sârra, to speak in secret with any one), or what is made firm, i.e., what is impenetrable, therefore a secret (from sâda, to be or make close, firm, compact; cognate root, יָסַד, wasada, cognate in signification, sirr, a secret, from sarra, שָׁרַר, which likewise signifies to make firm). Those to whom he has made known his most secret plans (comp. Ps. 55:13–15) now abhor him; and those whom he has thus (זֶה, as Job 15:17) become attached to, and to whom he has shown his affection,—he says this with an allusion to the three,—have turned against him. They gave tokens of their love and honour to him, when he was in the height of his happiness and prosperity, but they have not even shown any sympathy with him in his present form of distress.151 His bones cleave (דָּבְקָה, Aq. ἐκολλήθη, LXX erroneously ἐσάπησαν, i.e., רקבה) to his skin, i.e., the bones may be felt and seen through the skin, and the little flesh that remains is wasted away almost to a skeleton (vid., Job 7:15). This is not contradictory to the primary characteristic symptom of the lepra nodosa; for the wasting away of the rest of the body may attain an extraordinarily high degree in connection with the hypertrophy of single parts. He can indeed say of himself, that he is only escaped (se soit échappé) with the skin of his teeth. By the "skin of his teeth" the gums are generally understood. But (1) the gum is not skin, and can therefore not be called "skin of the teeth" in any language; (2) Job complains in v. 17 of his offensive breath, which in itself does not admit of the idea of healthy gums, and especially if it be the result of a scorbutic ulceration of the mouth, presupposes an ulcerous destruction of the gums. The current translation, "with my gums," is therefore to be rejected on account both of the language and the matter. For this reason Stickel (whom Hahn follows) takes עור as inf. from ערר, and

translates: "I am escaped from it with my teeth naked" [lit. with the being naked of my teeth], i.e., with teeth that are no longer covered, standing forward uncovered. This explanation is pathologically satisfactory; but it has against it (1) the translation of עור, which is wide of the most natural interpretation of the word; (2) that in close connection with ואתמלטה one expects the mention of a part of the body that has remained whole. Is there not, then, really a skin of the teeth in the proper sense? The gum is not skin, but the teeth are surrounded with a skin in the jaw, the so-called periosteum. If we suppose, what is natural enough, that his offensive breath, v. 17, arises from ulcers in the mouth (in connection with scorbutus, as is known, the breath has a terribly offensive smell), we obtain the following picture of Job's disease: his flesh is in part hypertrophically swollen, in part fearfully wasted away; the gums especially are destroyed and wasted away from the teeth, only the periosteum round about the teeth is still left to him, and single remnants of the covering of his loose and projecting teeth.

Thus we interpret שִׁנֵּי עוֹר in the first signification of the words, and have also no need for supposing that v. 20b is a proverbial phrase for "I have with great care and difficulty escaped the extreme." The declaration perfectly corresponds to the description of the disease; and it is altogether needless with Hupfeld, after Job 13:14, to read בשׁני עור, vitam solam et nudam vix reportavi, which is moreover inappropriate, since Job regards himself as one who is dying. Symm. alters the position of the בְּ similarly, since he translates after the Syriac Hexapla: καὶ ἐξέτιλλον (ותלשׁת) τὸ δέρμα τοῖς ὁδοῦσιν μου, from מלט = מרט, Arab. mllṭ, nudare pilis, which J. D. Michaelis also compares; the sense, however, which is thereby gained, is beneath all criticism. On the aoristic טָהֲוָאֶתְמַלְּטָה, vid., on Job 1:15. Stickel has on this passage an excursus on this ah, to which he also attributes, in this addition to the historic tense, the idea of striving after a goal: "I slip away, I escape;" it certainly gives vividness to the notion of the action, if it may not always have the force of direction towards anything. Therefore: with a destroyed flesh, and indeed so completely destroyed that there is even nothing left to him of sound skin except the skin of his teeth, wasted away to a skeleton, and become both to sight and smell a loathsome object;—such is the sufferer the friends have before them,—one who is tortured, besides, by a dark conflict which they only make more severe,—one who now implores them for pity, and because he has no pity to expect from man, presses forward to a hope which reaches beyond the grave.

21 Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends,
For the hand of Eloah hath touched me.
22 Wherefore do ye persecute me as God,
And are never satisfied with my flesh?
23 Oh that my words were but written,
That they were recorded in a book,
24 With an iron pen, filled in with lead,
Graven in the rock for ever!
25 And I know: my Redeemer liveth,
And as the last One will He arise from the dust.

Job 19:21–25. In v. 21 Job takes up a strain we have not heard previously. His natural strength becomes more and more feeble, and his voice weaker and weaker. It is a feeling of sadness that prevails in the preceding description of suffering, and now even stamps the address to the friends with a tone of importunate entreaty which shall, if possible, affect their heart. They are indeed his friends, as the emphatic רֵעַי אַתֶּם affirms; impelled towards him by sympathy they are come, and at least stand by him while all other men flee from him. They are therefore to grant him favour (חָנַן, prop. to incline to) in the place of right; it is enough that the hand of Eloah has touched him (in connection with this, one is reminded that leprosy is called נֶגַע, and is pre-eminently accounted as plaga divina; wherefore the suffering Messiah also bears the significant name רִבִּי דְבֵי חִוְרָא, "the leprous one from the school of Rabbi," in the Talmud, after Isa. 53:4, 8), they are not to make the divine

decree heavier to him by their uncharitableness. Wherefore do ye persecute me—he asks them in v. 22—like as God (כָּמוֹ־אֵל, according to Saad. and Ralbag = כמו־אֱלֹה, which would be very tame); by which he means not merely that they add their persecution to God's, but that they take upon themselves God's work, that they usurp to themselves a judicial divine authority, they act towards him as if they were superhuman (vid., Isa. 31:3), and therefore inhumanly, since they, who are but his equals, look down upon him from an assumed and false elevation. The other half of the question: wherefore are ye not full of my flesh (de ma chair, with מִן, as Job 31:31), but still continue to devour it? is founded upon a common Semitic figurative expression, with which may be compared our [Germ.] expression, "to gnaw with the tooth of slander" [comp. Engl. "backbiting"]. In Chaldee, דִּי קַרְצוּהִי אֲכַל, to eat the pieces of (any one), is equivalent to, to slander him; in Syriac, ochelqarsso is the name of Satan, like διάβολος. The Arabic here, as almost everywhere in the book of Job, presents a still closer parallel; for Arab. 'kl lḥm signifies to eat any one's flesh, then (different from בשׂר אכל, Ps. 27:2) equivalent to, to slander,152 since an evil report is conceived of as a wild beast, which delights in tearing a neighbour to pieces, as the friends do not refrain from doing, since, from the love of their assumption that his suffering must be the retributive punishment of heinous sins, they lay sins to his charge of which he is not conscious, and which he never committed. Against these uncharitable and groundless accusations he wishes (vv. 23f.) that the testimony of his innocence, to which they will not listen, might be recorded in a book for posterity, or because a book may easily perish, graven in a rock (therefore not on leaden plates) with an iron style, and the addition of lead, with which to fill up the engraved letters, and render them still more imperishable. In connection with the remarkable fidelity with which the poet throws himself back into the pre-Israelitish patriarchal time of his hero, it is of no small importance that he ascribes to him an acquaintance not only with monumental writing, but also with book and documentary writing (comp. Job 31:35).

The fut., which also elsewhere (Job 6:8, 13:5, 14:13, once the praet., Job 23:3, noverim) follows מִי־יִתֵּן, quis dabat = utinam, has Waw consec. here (as Deut. 5:26 the praet.); the arrangement of the words is extremely elegant, בַּסֵּפֶר stands per hyperbaton emphatically prominent. כָּתַב and חָקַק (whence fut. Hoph. יֵחָקוּ with Dag. implicitum in the ח, comp. Job 4:20, and the Dag. of the ק omitted, for יוּחָקוּ, according to Ges. § 67, rem. 8) interchange also elsewhere, Isa. 30:8. סֵפֶר, according to its etymon, is a book formed of the skin of an animal, as Arab. sufre, the leathern table-mat spread on the ground instead of a table. It is as unnecessary to read לְעֵד (comp. Job 16:8, LXX, εἰς μαρτύριον) instead of לָעַד here, as in Isa. 30:8. He wishes that his own declaration, in opposition to his accusers, may be inscribed as on a monument, that it may be immortalized,153 in order that posterity may behold it, and, it is to be hoped, judge him more justly than his contemporaries. He wishes this, and is certain that his wish is not vain. His testimony to his innocence will not descend to posterity without being justified to it by God, the living God.

Thus is יָדַעְתִּי וַאֲנִי connected with what precedes. ידעתי is followed, as in Job 30:23, Ps. 9:21, by the oratio directa. The monosyllable tone-word חָי (on account of which גֹּאֲלִי has the accent drawn back to the penult.) is 3 praet.: I know: my redeemer liveth; in connection with this we recall the name of God, העולם חי, Dan. 12:7, after which the Jewish oath per Anchialum in Martial is to be explained. גֹּאֵל might (with Umbr. and others), in comparison with Job 16:18, as Num. 35:12, be equivalent to הַדָּם גֹּאֵל: he who will redeem, demand back, avenge the shedding of his blood and maintain his honour as of blood that has been innocently shed; in general, however, גאל signifies to procure compensation for the down-trodden and unjustly oppressed, Prov. 23:11, Lam. 3:58, Ps. 119:154. This Rescuer of his honour lives and will rise up as the last One, as one who holds out over

everything, and therefore as one who will speak the final decisive word. To אַחֲרוֹן have been given the significations Afterman in the sense of vindex (Hirz., Ewald), or Rearman in the sense of a second [lit. in a duel,] (Hahn), but contrary to the usage of the language: the word signifies postremus, novissimus, and is to be understood according to Isa. 44:6, 48:12, comp. 41:4. But what is the meaning of עַל־עָפָר? Is it: upon the dust of the earth, having descended from heaven? The words may, according to Job 41:25 [Hebr., Engl. 41:33], be understood thus (without the accompanying notion, formerly supposed by Umbreit, of pulvis or arena = palaestra, which is Classic, not Hebraic); but looking to the process of destruction going on in his body, which has been previously the subject of his words, and is so further on, it is far more probable that על־עפר is to be interpreted according to Job 17:16, 20:11, 21:26, Ps. 30:10. Moreover, an Arab would think of nothing else but the dust of the grave if he read Arab. 'alâ turâbin in this connection.154 Besides, it is unnecessary to connect על קום, as perhaps 2 Chron. 21:4, and the Arab. qâm 'alâ (to stand by, help): על־עפר is first of all nothing more than a defining of locality. To affirm that if it refer to Job it ought to be עפרי, is unfounded. Upon the dust in which he is now soon to be laid, into which he is now soon to be changed, will He, the Rescuer of his honour, arise (קוּם, as in Deut. 19:15, Ps. 27:12, 35:11, of the rising up of a witness, and as e.g., Ps. 12:6, comp. 94:16, Isa. 33:10, of the rising up and interposing of a rescuer and help) and set His divine seal to Job's own testimony thus made permanent in the monumental inscription. Oetinger's interpretation is substantially the same: "I know that He will at last come, place himself over the dust in which I have mouldered away, pronounce my cause just, and place upon me the crown of victory."

A somewhat different connection of the thought is obtained, if וַאֲנִי is taken not progressively, but adversatively: "Yet I know," etc. The thought is then, that his testimony of his innocence need not at all be inscribed in the rock; on the contrary, God, the ever living One, will verify it. It is difficult to decide between them; still the progressive rendering seems to be preferable, because the human vindication after death, which is the object of the wish expressed in vv. 23f., is still not essentially different from the divine vindication hoped for in v. 25, which must not be regarded as an antithesis, but rather as a perfecting of the other designed for posterity. V. 25 is, however, certainly a higher hope, to which the wish in vv. 23f. forms the stepping-stone. God himself will avenge Job's blood, i.e., against his accusers, who say that it is the blood of one who is guilty; over the dust of the departed He will arise, and by His majestic testimony put to silence those who regard this dust of decay as the dust of a sinner, who has received the reward of his deeds.

But is it perhaps this his hope of God's vindication, expressed in vv. 25–27, which (as Schlottmann and Hahn,155 though in other respects giving very different interpretations, think) is, according to Job's wish, to be permanently inscribed on the monument, in order to testify to posterity with what a stedfast and undismayed conviction he had died? The high-toned introitus, vv. 23f., would be worthy of the important inscription it introduces. But (1) it is improbable that the inscription would begin with ואני, consequently with Waw,—a difficulty which is not removed by the translation, "Yea, I know," but only covered up; the appeal to Ps. 2:6, Isa. 3:14, is inadmissible, since there the divine utterance, which begins with Waw, per aposiopesin continues a suppressed clause; אני כי would be more admissible, but that which is to be written down does not even begin with כי in either Hab. 2:3 or Jer. 30:3. (2.) According to the whole of Job's previous conduct and habitual state of mind, it is to be supposed that the contents of the inscription would be the expression of the stedfast consciousness of his innocence, not the hope of his vindication, which only here and there flashes through the darkness of the conflict and temptation, but is always again swallowed up by this darkness, so that the thought of a perpetual preservation, as on a monument, of this hope can by no means have

its origin in Job; it forms everywhere only, so to speak, the golden weft of the tragic warp, which in itself even resists the tension of the two opposites: Job's consciousness of innocence, and the dogmatic postulate of the friends; and their intensity gradually increases with the intensity of this very tension. So also here, where the strongest expression is given both to the confession of his innocence as a confession which does not shun, but even desires, to be recorded in a permanent form for posterity, and also at the same time in connection with this to the confidence that to him, who is misunderstood by men, the vindication from the side of God, although it may be so long delayed that he even dies, can nevertheless not be wanting. Accordingly, by מִלָּי we understand not what immediately follows, but the words concerning his innocence which have already been often repeated by him, and which remain unalterably the same; and we are authorized in closing one strophe with v. 25, and in beginning a new one with v. 26, which indeed is commended by the prevalence of the decastich in this speech, although we do not allow to this observance of the strophe division any influence in determining the exposition. It is, however, of use in our exposition. The strophe which now follows develops the chief reason of believing hope which is expressed in v. 25; comp. the hexastich Job 12:11–13, also there in vv. 14ff. is the expansion of v. 13, which expresses the chief thought as in the form of a thema.

26 And after my skin, thus torn to pieces,
And without my flesh shall I behold Eloah,
27 Whom I shall behold for my good,
And mine eyes shall see Him and no other—
My veins languish in my bosom.
28 Ye think: "How shall we persecute him?"
Since the root of the matter is found in me—
29 Therefore be ye afraid of the sword,
For wrath meeteth the transgressions of the sword,
That ye may know there is a judgment!

Job 19:26–29. If we have correctly understood עַל־עפר, v. 25b, we cannot in this speech find that the hope of a bodily recovery is expressed. In connection with this rendering, the oldest representative of which is Chrysostom, מִבְּשָׂרִי is translated either: free from my flesh = having become a skeleton (Umbr., Hirz., and Stickel, in comm. in Iobi loc. de Goële, 1832, and in the transl., Gleiss, Hlgst., Renan), but this מבשׂרי, if the מן is taken as privative, can signify nothing else but fleshless = bodiless; or: from my flesh, i.e., the flesh when made whole again (viz., Eichhorn in the Essay, which has exercised considerable influence, to his Allg. Bibl. d. bibl. Lit. i. 3, 1787, von Cölln, BCr., Knapp, von Hofm.,156 and others), but hereby the relation of v. 26b to 26a becomes a contrast, without there being anything to indicate it. Moreover, this rendering, as מבשׂרי may also be explained, is in itself contrary to the spirit and plan of the book; for the character of Job's present state of mind is, that he looks for certain death, and will hear nothing of the consolation of recovery (Job 17:10–16), which sounds to him as mere mockery; that he, however, notwithstanding, does not despair of God, but, by the consciousness of his innocence and the uncharitableness of the friends, is more and more impelled from the God of wrath and caprice to the God of love, his future Redeemer; and that then, when at the end of the course of suffering the actual proof of God's love breaks through the seeming manifestation of wrath, even that which Job had not ventured to hope is realized: a return of temporal prosperity beyond his entreaty and comprehension.

On the other hand, the mode of interpretation of the older translators and expositors, who find an expression of the hope of a resurrection at the end of the preceding strophe or the beginning of this, cannot be accepted. The LXX, by reading יקים instead of יקום, and connecting זאת נקפו עורי יקים, translates: ἀναστήσει δέ (Cod. Vat. only ἀναστῆσαι) μου τὸ σῶμα (Cod. Vat. τὸ δέρμα μου) τὸ ἀναντλοῦν μοι (Cod. Vat. om. μοι) ταῦτα,—but how can any one's skin be said to awake (Italic: super terram resurget cutis mea),157 and whence does the verb נקף

obtain the signification exhaurire or exantlare? Jerome's translation is not less bold: Scio enim quod redemptor meus vivit et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum, as though it were אקום, not יקום, and as though אחרון could signify in novissimo die (in favour of which Isa. 8:23 can only seemingly be quoted)! The Targ. translates: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and hereafter His redemption will arise (become a reality) over the dust (into which I shall be dissolved), and after my skin is again made whole (thus158 אִתְּפַח seems to require to be translated, not intumuit) this will happen; and from my flesh I shall again behold God." It is evident that this is intended of a future restoration of the corporeal nature that has become dust, but the idea assigned to נקפו is without foundation. Luther also cuts the knot by translating: (But I know that my Redeemer liveth), and He will hereafter raise me up out of the ground, which is an impossible sense that is word for word forced upon the text. There is just as little ground for translating v. 26a with Jerome: et rursum circumdabor pelle mea (after which Luther: and shall then be surrounded with this my skin); for נִקְּפוּ can as Niph. not signify circumdabor, and as Piel does not give the meaning cutis mea circumdabit (scil. me), since נקפו cannot be predicate to the sing. עורי. In general, נקפו cannot be understood as Niph., but only as Piel; the Piel נָקַף, however, signifies not: to surround, but: to strike down, e.g., olives from the tree, Isa. 17:6, or the trees themselves, so that they lie felled on the ground, Isa. 10:34, comp. Arab. nqf, to strike into the skull and injure the soft brain, then: to strike forcibly on the head (gen. on the upper part), or also: to deal a blow with a lance or stick.159

Therefore v. 26a, according to the usage of the Semitic languages, can only be intended of the complete destruction of the skin, which is become cracked and broken by the leprosy; and this was, moreover, the subject spoken of above (v. 20, comp. 30:19). For the present we leave it undecided whether Job here confesses the hope of the resurrection, and only repel those forced misconstructions of his words which arbitrarily discern this hope in the text. Free from such violence is the translation: and after this my skin is destroyed, i.e., after I shall have put off this my body, from my flesh (i.e., restored and transfigured), I shall behold God. Thus is מבשׂרי understood by Rosenm., Kosegarten (diss. in Iob, xix. 1815), Umbreit (Stud. u. Krit. 1840, i.), Welte, Carey, and others. But this interpretation is also untenable. For, 1. In this explanation v. 26a is taken as an antecedent; a praepos., however, like אַחַר or עַד, used as a conj., has, according to Hirzel's correct remark, the verb always immediately after it, as Job 42:7, Lev. 14:43; whereas 1 Sam. 20:41, the single exception, is critically doubtful. 2. It is not probable that the poet by עורי should have thought of the body, which disease is rapidly hurrying on to death, and by בְּשָׂרִי, on the other hand, of a body raised up and glorified. 3. Still more improbable is it that בשׂר should be so used here as in the church's term, resurrectio carnis, which is certainly an allowable expression, but one which exceeds the meaning of the language of Scripture. בשׂר, σάρξ, is in general, and especially in the Old Testament, a notion which has grown up in almost inseparable connection with the marks of frailty and sinfulness. And 4. The hope of a resurrection as a settled principle in the creed of Israel is certainly more recent than the Salomonic period. Therefore by far the majority of modern expositors have decided that Job does not indeed here avow the hope of the resurrection, but the hope of a future spiritual beholding of God, and therefore of a future life; and thus the popular idea of Hades, which elsewhere has sway over him, breaks out. Thus, of a future spiritual beholding of God, are Job's words understood by Ewald, Umbreit (who at first explained them differently), Vaihinger, Von Gerlach, Schlottmann, Hölemann (Sächs. Kirchen- u. Schulbl. 1853, Nos. 48, 50, 62), König (Die Unsterblichkeitsidee im B. Iob, 1855), and others, also by the Jewish expositors Arnheim and Löwenthal. This rendering, which is also adopted in the Art. Hiob in Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie, does not necessitate any impossible misconstruction of the language,

but, as we shall see further on, it does not exhaust the meaning of Job's confession.

First of all, we will continue the explanation of each expression אַחַר is a praepos., and used in the same way as the Arabic ba'da is sometimes used: after my skin, i.e., after the loss of it (comp. Job 21:21, אחריו, after he is dead). נָקְפוּ is to be understood relatively: which they have torn in pieces, i.e., which has been torn in pieces (comp. the same use of the 3 pers., Job 4:19, 18:18); and זֹאת, which, according to Targ., Koseg., Stickel de Goële, and Ges. Thes., ought to be taken inferentially, equivalent to hoc erit (this, however, cannot be accepted, because it must have been וגו׳ אחר וזאת, Arab. w-dlk b'd 'n, idque postquam, and moreover would require the words to be arranged עורי נקפו אחר), commonly however taken together with עורי (which is nevertheless masc.), is understood as pointing to his decayed body, seems better to be taken adverbially: in this manner (Arnheim, Stickel in his translation, von Gerl., Hahn); it is the acc. of reference, as Job 33:12. The מן of מִבְּשָׂרִי is the negative מן: free from my flesh (prop. away, far from, Num. 15:25, Prov. 20:3),—a rather frequent way of using this preposition (vid., Job 11:15, 21:9; Gen. 27:39; 2 Sam. 1:22; Jer. 48:45). Accordingly, we translate: "and after my skin, which they tear to pieces thus, and free from my flesh, shall I behold Eloah." That Job, after all, is permitted to behold God in this life, and also in this life receives the testimony of his justification, does not, as already observed, form any objection to this rendering of v. 26: it is the reward of his faith, which, even in the face of certain death, has not despaired of God, that he does not fall into the power of death at all, and that God forthwith condescends to him in love. And that Job here holds firm, even beyond death, to the hope of beholding God in the future as a witness to his innocence, does not, after Job 14:13–15, 16:18–21, come unexpectedly; and it is entirely in accordance with the inner progress of the drama, that the thought of a redemption from Hades, expressed in the former passage, and the demand expressed in the latter passage, for the rescue of the honour of his blood, which is even now guaranteed him by his witness in heaven, are here comprehended, in the confident certainty that his blood and his dust will not be declared by God the Redeemer as innocent, without his being in some way conscious of it, though freed from this his decaying body. In v. 27 he declares how he will behold God: whom I shall behold to me, i.e., I, the deceased one, as being for me (לִי, like Ps. 61:10, 118:6), and my eyes see Him, and not a stranger. Thus (neque alius) LXX, Targ., Jerome, and most others translate; on the other hand, Ges. Thes., Umbr., Vaih., Stick., Hahn, and von Hofm. translate: my eyes see Him, and indeed not as an enemy; but זָר signifies alienus and alius, not however adversarius, which latter meaning it in general obtains only in a national connection; here (used as in Prov. 27:2) it excludes the three: none other but Job, by which he means his opponents, will see God rising up for him, taking up his cause. רָאוּ is praet. of the future, therefore praet. propheticum, or praet. confidentiae (as frequently in the Psalms). His reins within him pine after this vision of God. Hahn, referring to Job 16:13, translates incorrectly: "If even my reins within me perish," which is impossible, according to the syntax; for Ps. 73:26 has כלה in the sense of licet defecerit as hypothetical antecedent. The Syriac version is altogether wrong: my reins (culjot) vanish completely away by reason of my lot (בְּחֶקִי). It would be expressed in Arabic exactly as it is here: culâja (or, dual, culatâja) tadhûbu, my reins melt; for in Arab. also, as in the Semitic languages generally, the reins are considered as the seat of the tenderest and deepest affections (Psychol. S. 268, f), especially of love, desire, longing, as here, where כָּלָה, as in Ps. 119:123 and freq., is intended of wasting away in earnest longing for salvation.

Having now ended the exposition of the single expressions, we inquire whether those do justice to the text who understand it of an absolutely bodiless future beholding of God. We doubt it. Job says not merely that he, but that his eyes, shall behold God. He therefore imagines the spirit as clothed with a new

spiritual body instead of the old decayed one; not so, however, that this spiritual body, these eyes which shall behold in the future world, are brought into combination with the present decaying body of flesh. But his faith is here on the direct road to the hope of a resurrection; we see it germinating and struggling towards the light. Among the three pearls which become visible in the book of Job above the waves of conflict, viz., Job 14:13–15, 16:18–21, 19:25–27, there is none more costly than this third. As in the second part of Isaiah, the fifty-third chapter is outwardly and inwardly the middle and highest point of the × prophetic utterances, so the poet of the book of Job has adorned the middle of his work with this confession of his hero, wherein he himself plants the flag of victory above his own grave.

Now in v. 28 Job turns towards the friends. He who comes forth on his side as his advocate, will make Himself felt by them to be a judge, if they continue to persecute the suffering servant of God (comp. Job 13:10–12). It is not to be translated: for then ye will say, or: forsooth then will ye say. This would be תאמרו אָז כי, and certainly imply that the opponents will experience just the same theophany, that therefore it will be on the earth. Oehler (in his Veteris Test. sententia de rebus post mortem futuris, 1846) maintains this instance against the interpretation of this confession of Job of a future beholding; it has, however, no place in the text, and Oehler rightly gives no decisive conclusion.160 For v. 28, as is rightly observed by C. W. G. Köstlin (in his Essay, de immortalitatis spe, quae in l. Iobi apparere dicitur, 1846) against Oehler, and is even explained by Oetinger, is the antecedent to v. 29 (comp. Job 21:28f.): if ye say: how, i.e., under what pretence of right, shall we prosecute him (ה־לוֹנְרְדֶּנּוּ, prop. pursue him, comp. Judg. 7:25), and (so that) the root of the matter (treated of) is found in me (בִּי, not בּוֹ, since the oratio directa, as in Job 22:17, passes into the oratio obliqua, Ew. § 338, a); in other words: if ye continue to seek the cause of my suffering in my guilt, fear ye the sword, i.e., God's sword of vengeance (as Job 15:22, and perhaps as Isa. 31:8: a sword, without the art. in order to combine the idea of what is boundless, endless, and terrific with the indefinite—the indetermination ad amplificandum described on Ps. 2:12). The confirmatory substantival clause which follows has been very variously interpreted. It is inadmissible to understand חֵמָה of the rage of the friends against Job (Umbr., Schlottm., and others), or חֶרֶב נוֹתעָו of their murderous sinning respecting Job; both expressions are too strong to be referred to the friends. We must explain either: the glow, i.e., the glow of the wrath of God, are the expiations which the sword enjoins (Hirz., Ew., and others); but apart from עָוֹן not signifying directly the punishment of sin, this thought is strained; or, which we with Rosenm. and others prefer: glow, i.e., the glow of the wrath of God, are the sword's crimes, i.e., they carry glowing anger as their reward in themselves, wrath overtakes them. Crimes of the sword are not such as are committed with the sword—for such are not treated of here, and, with Arnh. and Hahn, to understand חרב of the sword "of hostilely mocking words," is arbitrary and artificial—but such as have incurred the sword. Job thinks of slander and blasphemy. These are even before a human tribunal capital offences (comp. Job 31:11, 28). He warns the friends of a higher sword and a higher power, which they will not escape: "that ye may know it." שַׁדִּין, for which the Keri is שַׁדּוּן. An ancient various reading (in Pinkster) is יֵדְעוּן (instead of תֵּדָעוּן). The LXX shows how it is to be interpreted: θυμὸς γὰρ ἐπ᾽ ἀνόμους (Cod. Alex.—οις) ἐπελεύσεταὶ καὶ τότε γνώσονται. According to Cod. Vat. the translation continues ποῦ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἡ ὕλη (שׁדין, comp. Job 29:5, where שׁדי is translated by ὑλώδης); according to Cod. Alex. ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ αὐτῶν ἡ ἴσχυς ἐστίν (שׁדין from שׁדד). Ewald in the first edition, which Hahn follows, considers, as Eichhorn already had, שַׁדִּין as a secondary form of שַׁדַּי; Hlgst. wishes to read שַׁדַּי at once. It might sooner, with Raschi, be explained: that ye might only know the powers of justice, i.e., the manifold power of destruction which the judge has at his disposal. But all these explanations are unsupported by

the usage of the language, and Ewald's conjecture in his second edition: עָשְׁקֶם אֵי (where is your violence), has nothing to commend it; it goes too far from the received text, calls the error of the friends by an unsuitable name, and gives no impressive termination to the speech.

On the other hand, the speech could not end more suitably than by Job's bringing home to the friends the fact that there is a judgment; accordingly it is translated by Aq. ὅτι κρίσις; by Symm., Theod., ὅτι ἔστι κρίσις. שׁ is = אשׁר once in the book of Job, as probably also once in the Pentateuch, Gen. 6:3. דִּין or דּוּן are infinitive forms; the latter from the Kal, which occurs only in Gen. 6:3, with Cholem, which being made a substantive (as e.g., בּוּז), signifies the judging, the judgment. Why the Keri substitutes דון, which does not occur elsewhere in the signification judicium, for the more common דין, is certainly lost to view, and it shows only that the reading שׁדון was regarded in the synagogue as the traditional. דִּין has everywhere else the signification judicium, e.g., by Elihu, Job 36:17, and also often in the book of Proverbs, e.g., Prov. 20:8 (comp. in the Arabizing supplement, Job 31:8). The final judgment is in Aramaic דִּינָא רַבָּא; the last day in Hebrew and Arabic, הַדִּין יוֹם, jaum ed-dîn. To give to "שׁדין, that [there is] a judgment," this dogmatically definite meaning, is indeed, from its connection with the historical recognition of the plan of redemption, inadmissible; but there is nothing against understanding the conclusion of Job's speech according to the conclusion of the book of Ecclesiastes, which belongs to the same age of literature.

The speech of Job, now explained, most clearly shows us how Job's affliction, interpreted by the friends as a divine retribution, becomes for Job's nature a wholesome refining crucible. We see also from this speech of Job, that he can only regard his affliction as a kindling of divine wrath, and God's meeting him as an enemy (Job 19:11). But the more decidedly the friends affirm this, and describe the root of the manifestation as lying in himself, in his own transgression; and the more uncharitably, as we have seen it at last in Bildad's speech, they go to an excess in their terrible representations of the fate of the ungodly with unmistakeable reference to him: the more clearly is it seen that this indirect affliction of misconstruction must tend to help him in his suffering generally to the right relation towards God. For since the consolation expected from man is changed into still more cutting accusation, no other consolation remains to him in all the world but the consolation of God; and if the friends are to be in the right when they persist unceasingly in demonstrating to him that he must be a heinous sinner, because he is suffering so severely, the conclusion is forced upon him in connection with his consciousness of innocence, that the divine decree is an unjust one (Job 19:5f.). From such a conclusion, however, he shrinks back; and this produces a twofold result. The crushing anguish of soul which the friends inflict on him, by forcing upon him a view of his suffering which is as strongly opposed to his self-consciousness as to his idea of God, and must therefore bring him into the extremest difficulty of conscience, drives him to the mournful request, "Have pity upon, have pity upon me, O ye my friends" (Ch. 19:21); they shall not also pursue him whom God's hand has touched, as if they were a second divine power in authority over him, that could dispose of him at its will and pleasures; they shall, moreover, cease from satisfying the insatiable greed of their nature upon him. He treats the friends in the right manner; so that if their heart were not encrusted by their dogma, they would be obliged to change their opinion. This in Job's conduct is an unmistakeable step forward to a more spiritual state of mind. But the stern inference of the friends has a beneficial influence not merely on his relation to them, but also on his relation to God. To the wrathful God, whom they compel him to regard also as unjust, he cannot in itself cling. He is so much the less able to do this, as he is compelled the more earnestly to long for vindication, the more confidently he is accused.

When he now wishes that the testimony which he has laid down concerning his innocence, and

which is contemporaries do not credit, might be graven in the rock with an iron pen, and filled in with lead, the memorial in words of stone is but a dead witness; and he cannot even for the future rely on men, since he is so contemptuously misunderstood and deceived by them in the present. This impels his longing after vindication forward from a lifeless thing to a living person, and turns his longing from man below to God above. He has One who will acknowledge his misjudged cause, and set it right,—a Goël, who will not first come into being in a later generation, but liveth—who has not to come into being, but is. There can be no doubt that by the words חי נאל he means the same person of whom in Job 16:19 he says: "Behold, even now in heaven is my Witness, and One who acknowledges me is in the heights." The חי here corresponds to the עתה גם in that passage; and from this—that the heights of heaven is the place where this witness dwells—is to be explained the manner in which Job (Job 19:25b) expresses his confident belief in the realization of that which he (Job 16:20f.) at first only importunately implores: as the Last One, whose word shall avail in the ages of eternity, when the strife of human voices shall have long been silent, He shall stand forth as finally decisive witness over the dust, in which Job passed away as one who in the eye of man was regarded as an object of divine punishment. And after his skin, in such a manner destroyed, and free from his flesh, which is even now already so fallen in that the bones may be seen through it (Job 19:20), he will behold Eloah; and he who, according to human judgment, has died the death of the unrighteous, shall behold Eloah on his side, his eyes shall see and not a stranger; for entirely for his profit, in order that he may bask in the light of His countenance, will He reveal himself.

This is the picture of the future, for the realization of which Job longs so exceedingly, that his reins within him pine away with longing. Whence we see, that Job does not here give utterance to a transient emotional feeling, a merely momentary flight of faith; but his hidden faith, which during the whole controversy rests at the bottom of his soul, and over which the waves of despair roll away, here comes forth to view. He knows, that although his outward man may decay, God cannot, however, fail to acknowledge his inner man. But does this confidence of faith of Job really extend to the future life? It has, on the contrary, been observed, that if the hope expressed with such confidence were a hope respecting the future life, Job's despondency would be trifling, and to be rejected; further, that this hope stands in contradiction to his own assertion, Job 14:14: "If man dies, shall he live again? All the days of my warfare would I wait, till my change should come;" thirdly, that Job's character would be altogether wrongly drawn, and would be a psychological caricature, if the thought slumbering in Job's mind, which finds utterance in Job 19:25–27, were the thought of a future vision of God; and finally, that the unravelling of the knot of the puzzle, which continually increases in entanglement by the controversy with the friends, at the close of the drama, is effected by a theophany, which issues in favour of one still living, not, as ought to be expected by that rendering, a celestial scene unveiled over the grave of Job. But such a conclusion was impossible in an Old Testament book. The Old Testament as yet knew nothing of a heaven peopled with happy human spirits, arrayed in white robes (the stola prima). And at the time when the book of Job was composed, there was also neither a positive revelation nor a dogmatic confession of the resurrection of the dead, which forms the boundary of the course of this world, in existence. The book of Job, however, shows us how, from the conflict concerning the mystery of this present life, faith struggled forth towards a future solution. The hope which Job expresses is not one prevailing in his age—not one that has come to him from tradition—not one embracing mankind, or even only the righteous in general. All the above objections would be really applicable, if it were evident here that Job was acquainted with the doctrine of a beholding of God after death, which should recompense the pious for the sufferings of this present time. But such is not

the case. The hope expressed is not a finished and believingly appropriating hope; on the contrary, it is a hope which is first conceived and begotten under the pressure of divinely decreed sufferings, which make him appear to be a transgressor, and of human accusations which charge him with transgression. It is impossible for him to suppose that God should remain, as now, so hostilely turned from him, without ever again acknowledging him. The truth must at last break through the false appearance, and wrath again give place to love. That it should take place after his death, is only the extreme which his faith assigns to it.

If we place ourselves on the standpoint of the poet, he certainly here gives utterance to a confession, to which, as the book of Proverbs also shows, the Salomonic Chokma began to rise in the course of believing thought; but also on the part of the Chokma, this confession was primarily only a theologoumenon, and was first in the course of centuries made sure under the combined agency of the progressive perception of the revelation and facts connected with redemption; and it is first of all in the New Testament, by the descent to Hades and the ascension to heaven of the Prince of Life, that it became a fully decided and well-defined element of the church's creed. If, however, we place ourselves on the standpoint of the hero of the drama, this hope of future vindication which flashes through the fierceness of the conflict, far from making it a caricature,161 gives to the delineation of his faith, which does not forsake God, the final perfecting stroke. Job is, as he thinks, meeting certain death. Why then should not the poet allow him to give utterance to that demand of faith, that he, even if God should permit him apparently to die the sinner's death, nevertheless cannot remain unvindicated? Why should he not allow him here, in the middle of the drama, to rise from the thought, that the cry of his blood should not ascend in vain, to the thought that this vindication of his blood, as of one who is innocent, should not take place without his being consciously present, and beholding with his own eyes the God by whose judicial wrath he is overwhelmed, as his Redeemer? This hope, regarded in the light of the later perception of the plan of redemption, is none other than the hope of a resurrection; but it appears here only in the germ, and comes forward as purely personal: Job rises from the dust, and, after the storm of wrath is passed, sees Eloah, as one who acknowledges him in love, while his surviving opponents fall before the tribunal of this very God. It is therefore not a share in the resurrection of the righteous (in Isa. 26, which is uttered prophetically, but first of all nationally), and not a share in the general resurrection of the dead (first expressed in Dan. 12:2), with which Job consoled himself; he does not speak of what shall happen at the end of the days, but of a purely personal matter after his death. Considering himself as one who must die, and thinking of himself as deceased, and indeed, according to appearance, overwhelmed by the punishment of his misdeeds, he would be compelled to despair of God, if he were not willing to regard even the incredible as unfailing, this, viz., that God will not permit this mark of wrath and of false accusation to attach to his blood and dust. That the conclusion of the drama should be shaped in accordance with this future hope, is, as we have already observed, not possible, because the poet (apart from his transferring himself to the position and consciousness of his patriarchal hero) was not yet in possession, as a dogma, of that hope which Job gives utterance to as an aspiration of his faith, and which even he himself only at first, like the psalmists (vid., on Ps. 17:15, 49:15f., 73:26), had as an aspiration of faith;162 it was, however, also entirely unnecessary, since it is indeed not the idea of the drama that there is a life after death, which adjusts the mystery of the present, but that there is a suffering of the righteous which bears the disguise of wrath, but nevertheless, as is finally manifest, is a dispensation of love.

If, however, it is a germinating hope, which in this speech of Job is urged forth by the strength of his faith, we can, without anachronistically confusing the different periods of the development of the knowledge of redemption,

regard it as a full, but certainly only developing, preformation of the later belief in the resurrection. When Job says that with his own eyes he shall behold Eloah, it is indeed possible by these eyes to understand the eyes of the spirit;163 but it is just as possible to understand him to mean the eyes of his renewed body (which the old theologians describe as stola secunda, in distinction from the stola prima of the intermediate state); and when Job thinks of himself (v. 25b) as a mouldering corpse, should he not by his eyes, which shall behold Eloah, mean those which have been dimmed in death, and are now again become capable of seeing? While, if we wish to expound grammatical-historically, not practically, not homiletically, we also dare not introduce the definiteness of the later dogma into the affirmation of Job. It is related to eschatology as the protevangelium is to soteriology; it presents only the first lines of the picture, which is worked up in detail later on, but also an outline, sketched in such a way that every later perception may be added to it. Hence Schlottmann is perfectly correct when he considers that it is justifiable to understand these grand and powerful words, in hymns, and compositions, and liturgies, and monumental inscriptions, of the God-man, and to use them in the sense which "the more richly developed conception of the last things might so easily put upon them." It must not surprise us that this sublime hope is not again expressed further on. On the one hand, what Sanctius remarks is not untrue: ab hoc loco ad finem usque libri aliter se habet Iobus quam prius; on the other hand, Job here, indeed in the middle of the book, soars triumphantly over his opponents to the height of a believing consciousness of victory, but as yet he is not in that state of mind in which he can attain to the beholding of God on his behalf, be it in this world or in the world to come. He has still further to learn submission in relation to God, gentleness in relation to the friends. Hence, inexhaustibly rich in thought and variations of thought, the poet allows the controversy to become more and more involved, and the fire in which Job is to be proved, but also purified, to burn still longer.

JOB 20

Zophar's Second Speech.

[Then began Zophar the Naamathite, and said:]

2 Therefore do my thoughts furnish me with a reply,

And indeed by reason of my feeling within me.

3 The correction of my reproach I must hear,

Nevertheless the spirit of my understanding informeth me.

4 Knowest thou this which is from everlasting,

Since man was placed upon the earth:

5 That the triumphing of the evil-doer is not long,

And the joy of the godless is but for a moment?

Job 20:2–5. All modern expositors take v. 2 as an apology for the opposition which follows, and the majority of them consider בַּעֲבוּר as elliptical for זאת בעבור, as Tremell., Piscator, and others have done, partly (but wrongly) by referring to the Rebia mugrasch. Ewald observes: "בעבור stands without addition, because this is easily understood from the כן in לָכֵן." But although this ellipsis is not inadmissible (comp. אשׁר לכן = לכן, Job 34:25; כעל, Isa. 59:18), in spite of it v. 2b furnishes no meaning that can be accepted. Most expositors translate: "and hence the storm within me" (thus e.g., Ewald); but the signification perturbatio animi, proposed by Schultens for חוּשִׁי, after the Arab. ḥâš, is too remote from the usage of Hebrew. Moreover, this Arab. ḥâš signifies prop. to scare, hunt, of game; not, however: to be agitated, to storm,—a signification which even the corresponding Hebr. חוּשׁ, properare, does not support. Only a few expositors (as Umbreit, who translates: because of my storm within me) take בעבור (which occurs only this once in the book of Job) as praepos., as it must be taken in consideration of the infin. which follows (comp. Ex. 9:16,

20:20; 1 Sam. 1:6; 2 Sam. 10:3). Further, לָכֵן (only by Umbreit translated by "yet," after the Arab. lâkin, lâkinna, which it never signifies in Hebr., where לָ is not = לֹא, but = לְ with Kametz before the tone) with that which follows is referred by several expositors to the preceding speech of Job, e.g., Hahn: "under such circumstances, if thou behavest thus;" by most, however, it is referred to v. 3, e.g., Ew.: "On this account he feels called upon by his thoughts to answer, and hence his inward impulse leaves him no rest: because he hears from Job a contemptuous wounding reproof of himself." In other words: in consequence of the reproach which Job casts upon him, especially with his threat of judgment, Zophar's mind and feelings fall into a state of excitement, and give him an answer to which he now gives utterance. This prospective sense of לכן may at any rate be retained, though בעבור is taken as a preposition (wherefore … and indeed on account of my inward commotion); but it is far more natural that the beginning of Zophar's speech should be connected with the last word of Job's. V. 2 may really be so understood if we connect חוּשִׁי, not with Arab. ḥâš, חוּשׁ, to excite, to make haste (after which also Saad. and Aben-Ezra: on account of my inward hastening or urging), but with Arab. ḥs, to feel; in this meaning חשׁ is usual in all the Semitic dialects, and is even biblical also; for Eccles. 2:25 is to be translated: who hath feeling (pleasure) except from Him (read ממנו)? i.e., even in pleasure man is not free, but has conditions fixed by God.

With לכן (used as in Job 42:3) Zophar draws an inference from Job's conduct, esp. from the turn which his last speech has taken, which, as שְׂעִיפַי יְשִׁיבוּנִי164 affirms, urges him involuntarily and irresistibly forward, and indeed, as he adds with Waw explic.: on account of the power of feeling dwelling in him, by which he means both his sense of truth and his moral feeling, in general the capacity of direct perception, not perception that is only attained after long reflection. On שׂעיפי, of thoughts which, as it were, branch out, vid., on Job 4:13, and Psychol. S. 181. הֵשִׁיב signifies, as everywhere, to answer, not causative, to compel to answer. חוּשִׁי is n. actionis in the sense of רְגִישָׁתִי (Targ.), or שׂיהרגי (Ralbag), which also signifies "my feeling (αἴσθησις)," and the combination בי חושׁי is like Job 4:21, 6:13. Wherein the inference consists in self-evident, and proceeds from vv. 4f. In v. 3 expression is given to the ground of the conclusion intended in לכן: the chastisement of my dishonour, i.e., which tends to my dishonour (comp. Isa. 53:5, chastisement which conduces to our peace), I must hear (comp. on this modal signification of the future, e.g., Job 17:2); and in v. 3b Zophar repeats what he has said in v. 2, only somewhat differently applied: the spirit, this inner light (vid., Job 32:8; Psychol. S. 154, f), answers him from the perception which is peculiar to himself, i.e., out of the fulness of this perception it furnishes him with information as to what is to be thought of Job with his insulting attacks, viz., (this is the substance of the הָשִׁיב of the thoughts, and of the עֲנוֹת of the spirit), that in this conduct of Job only his godlessness is manifest. This is what he warningly brings against him, vv. 4f.: knowest thou indeed (which, according to Job 41:1, 1 Kings 21:19, sarcastically is equivalent to: thou surely knowest, or in astonishment: what dost thou not know?!) this from the beginning, i.e., this law, which has been in operation from time immemorial (or as Ew.: hoccine scis aeternum esse, so that מני־עד is not a virtual adj., but virtual predicate-acc.), since man was placed (שִׂים infin., therefore prop., since one has placed man) upon the earth (comp. the model passage, Deut. 4:32), that the exulting of the wicked is מִקָּרוֹב, from near, i.e., not extending far, enduring only a short time (Arab. qrîb often directly signifies brevis); and the joy of the godless עֲדֵי־רָגַע, only for a moment, and continuing no longer?

6 If his aspiration riseth to the heavens,
And he causeth his head to touch the clouds:
7 Like his dung he perisheth for ever;
Those who see him say: Where is he?
8 As a dream he flieth away, and they cannot find him;

And he is scared away as a vision of the night.

9 The eye hath seen him, and never again,
And his place beholdeth him no more.
10 His children must appease the poor,
And his hands give up his wealth.
11 His bones were full of youthful vigour;
Now it is laid down with him in the dust.

Job 20:6–11. If the exaltation of the evil-doer rises to heaven, and he causes his head to reach to the clouds, i.e., to touch the clouds, he notwithstanding perishes like his own dung. We are here reminded of what Obadiah, v. 4, says of Edom, and Isaiah, Is. 14:13–15, says of the king of Babylon. שִׂיא is equivalent to נָשִׂיא, like שׂוא, Ps. 89:10 = נָשׂוֹא; the first weak radical is cast away, as in כִּילַי = נָכִילַי, fraudulentus, machinator, Isa. 32:5, and according to Olsh. in שִׁיבָה = יְשִׁיבָה, 2 Sam. 19:33. הִגִּיעַ is to be understood as causative (at least this is the most natural) in the same manner as in Isa. 25:12, and freq. It is unnecessary, with Ew., Hirz., and Hlgst., after Schultens, to transl. כגלֹלו, v. 7a, according to the Arab. jlâl (whence the name Gelâl-ed-dîn): secundum majestatem suam, or with Reiske to read בגלֹלו, in magnificentia sua, and it is very hazardous, since the Hebrew גלל has not the meaning of Arab. jll, illustrem esse. Even Schultens, in his Commentary, has retracted the explanation commended in his Animadv., and maintained the correctness of the translation, sicut stercus suum (Jer. sicut sterquilinium), which is also favoured by the similar figurative words in 1 Kings 14:10: as one burneth up (not: brushes away) dung (הַגָּלָל), probably cow-dung as fuel, until it is completely gone. גֻּלֹּו (or גֻּלֹּו with an audible Shevâ) may be derived from גֻּלָּל, but the analogy of צְלֹלו favours the primary form גֻּל (Ew. § 255, b); on no account is it גֻּלָּל. The word is not low, as Ezek. 4:12, comp. Zeph. 1:17, shows, and the figure, though revolting, is still very expressive; and how the fulfilment is to be thought of may be seen from an example from 2 Kings 9:37, according to which, "as dung upon the face of the field shall it be, so that they cannot say: this is Jezebel."165

The continuation here, v. 7b, is just the same: they who saw him (partic. of what is past, Ges. § 134, 1) say: where is he? As a dream he flieth away, so that he is not found, and is scared away (יֻדַּד Hoph., not יִדַּד Kal) as a vision of the night (חִזְיֹון everywhere in the book of Job instead of חָזוֹן, from which it perhaps differs, as visum from visio), which one banishes on waking as a trick of his fancy (comp. Ps. 73:20, Isa. 29:7f.). Eyes looked upon him (שָׁזַף only in the book of Job in this signification of a fixed scorching look, cogn. שָׁדַף, adurere, as is manifest from Cant. 1:6), and do it no more; and his place (מְקוֹמו construed as fem., as Gen. 18:24, 2 Sam. 17:12, Cheth.) shall not henceforth regard him (שׁור, especially frequent in the book of Job, prop. to go about, cogn. תור, then to look about one). The futt. here everywhere describe what shall meet the evil-doer. Therefore Ewald's transl., "his fists smote down the weak," cannot be received. Moreover, חָפְנָיו, which must then be read instead of בָּנָיו, does not occur elsewhere in this athletic signification; and it is quite unnecessary to derive יְרַצּוּ from a רָצָה = רִצַּץ (to crush, to hurl to the ground), or to change it to וְיָרֹצּ (Schnurrer) or יְרַצְּצוּ (Olsh.); for although the thought, filios ejus vexabunt egeni (LXX according to the reading θλάσειαν and Targ. according to the reading יְרֵעֲעוּן), is not unsuitable for v. 10b, a sense more natural in connection with the position of בניו, and still more pleasing, is gained if רָצָה is taken in the usual signification: to conciliate, appease, as the Targ. according to the reading יְרַעוּן (Peschito-word for ἀποκαταλλάσσειν), and Ges., Vaih., Schlottm., and others, after Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Merc.: filii ejus placabunt tenues, quos scilicet eorum pater diripuerat, vel eo inopiae adigentur, ut pauperibus sese adjungere et ab illis inire gratiam cognantur. Its retributive relation to v. 19a is also retained by this rendering. The children of the unfeeling oppressor of the poor will be obliged, when the tyrant is dead, to conciliate the destitute; and his hands, by means of his children, will be obliged to give back his property, i.e., to those

whom his covetousness had brought to beggary (אוֹן, exertion, strength, Job 18:7, then as הוֹן, and synon. חַיִל, wealth, prob. from the radical meaning to breathe, which is differently applied in the Arabic aun, rest, and haun, lightness). Carey thinks that the description is retrospective: even he himself, in his lifetime, which, however, does not commend itself, since here it is throughout the deceased who is spoken of. As in v. 9, so now in v. 11 also, perf. and fut. interchange, the former of the past, the latter of the future. Jerome, by an amalgamation of two distinct radical significations, translates: ossa ejus implebuntur (it should be impleta erant) vitiis adolescentiae ejus, which is to be rejected, because עֲלוּם, Ps. 90:8, is indeed intended of secret sin, but signifies generally that which is secret (veiled). On the contrary, עֲלוּמִים, Job 33:25, certainly signifies adolescentia (Arab. gulûmat), and is accordingly, after LXX, Targ., and Syr., to be translated: his bones were full of youthful vigour. In v. 11b, תִּשְׁכַּב, as Job 14:19, can refer to the purely plural עַצְמוֹתָיו, but the predicate belonging to it would then be plur. in v. 11a, and sing. in v. 11b; on which account the reference to עֲלוּמָו, which is in itself far more suitable, is to be preferred (Hirz., Schlottm.): his youthful vigour, on which he relied, lies with him in the dust (of the grave).

12 If wickedness tasted sweet in his mouth,
He hid it under his tongue;
13 He carefully cherished it and did not let it go,
And retained it in his palate:
14 His bread is now changed in his bowels,
It is the gall of vipers within him.
15 He hath swallowed down riches and now he spitteth them out,
God shall drive them out of his belly.
16 He sucked in the poison of vipers,
The tongue of the adder slayeth him.

Job 20:12–16. The evil-doer is, in vv. 12f., likened to an epicure; he keeps hold of wickedness as long as possible, like a delicate morsel that is retained in the mouth (Renan: comme un bonbon qu'on laisse fondre dans la bouche), and seeks to enjoy it to the very last. הֶמְתִּיק, to make sweet, has here the intransitive signification dulcescere, Ew. § 122, c. הֶכְחִיד, to remove from sight, signifies elsewhere to destroy, here to conceal (as the Piel, Job 6:10, 15:18). חָמַל, to spare, is construed with עַל, which is usual with verbs of covering and protecting. The conclusion of the hypothetical antecedent clauses begins with v. 14; the perf. נֶהְפָּךְ (with Kametz by Athnach) describes the suddenness of the change; the מְרוֹרַת which follows is not equivalent to לְמָרוֹרת (Luther: His food shall be turned to adder's gall in his body), but v. 14b expresses the result of the change in a substantival clause. The bitter and poisonous are synonymous in the ancient languages; hence we find the meanings poison and gall (v. 25) in מָרָה, and רֹאשׁ signifies both a poisonous plant which is known by its bitterness, and the poison of plants like to the poison of serpents (v. 16; Deut. 32:33). חַיִל (v. 15) is property, without the accompanying notion of forcible acquisition (Hirz.), which, on the contrary, is indicated by the בָּלַע. The following fut. consec. is here not aor., but expressive of the inevitable result which the performance of an act assuredly brings: he must vomit back the property which he has swallowed down; God casts it out of his belly, i.e., (which is implied in הוֹרִישׁ, expellere) forcibly, and therefore as by the pains of colic. The LXX, according to whose taste the mention of God here was contrary to decorum, trans. ἐξ οἰκίας (read κοιλίας, according to Cod. Alex.) αὐτοῦ ἐξελκύσει αὐτὸν ἄγγελος (Theod. δυνάστης). The perf., v. 15a, is in v. 16a changed into the imperf. fut. יִינָק, which more strongly represents the past action as that which has gone before what is now described; and the ἀσυνδέτως, fut. which follows, describes the consequence which is necessarily and directly involved in it. Ps. 140:4 may be compared with v. 16a, Prov. 23:32 with 16b. He who sucked in the poison of low desire with a relish, will meet his punishment in that in which he sinned: he is destroyed by the poisonous deadly bite of the serpent, for the

punishment of sin is fundamentally nothing but the nature of sin itself brought fully out.

17 He shall not delight himself in streams,

Like to rivers and brooks of honey and cream.

18 Giving back that for which he laboured, he shall not swallow it;

He shall not rejoice according to the riches he hath gotten.

19 Because he cast down, let the destitute lie helpless;

He shall not, in case he hath seized a house, finish building it.

20 Because he knew no rest in his craving,

He shall not be able to rescue himself with what he most loveth.

Job 20:17–20. As poets sing of the aurea aetas of the paradise-like primeval age: Flumina jam lactis, jam flumina nectaris ibant, 166 and as the land of promise is called in the words of Jehovah in the Thora, "a land flowing with milk and honey," the puffed-up prosperity to which the evil-doer has attained by injustice is likened to streams (פַּלְגוֹת, prop. dividings, and indeed perhaps of a country = districts, Judg. 5:15f., or as here, of a fountain = streams) of rivers, of brooks (two gen. appositionis which are co-ordinate, of which Hupfeld thinks one must be crossed out; they, however, are not unpoetical, since, just as in Ps. 78:9, the flow of words is suspended, Ew. § 289, c) of honey and cream (comp. cream and oil, Job 29:6), if נחלי נהרי is not perhaps (which is more in accordance with the accentuation) intended as an explanatory permutative of בפלגות: he shall not feast himself upon streams, streamings of rivers of honey and cream (Dachselt); and by אַל־יֶרֶא (seq. Beth, to fasten one's gaze upon anything = feast one's self upon it), the prospect of enjoying this prosperity, and indeed, since the moral judgment and feeling are concerned in the affirmation of the fact (אַל, as Job 5:22, Ps. 41:3, Prov. 3:3, 25), the privilege of this prospect, is denied. This thought, that the enjoyment aimed at and anticipated shall not follow the attainment of this height of prosperity, is reiterated in a twofold form in v. 18.

Ver. 18a is not to be translated: He gives back that which he has gained without swallowing it down, which must have been יָשִׁיב; the syntactic relation is a different one: the Waw of וְלֹא is not expressive of detail; the detailing is implied in the partic., which is made prominent as an antecedent, as if it were: because, or since, he gives out again that which he has acquired (יָגֵעַ only here instead of יָגִיעַ, Job 10:3 and freq.), he has no pleasure in it, he shall or may not altogether swallow it down (Targ. incorrectly ולא־יגמר, after the Arabic blg, to penetrate, attain an object). The formation of the clause corresponds entirely with v. 18b. All attempts at interpretation which connect תְּמוּרָתוֹ כְּחֵיל with מֵשִׁיב, v. 18a, are to be objected to: (he gives it back again) as property of his restitution, i.e., property that is to be restored (Schlottm.), or the property of another (Hahn). Apart from the unsuitableness of the expression to the meaning found in it, it is contrary to the relative independence of the separate lines of the verse, which our poet almost always preserves, and is also opposed by the interposing of ולא יבלע. The explanation chosen by Schult., Oet., Umbr., Hirz., Renan, and others, after the Targ., is utterly impossible: as his possession, so his exchange (which is intended to mean: restitution, giving up); this, instead of כְּחֵיל, must have been not merely כְּחַיִל, but כְּחֵילוֹ. The designed relation of the members of the sentence is, without doubt, that תמורתו כחיל is a nearer defining of יעלס ולא, after the manner of an antecedent clause, and from which, that it may be emphatically introduced, it begins by means of Waw apod. (to which Schult. not unsuitably compares Jer. 6:19, 1 Kings 15:13). The following explanation is very suitable: according to the power, i.e., entire fulness of his exchange, but not in the sense of "to the full amount of its value" (Carey, as Rosenm.), connected with מֵשִׁיב, but connected with what follows: "how great soever his exchange (gain), still he does not rejoice" (Ew.). But it is not probable that חֵיל here signifies power = a great quantity, where property and possessions are

spoken of. The most natural rendering appears to me to be this: according to the relation of the property of his exchange (תמורה from מור, Syr. directly emere, cogn. מהר, מחר, and perhaps also מכר, here of exchange, barter, or even acquisition, as Job 15:31; comp. 28:17, of the means of exchange), i.e., of the property exchanged, bartered, gained by barter by him, he is not to enjoy, i.e., the rejoicing which might have been expected in connection with the greatness of the wealth he has amassed, departs from him.

Jerome is not the only expositor who (as though the Hebrew tenses were subject to no rule, and might mean everything) translates v. 19, domum rapuit et non aedificvit eam (equivalent to quam non aedificaverat). Even Hupfeld translates thus, by taking יבנהו ולא as imperfect = בֹּנָהוּ לֹא וְהוּא; but he, of course, fails to furnish a grammatical proof for the possibility of inferring a plusquamperfectum sense. It might sooner be explained: instead of building it (Lit. Centralblatt, 1853, Nr. 24). But according to the syntax, v. 19a must be an antecedent clause: because he crushed, left (therefore: crushed by himself) the destitute alone;167 and 19b the conclusion: he has pillaged a house, and will not build it, i.e., in case he has plundered a house, he will not build it up. For גָּזַל בַּיִת, according to the accents, which are here correct, is not to be translated: domus, quam rapuit, but hypothetically: si (ἐὰν) domum rapuit, to which יבנהו ולא is connected by Waw apod. (comp. Job 7:21b); and בָּנָה signifies here, as frequently, not: to build, but: to build round, build additions to, continue building (comp. 2 Chron. 11:5, 6; Ps. 89:3, 5). In v. 20 similar periodizing occurs: because he knew not שָׁלְוֹ (neutral = שַׁלְוָה, Prov. 17:1; Ew. § 293, c), contentment, rest, and sufficiency (comp. Isa. 59:8, שׁלום ידע לא) in his belly, i.e., his craving, which swallows up everything: he will not be able to deliver himself (מִלֵּט like פִּלֵּט, Job 23:7, as intensive of Kal: to escape, or also = נַפְשׁוֹ מִלֵּט, which Amos 2:25 seems to favour) with (בְּ as Job 19:20) his dearest treasure (thus e.g., Ewald), or: he will not be able to rescue his dearest object, prop. not to effect a rescue with his dearest object, the obj., as Job 16:4, 10, 31:12, conceived of as the instrument (vid., e.g., Schlottm.). The former explanation is more natural and simple. חֶמּוּד, that which is exceedingly desired (Ps. 39:12), of health and pleasantness; Isa. 44:9, of idols, as the cherished objects of their worshippers), is the dearest and most precious thing to which the sinner clung with all his soul, not, as Böttch. thinks, the soul itself.168

21 Nothing escaped his covetousness,

Therefore his prosperity shall not continue.

22 In the fulness of his need it shall be strait with him,

Every hand of the needy shall come upon him.

23 It shall come to pass: in order to fill his belly,

He sendeth forth the glow of His anger into him,

And He causeth it to rain upon him into his flesh.

24 He must flee from an iron weapon,

Therefore a brazen bow pierceth him through.

25 It teareth, then it cometh forth out of his body,

And the steel out of his gall,

The terrors of death come upon him.

Job 20:21–25. The words of v. 21a are: there was nothing that escaped (שָׂרִיד, as Job 18:19, from שָׂרַד, Arab. šarada, aufugere) his eating (from אָכַל, not from אֹכֶל), i.e., he devoured everything without sparing, even to the last remnant; therefore טוּבוֹ, his prosperity, his abundant wealth, will not continue or hold out (יָחִיל, as Ps. 10:5, to be solid, powerful, enduring, whence חַיִל, Arab. ḥîlat, ḥawl). Hupf. transl. differently: nihil ei superstes ad vescendum, itaque non durant ejus bona; but שׂריד signifies first elapsum, and על־כן propterea; and we may retain these first significations, especially since v. 21a is not future like 21b. The tone of prediction taken up in v. 21b is continued in what follows. The inf. constr. מְלֹאוֹת (prop. מָלְאוֹת, but with Cholem by the Aleph, since the Waw is

regarded as יתיר, superfluous), formed after the manner of the verbs Lamed He (Ew. 238, c), is written like קְרֹאוֹת, Judg. 8:1 (comp. on the other hand the scriptio devectiva, Lev. 8:33, 12:4); and שִׂפְקוֹ (with Sin, as Norzi decides after Codd., Kimchi, and Farisol, not Samech) is to be derived from שָׂפָק (סָפָק), sufficientia (comp. the verb, 1 Kings 20:10): if his sufficiency exists in abundance, not from שָׂפָק = Arab. safqat, ṣafqat, complosio, according to which Schultens explains: if his joyous clapping of hands has reached its highest point (Elizabeth Smith: "while clapping the hands in the fulness of joy"), to which מלאות is not suitable, and which ought at least to be כַּפָּיו שָׂפָק. Therefore: in the fulness of his need shall he be straitened (יֵצַר with the tone drawn back for יֵצַר on account of the following monosyllable, although also apocopated futt. follow further on in the strict future signification, according to poetic usage), by which not merely the fearful foreboding is meant, which just in the fullest overflow makes known his impending lot, but the real calamity, into which his towering prosperity suddenly changes, as v. 22b shows: All the hands of the destitute come upon him (בּוֹא seq. acc.: invadere) to avenge on him the injustice done to the needy. It is not necessary to understand merely such as he has made destitute, it is כָּל־יַד; the assertion is therefore general: the rich uncompassionate man becomes a defenceless prey of the proletaries.

Ver. 23. The יְהִי which opens this verse (and which also occurs elsewhere, e.g., Job 18:12, in a purely future signification), here, like וַיְהִי, 2 Sam. 5:24 (Ew. § 333, b), serves to introduce the following יְשַׁלַּח (it shall happen: He shall send forth); וַיְהִי (e.g., Gen. 40:1) frequent in the historical style, and וְהָיָה in the prophetical, are similarly used. In order to fill his belly, which is insatiable, God will send forth against him His glowing wrath (comp. Lam. 1:13, from on high hath He sent fire into my bones), and will rain upon him into his flesh, or his plumpness (Arab. fi lachmihi). Thus we believe בְּלֶחוּמוֹ must be understood by referring to Zeph. 1:17; where, perhaps not without reference to this speech of Zophar, the כַּגְּלָלִים, which serves to explain v. 7, coincides with וּלְחֻמָּם, which serves to explain this בלחומו; and the right meaning is not even missed by the LXX, which translates καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ὡς βόλβιτα.169 A suitable thought is obtained if לֶחוּם is taken in the signification, food: He will rain upon him his food, i.e., what is fit for him (with Beth of the instrument instead of the accusative of the object), or: He will rain down (His wrath) upon him as his food (with Beth essent., according to which Ew.: what can satisfy him; Bridel: pour son aliment; Renan: en guise de pain); but we give the preference to the other interpretation, because it is at once natural in this book, abounding in Arabisms, to suppose for לחום the signification of the Arab. laḥm, which is also supported in Hebrew by Zeph. 1:17; further, because the Targ. favours it, which transl. בְּשִׁלְדֵיהּ, and expositors, as Aben-Ezra and Ralbag, who interpret by בבשׂרו; finally, because it gives an appropriate idea, to which Lam. 1:13 presents a commendable parallel, comp. also James 5:3, and Koran, Sur. 2, 169: "those who hide what God has sent down by the Scripture, and thereby obtain a small profit, eat only fire into their belly." That עָלָיו can be used pathetically for עָלָיו is unmistakeably clear from Job 22:2, comp. 27:23, and on Ps. 11:7; the morally indignant speech which threatens punishment, intentionally seeks after rare solemn words and darksome tones. Therefore: Upon his flesh, which has been nourished in unsympathizing greediness, God rains down, i.e., rain of fire, which scorches it. This is the hidden background of the lot of punishment, the active principle of which, though it be effected by human agency, is the punitive power of the fire of divine wrath. Vv. 24f. describe, by illustration, how it is worked out. The evil-doer flees from a hostile superior power, is hit in the back by the enemy's arrows; and since he, one who is overthrown, seeks to get free from them, he is made to feel the terrors of inevitably approaching death.

Ver. 24. The two futt. may be arranged as in a conditional clause, like Ps. 91:7a, comp. Amos 9:2–4; and this is, as it seems, the mutual relation of the two expressions designed by the

poet (similar to Isa. 24:18): if he flee from the weapons of iron, i.e., the deadly weapon in the thick of the fight, he succumbs to that which is destructive by and by: the bow of brass (נְחוּשָׁה poet. for נְחֹשֶׁת, as Ps. 18:35, although it might also be an adj., since eth, as the Arab. qaws shows, is really a feminine termination) will pierce him through (fut. Kal of חָלַף, Arab. chlf, to press further and further, press after, here as in Judg. 5:26). The flight of the disheartened is a punishment which is completed by his being hit while fleeing by the arrow which the brazen bow sends with swift power after him. In v. 25 the Targ. reads מְגֵוֵה with He mappic., and translates: he (the enemy, or God) draws (stringit), and it (the sword) comes out of its sheath, which is to be rejected because גֵּו cannot signify vagina. Kimchi and most Jewish expositors interpret מְגֵוֵה by מְגוּפוֹ; the LXX also translates it σῶμα. To understand it according to גֵּו (back), of the hinder part of the body, gives no suitable sense, since the evil-doer is imagined as hit in the back, the arrow consequently passing out at the front;170 whereas the signification body is suitable, and is also made sufficiently certain by the cognate form גְּוִיָּה. The verb שָׁלַף, however, is used as in Judg. 3:22: he who is hit drawn the arrow out, then it comes out of his body, into which it is driven deep; and the glance, i.e., the metal head of the arrow (like לַהַב, Judg. 3:22, the point in distinction from the shaft), out of his gall (מְרֹרָה = מָרֹרָה, Job 16:13, so called from its bitterness, as χολή χόλος, comp. χλόοὸ χλωρός, from the green-yellow colour), since, as the Syriac version freely translates, his gall-bladder is burst.171 Is יַהֲלֹךְ, as a parallel word to וַיֵּצֵא, to be connected with ממררתו, or with what follows? The accentuation varies. The ordinary interpunction is וברק with Dechî, ממררתו Mercha, or more correctly Mercha-Zinnorith, יהלך Rebia mugrasch (according to which, Ew., Umbr., Vaih., Welte, Hahn, Schlottm., and Olsh. divide); ממררתו is, however, also found with Athnach. Although the latter mode of accentuation is only feebly supported, we nevertheless consider it as the more correct, for אֵמִים עָלָיו, in the mind of the poet, can hardly have formed a line of the verse. If, however, אמים עליו יהלך is now taken together, it is a matter for inquiry whether it is to be explained: he passes away, since terrors come upon him (Schult., Rosenm., Hirz., Von Gerl., Carey), or: terrors come upon him (LXX, Targ., Syr., Jer., Ramban). We consider the latter as the only correct interpretation; for if יהלך ought to be understood after Job 14:20, 16:22, the poet would have expressed himself ambiguously, since it is at least as natural to consider אמים as the subject of יהלך, as to take אמים עליו as an adverbial clause. The former, however, is both natural according to the syntax (vid., Ges. § 147, a) and suitable in matter: terrors (i.e., of certain death to him in a short time) draw on upon him, and accordingly we decide in its favour.

26 All darkness is reserved for his treasured things,

A fire that is not blown upon devoureth him;

It feedeth upon what is left in his tent.

27 The heavens reveal his iniquity,

And the earth riseth up against him.

28 The produce of his house must vanish,

Flowing away in the day of God's wrath.

…

29 This is the lot of the wicked man from Elohim,

And the heritage decreed for him from God.

Job 20:26–29. As in Ps. 17:14 God's store of earthly goods for the children of men is called צָפוּן (צָפִין), so here the stores laid up by man himself are called צְפוּנָיו. Total darkness, which will finally destroy them, is decreed by God against these stores of the godless, which are brought together not as coming from the hand of God, but covetously, and regardless of Him. Instead of טָמוּן it might also have been צָפוּן (Job 15:20, 21:19, 24:1), and instead of לִצְפוּנָיו also לִטְמוּנָיו (Deut. 33:19); but טָמוּן is, as Job 40:13 shows, better suited to darkness (on account of the ט, this dull-toned muta, with which the word begins). כָּל־חֹשֶׁךְ signifies sheer darkness, as in Ps. 39:6, כל־הבל, sheer nothingness; Ps.

45:14, כל־כבודה, sheer splendour; and perhaps Isa. 4:5, כל־כבוד, sheer glory. And the thought, expressed with somewhat of a play upon words, is, that to the θησαυρίζειν of the godless corresponds a θησαυρίζειν of God, the Judge (Rom. 2:5; James 5:3): the one gathers up treasures, and the other nothing but darkness, to whom at an appointed season they shall be surrendered. The תְּאָכְלֵהוּ which follows is regarded by Ges. as Piel instead of תְּאַכְּלֵהוּ, but such a resolving of the characteristic sharpened syllable of Piel is unsupportable; by Hirz., Olsh. § 250, b, and Pual instead of תְּאֻכְלֵהוּ, but אָכַל signifies to be eaten, not (so that it might be connected with an accusative of the obj.) to get to eat; by Ew., Hupf., as Kal for תֹּאכְלֵהוּ, which is possible both from the letters and the matter (vid., on Ps. 94:20); but more correctly it is regarded as Poel, for such Poel forms from strong roots do occur, as שׁשֵּׁט (vid., on Job 9:15), and that the Cholem of these forms can be shortened into Kametz-chatuph is seen from וְדָרְשׁוּ, Ps. 109:10 (vid., Psalter in loc.).172 The Poel is in the passage before us the intensive of Kal: a fire which is not blown upon shall eat him up. By this translation נָפַח is equivalent to נָפָחָה, since attention is given to the gender of אֵשׁ in the verb immediately connected with it, but it is left out of consideration in the verbs נפח and יֵרַע which stand further form it, which Olshausen thinks doubtful; there are, however, not a few examples which may be adduced in favour of it, as 1 Kings 19:11, Isa. 33:9; comp. Ges. § 147, rem. 1. Certainly the relative clause לא נפח may also be explained by supplying בָּהּ: into which one has not blown, or that one has not blown on (Symm., Theod., ἄνευ φυσήματος): both renderings are possible, according to Ezek. 22:20, 22; but since the masc. יֵרַע follows, having undoubtedly אשׁ as its subject, we can unhesitatingly take the Synallage gen. as beginning even with נפח. A fire which needs no human help for its kindling and its maintenance is intended (comp. on לֹא בָיַד, Job 34:20); therefore "fire of God," Job 1:16. This fire feasts upon what has escaped (שָׂרִיד, as v. 21, Job 18:19), i.e., whatever has escaped other fates, in his tent. יֵרַע (Milel) is fut. apoc. Kal; the form of writing יֵרָע (fut. apoc. Niph.) proposed by Olsh. on account of the change of gender, i.e., it is devoured, is to be rejected for the reason assigned in connection with נפח. The correct interpretation has been brought forward by Schultens.

It is not without reference to Job 16:18, 19, where Job has called upon earth and heaven as witnesses, that in v. 27 Zophar continues: "the heavens reveal his guilt, and the earth rises against him;" heaven and earth bear witness to his being an abhorrence, not worthy of being borne by the earth and shone upon by the light of heaven; they testify this, since their powers from below and above vie with one another to get rid of him. מְתָקוֹמָמָה is connected closely with לוֹ (which has Lamed raphatum) by means of Mercha-Zinnorith, and under the influence of the law, according to which before a monosyllabic accented word the tone is drawn back from the last syllable of the preceding word to the penultima (Ew. § 73, 3), is accented as Milel on account of the pause.173 In v. 28, Ges., Olsh., and others translate: the produce of his house, that which is swept together, must vanish away in the day of His wrath; נְגָרוֹת corrasae (opes), Niph. from גָּרַר. But first, the suff. is wanting to נגרות; and secondly, אַפּוֹ ומבּיּ has no natural connection in what precedes. The Niph. נגרות in the signification diffluentia, derived from נָגַר, to flow away (comp. Arab. jry, to flow), is incomparably better suited to the passage (comp. 2 Sam. 14:14, where Luther transl.: as water which glides away into the earth). The close of the description is similar to Isa. 17:11: "In the day that thou plantedst, thou causedst it to increase, and with the morning thy seed was in flower—a harvest-head in the day of deep wounding and deadly sorrow." So here everything that the evil-doer hoards up is spoken of as "vanishing in the day of God's wrath."

The speech now closes by summing up like Bildad's, Job 18:21: "This is the portion or inheritance of, i.e., the lot that is assigned or falls to, the wicked man (רָשָׁע אָדָם, a rare application of אדם, comp. Prov. 6:12, instead of

which אִישׁ is more usual) from Elohim, and this the heritage of his (i.e., concerning him) decree from God." אֵמֶר (אֹמֶר) with an objective suff., which also occurs elsewhere of the almighty word of command of God (vid., on Hab. 3:9), signifies here God's judicial arrangement or order, in this sense just as Arabic as Hebraic, for also in Arab. amr (plur. awâmir) signifies command and order.

The speech of Zophar, Job 20, is his ultimatum, for in the third course of the controversy he takes no part. We have already seen from his first speech, Job 11, that he is the most impassioned of the friends. His vehemence is now the less excusable, since Job in his previous speech has used the truly spiritual language of importunate entreaty and earnest warning in reply to the friends. The friends would now have done well if they had been silent, and still better if they had recognised in the sufferer the tried and buffeted servant of God, and had withdrawn their charges, which his innermost nature repudiates. But Zophar is not disposed to allow the reproach of the correction which they received to rest upon him; in him we have an illustration of the fact that a man is never more eloquent than when he has to defend his injured honour, but that he is also never more in danger of regarding the extravagant images of natural excitement as a higher inspiration, or, however, as striking justifications coming from the fulness of a superior perception. It has been rightly remarked, that in Zophar the poet described to us one of those hot-heads who pretend to fight for religion that is imperilled, while they are zealous for their own wounded vanity. Instead of being warned by Job's threat of judgment, he thrusts back his attempt at producing dismay be a similar attempt. He has nothing new to bring forward in reply to Job; the poet has skilfully understood how to turn the heart of his readers step by step from the friends, and in the same degree to gain its sympathy for Job. For they are completely spent in their one dogma; and while in Job an endless multitude of thoughts and feelings surge up one after another, their heart is as hermetically closed against every new perception and emotion. All that is new in the speech of Zophar, and in those of the friends generally, in this second course of the controversy, is, that they no longer try to lure Job on to penitence by promises, but endeavour to bring him to a right state of mind, or rather to weaken his supposedly-mad assault upon themselves, by presenting to him only the most terrible images. It is not possible to illustrate the principle that the covetous, uncompassionate rich man is torn away from his prosperity by the punishment God decrees for him, more fearfully and more graphically than Zophar does it; and this terrible description is not overdrawn, but true and appropriate,—but in opposition to Job it is the extreme of uncharitableness which outdoes itself: applied to him, the fearful truth becomes a fearful lie. For in Zophar's mind Job is the godless man, whose rejoicing does not last long, who indeed raises himself towards heaven, but as his own dung must he perish, and to whom the sin of his unjust gain is become as the poison of the viper in his belly. The arrow of God's wrath sticks fast in him; and though he draw it out, it has already inflicted on him a deservedly mortal wound! The fire of God which has already begun to consume his possessions, does not rest until even the last remnant in his tent is consumed. The heavens, where in his self-delusion he seeks the defender of his innocence, reveal his guilt, and the earth, which he hopes to have as a witness in his favour, rises up as his accuser. Thus mercilessly does Zophar seek to stifle the new trust which Job conceives towards God, to extinguish the faith which bursts upwards from beneath the ashes of the conflict. Zophar's method of treatment is soul-destroying; he seeks to slay that life which germinates from the feeling of death, instead of strengthening it. He does not, however, succeed; for so long as Job does not become doubtful of his innocence, the uncharitableness of the friends must be to him the thread by which he finds his way through the labyrinth of his sufferings to the God who loves him, although He seems to be angry with him.

JOB 21

Job's Third Answer.

[Then began Job, and said:]

2 Hear, oh hear, my speech,
And let this be instead of your consolations.
3 Suffer me, and I will speak,
And after I have spoken thou mayest mock.
4 As for me, then, doth my complaint concern man,
Or wherefore should I not become impatient?
5 Turn ye to me and be astonished,
And lay your hand upon your mouth.
6 Even if I think of it I am bewildered,
And my flesh taketh hold on trembling—:

Job 21:2–6. The friends, far from being able to solve the enigma of Job's affliction, do not once recognise the mystery as such. They cut the knot by wounding Job most deeply by ever more and more frivolous accusations. Therefore he entreats them to be at least willing to listen (שִׁמְעוּ with the gerund) to his utterance (מִלָּה) respecting the unsolved enigma; then (Waw apodosis imper.) shall this attention supply the place of their consolations, i.e., be comforting to him, which their previous supposed consolations could not be. They are to bear with him, i.e., without interruption allow him to answer for himself (שָׂאוּנִי with Kametz before the tone, as Jonah 1:12, comp. קָחֻהוּ, 1 Kings 20:33, not as Hirz. thinks under the influence of the distinctive accent, but according to the established rule, Ges. § 60, rem. 1); then he will speak (אנכי contrast to the "ye" in שׂאוני without further force), and after he has expressed himself they may mock. It is, however, not תַּלְעִיגוּ (as Olshausen corrects), but תַּלְעִיג (in a voluntative signific. = תַּלְעֵג), since Job here addresses himself specially to Zophar, the whole of whose last speech must have left the impression on him of a bitter sarcasm (σαρκασμός from σαρκάζειν in the sense of Job 19:22b), and has dealt him the freshest deep blow. In v. 4 שִׂיחִי is not to be understood otherwise than as in Job 7:13, 9:27, 10:1, 23:2, and is to be translated "my complaint." Then the prominently placed אֲנִכִי is to be taken, after Ezek. 33:17, Ges. § 121, 3, as an emphatic strengthening of the "my": he places his complaint in contrast with another. This emphasizing is not easily understood, if one, with Hupf., explains: nonne hominis est querela mea, so that הֲ is equivalent to הֲלֹא (which here in the double question is doubly doubtful), and לְ is the sign of the cause. Schultens and Berg, who translate לְאָדָם more humano, explain similarly, by again bringing their suspicious ל comparativum 174 here to bear upon it. The לְ by שׂיחי (if it may not also be compared with Job 12:8) may certainly be expected to denote those to whom the complaint is addressed. We translate: As for me, then, does my complaint concern men? The אנכי which is placed at the beginning of the sentence comes no less under the rule, Ges. § 145, 2, than § 121, 3. In general, sufferers seek to obtain alleviation of their sufferings by imploring by words and groans the pity of sympathizing men; the complaint, however, which the three hear from him is of a different kind, for he has long since given up the hope of human sympathy,—his complaint concerns not men, but God (comp. Job 16:20).175 He reminds them of this by asking further: or (וְאִם, as Job 8:3, 34:17, 40:9, not: and if it were so, as it is explained by Nolde contrary to the usage of the language) why (interrogative upon interrogative: an quare, as Ps. 94:9, הלא אם, an nonne) should not my spirit (disposition of mind, θυμός) be short, i.e., why should I not be short-tempered (comp. Judg. 10:16, Zech. 11:8, with Prov. 13:29) = impatient? Dürr, in his commentatio super voce רוּחַ, 1776, 4, explains the expression habito simul halitus, qui iratis brevis esse solet, respectu, but the signification breath is far from the nature of the language here; רוח signifies emotional excitement (comp. Job 15:13), either long restrained (with ארך), or not allowing itself to be restrained and breaking out after a short time (קצר). That which causes his vexation to burst forth is such that the three also, if they would attentively turn to him who thus openly expresses himself, will be astonished and lay

their hand on their mouth (comp. Job 29:9, 40:4), i.e., they must become dumb in recognition of the puzzle,—a puzzle insoluble to them, but which is nevertheless not to be denied. הִשְׁמוּ is found in Codd. and among grammarians both as Hiph. הָשַׁמּוּ hashammu (Kimchi) and as Hoph. הָשַׁמּוּ, or what is the same, הָשַׁמּוּ hŏshshammu (Abulwalid) with the sharpening of the first radical, which also occurs elsewhere in the Hoph. of this verb (Lev. 26:34f.) and of others (Olsh. § 259, b, 260). The pointing as Hiph. (הָשֵׁמּוּ for הָשַׁמּוּ) in the signification obstupescite is the better attested. Job himself has only to think of this mystery, and he is perplexed, and his flesh lays hold on terror. The expression is like Job 18:20. The emotion is conceived of as a want arising from the subject of it, which that which produces it must as of necessity satisfy.

In the following strophe the representation of that which thus excites terror begins. The divine government does not harmonize with, but contradicts, the law maintained by the friends.

7 Wherefore do the wicked live,

Become old, yea, become mighty in power?

8 Their posterity is established before them about them,

And their offspring before their eyes.

9 Their houses have peace without fear,

And the rod of Eloah cometh not upon them.

10 His (the evil-doer's) bull gendereth and faileth not;

His cow calveth easily, and casteth not her calf.

11 They let their little ones run about as a flock,

And their children jump about.

Job 21:7–11. The question in v. 7 is the same as that which Jeremiah also puts forth, Jer. 12:1–3. It is the antithesis of Zophar's thesis, Job 20:5, and seeks the reason of the fact established by experience which had also well-nigh proved the ruin of Asaph (Ps. 73: comp. Mal. 3:13–15), viz., that the ungodly, far from being overtaken by the punishment of their godlessness, continued in the enjoyment of life, that they attain to old age, and also a proportionately increasing power and wealth. The verb עָתַק, which in Job 14:18, 18:4 (comp. the Hiph. Job 9:5, 32:15), we read in the signification promoveri, has here, like the Arabic 'ataqa, 'atuqa, the signification to become old, aetate provehi; and חַיִל גָּבַר, to become strong in property, is a synonym of יִלֹּחַ הִשְׂגָּה, to acquire constantly increasing possessions, used in a similar connection in Ps. 73:12. The first feature in the picture of the prosperity of the wicked, which the pang of being bereft of his own children brings home to Job, is that they are spared the same kind of loss: their posterity is established (נָכוֹן, constitutus, elsewhere standing in readiness, Job 12:5, 15:23, 18:12, here standing firm, as e.g., Ps. 93:2) in their sight about them (so that they have to mourn neither their loss by death nor by separation from their home), and their offspring (צֶאֱצָאִים, a word common only to the undisputed as well as to the disputed prophecies of Isaiah and the book of Job) before their eyes; נכון must be carried over to v. 8b as predicate: they are, without any loss, before their eyes. The description passes over from the children, the corner-stones of the house (vid., Ges. Thes., s.v. בנה), to the houses themselves. It is just as questionable here as in Job 5:24, Isa. 41:3, and elsewhere, whether שָׁלוֹם is a subst. (= בשׁלום) or an adj.; the substantival rendering is at least equally admissible in such an elevated poetic speech, and the plur. subject בָּתֵּיהֶם, which, if the predicate were intended to be taken as an adj., leads one to expect שׁלומים, decides in its favour. On מִפַּחַד, without (far from) terrifying misfortune, as Isa. 22:3, מקשׁת, without a bow, vid., on Job 19:26. That which is expressed in v. 9a, according to external appearance, is in v. 9b referred to the final cause; Eloah's בֶּטֶשׁ, rod, with which He smites in punishment (Job 9:34, 37:13, comp. Isa. 10:24–26, where שׁוֹט, scourge, interchanges with it), is not over them, i.e., threatens and smites them not.

Ver. 10 comes specially to the state of the cattle, after the state of the household in general has been treated of. Since שׁוֹרוֹ and פָּרָתוֹ are interchangeable, and are construed according to their genus, the former undoubtedly is intended of the male, not also ἐπικοίνως of the female (LXX ἡ βοῦς, Jerome, Saadia), as Rosenm., after Bochart, believes it must be taken, because עבר is never said de mare feminam ineunte, but always de femina quae concipit. In reality, however, it is with עבר otherwise than with עדה, whose Pael and Aphel certainly signify concipere (prop. transmittere sc. semen in a passive sense). On the other hand, עבר, even in Kal, signifies to be impregnated (whence עֹבֶר, the embryo, and the biblical אָבוּר, like the extra-biblical עִבּוּר, the produce of the land), the Pael consequently to impregnate, whence מְעַבְּרָא (from the part. pass. מְעֻבָּר) impregnated (pregnant), the Ithpa. to be impregnated, as Rabb. Pual מְעֻבֶּרֶת, impregnated (by which עֻבָּרָה also signifies pregnant, which would be hardly possible if עבר in this sexual sense were not radically distinct from עבר, περ-ᾶν). Accordingly the Targ. translates עִבַּר by מבטין (impraegnans), and Gecatilia translates שׁורו by Arab. fḥlhm (admissarius eorum), after which nearly all Jewish expositors explain. This explanation also suits יַגְעִיל לֹא, which LXX translates οὐκ ὠμοτόκησε (Jer. non abortivit), Symm. in a like sense οὐκ ἐξέτρωσε, Aq. οὐκ ἐξέβαλε, Saad. la julziq. The reference of שׁורו to the female animal everywhere assumed is incorrect; on the contrary, the bullock kept for breeding is the subject; but proceeding from this, that which is affirmed is certainly referred to the female animal. For גָּעַל signifies to cast out, cast away; the Hiph. therefore: to cause to cast out; Rabb. in the specified signification: so to heat what has sucked in that which is unclean, that it gives it back or lets it go (לפלוט הבלוע). Accordingly Raschi explains: "he injects not useless seed into her, which might come back and be again separated (נפלט) from her inward part, without impregnation taking place." What therefore עִבַּר says positively, ולא יגעיל says negatively: neque efficit ut ejiciat. 176 It is then further, in v. 9b, said of the female animal which has been impregnated that she does not allow it to glide away, i.e., the fruit, therefore that she brings forth (פִּלֵּט as מָלַט, הִמְלִיט), and that she does not cause or suffer any untimely birth.

At the end of the strophe, v. 11, the poet with delicate tact makes the sufferer, who is become childless, return to the joy of the wicked in the abundance of children. שְׁלֵחַ signifies here, as Isa. 32:20, to allow freedom for motion and exercise. On עֲוִיל, vid., on Job 16:11, 19:18. It has a similar root (Arab. 'âl, alere) to the Arab. 'ajjil (collect. 'ijâl), servants, but not a similar meaning. The subj. to v. 12 are not the children, but the "wicked" themselves, the happy fathers of the flocks of children that are let loose.

12 They raise their voice with the playing of timbrel and harp,

And rejoice at the sound of the pipe.

13 They enjoy their days in prosperity,

And in a moment they go down to Sehôl.

14 And yet they said to God: "Depart from us!

We desire not the knowledge of Thy ways.

15 What is the Almighty, that we should serve Him?

And what doth it profit us that we should importune Him?"—

16 Lo! they have not their prosperity by their own hand,

The thought of the wicked be far from me!

Job 21:12–16. קוֹלָם is to be supplied to יִשָּׂאוּ, as in Isa. 42:11; and instead of בְּתֹף with בְּ of the musical accompaniment (as Ps. 4:1, 49:5), it is to be read כְּתֹף after the Masora with Kimchi, Ramban, Ralbag, and Farisol,177 but not with Rosenm. to be explained: personant velut tympano et cythera, but: they raise their voice as the timbrel and harp sound forth simultaneously; כְּ as Isa. 18:4 (which is to be transl.: during the clear warmth of the sunshine, during the dew-clouds in the heat of harvest). תֹּף (Arabic duff, Spanish adufe) is τύμπανον᾽τύπανον), כִּנּוֹר (Arab. canâre) κινύρα or κιθάρα) Dan. 3:5), עוּגָב or עֻגָב, Job 30:31 (from עָגַב, flare; vid., on Gen. 4:21), the Pan-pipe

(Targ. from a similar root אַבּוּבָא, whence the name of the ambubajae). In v. 13a and Keri gives the more usual יְכַלּוּ (Job 36:11) in place of the Chethib יְבַלּוּ, though יְבַלּוּ occurs in Isa. 65:22 without this Keri; יכלו signifies consument, and יבלו usu deterent: they use up their life, enjoy it to the last drop. In connection with this one thinks of a coat which is not laid aside until it is entirely worn out. It is therefore not, as the friends say, that the ungodly is swept away before his time (Job 15:32), also a lingering sickness does not hand him over to death (Job 18:13f.), but בְּרֶגַע, in a moment (comp. Job 34:20, not: in rest, i.e., freedom from pain, which רֶגַע never signifies), they sink down to Hades (acc. loci). The matter does not admit of one's deriving the fut. יֵחַתּוּ here, as Job 39:22, 31:34, from the Niph. of the verb חָתַת, terrore percelli; it is to be referred to נָחַת or תָּנָחַ (Aram. for יָרַד), which is the only certain example of a Hebrew verb Pe Nun ending with ת, whose fut. יִנְחַת, Ps. 38:3, also יֵחַת (Prov. 17:10; Jer. 21:13), instead of יִחַת, and in the inflexion its ת (after the analogy of יְצַתּוּ, Isa. 33:12) is doubled; as an exception (vid., Psalter, ii. 468), the lengthening of the short vowel (יֵחָתּוּ, Olsh. § 83 b) by Silluk does not take place, as e.g., by Athnach, Job 34:5.

The fut. consec. וַיֹּאמְרוּ, in which v. 14 is continued, does not here denote temporally that which follows upon and from something else, but generally that which is inwardly connected with something else, and even with that which is contradictory, and still occurring at the same time, exactly as Gen. 19:9, 2 Sam. 3:8, comp. Ew. § 231, b: they sink down after a life that is completely consumed away, without a death-struggle, into Hades, and yet they denied God, would not concern themselves about His sways (comp. the similar passage, Isa. 58:2), and accounted the service of God and prayer (בְּ פָּגַע, precibus adire) as useless. The words of the ungodly extend to v. 15b; according to Hirz., Hlgst., Welte, and Hahn, v. 16a resumes the description: behold, is not their prosperity in their hand? i.e., is it not at their free disposal? or: do they not everywhere carry it away with them? But v. 16b is not favourable to this interrogative rendering of לֹא (= הֲלֹא). Schlottm. explains more correctly: behold, their prosperity is not in their power; but by taking not only v. 16a (like Schnurrer), but the whole of v. 16, as an utterance of an opponent, which is indeed impossible, because the declining of all fellowship with the godless would be entirely without aim in the mouth of the opponent. For it is not the friends who draw the picture of the lot of the punishment of the godless with the most terrible lines possible, who suggest the appearance of looking wishfully towards the godless, but Job, who paints the prosperity of the godless in such brilliant colours. On the other hand, both sides are agreed in referring prosperity and misfortune to God as final cause. And for this very reason Job thinks that אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים בֵּרַךְ, which he makes the godless, in vv. 14, 15, express in their own words, so horrible.

Ver. 16a is therefore to be taken as Job's judgment, and 16b as the moral effect which it produces upon him. הֵן introduces the true relation of things; טוּבָם signifies, as Job 20:21, their prosperity; and בְיָדָם לֹא (the emphatic position of בידם is to be observed) that this is not in their hand, i.e., arbitrary power, or perhaps better: that it is not by their own hand, i.e., that it is not their own work, but a gift from above, the gift even of the God whom they so shamelessly deny. That God grants them such great and lasting prosperity, is just the mystery which Job is not able to bring forth to view, without, however, his abhorrence of this denying of God being in the slightest degree lessened thereby. Not by their own hand, says he, do they possess such prosperity—the counsel (עֲצַת, similar to Job 5:13, 10:3, 18:7: design, principle, and general disposition, or way of thinking) of the wicked be far from me; i.e., be it far from me that so I should speak according to their way of thinking, with which, on the contrary, I disavow all fellowship. The relation of the clauses is exactly like Job 22:18, where this formula of detestation is repeated. רָחֲקָה is, according to the meaning, optative or precative (EW. § 223, b, and Ges. § 126, 4*), which Hahn and Schlottm. think impossible,

without assigning any reason. It is the perf. of certainty, which expresses that which is wished as a fact, but with an emotional exclamative accent. In ancient Arabic it is a rule to use the perf. as optative; and also still in modern Arabic (which often makes use of the fut. instead of the perf.), they say e.g., la cân, i.e., he must never have been! The more detestable the conduct of the prosperous towards Him to whom they owe their prosperity is, the sooner, one would think, the justice of God would be called forth to recompense them according to their deeds; but—

17 How rarely is the light of the wicked put out,
And their calamity breaketh in upon them,
That He distributeth snares in his wrath,
18 That they become as straw before the wind,
And as chaff which the storm sweepeth away!?
19 "Eloah layeth up his iniquity for his children!"
May He recompense it to him that he may feel it.
20 May his own eyes see his ruin,
And let him drink of the glowing wrath of the Almighty.
21 For what careth he for his house after him,
When the number of his months is cut off?

Job 21:17–21. The interrogative כַּמָּה has here the same signification as in Ps. 78:40: how often (comp. Job 7:19, how long? 13:23, how many?), but in the sense of "how seldom?!" How seldom does what the friends preach to him come to pass, that the lamp of the wicked is put out (thus Bildad, Job 13:5f.), and their misfortune breaks in upon them (יָבֹא, ingruit; thus Bildad, Job 18:12: misfortune, אֵיד, prop. pressure of suffering, stands ready for his fall), that He distributes (comp. Zophar's "this is the portion of the wicked man," i.e., what is allotted to him, Job 20:29) snares in His wrath. Hirz., Ew., Schlottm., and others, translate חֲבָלִים, after the precedent of the Targ. (עֲדָבִין, sortes), "lots," since they understand it, after Ps. 16:6, of visitations of punishment allotted, and as it were measured out with a measuring-line; but that passage is to be translated, "the measuring-lines have fallen to me in pleasant places," and indeed חֶבֶל can signify the land that is allotted to one (Josh. 17:14, comp. 5); but the plural does not occur in that tropical sense, and if it were so intended here, חַבְלֵיהֶם or לָהֶם חֲבָלִים might at least be expected. Rosenm., Ges., Vaih., and Carey transl. with LXX and Jer. (ὠδῖνες, dolores) "pains," but חבלים is the peculiar word for the writhings of those in travail (Job 39:3), which is not suited here. Schnurr. and Umbr. are nearer to the correct interpretation when they understand חבלים like פחים, Ps. 11:6, of lightning, as it were fiery strings cast down from above. If we call to mind in how many ways Bildad, Job 18:8–10, has represented the end of the godless as a divinely decreed seizure, it is certainly the most natural, with Stick. and Hahn, to translate (as if it were Arabic ḥabâ'ilin) "snares," to be understood after the idea, however, not of lightning, but generally of ensnaring destinies (e.g., עֲנִי חַבְלִי, Job 36:8).

Both v. 17 with its three members and v. 18 with two, are under the control of כמה. The figure of straw, or rather chopped straw (Arab. tibn, tabn), occurs only here. The figure of chaff is more frequent, e.g., Ps. 1:4. Job here puts in the form of a question what Ps. 1 maintains, being urged on by Zophar's false application and superficial comprehension of the truth expressed in the opening of the Psalter. What next follows in v. 19a is an objection of the friends in vindication of their thesis, which he anticipates and answers; perhaps the clause is to be spoken with an interrogative accent: Eloah will—so ye object—reserve his evil for his children? אוֹנוֹ, not from אוֹן, strength, wealth, as Job 18:7, 12, 20:10, 40:16, but from אָוֶן, wickedness (Job 11:11) and evil (Job 15:35), here (without making it clear which) of wickedness punishing itself by calamity, or of calamity which must come forth from the wickedness as a moral necessity [comp. on Job 15:31]. That this is really the opinion of the friends: God punishes the guilt of the godless, if not in himself, at least in his children, is seen

from Job 20:10, 5:4. Job as little as Ezekiel, Ezek. 18, disputes the doctrine of retribution in itself, but that imperfect apprehension, which, in order that the necessary satisfaction may be rendered to divine justice, maintains a transfer of the punishment which is opposed to the very nature of personality and freedom: may He recompense him himself, וְיֵדָע, that he may feel it, i.e., repent (which would be in Arab. in a similar sense, faja'lamu; יָדַע as Isa. 9:8, Hos. 9:7, Ezek. 25:14).

Ver. 20 continues in the same jussive forms; the ἅπ. γεγρ. כִּיד signifies destruction (prop. a thrust, blow), in which sense the Arab. caid (commonly: cunning) is also sometimes used. The primary signification of the root כד, Arab. kd, is to strike, push; from this, in the stems Arab. kâd, med. Wau and med. Je, Arab. kdd, kdkd, the most diversified turns and applications are developed; from it the signif. of כִּידוֹד, Job 41:11, כִּידוֹן, 39:23, and according to Fleischer (vid., supra, pp. 388) also of כִּידוֹר, are explained. V. 20b, as Ps. 60:5, Obad. 16, refers to the figure of the cup of the wrath of God which is worked out by Asaph, Ps. 75:9, and then by the prophets, and by the apocalyptic seer in the New Testament. The emphasis lies on the signs of the person in עֵינָו (עֵינָיו) and יִשְׁתֶּה. The rather may his own eyes see his ruin, may he himself have to drink of the divine wrath; for what is his interest (what interest has he) in his house after him? מה puts a question with a negative meaning (hence Arab. mâ is directly used as non); חֶפְצוֹ, prop. inclination, corresponds exactly to the word "interest" (quid ejus interest), as Job 22:3, comp. Isa. 58:3, 13 (following his own interest), without being weakened to the signification, affair, πραγμα, a meaning which does not occur in our poet or in Isaiah. V. 21b is added as a circumstantial clause to the question in 21a: while the number of his own months …, and the predicate, as in Job 15:20 (which see), is in the plur. per attractionem. Schnurr., Hirz., Umbr., and others explain: if the number of his months is drawn by lot, i.e., is run out; but חָצַץ as v. denom. from חֵץ, in the signification to shake up arrows as sticks for drawing lots (Arab. sahm, an arrow and a lot, just so Persian tîr) in the helmet or elsewhere (comp. Ezek. 21:26), is foreign to the usage of the Hebrew language (for מחצצים, Judg. 5:11, signifies not those drawing lots, but the archers); besides, חִצַּץ (pass. חֻצַּץ) would signify "to draw lots," not "to dispose of by lot," and "disposed of by lot" is an awkward metaphor for "run out." Cocceius also gives the choice of returning to חָצָץ, ψῆφος, in connection with this derivation: calculati sive ad calculum, i.e., pleno numero egressi, which has still less ground. Better Ges., Ew., and others: if the number of his months is distributed, i.e., to him, so that he (this is the meaning according to Ew.) can at least enjoy his prosperity undisturbed within the limit of life appointed to him. By this interpretation one misses the לוֹ which is wanting, and an interpretation which does not require it to be supplied is therefore to be preferred. All the divers significations of the verbs חָצַץ (to divide, whence Prov. 30:27, חֹצֵץ, forming divisions, i.e., in rank and file, denom. to shoot with the arrow, Talm. to distribute, to halve, to form a partition), חָצָה (to divide, Job 40:30; to divide in two equal parts), Arab. ḥṣṣ (to divide, whence Arab. ḥṣṣah, portio), and Arab. chṣṣ (to separate, particularize)—to which, however, Arab. chṭṭ (to draw, write), which Ew. compares here, does not belong—are referable to the primary signification scindere, to cut through, split (whence חֵץ, an arrow, LXX 1 Sam. 20:20, σχίζα); accordingly the present passage is to be explained: when the number of his months is cut off (Hlgst., Hahn), or cut through, i.e., when a bound is set to the course of his life at which it ends (comp. בְּצֵעַ, of the cutting off of the thread of life, Job 6:9, 27:8, Arab. ṣrm). Ch. 14:21f., Eccles. 3:22, are parallels to v. 21. Death is the end of all clear thought and perception. If therefore the godless receives the reward of his deeds, he should receive it not in his children, but in his own body during life. But this is the very thing that is too frequently found to be wanting.

22 Shall one teach God knowledge,
Who judgeth those who are in heaven?

23 One dieth in his full strength,

Being still cheerful and free from care.

24 His troughs are full of milk,
And the marrow of his bones is well watered.

25 And another dieth with a sorrowing spirit,
And hath not enjoyed wealth.

26 They lie beside one another in the dust,
And worms cover them both.

Job 21:22–26. The question, v. 22, concerns the friends. Since they maintain that necessarily and constantly virtue is rewarded by prosperity, and sin by misfortune, but without this law of the divine order of the world which is maintained by them being supported by experience: if they set themselves up as teachers of God, they will teach Him the right understanding of the conduct which is to be followed by Him as a ruler and judge of men, while nevertheless He is the Absolute One, beneath whose judicial rule not merely man, but also the heavenly spirits, are placed, and to which they must conform and bow. The verb לִמֵּד, instead of being construed with two acc., as in the dependent passage Isa. 40:14, is here construed with the dat. of the person (which is not to be judged according to Job 5:2, 19:3, but according to διδάσκειν τινί τι, to teach one anything, beside the other prevailing construction). With והוא a circumstantial clause begins regularly: while He, however, etc. Arnh. and Löwenth. translate: while, however, He exaltedly judges, i.e., according to a law that infinitely transcends man; but that must have been מָרוֹם (and even thus it would still be liable to be misunderstood). Hahn (whom Olsh. is inclined to support): but He will judge the proud, to which first the circumstantial clause, and secondly the parallels, Job 35:2, 15:15, 4:18 (comp. Isa. 24:21), from which it is evident that רָמִים signifies the heavenly beings (as Ps. 78:69, the heights of heaven), are opposed: it is a fundamental thought of this book, which abounds in allusions to the angels, that the angels, although exalted above men, are nevertheless in contrast with God imperfect, and therefore are removed neither from the possibility of sin nor the necessity of a government which holds them together in unity, and exercises a judicial authority over them. The rule of the all-exalted Judge is different from that which the three presumptuously prescribe to Him.

The one (viz., the evil-doer) dies תָּמוֹ בְּעֶצֶם, in ipsa sua integritate, like היום בעצם, ipso illo die; the Arabic would be fî ʻyn, since there the eye, here the bone (comp. Uhlemann, Syr. Gramm. § 58), denote corporeality, duration, existence, and therefore identity. תּם is intended of perfect external health, as elsewhere מָתֹם; comp. מִיתָּמִי, Prov. 1:12. In v. 23b the pointing שַׁלְאֲנָן (adj.) and שַׁלְאֲנַן (3 praet.) are interchanged in the Codd.; the following verbal adjective favours the form of writing with Kametz. As to the form, however (which Röd. and Olsh. consider to be an error in writing), it is either a mixed form from שׁאנן and שׁלו with the blended meaning of both (Ew. § 106, c), to which the comparison with שָׁלֵיו (= שָׁלֵו) is not altogether suitable, or it is formed from שׁאנן by means of an epenthesis (as זלעף from זעף, aestuare, and בלסם, βάλσαμον, from בשׂם), and of similar but intensified signification; we prefer the latter, without however denying the real existence of such mixed forms (vid., on Job 26:9, 33:25). This fulness of health and prosperity is depicted in v. 24. The ancient translators think, because the bones are mentioned in the parallel line, עֲטִינָיו must also be understood of a part of the body: LXX ἔγκατα, Jer. viscera; Targ. בִּיזוֹי, his breasts, βυζία178 (for Hebr. שַׁדַּיִם, שַׁד); Syr. version gabauh (= ganbauh), his sides in regard to עִטְמָא, Syr. ʼattmo = אַטְמָא, side, hip; Saad. audâguhu, his jugular veins, in connection with which (not, however, by this last rendering) חֵלֶב is read instead of חָלָב: his bowels, etc., are full of fat.179 But the assumption that עטיניו must be a part of the body is without satisfactory ground (comp. against it e.g., Job 20:17, and for it 20:11); and Schlottm. very correctly observes, that in the contrast in connection with the representation of the well-watered marrow one expects a reference to a rich nutritious drink. To this expectation corresponds the translation: “his resting-places (i.e., of his flocks) are full of

milk," after the Arab. ʾaṭan or maʾṭin. which was not first compared by Schultens and Reiske (epaulia), but even by Abul-walid, Aben-Ezra, and others.

But since the reference of what was intended to be said of the cattle at the watering-places to the places where the water is, possesses no poetic beauty, and the Hebrew language furnished the poet with an abundance of other words for pastures and meadows, it is from the first more probable that עטיניו are large troughs,—like Talm. מַעֲטָן, a trough, in which the unripe olives were laid in order that they might become tender and give forth oil, that they may then be ready for the oil-press (בַּד), and עָטָן denotes this laying in itself,—and indeed either milk-tubs or milk-pails (לתוכן שׁחולבין), or with Kimchi (who rightly characterizes this as more in accordance with the prosperous condition which is intended to be described), the troughs for the store of milk, which also accords better with the meaning of the verb עטן, Arab. ʾaṭana, to lay in, confire. 180 From the abundance of nutriment in v. 24a, the description passes over in 24b to the well-nourished condition of the rich man himself in consequence of this abundance. מֹחַ (Arab. muchch, or even nuchch, as מֹחַ = נֹחַ, naurag = מוֹרַג) is the marrow in the bones, e.g., the spinal marrow, but also the brain as the marrow of the head (Psychol. S. 233). The bones (Prov. 3:8), or as it is here more exactly expressed, their marrow, is watered, when the body is inwardly filled with vigour, strength, and health; Isaiah, Is. 58:11, fills up the picture more (as a well-watered garden), and carries it still further in Is. 66:14 (thy bones shall blossom like a tender herb). The counterpart now follows with וְזֶה (and the other, like Job 1:16). The other (viz., the righteous) dies with a sorrowful soul (comp. Job's lament, Job 7:11, 10:1), i.e., one which is called to experience the bitterness of a suffering life; he dies and has not enjoyed בַּטּוֹבָה, any of the wealth (with partitive Beth, as Ps. 141:4, comp. supra, Job 7:13), has had no portion in the enjoyment of it (comp. Job's lament, Job 9:25). In death they are then both, unrighteous and righteous, alike, as the Preacher said: מקרה אחד comes upon the wise as upon the fool, Eccles. 2:15, comp. 9:2f. They lie together in the dust, i.e., the dust of the grave (vid., on Job 19:25), and worms cover them. What then is become of the law of retribution in the present world, which the friends maintained with such rigid pertinacity, and so regardless of the deep wound they were inflicting on Job?

27 Behold I know your thoughts

And the stratagems, with which ye overpower me!

28 When ye say: Where is the house of the tyrant,

And where the pavilions of the wicked—:

29 Have ye not asked those who travel,

Their memorable things ye could surely not disown:

30 That the wicked was spared in the day of calamity,

In the day of the outburst of wrath they were led away.

31 Who liketh to declare to him his way to his face?

And hath he done aught, who will recompense it to him?

Job 21:27–31. Their thoughts which he sees through, are their secret thoughts that he is such an evil-doer reaping the reward of his deeds. מְזִמּוֹת (which occurs both of right measures, good wise designs, Prov. 5:2, 8:12, and of artful devices, malicious intrigues, Prov. 12:2, 14:17, comp. the definition of מְזִמּוֹת בַּעַל, Prov. 24:8) is the name he gives to the delicately developed reasoning with which they attack him; חָמַס (comp. Arab. taḥammasa, to act harshly, violently, and overbearingly) is construed with עַל in the sense of forcing, apart from the idea of overcoming. In v. 28, which is the antecedent to v. 29, beginning with כִּי תֹאמְרוּ (as Job 19:28), he refers to words of the friends like Job 8:22, 15:34, 18:15, 21. נָדִיב is prop. the noble man, whose heart impels (נָדַב, Arab. nadaba) him to what is good, or who is ready and willing, and does spontaneously that which is good (Arab. naduba), vid., Psychol. S. 165;

then, however, since the notion takes the reverse way of generosus, the noble man (princely) by birth and station, with which the secondary notion of pride and abuse of power, therefore of a despot or tyrant, is easily as here (parall. רִשָּׁעִים, comp. עָשִׁיר, Isa. 53:9, with the same word in the parallel) combined (just so in Isa. 13:2, and similarly at least above, Job 12:21, —an anomaly of name and conduct, which will be for the future put aside, according to Isa. 32:5). It is not admissible to understand the double question as antithetical, with Wolfson, after Prov. 14:11; for the interrogative אַיֵּה is not appropriate to the house of the נדיב, in the proper sense of the word. V. 28, מִשְׁכְּנוֹת is not an externally but internally multiplying plur.; perhaps the poet by בית intends a palace in the city, and by נותמִשְׁכַּן אהל a tent among the wandering tribes, rendered prominent by its spaciousness and the splendour of the establishment.181 Job thinks the friends reason a priori since they inquire thus; the permanent fact of experience is quite different, as they can learn from דֶּרֶךְ עֹבְרֵי, travellers, i.e., here: people who have travelled much, and therefore are well acquainted with the stories of human destinies. The Piel נִכַּר, proceeding from the radical meaning to gaze fixedly, is an ἐναντιόσημον, since it signifies both to have regard to, Job 34:19, and to disown, Deut. 32:27; here it is to be translated: their אֹתֹת ye cannot nevertheless deny, ignore (as Arab. nakira and ankara). אֹתֹת are tokens, here: remarkable things, and indeed the remarkable histories related by them; Arab. âyatun (collective plur. âyun), signs, is also similarly used in the signification of Arab. 'ibrat, example, historical teaching.

That the כִּי, v. 30, as in v. 28, introduces the view of the friends, and is the antecedent clause to v. 31: quod (si) vos dicitis, in tempora cladis per iram divinam immissae servari et nescium futuri velut pecudem eo deduci improbum (Böttcher, de fin. § 76), has in the double לְ an apparent support, which is not to be denied, especially in regard to Job 38:23; it is, however, on account of the omission of the indispensable תאמרו in this instance, an explanation which does violence to the words. The כִּי, on the contrary, introduces that which the accounts of the travellers affirm. Further, the ל in לְיוֹם indicates here not the terminus ad quem, but as in לערב, in the evening, the terminus quo. And the verb חָשַׂךְ, cohibere, signifies here to hold back from danger, as Job 33:18, therefore to preserve uninjured. Ew. translates v. 30b erroneously: "in the day when the floods of wrath come on." How tame would this הוּבַל, "to be led near," be! This Hoph. signifies elsewhere to be brought and conducted, and occurs in v. 32, as in Isa. 55:12 and elsewhere, of an honourable escort; here, in accordance with the connection: to be led away out of the danger (somewhat as Lot and his family by the escort of angels). At the time, when streams of wrath (עֶבְרָה, the overflowing of vexation = outburst of wrath, like the Arab. 'abrt, the overflowing of the eye = tears) go forth, they remain untouched: they escape them, as being under a special, higher protection.182 V. 31 is commonly taken as a reflection on the exemption of the evil-doer: God's mode of action is exalted above all human scrutiny, although it is not reconcilable with the idea of justice, Job 9:12, 23:13. But the יְשַׁלֶּם־לוֹ מִי, who will recompense it to him, which, used of man in relation to God, has no suitable meaning, and must therefore mean: who, after God has left the evil-doer unpunished—for which, however, עָשָׂה הוּא would be an unsuitable expression—shall recompense him, the evil-doer? is opposed to it. Therefore, against Ew., Hirz., and Hlgst., it must with most expositors be supposed that v. 31 is a reflection referable not to God, but to the evil-doer: so powerful is the wicked generally, that no one can oppose his pernicious doings and call him to account for them, much less that any one would venture to repay him according to his desert when he has brought anything to a completion (עָשָׂה הוּא, intentionally thus seriously expressed, as elsewhere of God, e.g., Isa. 38:15). In the next strophe, that which is gathered from the accounts of travellers is continued, and is then followed by a declamatory summing up.

32 And he is brought to the grave,

And over the tomb he still keepeth watch.
33 The clods of the valley are sweet to him,
And all men draw after him,
As they preceded him without number.
…
34 And how will ye comfort me so vainly!
Your replies are and remain perfidy.

Job 21:32–34. During life removed at the time of dire calamity, this unapproachable evil-doer is after his death carried to the grave with all honour (יוּבָל, comp. 10:19), and indeed to a splendid tomb; for, like מִשְׁכְּנוֹת above, קִבְרוֹת is also an amplificative plural. It is certainly the most natural to refer יִשְׁקֹד, like יוּבָל, to the deceased. The explanation: and over the tomb one keeps watch (Böttch., Hahn, Röd., Olsh.), is indeed in itself admissible, since that which serves as the efficient subject is often left unexpressed (Gen. 48:2; 2 Kings 9:21; Isa. 53:9; comp. supra, on Job 18:18); but that, according to the prevalent usage of the language, יִשְׁקֹד would denote only a guard of honour at night, not also in the day, and that for clearness it would have required גָּדִישׁוֹ instead of גָּדִישׁ, are considerations which do not favour this explanation, for שָׁקַד signifies to watch, to be active, instead of sleeping or resting; and moreover, the placing of guards of honour by graves is an assumed, but not proved, custom of antiquity. Nevertheless, יִשְׁקֹד might also in general denote the watchful, careful tending of the grave, and the maqâm (the tomb) of one who is highly honoured has, according to Moslem custom, servants (châdimîn) who are appointed for this duty. But though the translation "one watches" should not be objected to on this ground, the preference is to be given to a commendable rendering which makes the deceased the subject of יִשְׁקֹד. Raschi's explanation does not, however, commend itself: "buried in his own land, he also in death still keeps watch over the heaps of sheaves." The LXX translates similarly, ἐπὶ σωρῶν, which Jerome improperly, but according to a right sentiment, translates, in congerie mortuorum. For after the preceding mention of the pomp of burial, גָּדִישׁ, which certainly signifies a heap of sheaves in Job 5:26, is favoured by the assumption of its signifying a sepulchral heap, with reference to which also in that passage (where interment is likewise the subject of discourse) the expression is chosen. Haji Gaon observes that the dome (קֻבָּה, Arab. qbbt, the dome and the sepulchral monument vaulted over by it)183 erected over graves according to Arab custom is intended; and Aben-Ezra says, that not exactly this, but in general the grave-mound formed of earth, etc., is to be understood. In reality, גדישׁ (from the verb גדשׁ, cumulare, commonly used in the Talmud and Aramaic) signifies cumulus, in the most diversified connections, which in Arabic are distributed among the verbs jds, kds, and jdš, especially tumulus, Arab. jadatun (broader pronunciation jadafun). If by grave-mound a mound with the grave upon it can be understood, a beautiful explanation is presented which accords with the preference of the Beduin for being buried on an eminence, in order that even in death he may be surrounded by his relations, and as it were be able still to overlook their encampment: the one who should have had a better lot is buried in the best place of the plain, in an insignificant grave; the rich man, however, is brought up to an eminence and keeps watch on his elevated tomb, since from this eminence as from a watch-tower he even in death, as it were, enjoys the wide prospect which delighted him so while living.184

But the signification collis cannot be supported; גדישׁ signifies the hill which is formed by the grave itself, and v. 33 indeed directs us to the wady as the place of burial, not to the hill. But if גדישׁ is the grave-mound, it is also not possible with Schlottm. to think of the pictures on the wall and images of the deceased, as they are found in the Egyptian vaults (although in Job 3:14 we recognised an allusion to the pyramids), for it cannot then be a גדישׁ in the strict sense that is spoken of; the word ought, like the Arabic jdt (which the Arab. translation of the New Testament in the London Polyglott uses of the μνημεῖον of Jesus), with a mingling

of its original signification, to have been used in the general signification sepulcrum. This would be possible, but it need not be supposed. Job's words are the pictorial antithesis to Bildad's assertion, Job 18:17, that the godless man dies away without trace or memorial; it is not so, but as may be heard from the mouth of people who have experience in the world: he keeps watch over his tomb, he continues to watch although asleep, since he is continually brought to remembrance by the monument built over his tomb. A keeping watch that no one approaches the tomb disrespectfully (Ew.), is not to be thought of. שׁקד is a relative negation of the sleep of death: he is dead, but in a certain manner he continues to live, viz., in the monument planting forward his memory, which it remains for the imagination to conceive of as a mausoleum, or weapons, or other votive offerings hung upon the walls, etc. In connection with such honour, which follows him even to and beyond death, the clods of the valley (est ei terra levis) are sweet (מָתְקוּ is accentuated with Mercha, and לוֹ without Makkeph with little-Rebia) to him; and if death in itself ought to be accounted an evil, he has shared the common fate which all men after him will meet, and which all before him have met; it is the common end of all made sweet to him by the pageantry of his burial and his after-fame. Most modern expositors (Ew., Hirz., Umbr., Hlgst., Welte) understand the יִמְשֹׁךְ, which is used, certainly, not in the transitive signification: to draw after one's self, but in the intransitive: to draw towards (LXX ἀπελεύσεται), as Judg. 4:6 (vid., Ges. Thes.), of an imitative treading of the same way; but כָּל־אָדָם would then be an untrue hyperbole, by which Job would expose himself to the attack of his adversaries.

In v. 34 Job concludes his speech; the Waw of וְאֵיךְ, according to the idea (as e.g., the Waw in ואני, Isa. 43:12), is an inferential ergo. Their consolation, which is only available on condition of penitence, is useless; and their replies, which are intended to make him an evil-doer against the testimony of his conscience, remain מָעַל. It is not necessary to construe: and as to your answers, only מעל remains. The predicate stands per attractionem in the sing.: their answers, reduced to their true value, leave nothing behind but מעל, end in מעל, viz., באלהים, Josh. 22:22, perfidious sinning against God, i.e., on account of the sanctimonious injustice and uncharitableness with which they look suspiciously on him.

Job has hitherto answered the accusations of the friends, which they express in ever-increasingly terrible representations of the end of the godless, presenting only the terrible side of their dogma of the justice of God, with a stedfast attestation of his innocence, and with the ever-increasing hope of divine vindication against human accusation. In him was manifest that faith which, being thrust back by men, clings to God, and, thrust back by God, even soars aloft from the present wrath of God to His faithfulness and mercy. The friends, however, instead of learning in Job's spiritual condition to distinguish between the appearance and the reality in this confidence, which comes back to itself, see in it only a constant wilful hardening of himself against their exhortations to penitence. It does not confound them, that he over whom, according to their firm opinion, the sword of God's vengeance hangs, warns them of that same sword, but only confirms them still more in their conviction, that they have to do with one who is grievously self-deluded.

Zophar has painted anew the end of the evil-doer in the most hideous colours, in order that Job might behold himself in this mirror, and be astonished at himself. We see also, from the answer of Job to Zophar's speech, that the passionate excitement which Job displayed at first in opposition to the friends has given place to a calmer tone; he has already got over the first impression of disappointed expectation, and the more confidently certain of the infallibility of divine justice he becomes, the more does he feel raised above his accusers. He now expects no further comfort; careful attention to what he has to say shall henceforth be his consolation. He will also complain against and of men no more, for he has long

since ceased to hope for anything for himself from men; his vexation concerns the objective indefensibility of that which his opponents maintain as a primeval law of the divine government in the world. The maxim that godlessness always works its own punishment by a calamitous issue, is by no means supported by experience. One sees godless persons who are determined to know nothing of God, and are at the same time prosperous. It is not to be said that God treasures up the punishment they have deserved for their children. The godless ought rather to bear the punishment themselves, since the destiny of their children no longer concerns them after they have enjoyed their fill of life. That law is therefore a precept which human short-sightedness has laid down for God, but one by which, however, He is not guided. The godless who have lived prosperously all their days, and the righteous who have experienced only sorrow, share the common lot of death. One has only to ask persons who have had experience of the world: they can relate instances of notorious sinners who maintained their high position until death, and who, without being overtaken by divine judgments, and without human opposition and contradiction, were carried in honour to the grave, and their memory is immortalized by the monuments erected over their tomb. From this Job infers that the connection into which the friends bring his suffering with supposed guilt, is a false one, and that all their answers are, after all, reducible to an unjust and uncharitable judgment, by which they attack (מַעַל) God.

Job has more than once given expression to the thought, that a just distribution of prosperity and misfortune is not to be found in the world, Job 9:22–24, 12:6. But now for the first time he designedly brings it forward in reply to the friends, after he has found every form of assertion of his innocence unavailing, and their behaviour towards him with their dogma is become still more and more inconsiderate and rash. Job sins in this speech; but in order to form a correct judgment of this sinning, two things must be attended to. Job does not revel in the contradiction in which this lasting fact of experience stands to the justice of divine retribution, he had rather be ignorant of it; for he has no need of it in order, in spite of his affliction, to be able to hold fast the consciousness of his innocence. No indeed! if he thinks of this mystery he is perplexed, and shuddering comes over him, Job 21:6. And when he depicts the prosperity of sinners, he expresses his horror of the sins of such prosperous men in the words: The counsel of the ungodly be far from me! (Job 21:16), in order that it may not be erroneously imagined that he lusts after such prosperity.

If we compare Zophar's and Job's speeches one with another, we are obliged to say, that relatively the greater right is on the side of Job. True, the Scriptures confirm what Zophar says of the destruction of the evil-doer in innumerable passages; and this calamitous end of one who has long been prosperous and defiant, is the solution by which the Old Testament Scriptures (Ps. 37, 73; Jer. 12:1–3; Hab. 1:13–2:1) remove the stumbling-block of the mysterious phenomenon of the prosperity of the evil-doer. But if we bear in mind that this solution is insufficient, so long as that calamitous end is regarded only outwardly, and with reference to the present world,—that the solution only becomes satisfactory when, as in the book of Ecclesiastes, in reply to a similar doubt to that which Job expresses (Eccles. 7:15, 8:14), the end is regarded as the end of all, and as the decision of a final judgment which sets all contradictions right,—that, however, neither Zophar nor Job know anything of a decision beyond death, but regard death as the end whither human destiny and divine retribution tend, without being capable of any further distinction: we cannot deny that Job is most in the right in placing the prosperous life and death of the godless as based upon the incontrovertible facts of experience, in opposition to Zophar's primeval exceptionless law of the terrible end of the godless. The speeches of Zophar and of Job are both true and false,—both one-sided, and therefore mutually supplementary. The real final end of the evil-

doer is indeed none other than Zophar describes; and the temporal prosperity of the evil-doer, lasting often until death, is really a frequent phenomenon. If, however, we consider further, that Job is not able to deny the occurrence of such examples of punishment, such revelations of the retributive justice of God, as those which Zophar represents as occurring regularly and without exception; that, however, on the other hand, exceptional instances undeniably do exist, and the friends are obliged to be blind to them, because otherwise the whole structure of their opposition would fall in,—it is manifest that Job is nearer to the truth than Zophar. For it is truer that the retributive justice of God is often, but by far not always, revealed in the present world and outwardly, than that it never becomes manifest.

Wherein, then, does Job's sin in this speech consist? Herein, that he altogether ignores the palpably just distribution of human destinies, which does occur frequently enough. In this he becomes unjust towards his opponent, and incapable of convincing him. From it, it appears as though in the divine government there is not merely a preponderance of what is mysterious, of what is irreconcilable with divine justice, but as though justice were altogether contradicted. The reproach with which he reproaches his opponents: Shall one teach God understanding? is one which also applies to himself; for when he says that God, if He punishes, must visit punishment upon the evil-doer himself, and not on his children, it is an unbecoming dictation with regard to God's doing. We should be mistaken in supposing that the poet, in Job 21:19–21, brings forward a concealed contradiction to the Mosaic doctrine of retribution; nowhere in the Old Testament, not even in the Mosaic law, is it taught, that God visits the sins of the fathers on the children, while He allows them themselves to go free, Ex. 20:5, comp. Deut. 24:16, Ezek. 18, Jer. 31:29f. What Job asserts, that the sinner himself must endure the punishment of his sins, not his children instead of him, is true; but the thought lying in the background, that God does not punish where He ought to punish, is sinful. Thus here Job again falls into error, which he must by and by penitently acknowledge and confess, by speaking unbecomingly of God: the God of the future is again vanished from him behind the clouds of temptation, and he is unable to understand and love the God of the present; He is a mystery to him, the incomprehensibility of which causes him pain. "The joyous thought of the future, which a little before struggled forth, again vanishes, because the present, into the abyss of which he is again drawn down, has remained perfectly dark the whole time, and as yet no bridge has been revealed crossing from this side to that."

JOB 22

The Third Course of the Controversy.—Ch. 22–26.

Eliphaz' Third Speech.—Ch. 22.

[Then began Eliphaz the Temanite, and said:]

2 Is a man profitable unto God?

No, indeed! the intelligent man is profitable to himself.

3 Hath the Almighty any profit if thou art righteous,

Or gain if thou strivest to walk uprightly?

4 Will He reprove thee for thy fear of God,

Will He go with thee into judgment?

5 Is not thy wickedness great,

Thine iniquities infinite?

Job 22:2–5. The verb כָּוַשׂ, in the signification to be profitable, is peculiar to the book of Job (although also סָכַן and סָכָנָה elsewhere, according to its primary signification, does not differ from מוֹעִיל, מוֹעִילָה, by which it is explained by Kimchi); the correct development of the notion of this verb is to be perceived from the Hiph., which occurs in v. 21 in this speech of Eliphaz (vid., Ges. Thes.): it signifies originally, like שׁכן, Arab. skn, to rest, dwell, especially to dwell beside one another, then to become accustomed to one another (comp. שָׁכֵן, a neighbour, and Arab. sakanun, a friend, confidant), and to assist one another, to be serviceable, to be profitable; we can say both

סָכַנְתִּי, I have profit, Job 34:9, and סָכָן, it is profitable, Job 15:3, 35:3, here twice with a personal subj., and first followed by לְ, then with the עַל usual also elsewhere in later prose (e.g., על טוב, 1 Chron. 13:2, comp. supra, Job 10:3, to be pleasant) and poetry, which gladly adopts Aramaisms (as here and Ps. 16:6, על שׁפר, well-pleased), instead of ל, whence here עָלֵימוֹ, as Job 20:23, pathetic for עָלָיו. The question, which is intended as a negative, is followed by the negative answer (which establishes its negative meaning) with כִּי; מַשְׂכִּיל is, like Ps. 14:2, the intelligent, who wills and does what is good, with an insight into the nature of the extremes in morality, as in Prov. 1:3 independent morality which rests not merely on blind custom is called השׂכל מוסר. לְ חֶפֶץ היה, it is to the interest of any one (different from 1 Sam. 15:22, vid., on Job 21:21), and לְ בֶצַע היה, it is to the gain of any one (prop. the act of cutting, cutting off, i.e., what one tears in pieces), follow as synonyms of סכן. On the Aramaizing doubling of the first radical in the Hiph. תַּמּתֵּ (instead of תָּמַם), vid., Ges. § 67, rem. 8, comp. 3. It is translated an lucrum (ei) si integras facias vias tuas. The meaning of the whole strophe is mainly determined according to the rendering of הֲמִיְרָאָתְךָ (like המבינתך, Job 39:26, with Dechî, and as an exception with Munach, not removed to the place of the Metheg; vid., Psalter, ii. 491, Anm. 1). If the suff. is taken objectively (from fear of thee), e.g., Hirz., we have the following line of thought: God is neither benefited by human virtue nor injured by human sin, so that when He corrects the sinner He is turning danger from himself; He neither rewards the godly because He is benefited by his piety, nor punishes the sinner because by his sinning he threatens Him with injury. Since, therefore, if God chastises a man, the reason of it is not to be found in any selfish purpose of God, it must be in the sin of the man, which is on its own account worthy of punishment. But the logical relation in which v. 5 stands to v. 4 does not suit this: perhaps from fear of thee … ? no, rather because of thy many and great sins! Hahn is more just to this relation when he explains: "God has no personal profit to expect from man, so that, somewhat from fear, to prevent him from being injurious, He should have any occasion to torment him with sufferings unjustly." But if the personal profit, which is denied, is one that grows out of the piety of the man, the personal harm, which is denied as one which God by punishment will keep far from Himself, is to be thought of as growing out of the sin of the man; and the logical relation of v. 5 to 4 is not suited to this, for. v. 5 assigns the reason of the chastisement to the sin, and denies, as it runs, not merely any motive whatever in connection with the sin, but that the reason can lie in the opposite of sin, as it appears according to Job's assertion that, although guiltless, he is still suffering from the wrath of God.

Thus, then, the suff. of המיראתך is to be taken subjectively: on account of thy fear of God, as Eliphaz has used יראתך twice already, Job 4:6, 15:4. By this subjective rendering vv. 4 and 5 form a true antithesis: Does God perhaps punish thee on account of thy fear of God? Does He go (on that account) with thee into judgment? No (it would be absurd to suppose that); therefore thy wickedness must be great (in proportion to the greatness of thy suffering), and thy misdeeds infinitely many. If we now look at what precedes, we shall have to put aside the thought drawn into vv. 2 and 3 by Ewald (and also by Hahn): whether God, perhaps with the purpose of gaining greater advantage from piety, seeks to raise it by unjustly decreed suffering; for this thought has nothing to indicate it, and is indeed certainly false, but on account of the force of truth which lies in it (there is a decreeing of suffering for the godly to raise their piety) is only perplexing.

First of all, we must inquire how it is that Eliphaz begins his speech thus. All the exhortations to penitence in which the three exhaust themselves, rebound from Job without affecting him. Even Eliphaz, the oldest among them, full of a lofty, almost prophetic consciousness, has with the utmost solicitude allured and terrified him, but in vain. And it is the cause of God which he brings against him,

or rather his own well-being that he seeks, without making an impression upon him. Then he reminds him that God is in Himself the all-sufficient One; that no advantage accrues to Him from human uprightness, since His nature, existing before and transcending all created things, can suffer neither diminution nor increase from the creature; that Job therefore, since he remains inaccessible to that well-meant call to penitent humiliation, has refused not to benefit Him, but himself; or, what is the reverse side of this thought (which is not, however, expressed), that he does no injury to Him, only to himself. And yet in what except in Job's sin should this decree of suffering have its ground? If it is a self-contradiction that God should chastise a man because he fears Him, there must be sin on the side of Job; and indeed, since the nature of the sin is to be measured according to the nature of the suffering, great and measureless sin. This logical necessity Eliphaz now regards as real, without further investigation, by opening out this bundle of sins in the next strophe, and reproaching Job directly with that which Zophar, Job 20:19–21, aiming at Job, has said of the רשׁע. In the next strophe he continues, with כי explic.:

6 For thou distrainedst thy brother without cause,
And the clothes of the naked thou strippedst off.
7 Thou gavest no water to the languishing,
And thou refusedst bread to the hungry.
8 And the man of the arm—the land was his,
And the honourable man dwelt therein.
9 Thou sentest widows away empty,
And the arms of the orphan are broken.

Job 22:6–9. The reason of exceeding great suffering most be exceeding great sins. Job must have committed such sins as are here cited; therefore Eliphaz directly attributes guilt to him, since he thinks thus to tear down the disguise of the hypocrite. The strophe contains no reference to the Mosaic law: the compassionate Mosaic laws respecting duties towards widows and orphans, and the poor who pledge their few and indispensable goods, may have passed before the poet's mind; but it is not safe to infer it from the expression. As specific Mohammedan commandments among the wandering tribes even in the present day have no sound, so the poet dare not assume, in connection with the characters of his drama, any knowledge, of the Sinaitic law; and of this he remains conscious throughout: their standpoint is and remains that of the Abrahamic faith, the primary commands (later called the ten commands of piety, el-felâhh) of which were amply sufficient for stigmatizing that to which this strophe gives prominence as sin. It is only the force of the connection of the matter here which gives the futt. which follow כי a retrospective meaning. חָבַל is connected either with the accusative of the thing for which the pledge is taken, as in the law, which meets a response in the heart, Ex. 22:25f.; or with the accus. of the person who is seized, as here אַחֶיךָ; or, if this is really (as Bär asserts) a mistake that has gained a footing, which has Codd. and old printed editions against it, rather אָחִיךָ. LXX, Targ., Syr., and Jer. read the word as plural. עֲרוּמִּים (from עָרוֹם), like γυμνοί, James 2:15, nudi (comp. Seneca, de beneficiis, v. 13: si quis male vestitum et pannosum videt, nudum se vidisse dicit), are, according to our mode of expression, the half-naked, only scantily (vid., Isa. 20:2) clothed.

Ver. 8. The man of the arm, זְרוֹעַ, is in Eliphaz' mind Job himself. He has by degrees acquired the territory far and wide for himself, by having brought down the rightful possessors by open violence (Job 20:19), or even by cunning and unfeeling practices, and is not deterred by any threat of a curse (Job 15:28): הָאָרֶץ לוֹ, he looked upon it as his, and his it must become; and since with his possessions his authority increased, he planted himself firmly in it, filled it out alone, like a stout fellow who takes the room of all others away. Umbr., Hahn, and others think Job's partiality for power and rank is described in v. 8; but both assertions read straightforward, without any intimation of co-operation. The address is here only suspended, in order to describe the man as he was and is.

The all-absorbing love of self regulated his dealings. In possession of the highest power and highest rank, he was not easy of access. Widows and orphans, that they might not perish, were obliged to turn suppliantly to him. But the widows he chased away with empty hands, and the arms of the orphans were crushed. From the address a turn is also here taken to an objective utterance turned from the person addressed, intended however for him; the construction is like יֵאָכֵל מצות, unleavened bread is eaten, Ex. 13:7, according to Ew. § 295, b. The arms are not conceived of as stretched out for help (which would rather be יְדֵי), nor as demanding back their perverted right, but the crushing of the arms, as Ps. 37:17, Ezek. 30:22, and frequently implies a total destruction of every power, support, and help, after the analogy of the Arabic phrase compared by Ges. in his Thes. pp. 268b, 433b. The arm, זְרוֹעַ (Arab. dirâ', oftener 'aḍud or sâ'id), signifies power, Job 40:9, Ps. 57:16; force and violence, v. 8, Job 35:9; self-help, and help from without, Ps. 83:9 (comp. Ps. 44:4). Whatever the orphans possessed of goods, honour, and help still available, is not merely broken, it is beaten into fragments.

10 Therefore snares are round about thee,
And fear terrifieth thee suddenly;
11 Or percievest thou not the darkness,
And the overflow of waters, which covereth thee?

Job 22:10, 11. On account of this inhuman mode of action by which he has challenged the punishment of justice, snares are round about him (comp. Bildad's picture of this fate of the evil-doer, Job 18:8–10), destruction encompasses him on every side, so that he sees no way out, and must without any escape succumb to it. And the approaching ruin makes itself known to him time after time by terrors which come suddenly upon him and disconcert him; so that his outward circumstances being deranged and his mind discomposed, he has already in anticipation to taste that which is before him. In v. 11, תִּרְאֶה לֹא is by no means to be taken as an eventual circumstantial clause, whether it is translated affirmatively: or darkness (covers thee), that thou canst not see; or interrogatively: or does darkness (surround thee), that thou seest not? In both cases the verb in the principal clause is wanting; apart from the new turn, which אוֹ introduces, being none, it would then have to be explained with Löwenthal: or has the habit of sinning already so dulled thy feeling and darkened thine eye, that thou canst not perceive the enormity of thy transgression? But this is a meaning forced from the words which they are not capable of; it must have been at least בַּעֲדְךָ חֹשֶׁךְ אוֹ, or something similar. Since אוֹ חֹשֶׁךְ (to be accented without Makkeph with Mûnach, Dechî) cannot form a principal clause of itself, תראה is without doubt the verb belonging to it: or (אוֹ as Job 16:3) seest thou not darkness? Because, according to his preceding speeches, Job does not question the magnitude of his sufferings, but acknowledges them in all their fearfulness; therefore Hahn believes it must be explained: or shouldst thou really not be willing to see thy sins, which encompass thee as thick dark clouds, which cover thee as floods of water? The two figures, however, can only be understood of the destruction which entirely shrouds Job in darkness, and threatens to drown him. But destruction, in the sense in which Eliphaz asks if Job does not see it, is certainly intended differently to what it was in Job's complaints. Job complains of it as being unmerited, and therefore mysterious; Eliphaz, on the other hand, is desirous that he should open his eyes that he may perceive in this darkness of sorrow, this flood of suffering, the well-deserved punishment of his heinous sins, and anticipate the worst by penitence. תְּכַסֶּךָּ֑ לֹא is a relative clause, and belongs logically also to חֹשֶׁךְ, comp. Isa. 60:2, where שִׁפְעַת is also found in v. 6 (from שׁפע, abundare; comp. Arab. šf', ספק, Job 20:22). Eliphaz now insinuates that Job denies the special providence of God, because he doubts the exceptionless, just government of God. In the second strophe he has explained his affliction as the result of his uncharitableness; now he explains it as the result of his unbelief, which is now become manifest.

12 Is not Eloah high as the heavens?
See but the head of the stars, how exalted!
13 So then thou thinkest: "What doth God know?
Can He judge through the thick cloud?
14 Clouds veil Him that He seeth not,
And in the vault of heaven He walketh at His pleasure."

Job 22:12–14. Because Job has denied the distribution of worldly fortune, of outward prosperity and adversity, according to the law of the justice that recompenses like for like, Eliphaz charges him with that unbelief often mentioned in the Psalms (Ps. 73:11, 94:7; comp. Isa. 29:15, Ezek. 8:12), which denies to the God in heaven, as Epicurus did to the gods who lead a blessed life in the spaces between the worlds, a knowledge of earthly things, and therefore the preliminary condition for a right comprehension of them. The mode of expression here is altogether peculiar. שָׁמַיִם גֹּבַהּ is not acc. loci, as the like accusatives in combination with the verb שׁכן, Isa. 57:15, may be taken: the substantival clause would lead one to expect בְּגֹבַהּ, or better בְּגָבְהֵי (Job 11:8); it is rather (similar to Job 11:8) nomin. praedicati: Eloah is the height of the heavens = heaven-high, as high as the heavens, therefore certainly highly, and indeed very highly, exalted above this earth. In this sense it is continued with Waw explic.: and behold (= behold then) the head of the stars, that, or how (כִּי as in Gen. 49:15, 1 Sam. 14:29, quod = quam) exalted they are. וּרְאֵה has Asla (Kadma) in correct texts, and רמו is written רָמּוּ (râmmu) with a so-called Dag. affectuosum (Olsh. § 83, b). It may be received as certain that רֹאשׁ, the head (vertex), beside רְאֵה (not סְפֹר), does not signify the sum (Aben-Ezra). But it is questionable whether the genitive that follows ראשׁ is gen. partitivus: the highest among the stars (Ew., Hirz., Schlottm.), or gen. epexegeticus: the head, i.e., (in relation to the rest of the universe) the height, which is formed by the stars, or even which they occupy (Ges. coelum stellatum); the partitive rendering is to be preferred, for the Semitic perception recognises, as the plural שָׁמַיִם implies, nearer and more distant celestial spheres. The expression "head of the stars" is therefore somewhat like fastigium coeli (the extreme height, i.e., the middle of the vault of heaven), or culmen aereum (of the aether separating the strata of air above); the summit of the stars rising up into the extremest spheres is intended (we should say: the fixed stars, or to use a still more modern expression, the milky way), as also the רמו naturally refers to כוכבים ראשׁ as one notion (summitas astrorum = summa astra).

The connection of what follows with Waw is not adversative (Hirz., Ew., and others: and yet thou speakest), it is rather consecutive (Hahn: and since thou speakest; better: and in consequence of this thou speakest; or: thus speakest thou, thinkest thou then). The undeniable truth that God is exalted, and indeed absolute in His exaltation, is misapplied by Job to the false conclusion: what does God know, or (since the perf. in interrogative sentences frequently corresponds to the Latin conjunctive, vid., on Ps. 11:3) how should God know, or take knowledge, i.e., of anything that happens on earth? In v. 13b the potential takes the place of this modal perfect: can He rule judicially behind the dark clouds, i.e., over the world below from which He is shut out? בְּעַד (of like verbal origin with the Arab. b'da, post, prop. distance, separation, succession, but of wider use) signifies here, as in Job 1:10, 9:7, behind, pone, with the secondary notion of being encompassed or covered by that which shuts off. Far from having an unlimited view of everything earthly from His absolute height, it is veiled from His by the clouds, so that He sees not what occurs here below, and unconcerned about it He walks the circle of the heavens (that which vaults the earth, the inhabitants of which seem to Him, according to Isa. 40:22, as grasshoppers); הִתְהַלֵּךְ is here, after the analogy of Kal, joined with the accus. of the way over which He walks at His pleasure: orbem coelum obambulat. By such unworthy views of the Deity, Job puts himself on a par with the godless race that was swept away by the flood in

ancient days, without allowing himself to be warned by this example of punishment.

15 Wilt thou observe the way of the ancient world,

Which evil men have trodden,

16 Who were withered up before their time,

Their foundation was poured out as a stream,

17 Who said unto God: Depart from us!

And what can the Almighty do to them?

18 And notwithstanding He had filled their houses with good—

The counsel of the wicked be far from me!

Job 22:15–18. While in Ps. 139:24 עולם דרך prospectively signifies a way of eternal duration (comp. Ezek. 26:20, עולם עם, of the people who sleep the interminably long sleep of the grave), עוֹלָם אֹרַח signifies here retrospectively the way of the ancient world, but not, as in Jer. 6:16, 18:15, the way of thinking and acting of the pious forefathers which put their posterity to shame, but of a godless race of the ancient world which stands out as a terrible example to posterity. Eliphaz asks if Job will observe, i.e., keep (שׁמר as in Ps. 18:22), this way trodden by people (מָתֵי, comp. אַנְשֵׁי, Job 34:36) of wickedness. Those worthless ones were withered up, i.e., forcibly seized and crushed, וְלֹא־עֵת, when it was not yet time (ולא after the manner of a circumstantial clause: quum nondum, as Ps. 139:16), i.e., when according to God's creative order their time was not yet come. On קָמְטוּ,185 vid., on Job 16:8; LXX correctly, συνελήφθησαν ἄωροι, nevertheless συλλαμβάνειν is too feeble as a translation of קמט; for as Arab. qbṣ signifies to take with the tip of the finer, whereas Arab. qbḍ signifies to take with the whole bent hand, so קמט, in conformity to the dull, emphatic final consonant, signifies "to bind firmly together." In v. 16b יוּצַק is not perf. Pual for יֻצַק (Ew. § 83, b), for this exchange, contrary to the law of vowels, of the sharp form with the lengthened form is without example; it must at least have been written יוּצָק (comp. Judg. 18:29). It is fut. Hoph., which, according to Job 11:15, might be יֻצַק; here, however, it is with a resolving, not assimilation, of the Jod, as in Lev. 21:10. The fut. has the signification of the imperfect which it acquires in an historic connection. It is not to be translated: their place became a stream which has flowed away (Hirz.), for the היה which would be required by such an interpretation could not be omitted; also not: flumen effusum est in fundamentum eorum (Rosenm., Hahn, and others), which would be לִיסוֹדָם, and would still be very liable to be misunderstood; also not: whose foundation was a poured-out stream (Umbr., Olsh.), for then there would be one attributive clause inserted in the other; but: their solid ground became fluid like a stream (Ew., Hlgst., Schlottm.), so that נָהָר, after the analogy of the verbs with two accusative, Ges. § 139, 2, is a so-called second acc. of the obj. which by the passive becomes a nominative (comp. Job 28:2), although it might also be an apposition of the following subj. placed first: a stream (as such, like such a one) their solid ground was brought into a river; the ground on which they and their habitations stood was placed under water and floated away: without doubt the flood is intended; reference to this perfectly accords with the patriarchal pre- and extra-Israelitish standpoint of the book of Job; and the generation of the time of the flood (דור המבול) is accounted in the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament as a paragon of godlessness, the contemporaries of Noah are the ἀπειθοῦντες, סוררים, κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν (comp. 1 Pet. 3:20 with Ps. 68:19).

Accordingly they are now here also further described (v. 17) as those who said to God, "Depart from us," and what could the Almighty do to them (לָמוֹ instead of לָנוּ, which was to be expected, since, as in Job 19:28, there is a change from the oratio directa to obliqua)! Olshausen explains with Hahn: "with respect to what thou sayest: and what then does the Almighty do to them (for it)? He fills their houses with prosperity, while the counsel of the wicked is far from me (notwithstanding I am unfortunate)." But this explanation is as forced (since ומה without a אמרת or תאמר standing with it is taken as the word of Job) as it is contrary to

the syntax (since the circumstantial clause with והוא is not recognised, and on the other hand וגו׳ וַעֲצַת, instead of which it ought at least to have been וגו׳ וּמַמָּנִי, is regarded as such an one). No indeed, just this is an exceedingly powerful effect, that Eliphaz describes those godless ones who dismiss God with ממנו סור, to whom, according to Job's assertion, Job 21:13f., undimmed prosperity is portioned out, by referring to a memorable fact as that which has fallen under the strict judgment of God; and that with the very same words with which Job, Job 21:16, declines communion with such prosperous evil-doers: "the counsel of the wicked be far from me," he will have nothing more to do, not with the wicked alone, but, with a side glance at Job, even with those who place themselves on a level with them by a denial of the just government of God in the world. לְ פָעַל, as the following circumstantial clause shows, is intended like Ps. 68:29, comp. 31:20, Isa. 26:12: how can the Almighty then help or profit them? Thus they asked, while He had filled their houses with wealth—Eliphaz will have nothing to do with this contemptible misconstruction of the God who proves himself so kind to those who dwell below on the earth, but who, though He is rewarded with ingratitude, is so just. The truly godly are not terrified like Job Job 17:8, that retributive justice is not to be found in God's government of the world; on the contrary, they rejoice over its actual manifestation in their own case, which makes them free, and therefore so joyous.

19 The righteous see it and rejoice,
And the innocent mock at them:
20 "Verily our opponent is destroyed,
And the fire hath devoured their abundance."

Job 22:19, 20. This thought corresponds to that expressed as a wish, hope, or anticipation at the close of many of the Psalms, that the retributive justice of God, though we may have to wait a long time for it, becomes at length the more gloriously manifest to the joy of those hitherto innocently persecuted, Ps. 58:11f. The obj. of יִרְאוּ, as in Ps. 107:42, is this its manifestation. לָמוֹ is not an ethical dative, as in Ps. 80:7, but as in Ps. 2:4 refers to the ungodly whose mocking pride comes to such an ignominious end. What follow in v. 20 are the words of the godly; the introductory לאמר is wanting, as e.g., Ps. 2:3. אִם־לֹא can signify neither si non, as Job 9:24, 24:25, 31:31, nor annon, as in a disjunctive question, Job 17:2, 30:25; it is affirmative, as Job 1:11, 2:5, 31:36—an Amen to God's peremptory judgment. On נִכְחַד (he is drawn away, put aside, become annulled), vid., supra, p. 398. קִימָנוּ (for which Aben-Ezra is also acquainted with the reading קִימֵנוּ with קטן קמץ, i.e., צירי) has a pausal â springing from ê, as Job 20:27, מתקוֹמָמה for מתקוֹמֵמה; Ruth 3:2, מודעָתָנו; Isa. 47:10, רְאָנִי (together with the reading רְאֵני, comp. 1 Chron. 12:17, לרמוֹתַני). The form קִים is remarkable; it may be more readily taken as part. pass. (like יִמְשׁ, positus) than as nom. infin. (the act of raising for those who raise themselves); perhaps the original text had קמינו (קָמֵינוּ). יִתְרָם is no more to be translated their remnant (Hirz.) here than in Ps. 17:14, at least not in the sense of Ex. 23:11; that which exceeds the necessity is intended, their surplus, their riches. It is said of Job in b. Megilla, 28a: הוה בממוניה וְתָרָן איוב, he was extravagant (prodigus) with his property. The fire devouring the wealth of the godless is an allusion to the misfortune which has befallen him.

After this terrible picture, Eliphaz turns to the exhortation of him who may be now perhaps become ripe for repentance.

21 Make friends now with Him, so hast thou peace;
Thereby good will come unto thee.
22 Receive now teaching from His mouth,
And place His utterances in thy heart.
23 If thou returnest to the Almighty, thou shalt be built up again;
If thou puttest away iniquity far from thy tents.
24 And lay by in the dust the gold ore,
And under the pebbles of the brooks the gold of Ophir.

25 So shall the Almighty be to thee gold ore in abundance,

And silver to thee of the brightest lustre.

Job 22:21–25. The relationship of the verbs סָכַן, שָׂכַן, and Arab. sakana, has been already discussed on v. 2: the Hiph. signifies to be on friendly terms with any one; to enter into, or to stand in, an intimate relationship to any one (Ps. 139:3); then also (as the Greek φιλεῖν) to get accustomed to, to be used to (Num. 22:30). The second imper. is consecutive, as e.g., Prov. 3:4: and have as the result of it peace (Arab. fa'âslam) = so shalt thou have peace, Ges. § 130, 2. In v. 21 the first thing to be done is to clear up the form תְּבוֹאַתְךָ or (according to another reading which is likewise well attested) תְּבוֹאָתְךָ. Olshausen (in Hirz. and in his Gramm.) and Rödiger (in Thes. p. 11, suppl.) explain this form the same as the other forms which come under consideration in connection with it, viz., תָּבוֹאתָה (veniat), Deut. 33:16, and וַתָּבֹאתִי, Keri וַתָּבֹאת (et venisses, addressed to Abigail), 1 Sam. 25:34, as errors in writing; whereas Ew., § 191, c, sees in תְּבוֹאַתְךָ the erroneous form תְּבוֹאָה = תָּבוֹא with a superfluous feminine termination, in תָּבוֹאתָה an extension of the double feminine by the unaccented ah of intention, and in תָּבֹאתִי a transfer of the inflexion of the perf. to the fut. Confining ourselves to the form which occurs here, we refer to what was said above, p. 346, note 2: תבואתך is not a forma mixta from תְּבוֹאֲךָ and בָּאַתְךָ, but the mistaken double feminine תְּבוֹאָה with suff., the ah of which, although the tone is on the penult., is not He voluntativum, as Isa. 5:19, but He femin. The exception of such double feminines is made as certain in Hebrew by the regular form הִנְגְּלָתָ (= נִגְלַת with a second feminine termination), and by examples like Prov. 1:20, Ezek. 23:20, and also Josh. 6:17, 2 Sam. 1:26, Amos 4:3 (comp. even Olsh. in his Gramm. S. 449), as the double plural and its further formation by a feminine termination in Arabic. It is therefore unnecessary, with Olsh. and Röd., after the precedent of the ancient versions, to read תְּבוּאָתְךָ (which is found in 19 Codd. in de Rossi): proventus tuus bonus erit. The suff. in בָּהֶם, as Isa. 64:4, Ezek. 23:18, comp. עֲלֵיהֶם, Isa. 38:16, is intended as neuter, as the fem. is used elsewhere (e.g., Isa. 38:16, בָּהֶן): by it, i.e., by such conduct, good (prosperity) shall come to thee, and indeed, as the בוא construed with the acc. implies, in a sudden change of thy previous lot, coming about without any further effort on thy part. In the certainty that it is God's word which he presents to his friend (the very certainty which Eliphaz also expresses elsewhere, e.g., Job 15:11), he further admonishes him (v. 22) to receive instruction from God's mouth (מִפִּיו as Prov. 2:6), and to allow His (God's) utterances a place in his heart, not to let them die away without effect, but to imprint them deeply on his mind.

Ver. 23. If he return to the Almighty (עַד שׁוּב as freq., e.g., Isa. 19:22, comp. 45:24, instead of the otherwise usual אל שׁוב, of thorough and complete conversion), he will be built up again, by his former prosperity being again raised from its ruins. בָּנָה, to build, always according to the connection, has at one time the idea of building round about, continuing to build, or finishing building (vid., on Job 20:19); at another of building up again (Job 12:14; Isa. 58:12), referred to persons, the idea of increasing prosperity (Mal. 3:15), or of the restoration of ruined prosperity (Jer. 24:6, 33:7), here in the latter sense. The promissory תִּבָּנֶה is surrounded by conditional clauses, for v. 23b (comp. Job 11:14) is a second conditional clause still under the government of אִם, which is added for embellishment; it opens the statement of that in which penitence must be manifested, if it is to be thorough. The LXX translates ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιστραφῇς καὶ ταπεινώσῃς, i.e., תֵּעָנֶה, which Ewald considers as the original; the omission of the אִם (which the poet otherwise in such connections has formerly heaped up, e.g., Job 8:5f., 11:13f.) is certainly inconvenient. And yet we should not on that account like to give up the figure indicated in תבנה, which is so beautiful and so suited to our poet. The statement advanced in the latter conditional clause is then continued in v. 24 in an independent imperative clause, which the old versions regard as a promise instead of exhortation, and therefore grossly misinterpret.

The Targ. translates: and place on the dust a strong city (i.e., thou shalt then, where there is now nothing but dust, raise up such), as if בָּצָר could be equivalent to בִּצָּרוֹן or מִבְצָר,—a rendering to which Saadia at least gives a turn which accords with the connection: "regard the stronghold (Arab. 'l-ḥṣn) as dust, and account as the stones of the valleys the gold of Ophir;" better than Eichhorn: "pull down thy stronghold of violence, and demolish (הפיר) the castles of thy valleys." On the other hand, Gecatilia, who understands בצר proportionately more correctly of treasures, translates it as a promise: so shalt thou inherit treasures (Arab. dchâyr) more numerous than dust, and gold ore (Arab. tbr') (more than) the stones of the valleys; and again also Rosenm. (repones prae pulvere argentum) and Welte interpret v. 24 as a promise; whereas other expositors, who are true to the imperative שִׁית, explain שִׁית aestimare, and על־עפר pulveris instar (Grot., Cocc., Schult., Dathe, Umbr.), by falsely assigning to עַל here, as to לְ elsewhere, a meaning which it never has anywhere; how blind, on the other hand, since the words in their first meaning, pone super pulverem, furnish an excellent thought which is closely connected with the admonition to rid one's self of unjust possessions. בָּצָר, like Arab. tibr (by which Abulwalid explains it), is gold and silver ore, i.e., gold and silver as they are broken out of the mine, therefore (since silver is partially pure, gold almost pure, and always containing more or less silver) the most precious metal in its pure natural state before being worked, and consequently also unalloyed (comp. Arab. nḍîr and nuḍâr, which likewise signifies aurum argentumve nativum, but not ab excidendo, but a nitore); and "to lay in the dust" is equivalent to, to part with a thing as entirely worthless and devoid of attraction. The meaning is therefore: put away from thee the idol of previous metal with contempt (comp. Isa. 2:20), which is only somewhat differently expressed in the parallel: lay the Ophir under the quartz (וּבְצוּר agreeing with בצר) of the brooks (such as is found in the beds of empty wâdys), i.e., place it under the rubble, after it has lost for thee its previous bewitching spell. As cloth woven from the filaments of the nettle is called muslin, from Mossul, and cloth with figures on it "damask, דִּמָּשֶׁק" (Amos 3:12), from Damascus,186 and aloes-wood Arab. mndl, from Coromandel; so the gold from Ophir, i.e., from the coast of the Abhîra, on the north coast of the Runn (Old Indian Irina, i.e., Salt Sea), east of the mouth of the Indus,187 is directly called אופיר. When Job thus casts from him temporal things, by the excessive cherishing of which he has hitherto sinned, then God himself will be his imperishable treasure, his everlasting higher delight. He frees himself from temporal בָּצָר; and the Almighty, therefore the absolute personality of God himself, will be to him instead of it בְּצָרִים, gold as from the mine, in rich abundance. This is what the contrast of the plur. (בצרך without Jod plur. is a false reading) with the sing. implies; the LXX, Syriac version, Jerome, and Arabic version err here, since they take the בְּ of בְּצַרְיִךְ as a preposition.

The ancient versions and lexicographers furnish no explanation of תּתֹוּעָפוֹ. The Targ. translates it רוּמָא תְּקוֹף, and accordingly it is explained by both חסן (strength) and גבה (height), without any reason being assigned for these significations. In the passage before us the LXX transl. ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον from עף, in the Targum signification to blow, forge; the Syriac versions, argentum computationum (חושׁבנין), from עף in the Targum-Talmudic signification to double (= Hebr. כפל). According to the usage of the language in question, יָעֵף, from the Hiph. of which תועפות is formed, signifies to become feeble, to be wearied; but even if, starting from the primary notion, an available signification is attained for the passage before us (fatigues = toilsome excitement, synon. יְגִיעַ) and Ps. 95:4 (climbings = heights), the use of the word in the most ancient passages citable, Num. 23:22, 24:8, לוֹ רְאֵם כְּתוֹעֲפֹת, still remains unexplained; for here the notion of being incapable of fatigue, invincibility, or another of the like kind, is required, without any means at hand for rightly deriving it from יָעֵף, to become feeble, especially as the radical signification anhelare supposed

by Gesenius (comp. אוֹן from the root אן) is unattested. Accordingly, we must go back to the root וף, יף, discussed on Ps. 95:4, which signifies to rise aloft, to be high, and from which יפע, or with a transposition of the consonants יעף (comp. עֵיף and עָיֵף), acquires the signification of standing out, rising radiantly, shining afar off, since יָעֵף, to become weary, is allied to the Arab. wgf, fut. i; this יעף (יפע), on the other hand, to Arab. yf', ascendere, adolescere, Arab. wf', elatum, adultum esse, and Arab. wfâ, eminere, and tropically completum, perfectum esse. Thus we obtain the signification enimentiae for תועפות. In Ps. 95:4, as a numerical plur., it signifies the towerings (tops) of the mountains, and here, as in the passages cited from Numbers, either prominent, eminent attributes, or as an intensive plur. excellence; whence, agreeing with Ewald, we have translated "silver of the brightest lustre" (comp. יִפְעָה, eminentia, splendor, Ezek. 28:7).

29 For then thou shalt delight thyself in the Almighty,

And lift up they countenance to Eloah;

27 If thou prayest to Him, He will hear thee,

And thou shalt pay thy vows.

28 And thou devisest a plan, and it shall be established to thee,

And light shineth upon thy ways.

29 If they are cast down, thou sayest, "Arise!"

And him that hath low eyes He saveth.

30 He shall rescue him who is not guiltless,

And he is rescued by the purity of thy hands.

Job 22:29–30. כִּי־אָז might also be translated "then indeed" (vid., on Job 11:15), as an emphatic resumption of the promissory וְהָיָה (tum erit), v. 25; but what follows is really the confirmation of the promise that God will be to him a rich recompense for the earthly treasures that he resigns; therefore: for then thou shalt delight thyself in the Almighty (vid., the primary passage, Ps. 37:4, and the dependent one, Isa. 58:14; comp. infra, Job 27:10), i.e., He will become a source of highest, heartfelt joy to thee (עַל as interchanging with בְּ by שָׂמַח). Then shall he be able to raise his countenance, which was previously depressed (נָפַל, Gen. 4:6, f.), in the consciousness of his estrangement from God by dearly cherished sin and unexpiated guilt, free and open, confident and joyous, to God. If he prays to Him (תַּעְתִּיר may be thus regarded as the antecedent of a conditional clause, like יִבְרַח, Job 20:24), He will hear him; and what he has vowed in prayer he will now, after that which he supplicated is granted, thankfully perform; the Hiph. הֶעֱתִיר (according to its etymon: to offer the incense of prayer) occurs only in Ex. 8–10 beside this passage, whereas גָּזַר (to cut in pieces, cut off) occurs here for the first time in the signification, to decide, resolve, which is the usual meaning of the word in the later period of the language. On ותגזר (with Pathach, according to another reading with Kametz-chatuph), vid., Ges. § 47, rem. 2. Moreover, the paratactic clauses of v. 28 are to be arranged as we have translated them; קוּם signifies to come to pass, as freq. (e.g., Isa. 7:7, in connection with הָיָה, to come into being). That which he designs (אֹמֶר) is successful, and is realized, and light shines upon his ways, so that he cannot stumble and does not miss his aim,—light like moonlight or morning light; for, as the author of the introductory Proverbs, to which we have already so often referred as being borrowed from the book of Job (comp. Job 21:24 with Prov. 3:8), ingeniously says, Job 4:18: "The path of the righteous is as the morning light (נֹגַהּ כְּאוֹר, comp. Dan. 6:20), which shineth brighter and brighter into the height of day (i.e., noonday brightness)."

Ver. 29. הִשְׁפִּילוּ refers to דְּרָכֶיךָ; for if it is translated: in case they lower (Schlottm., Renan, and others), the suff. is wanting, and the thought is halting. As הִשְׁפִּיל signifies to make low, it can also signify to go down (Jer. 13:18), and said of ways, "to lead downwards" (Rosenm., Ew., Hahn). The old expositors go altogether astray in v. 29a, because they did not discern the exclamative idea of גֵּוֶה. The noun גֵּוֶה—which is formed from the verb גָּוָה = גָּאָה, as גַּאֲוָה, arrogance, Prov. 8:13; גַּהָה, healing, Prov. 17:22; כֵּהָה, mitigation, Nah. 3:19 (distinct from

גְּוָה, the body, the fem. of גֵּו), without the necessity of regarding it as syncopated from גְּאָוָה (Olsh. § 154, b), as שֵׁלָה, 1 Sam. 1:17, from שְׁאֵלָה—does not here signify pride or haughtiness, as in Job 33:17, Jer. 13:17, but signifies adverbially sursum (therefore synon. of סָלָה, which, being formed from סַל, elevatio, with He of direction and Dag. forte implic., as פַּדָּנָה, הָרָה = paddannah, harrah,—perhaps, however, it is to be read directly סַלָּה, with He fem.,—is accordingly a substantive made directly into an adverb, like גְּוָה): suppose that (כִּי = ἐάν, as אִם = εἰ) thy ways lead downwards, thou sayest: on high! i.e., thy will being mighty in God, thy confidence derived from the Almighty, will all at once give them another and more favourable direction: God will again place in a condition of prosperity and happiness,—which יוּשְׁעַ (defectively written; LXX: σώσει; Jer. and Syr., however, reading יְוֻשַּׁע: salvabitur), according to its etymon, Arab. 'ws', signifies,—him who has downcast eyes (LXX κύφοντα ὀφθαλμοῖς).

Ver. 30. It may seem at first sight, that by אִי־נָקִי, the not-guiltless (אִי = אִין = אֵין, e.g., Isa. 40:29, 2 Chron. 14:10, Ges. § 152, 1), Eliphaz means Job himself in his present condition; it would then be a mild periphrastic expression for "the guilty, who has merited his suffering." If thou returnest in this manner to God, He will—this would be the idea of v. 30a—free thee, although thy suffering is not undeserved. Instead now of proceeding: and thou shalt be rescued on account of the purity of thy hands, i.e., because thou hast cleansed them from wrong, Eliphaz would say: and this not-guiltless one will be rescued, i.e., thou, the not-guiltless, wilt be rescued, by the purity of thy hands. But one feels at once how harsh this synallage would be. Even Hirzel, who refers v. 30a to Job, refers 30b to some one else. In reality, however, another is intended in both cases (Ew., Schlottm., Hahn, Olsh.); and v. 30a is just so arranged as to be supplemented by כַּפֶּיךָ בְּבֹר, v. 30b. Even old expositors, as Seb. Schmid and J. H. Michaelis, have correctly perceived the relation: liberabit Deus et propter puritatem manuum tuarum alios, quos propria innocentia ipsos deficiens non esset liberatura. The purity of the hands (Ps. 18:21) is that which Job will have attained when he has put from him that which defiles him (comp. Job 9:30 with 17:9). Hirzel has referred to Matt. 6:33 in connection with vv. 24f.; one is here reminded of the words of our Lord to Peter, Luke 22:32: σύ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου. Eliphaz, although unconsciously, in these last words expresses prophetically what will be fulfilled in the issue of the history in Job himself.

The speech of Eliphaz opens the third course of the controversy. In the first course of the controversy the speeches of the friends, though bearing upon the question of punishment, were embellished with alluring promises; but these promises were incapable of comforting Job, because they proceeded upon the assumption that he is suffering as a sinner deserving of punishment, and can only become free from his punishment by turning to God. In the second course of the controversy, since Job gave no heed to their exhortations to penitence, the friends drew back their promises, and began the more unreservedly to punish and to threaten, by presenting to Job, in the most terrifying pictures of the ruin of the evil-doer, his own threatening destruction. The misconstruction which Job experiences from the friends has the salutary effect on him of rooting him still more deeply in the hope that God will not let him die without having borne witness to his innocence. But the mystery of the present is nevertheless not cleared up for Job by this glimpse of faith into the future. On the contrary, the second course of the controversy ends so, that to the friends who unjustly and uncharitably deny instead of solving the mystery of his individual lot, Job now presents that which is mysterious in the divine distribution of human fortune in general, the total irreconcilableness of experience with the idea of the just divine retribution maintained by them. In that speech of his, Job 21, which forms the transition to the third course of the controversy, Job uses the language of the doubter not without sinning against God. But

since it is true that the outward lot of man by no means always corresponds to his true moral condition, and never warrants an infallible conclusion respecting it, he certainly in that speech gives the death-blow to the dogma of the friends. The poet cannot possibly allow them to be silent over it. Eliphaz, the most discreet and intelligent, speaks. His speech, considered in itself, is the purest truth, uttered in the most appropriate and beautiful form. But as an answer to the speech of Job the dogma of the friends itself is destroyed in it, by the false conclusion by which it is obliged to justify itself to itself. The greatness of the poet is manifest from this, that he makes the speeches of the friends, considered in themselves, and apart from the connection of the drama, express the most glorious truths, while they are proved to be inadequate, indeed perverted and false, in so far as they are designed to solve the existing mystery. According to their general substance, these speeches are genuine diamonds; according to their special application, they are false ones.

How true is what Eliphaz says, that God neither blesses the pious because he is profitable to Him, nor punishes the wicked because he is hurtful to Him; that the pious is profitable not to God, but to himself; the wicked is hurtful not to God, but himself; that therefore the conduct of God towards both is neither arbitrary nor selfish! But if we consider the conclusion to which, in these thoughts, Eliphaz only takes a spring, they prove themselves to be only the premises of a false conclusion. For Eliphaz infers from them that God rewards virtue as such, and punishes vice as such; that therefore where a man suffers, the reason of it is not to be sought in any secondary purpose on the part of God, but solely and absolutely in the purpose of God to punish the sins of the man. The fallacy of the conclusion is this, that the possibility of any other purpose, which is just as far removed from self-interest, in connection with God's purpose of punishing the sins of the man, is excluded. It is now manifest how near theoretical error and practical falsehood border on one another, so that dogmatical error is really in the rule at the same time ἀδικία. For after Eliphaz, in order to defend the justice of divine retribution against Job, has again indissolubly connected suffering and the punishment of sin, without acknowledging any other form of divine rule but His justice, any other purpose in decreeing suffering than the infliction of punishment (from the recognition of which the right and true comfort for Job would have sprung up), he is obliged in the present instance, against his better knowledge and conscience, to distort an established fact, to play the hypocrite to himself, and persuade himself of the existence of sins in Job, of which the confirmation fails him, and to become false and unjust towards Job even in favour of the false dogma. For the dogma demands wickedness in an equal degree to correspond to a great evil, unlimited sins to unlimited sufferings. Therefore the former wealth of Job must furnish him with the ground of heavy accusations, which he now expresses directly and unconditionally to Job. He whose conscience, however, does not accuse him of mammon-worship, Job 31:24f., is suffering the punishment of a covetous and compassionless rich man. Thus is the dogma of the justice of God rescued by the unjust abandonment of Job.

Further, how true is Eliphaz' condemnatory judgment against the free-thinking, which, if it does not deny the existence of God, still regards God as shut up in the heavens, without concerning himself about anything that takes place on earth! The divine judgment of total destruction came upon a former generation that had thought thus insolently of God, and to the joy of the righteous the same judgment is still executed upon evil-doers of the same mind. This is true, but it does not apply to Job, for whom it is intended. Job has denied the universality of a just divine retribution, but not the special providence of God. Eliphaz sets retributive justice and special providence again here in a false correlation. He thinks that, so far as a man fails to perceive the one, he must at once doubt the other,—another instance of the absurd reasoning of their dogmatic one-sidedness. Such is Job's relation to God, that

even if he failed to discover a single trace of retributive justice anywhere, he would not deny His rule in nature and among men. For his God is not a mere notion, but a person to whom he stands in a living relation. A notion falls to pieces as soon as it is found to be self-contradictory; but God remains what He is, however much the phenomenon of His rule contradicts the nature of His person. The rule of God on earth Job firmly holds, although in manifold instances he can only explain it by God's absolute and arbitrary power. Thus he really knows no higher motive in God to which to refer his affliction; but nevertheless he knows that God interests himself about him, and that He who is even now his Witness in heaven will soon arise on the dust of the grave in his behalf. For such utterances of Job's faith Eliphaz has no ear. He knows no faith beyond the circle of his dogma.

The exhortations and promises by which Eliphaz then (Job 22:21–30) seeks to lead Job back to God are in and of themselves true and most glorious. There is also somewhat in them which reflects shame on Job; they direct him to that inward peace, to that joy in God, which he had entirely lost sight of when he spoke of the misfortune of the righteous in contrast with the prosperity of the wicked.189 But even these beauteous words of promise are blemished by the false assumption from which they proceed. The promise, the Almighty shall become Job's precious ore, rests on the assumption that Job is now suffering the punishment of his avarice, and has as its antecedent: "Lay thine ore in the dust, and thine Ophir beneath the pebbles of the brook." Thus do even the holiest and truest words lose their value when they are not uttered at the right time, and the most brilliant sermon that exhorts to penitence remains without effect when it is prompted by pharisaic uncharitableness. The poet, who is general has regarded the character of Eliphaz as similar to that of a prophet (vid., Job 4:12ff.), makes him here at the close of his speech against his will prophesy the issue of the controversy. He who now, considering himself as נקי, preaches penitence to Job, shall at last stand forth as אי נקי, and will be one of the first who need Job's intercession as the servant of God, and whom he is able mediatorially to rescue by the purity of his hands.

Translator's Preface

[to the Original English Edition, Volume 2]

It is with no ordinary feeling of relief and satisfaction that I am at length able to send forth the second and concluding volume of this Commentary. And I am confident that the trifling delay in this year's issues of the Foreign Theological Library will be readily pardoned, when the tedious toil involved in carrying such a work through the press amidst the pressure of other duties is considered. No pains have been spared to render the work worthy its position; and the care bestowed upon the work by myself has been fully seconded by the attention of the printers.

The duties of translation have been carefully discharged, and it has been my aim to preserve the complexion of the original as far as possible, even sometimes at the expense of an easy flow of language. Conscious of imperfection in the working out of my design, I have nevertheless sought to put the reader in the position of a student of the original volume. The task which I imposed upon myself has not been confined to mere translation; but close attention has been given to the accurate reproduction of the critical portions, with the hope of contributing in some small degree to the diffusion of sound exegetical knowledge for the elucidation of one of the grandest and most practical books of the Old Testament Scriptures, and from a conviction of the need there is for the cultivation of the cognate Semitic languages. This latter branch of study is specially applicable and necessary in the interpretation of the book of Job, and the established scholarship of Dr. Delitzsch eminently qualifies him for the effective execution of the work.

Further explanation need scarcely be added, except in reference to the retention of the word Chokma, and the character of the translation of the text. As to the former, I regret that I did not append a note to p. 247, to the effect that the

word Chokma (חָכְמָה, Wisdom) was reproduced because used technically by the author. I presumed that students of the volume would at once recognise the word; but from the consideration that the Commentary may also be used, so far as the practical parts are concerned, even by readers unacquainted with Hebrew, this explanation has been deemed needful.

And it may further suffice, in connection with the second section of the Introduction, to define Chokma as the one word for the lofty spirit of wisdom which dwelt in the minds of the wise men of Israel in the Salomonic age,—a wisdom taught, inspired, by the Holy Spirit of God—the culmination of which is found in Solomon himself. In brief, the Chokma is the divine philosophy of the Jewish church.

With reference to the new rendering of the text: it aims at a literal and faithful reproduction of Dr. Delitzsch's translation, as representing his "sense and appreciation of the original," and as the embodiment of the results of the critical notes. Therefore I have not felt at liberty to use that freedom of expression which I regard as most desirably in adapting the translation of the original text to the requirements of the general reader. This portion of my undertaking has not been free from difficulty; and occasionally an amount of stiffness has seemed unavoidable, owing to the different structure of the Hebrew and English languages, while, form the plastic nature of the German language, the author is enabled to mould his translation closely after the original text, and still render it elegant, and at times rhythmical.

A note on the transcription of Arabic words will be found at the end of the Appendix. The references have been verified, so far as the means of verification have been accessible; and I believe I may speak with confidence of those that I have not been able to verify, from the general accuracy I found in the others.

To clear up the misapprehension which has been manifested in many quarters, I would add that this Commentary forms a part of the Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament by Drs. Keil and Delitzsch. But the name of the latter only is appended to these volumes, because Dr. Delitzsch is the writer of this portion, just as Dr. Keil only is the author of the Commentary on the Pentateuch, and all the other volumes that have appeared to this date.

I have still to acknowledge the kind promptitude with which my esteemed friend Dr. Delitzsch has, in more than one instance, given me an explanation of a difficulty point, and favoured me with an additional amendment of the original work during the progress of this translation through the press.

In the hope that the usefulness of Dr. Delitzsch's valuable contribution to Biblical Exegesis may be extended beyond his original design, I commend it to all earnest students of the Holy Word, with the prayer that the blessing of the Spirit of Jehovah may rest upon the labours of our hands.

JOB 23

Job's First Answer

[Then began Job, and said:]

2 Even to-day my complaint still biddeth defiance,

My hand lieth heavy upon my groaning.

3 Oh that I knew where I might find Him,

That I might come even to His dwelling-place!

4 I would lay the cause before Him,

And fill my mouth with arguments:

5 I should like to know the words He would answer me,

And attend to what He would say to me.

Job 23:2–5. Since מָרִי (for which the LXX reads ἐκ τοῦ χειρός μου, מידי; Ew. מידו, from his hand) usually elsewhere signifies obstinacy, it appears that v. 2a ought to be explained: My complaint is always accounted as rebellion (against God); but by this rendering v. 2b requires some sort of expletive, in order to furnish a connected thought: although the hand which is upon me stifles my groaning (Hirz.); or, according to another rendering of the עַל: et

pourtant mes gémissements n'égalent pas mes souffrances (Renan. Schlottm.). These interpretations are objectionable on account of the artificial restoration of the connection between the two members of the verse, which they require; they lead one to expect וְיָדִי (as a circumstantial clause: LXX, Cod. Vat. καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ). As the words stand, it is to be supposed that the definition of time, גַּם־הַיּוֹם (even to-day still, as Zech. 9:12), belongs to both divisions of the verse. How, then, is מרי to be understood? If we compare Job 7:11, 10:1, where מר, which is combined with שִׂיחַ, signifies amarum = amartiduo, it is natural to take מרי also in the signification amaritudo, acerbitas (Targ., Syr., Jer.); and this is also possible, since, as is evident from Ex. 23:21, comp. Zech. 12:10, the verbal forms מרר and מרה run into one another, as they are really cognates.190 But it is more satisfactory, and more in accordance with the relation of the two divisions of the verse, if we keep to the usual signification of מָרִי; not, however, understanding it of obstinacy, revolt, rebellion (viz., in the sense of the friends), but, like מֹרֶה, 2 Kings 14:26) which describes the affliction as stiff-necked, obstinate), of stubbornness, defiance, continuance in opposition, and explain with Raschi: My complaint is still always defiance, i.e., still maintains itself in opposition, viz., against God, without yielding (Hahn, Olsh.: unsubmitting); or rather: against such exhortations to penitence as those which Eliphaz has just addressed to him. In reply to these, Job considers his complain to be well justified even to-day, i.e., even now (for it is not, with Ewald, to be imagined that, in the mind of the poet, the controversy extends over several days,—an idea which would only be indicated by this one word).

In v. 2b he continues the same thought under a different form of expression. My hand lies heavy on my groaning, i.e., I hold it immoveably fast (as Fleischer proposes to take the words); or better: I am driven to a continued utterance of it.191 By this interpretation ידי retains its most natural meaning, manus mea, and the connection of the two members of the verse without any particle is best explained. On the other hand, all modern expositors, who do not, as Olsh., at once correct ידי into ידו, explain the suffix as objective: the hand, i.e., the destiny to which I have to submit, weighs upon my sighing, irresistibly forcing it out from me. Then v. 2b is related to v. 2a as a confirmation; and if, therefore, a particle is to be supplied, it is כִּי (Olsh.) and no other. Thus, even the Targ. renders it מַחָתִי, plaga mea. Job's affliction is frequently traced back to the hand of God, Job 19:21, comp. 1:11, 2:5, 13:21; and on the suffix used objectively (pass.) we may compare v. 14, חֻקּוֹ; Job 20:29, אִמְרוֹ; and especially 34:6, חִצִּי. The interpretation: the hand upon me is heavy above my sighing, i.e., heavier than it (Ramban, Rosenm., Ges., Schlottm., Renan), also accords with the connection. עַל can indeed be used in this comparative meaning, Ex. 16:5, Eccl. 1:16; but על יד כבדה is an established phrase, and commonly used of the burden of the hand upon any one, Ps. 32:4 (comp. Job 33:7, in the division in which Elihu is introduced; and the connection with אֶל, 1 Sam. 5:6, and שָׁם, 1 Sam. 5:11); and this usage of the language renders the comparative rendering very improbable. But it is also improbable that "my hand" is = the hand [that is] upon me, since it cannot be shown that יד was directly used in the sense of plaga; even the Arabic, among the many turns of meaning which it gives to Arab. yd, does not support this, and least of all would an Arab conceive of Arab. ydâ passively, plaga quam patior. Explain, therefore: his complain now, as before, offers resistance to the exhortation of the friends, which is not able to lessen it, his (Job's) hand presses upon his lamentation so that it is forced to break forth, but—without its justification being recognised by men. This thought urges him on to the wish that he might be able to pour forth his complain directly before God. מִי־יִתֵּן is at one time followed by an accusative (Job 14:4, 29:2, 31:31, 35, to which belongs also the construction with the inf., Job 11:5), at another by the fut., with or without Waw (as here, v. 3b, Job 6:8, 13:5, 14:13, 19:23), and at another by the perf., with or without Waw (as here, v. 3a: utinam noverim,

and Deut. 5:26). And יָדַעְתִּי is, as in Job 32:22, joined with the fut.: scirem (noverim) et invenirem instead of possim invenire eum (לְמָצְאוֹ), Ges. § 142, 3, c. If he but knew [how] to reach Him (God), could attain to His throne; תְּכוּנָה (everywhere from כּוּן, not from תָּכַן) signifies the setting up, i.e., arrangement (Ezek. 43:11) or establishment (Nah. 2:10) of a dwelling, and the thing itself which is set out and established, here of the place where God's throne is established. Having attained to this, he would lay his cause (instuere causam, as Job 13:18, comp. 33:5) before Him, and fill his mouth with arguments to prove that he has right on his side (תּוֹכָחוֹת, as Ps. 38:15, of the grounds of defence, or proof that he is in the right and his opponent in the wrong). In v. 5 we may translate: I would, or: I should like (to learn); in the Hebrew, as in cognoscerem, both are expressed; the substance of v. 5a makes the optative rendering more natural. He would like to know the words with which He would meet him,192 and would give heed to what He would say to him. But will He condescend? will He have anything to do with the matter?—

6 Will He contend with me with great power?
No, indeed; He will only regard me!
7 Then the upright would be disputing with Him,
And I should for ever escape my judge.
8 Yet I go eastward, He is not there,
And westward, but I perceive Him not;
9 Northwards where He worketh, but I behold Him not;
He turneth aside southwards, and I see Him not.

Job 23:6–9. The question which Job, in v. 6a, puts forth: will He contend with me in the greatness or fulness of His strength, i.e., (as Job 30:18) with a calling forth of all His strength? he himself answers in v. 6b, hoping that the contrary may be the case: no, indeed, He will not do that.193 לֹא is here followed not by the כִּי, which is otherwise customary after a negation in the signification imo, but by the restrictive exceptive אַךְ, which never signifies sed, sometimes verum tamen (Ps. 49:16; comp. supra, Job 13:15, p. 361), but here, as frequently, tantummodo, and, according to the hyperbaton which has been mentioned so often (pp. 283, 374, and also 361), is placed at the beginning of the sentence, and belongs not to the member of the sentence immediately following it, but to the whole sentence (as in Arabic also the restrictive force of the Arab. innamâ never falls upon what immediately follows it): He will do nothing but regard me (יָשֵׂם, scil. לֵב, elsewhere with עַל of the object of regard or reflection, Job 34:23, 37:15, Judg. 19:30, and without an ellipsis, Job 1:8; also with אֶל, Job 2:3, or לְ, 1 Sam. 9:20; here designedly with בְּ, which unites in itself the significations of the Arab. b and fî, of seizing, and of plunging into anything). Many expositors (Hirz., Ew., and others) understand v. 6b as expressing a wish: "Shall He contend with me with overwhelming power? No, I do not desire that; only that He may be a judge attentive to the cause, not a ruler manifesting His almighty power." But v. 6a, taken thus, would be purely rhetorical, since this question (shall He, etc.) certainly cannot be seriously propounded by Job; accordingly, v. 6b is not intended as expressing a wish, but a hope. Job certainly wishes the same thing in Job 9:34, 13:21; but in the course of the discussion he has gradually acquired new confidence in God, which here once more breaks through. He knows that God, if He would but be found, would also condescend to hear his defence of himself, that He would allow him to speak, and not overwhelm him with His majesty.

Ver. 7. The question arises here, whether the שָׁם which follows is to be understood locally (Arab. tamma) or temporally (Arab. tumma); it is evident from Job 35:12, Ps. 14:5, 66:6, Hos. 2:17, Zeph. 1:14, that it may be used temporally; in many passages, e.g., Ps. 36:13, the two significations run into one another, so that they cannot be distinguished. We here decide in favour of the temporal signification, against Rosenm., Schlottm., and Hahn; for if שׁם be understood locally, a "then" must be supplied, and it may therefore be concluded that this שׁם is the expression for it. We assume

at the same time that נוכח is correctly pointed as part. with Kametz; accordingly it is to be explained: then, if He would thus pay attention to me, an upright man would be contending with Him, i.e., then it would be satisfactorily proved that an upright man may contend with Him. In v. 7b, פָּלַט, like מָלַט, Job 20:20 (comp. פָּתַח, to have open, to stand open), is intensive of Kal: I should for ever escape my judge, i.e., come off most completely free from unmerited punishment. Thus it ought to be if God could be found, but He cannot be found. The הֵן, which according to the sense may be translated by "yet" (comp. Job 21:16), introduces this antithetical relation: Yet I go towards the east (הֵן with Mahpach, קֶדֶם with Munach), and He is not there; and towards the west (אָחוֹר, comp. אחרנים, occidentales, Job 18:20), and perceive Him not (expressed as in Job 9:11; לְ בִין elsewhere: to attend to anything, Job 14:21, Deut. 32:29, Ps. 73:17; here, as there, to perceive anything, so that לוֹ is equivalent to אֹתוֹ). In v. 9 the left (שְׂמֹאול, Arab. shemâl, or even without the substantival termination, on which comp. Jesurun, pp. 222–227, sham, shâm) is undoubtedly an appellation of the north, and the right (יָמִין, Arab. jemîn) an appellation of the south; both words are locatives which outwardly are undefined. And if the usual signification of עשׂה and עטף are retained, it is to be explained thus: northwards or in the north, if He should be active—I behold not; if He veil himself southwards or in the south—I see not. This explanation is also satisfactory so far as v. 9a is concerned, so that it is unnecessary to understand בַּעֲשֹׂתוֹ other than in Job 28:26, and with Blumenfeld to translate according to the phrase דַּרְכּוֹ עָשָׂה, Judg. 17:8: if He makes His way northwards; or even with Umbr. to call in the assistance of the Arab. gšâ (to cover), which neither here nor Job 9:9, 15:27, is admissible, since even then בעשׂתו שׂמאול cannot signify: if He hath concealed himself on the left hand (in the north). Ewald's combination of עשׂה with עטה, in the assumed signification "to incline to" of the latter, is to be passed over as useless. On the other hand, much can be said in favour of Ewald's translation of v. 9b: "if He turn to the right hand—I see Him not;" for (1) the Arab. gṭf, by virtue of the radical notion,194 which is also traceable in the Heb. עטף, signifies both trans. and intrans. to turn up, bend aside; (2) Saadia translates: "and if He turns southwards ('atafa gunûban);" (3) Schultens correctly observes: עטף significatione operiendi commodum non efficit sensum, nam quid mirum is quem occultantem se non conspiciamus. We therefore give the preference to this Arabic rendering of יעטף. If יעטף, in the sense of obvelat se, does not call to mind the תֵּמָן חַדְרֵי, penetralia austri, Job 9:9 (comp. Arab. chidr, velamen, adytum), neither will בעשׂתו point to the north as the limit of the divine dominion. Such conceptions of the extreme north and south are nowhere found among the Arabs as among the Arian races (vid., Isa. 14:13);195 and, moreover, the conception of the north as the abode of God cannot be shown to be biblical, either from Job 37:22, Ezek. 1:4, or still less from Ps. 48:3. With regard to the syntax, יעטף is a hypothetical fut., as Job 20:24, 22:27f. The use of the fut. apoc. אַחֲז, like אַט, v. 11, without a voluntative or aoristic signification, is poetic. Towards all quarters of the heavens he turns, i.e., with his eyes and the longing of his whole nature, if he may by any means find God. But He evades him, does not reveal Himself in any place whatever.

The כִּי which now follows does not give the reason of Job's earnest search after God, but the reason of His not being found by him. He does not allow Himself to be seen anywhere; He conceals Himself from him, lest He should be compelled to acknowledge the right of the sufferer, and to withdraw His chastening hand from him.

10 For He knoweth the way that is with me:

If He should prove me, I should come forth as gold.

11 My foot held firm to His steps;

His way I kept, and turned not aside.

12 The command of His lips—I departed not from it;

More than my own determination I kept the words of His mouth.

13 Yet He remaineth by one thing, and who can turn Him?

And He accomplisheth what His soul desireth.

Job 23:10–13. That which is not merely outwardly, but inwardly with (אִם) any one, is that which he thinks and knows (his consciousness), Job 9:35, 15:9, or his willing and acting, Job 10:13, 27:11: he is conscious of it, he intends to do it; here, v. 10, עִם is intended in the former sense, in v. 14 in the latter. The "way with me" is that which his conscience (συνείδησις) approves (συμμαρτυρεῖ); comp. Psychol. S. 134. This is known to God, so that he who is now set down as a criminal would come forth as tried gold, in the event of God allowing him to appear before Him, and subjecting him to judicial trial. בְּחָנַנִי is the praet. hypotheticum so often mentioned, which is based upon the paratactic character of the Hebrew style, as Gen. 44:22, Ruth 2:9, Zech. 13:6; Ges. § 155, 4, a. His foot has held firmly196 to the steps of God (אָשׁוּר, together with אַשּׁוּר, Job 31:7, from אשׁר Piel, to go on), so that he was always close behind Him as his predecessor (אָחַז synon. תָּמַךְ, Ps. 17:5, Prov. 5:5). He guarded, i.e., observed His way, and turned not aside (אַט fut. apoc. Hiph. in the intransitive sense of deflectere, as e.g., Ps. 125:5).

In v. 12a, שְׂפָתָיו מִצְוַת precedes as cas. absolutus (as respects the command of His lips); and what is said in this respect follows with Waw apod. (= Arab. f) without the retrospective pronoun מִמֶּנָּה (which is omitted for poetic brevity). On this prominence of a separate notion after the manner of an antecedent, comp. p. 293, note 1. The Hiph. הֵמִישׁ, like הִטָּה, v. 11, and הִלִּיז, Prov. 4:21, is not causative, but simply active in signification. In v. 12b the question arises, whether מִן צָפַן is one expression, as in Job 17:4, in the sense of "hiding from another," or whether מִן is comparative. In the former sense Hirz. explains: I removed the divine will from the possible ascendancy of my own. But since צָפַן is familiar to the poet in the sense of preserving and laying by (צְפוּנִים, treasures, Job 20:26), it is more natural to explain, according to Ps. 119:11: I kept the words (commands) of Thy mouth, i.e., esteemed them high and precious, more than my statute, i.e., more than what my own will prescribed for me.197 The meaning is substantially the same; the LXX, which translates ἐν δὲ κόλπῳ μου (בְּחֻקִּי), which Olsh. considers to be "perhaps correct," destroys the significance of the confession. Hirz. rightly refers to the "law in the members," Rom. 7:23: חֻקִּי is the expression Job uses for the law of the sinful nature which strives against the law of God, the wilful impulse of selfishness and evil passion, the law which the apostle describes as ἕτερος νόμος, in distinction from the νόμος τοῦ Θεοῦ (Psychol. S. 379). Job's conscience can give him this testimony, but He, the God who so studiously avoids him, remains in one mind, viz., to treat him as a criminal; and who can turn Him from His purpose? (the same question as Job 9:12, 11:10); His soul wills it (stat pro ratione voluntas), and He accomplishes it. Most expositors explain permanet in uno in this sense; the Beth is the usual בְּ with verbs of entering upon and persisting in anything. Others, however, take the בְּ as Beth essentiae: He remains one and the same, viz., in His conduct towards me (Umbr., Vaih.), or: He is one, is alone, viz., in absolute majesty (Targ. Jer.; Schult., Ew., Hlgst., Schlottm.), which is admissible, since this Beth occurs not only in the complements of a sentence (Ps. 39:7, like a shadow; Isa. 48:10, after the manner of silver; Ps. 55:19, in great number; Ps. 35:2, as my help), but also with the predicate of a simple sentence, be it verbal (Job 24:13; Prov. 3:26) or substantival (Ex. 18:4; Ps. 118:7). The same construction is found also in Arabic, where, however, it is more frequent in simple negative clauses than in affirmative (vid., Psalter, i. 272). The assertion: He is one (as in the primary monotheistic confession, Deut. 6:4), is, however, an expression for the absoluteness of God, which is not suited to this connection; and if באחד הוא is intended to be understood of the unchangeable uniformity of His purpose concerning Job, the explanation: versatur (perstat) in uno, Arab. hua fi wâhidin,

is not only equally, but more natural, and we therefore prefer it.

Here again God appears to Job to be his enemy. His confidence towards God is again overrun by all kinds of evil, suspicious thoughts. He seems to him to be a God of absolute caprice, who punishes where there is no ground for punishment. There is indeed a phrase of the abiding fact which he considers superior to God and himself, both being conceived of as contending parties; and this phase God avoids, He will not hear it. Into this vortex of thoughts, as terrible as they are puerile, Job is hurried forward by the persuasion that his affliction is a decree of divine justice. The friends have greatly confirmed him in this persuasion; so that his consciousness of innocence, and the idea of God as inflicting punishment, are become widely opposite extremes, between which his faith is hardly able to maintain itself. It is not his affliction in itself, but this persuasion, which precipitates him into such a depth of conflict, as the following strophe shows.

14 For He accomplisheth that which is appointed for me,

And much of a like kind is with Him.

15 Therefore I am troubled at His presence;

If I consider it, I am afraid of Him.

16 And God hath caused my heart to be dejected,

And the Almighty hath put me to confusion;

17 For I have not been destroyed before darkness,

And before my countenance, which thick darkness covereth.

Job 23:14–17. Now it is the will of God, the absolute, which has all at once turned against him, the innocent (v. 13); for what He has decreed against him (חֻקִּי) He also brings to a complete fulfilment (הִשְׁלִים, as e.g., Isa. 44:26); and the same troubles as those which he already suffers, God has still more abundantly decreed for him, in order to torture him gradually, but surely, to death. Job intends v. 14b in reference to himself, not as a general assertion: it is, in general, God's way of acting. Hahn's objection to the other explanation, that Job's affliction, according to his own previous assertions, has already attained its highest degree, does not refute it; for Job certainly has a term of life before him, though it be but short, in which the wondrously inventive (Job 10:16) hostility of God can heap up ever new troubles for him. On the other hand, the interpretation of the expression in a general sense is opposed by the form of the expression itself, which is not that God delights to do this, but that He purposes (עִמּוֹ) to do it. It is a conclusion from the present concerning the future, such as Job is able to make with reference to himself; while he, moreover, abides by the reality in respect to the mysterious distribution of the fortunes of men. Therefore, because he is a mark for the enmity of God, without having merited it, he is confounded before His countenance, which is so angrily turned upon him (comp. פנים, Ps. 21:10, Lam. 4:16); if he considers it (according to the sense fut. hypothet., as v. 9b), he trembles before Him, who recompenses faithful attachment by such torturing pain. The following connection with לְ and the mention of God twice at the beginning of the affirmations, is intended to mean: (I tremble before Him), and He it is who has made me faint-hearted (הֵרַךְ Hiph. from the Kal, Deut. 20:3, and freq., to be tender, soft, disconcerted), and has troubled me; which is then supported in v. 17.

His suffering which draws him on to ruin he perceives, but it is not the proper ground of his inward destruction; it is not the encircling darkness of affliction, not the mysterious form of his suffering which disconcerts him, but God's hostile conduct towards him, His angry countenance as he seems to see it, and which he is nevertheless unable to explain. Thus also Ew., Hirz., Vaih., Hlgst., and Schlottm. explain the passage. The only other explanation worthy of mention is that which finds in v. 17 the thought already expressed in Job 3:10: For I was not then destroyed, in order that I might experience such mysterious suffering; and interpretation with which most of the old expositors were satisfied, and which has been revived by

Rosenm., Stick., and Hahn. We translate: for I have not been destroyed before darkness (in order to be taken away from it before it came upon me), and He has not hidden darkness before my face; or as an exclamation: that I have not been destroyed! which is to be equivalent to: Had I but been … ! Apart from this rendering of the quod non = utinam, which cannot be supported, (1) It is doubly hazardous thus to carry the לֹא forward to the second line in connection with verbs of different persons. (2) The darkness in v. 17b appears (at least according to the usual interpret. caliginem) as that which is being covered, whereas it is naturally that which covers something else; wherefore Blumenfeld explains: and darkness has not hidden, viz., such pain as I must now endure, from my face. (3) The whole thought which is thus gained is without point, and meaningless, in this connection. On the other hand, the antithesis between מִפָּנָיו and מִפָּנַי, מִמֶּנּוּ and מִפְּנֵי־חֹשֶׁךְ, is at once obvious; and this antithesis, which forces itself upon the attention, also furnishes the thought which might be expected from the context. It is unnecessary to take נִצְמַת in a different signification from Job 6:17; in Arabic ṣmt signifies conticescere; the idea of the root, however, is in general a constraining depriving of free movement. שָׁדְּחוֹ is intended as in the question of Eliphaz, Job 22:11: "Or seest thou not the darkness?" to which it perhaps refers. It is impossible, with Schlottm., to translate v. 17b: and before that darkness covers my face; מִן is never other than a praep., not a conjunction with power over a whole clause. It must be translated: et a facie mea quam obtegit caligo. As the absolute פנים, Job 9:27, signifies the appearance of the countenance under pain, so here by it Job means his countenance distorted by pain, his deformed appearance, which, as the attributive clause affirms, is thoroughly darkened by suffering (comp. Job 30:30). But it is not this darkness which stares him in the face, and threatens to swallow him up (comp. מפני־חשך, Job 17:12); not this his miserable form, which the extremest darkness covers (on אָפַל, vid., Job 10:22), that destroys his inmost nature; but the thought that God stands forth in hostility against him, which makes his affliction so terrific, and doubly so in connection with the inalienable consciousness of his innocence. From the incomprehensible punishment which, without reason, is passing over him, he now again comes to speak of the incomprehensible connivance of God, which permits the godlessness of the world to go on unpunished.

JOB 24

24:1 Wherefore are not bounds reserved by the Almighty,

And they who honour Him see not His days?

2 They remove the landmarks,

They steal flocks and shepherd them.

3 They carry away the ass of the orphan,

And distrain the ox of the widow.

4 They thrust the needy out of the way,

The poor of the land are obliged to slink away together.

Job 24:1–4. The supposition that the text originally stood מִשַּׁדַּי לָרְשָׁעִים מַדּוּעַ is natural; but it is at once destroyed by the fact that v. 1a becomes thereby disproportionately long, and yet cannot be divided into two lines of comparatively independent contents. In fact, לרשׁעים is by no means absolutely necessary. The usage of the language assumes it, according to which עֵת followed by the genitive signifies the point of time at which any one's fate is decided. Isa. 13:22, Jer. 27:7, Ezek. 22:3, 30:3; the period when reckoning is made, or even the terminus ad quem, Eccl. 9:12; and יום followed by the gen. of a man, the day of his end, Job 15:32, 18:20, Ezek. 21:30, and freq.; or with יהוה, the day when God's judgment is revealed, Joel 1:15, and freq. The boldness of poetic language goes beyond this usage, by using עִתִּים directly of the period of punishment, as is almost universally acknowledged since Schultens' day, and יָמָיו of God's days of judgment or of vengeance;198 and it is the less ambiguous, since צָפַן, in the sense of the divine predetermination of what is future, Job 15:20, especially of God's storing up

merited punishment, Job 21:19, is an acknowledged word of our poet. On מִן with the passive, vid., Ew. § 295, c (where, however, Job 28:4 is erroneously cited in its favour); it is never more than equivalent to ἀπό, for to use מִן directly as ὑπό with the passive is admissible neither in Hebrew nor in Arabic. ידעו (Keri יֹדְעָיו, for which the Targ. unsuitably reads יְדַעַי) are, as in Ps. 36:11, 87:4, comp. supra, Job 18:21, those who know God, not merely superficially, but from experience of His ways, consequently those who are in fellowship with Him. חָזוּ לֹא is to be written with Zinnorith over the לֹא, and Mercha by the first syllable of חזו. The Zinnorith necessitates the retreat of the tone of חזו to its first syllable, as in כי־חרה, Ps. 18:8 (Bär's Pslaterium, p. xiii.); for if חזו remained Milra, לא ought to be connected with it by Makkeph, and consequently remain toneless (Psalter, ii. 507).

Next follows the description of the moral, abhorrence which, while the friends (Job 22:19) maintain a divine retribution everywhere manifest, is painfully conscious of the absence of any determination of the periods and days of judicial punishment. Fearlessly and unpunished, the oppression of the helpless and defenceless, though deserving of a curse, rages in every form. They remove the landmarks; comp. Deut. 27:17, "Cursed is he who removeth his neighbour's landmark" (מַסִּיג, here once written with שׂ, while otherwise הִשִּׂיג from נָשַׂג signifies assequi, on the other hand הִסִּיג from סוּג signifies dimovere). They steal flocks, וַיִּרְעוּ, i.e., they are so barefaced, that after they have stolen them they pasture them openly. The ass of the orphans, the one that is their whole possession, and their only beast for labour, they carry away as prey (נָהַג, as e.g., Isa. 20:4); they distrain, i.e., take away with them as a pledge (on חָבַל, to bind by a pledge, obstringere, and also to take as a pledge, vid., on Job 22:6, and Köhler on Zech. 11:7), the yoke-ox of the widow (this is the exact meaning of שׁוֹר, as of the Arab. thôr). They turn the needy aside from the way which they are going, so that they are obliged to wander hither and thither without home or right: the poor of the land are obliged to hide themselves altogether. The Hiph. הִטָּה, with אֶבְיוֹנִים as its obj., is used as in Amos 5:12; there it is used of turning away from a right that belongs to them, here of turning out of the way into trackless regions. אֶבְיוֹן (vid., on Job 29:16) here, as frequently, is the parallel word with עָנָו, the humble one, the patient sufferer; instead of which the Keri is עָנִי, the humbled, bowed down with suffering (vid., on Ps. 9:13). עַנְוֵי־אֶרֶץ occurs without any Keri in Ps. 76:10, Zeph. 2:3, and might less suitably appear here, where it is not so much the moral attribute as the outward condition that is intended to be described. The Pual חֻבְּאוּ describes that which they are forced to do.

The description of these unfortunate ones is now continued; and by a comparison with Job 30:1–8, it is probable that aborigines who are turned out of their original possessions and dwellings are intended (comp. Job 15:19, according to which the poet takes his stand in an age in which the original relations of the races had been already disturbed by the calamities of war and the incursions of aliens). If the central point of the narrative lies in Haurân, or, more exactly, in the Nukra, it is natural, with Wetzstein, to think of the Arab. 'hl 'l-wukr or 'rb 'l-ḥujr, i.e., the (perhaps Ituraean) "races of the caves" in Trachonitis.

5 Behold, as wild asses in the desert,
They go forth in their work seeking for prey,
The steppe is food to them for the children.
6 In the field they reap the fodder for his cattle,
And they glean the vineyard of the evil-doer.
7 They pass the night in nakedness without a garment,
And have no covering in the cold.
8 They are wet with the torrents of rain upon the mountains,
And they hug the rocks for want of shelter.

Job 24:5–8. The poet could only draw such a picture as this, after having himself seen the home of his hero, and the calamitous fate of

such as were driven forth from their original abodes to live a vagrant, poverty-stricken gipsy life. By v. 5, one is reminded of Ps. 104:21–23, especially since in v. 11 of this Psalm the פְּרָאִים, onagri (Kulans), are mentioned,—those beautiful animals199 which, while young, as difficult to be broken in, and when grown up are difficult to be caught; which in their love of freedom are an image of the Beduin, Gen. 16:12; their untractableness an image of that which cannot be bound, Job 11:12; and from their roaming about in herds in waste regions, are here an image of a gregarious, vagrant, and freebooter kind of life. The old expositors, as also Rosenm., Umbr., Arnh., and Vaih., are mistaken in thinking that aliud hominum sceleratorum genus is described in vv. 5ff. Ewald and Hirz. were the first to perceive that vv. 5–8 is the further development of v. 4b, and that here, as in Job 30:1ff., those who are driven back into the wastes and caves, and a remnant of the ejected and oppressed aborigines who drag out a miserable existence, are described.

The accentuation rightly connects במדבר פראים; by the omission of the Caph similit., as e.g., Isa. 51:12, the comparison (like a wild ass) becomes an equalization (as a wild ass). The perf. יָצְאוּ is a general uncoloured expression of that which is usual: they go forth בָּפָעָלָם, in their work (not: to their work, as the Psalmist, in Ps. 104:23, expresses himself, exchanging בְּ for לְ). לַטָּרֶף מְשַׁחֲרֵי, searching after prey, i.e., to satisfy their hunger (Ps. 104:21), from טָרַף, in the primary signification decerpere (vid., Hupfeld on Ps. 7:3), describes that which in general forms their daily occupation as they roam about; the constructivus is used here, without any proper genitive relation, as a form of connection, according to Ges. § 116, 1. The idea of waylaying is not to be connected with the expression. Job describes those who are perishing in want and misery, not so much as those who themselves are guilty of evil practices, as those who have been brought down to poverty by the wrongdoing of others. As is implied in משחרי (comp. the morning Psalm, Ps. 63:2, Isa. 26:9), Job describes their going forth in the early morning; the children (נְעָרִים, as Job 1:19, 29:5) are those who first feel the pangs of hunger. לוֹ refers individually to the father in the company: the steppe (with its scant supply of roots and herbs) is to him food for the children; he snatches it from it, it must furnish it for him. The idea is not: for himself and his family (Hirz., Hahn, and others); for v. 6, which has been much misunderstood, describes how they, particularly the adults, obtain their necessary subsistence. There is no MS authority for reading בְּלִי־לוֹ instead of בְּלִילוֹ; the translation "what is not to him" (LXX, Targ., and partially also the Syriac version) is therefore to be rejected. Raschi correctly interprets יבולו as a general explanation, and Ralbag תבואתו: it is, as in Job 6:5, mixed fodder for cattle, farrago, consisting of oats or barley sown among vetches and beans, that is intended. The meaning is not, however, as most expositors explain it, that they seek to satisfy their hunger with food for cattle grown in the fields of the rich evil-doer; for קָצַר does not signify to sweep together, but to reap in an orderly manner; and if they meant to steal, why did they not seize the better portion of the produce? It is correct to take the suff. as referring to the רֶשַׁע which is mentioned in the next clause, but it is not to be understood that they plunder his fields per nefas; on the contrary, that he hires them to cut the fodder for his cattle, but does not like to entrust the reaping of the better kinds of corn to them. It is impracticable to press the Hiph. יקצירו of the Chethib to favour this rendering; on the contrary, הקציר stands to קצר in like (not causative) signification as הנחה to נחה (vid., on Job 31:18). In like manner, v. 6b is to be understood of hired labour. The rich man prudently hesitates to employ these poor people as vintagers; but he makes use of their labour (whilst his own men are fully employed at the wine-vats) to gather the straggling grapes which ripen late, and were therefore left at the vintage season. the older expositors are reminded of לָקֶשׁ, late hay, and explain יְלַקֵּשׁוּ as denom. by לקשו יכרתו (Aben-Ezra, Immanuel, and others) or לקשו יאכלו (Parchon); but how unnatural to think of the second mowing, or even of eating the after-growth of grass, where

the vineyard is the subject referred to! On the contrary, לִקֵּשׁ signifies, as it were, serotinare, i.e., serotinos fructus colligere (Rosenm.):200 this is the work which the rich man assigns to them, because he gains by it, and even in the worst case can lose but little.

Vv. 7f. tell how miserably they are obliged to shift for themselves during this autumnal season of labour, and also at other times. Naked (וּמֵעָר, whether an adverbial form or not, is conceived of after the manner of an accusative: in a naked, stripped condition, Arabic 'urjânan) they pass the night, without having anything on the body (on לְבוּשׁ, vid., on Ps. 22:19), and they have no (אֵין supply לָהֶם) covering or veil (corresponding to the notion of בֶּגֶד) in the cold.201 They become thoroughly drenched by the frequent and continuous storms that visit the mountains, and for want of other shelter are obliged to shelter themselves under the overhanging rocks, lying close up to them, and clinging to them,—an idea which is expressed here by חִבְּקוּ, as in Lam. 4:5, where, of those who were luxuriously brought up on purple cushions, it is said that they "embrace dunghills;" for in Palestine and Syria, the forlorn one, who, being afflicted with some loathsome disease, is not allowed to enter the habitations of men, lies ion the dunghill (mezâbil), asking alms by day of the passers-by, and at night hiding himself among the ashes which the sun has warmed.202 The usual accentuation, מזרם with Dechî, הרים with Munach, after which it should be translated ab inundatione montes humectantur, is false; in correct Codd. זרם has also Munach; the other Munach is, as in Job 23:5a, 9a, 24:6b, and freq., a substitute for Dechî. Having sketched this special class of the oppressed, and those who are abandoned to the bitterest want, Job proceeds with his description of the many forms of wrong which prevail unpunished on the earth:

9 They tear the fatherless from the breast,
And defraud the poor.
10 Naked, they slink away without clothes,
And hungering they bear the sheaves.
11 Between their walls they squeeze out the oil;
They tread the wine-presses, and suffer thirst.
12 In the city vassals groan,
And the soul of the oppressed crieth out—
And Eloah heedeth not the anomaly.

Job 24:9–12. The accentuation of v. 9a (יגזלו with Dechî, משׁד with Munach) makes the relation of יָתוֹם שׁד genitival. Heidenheim (in a MS annotation to Kimchi's Lex.) accordingly badly interprets: they plunder from the spoil of the orphan; Ramban better: from the ruin, i.e., the shattered patrimony; both appeal to the Targum, which translates יתום מביזת, like the Syriac version, men bezto de-jatme (comp. Jerome: vim fecerunt depraedantes pupillos). The original reading, however, is perhaps (vid., Buxtorf, Lex. col. 295) מִבִּיזָא, ἀπὸ βυζίου, from the mother's breast, as it is also, the LXX (ἀπὸ μαστοῦ), to be translated contrary to the accentuation. Inhuman creditors take the fatherless and still tender orphan away from its mother, in order to bring it up as a slave, and so to obtain payment. If this is the meaning of the passage, it is natural to understand יַחְבֹּלוּ, v. 9b, of distraining; but (1) the poet would then repeat himself tautologically, vid., v. 3, where the same thing is far more evidently said; (2) חָבַל, to distrain, would be construed with עַל, contrary to the logic of the word. Certainly the phrase חבל על may be in some degree explained by the interpretation, "to impose a fine" (Ew., Hahn), or "to distrain" (Hirz., Welte), or "to oppress with fines" (Schlottm.); but violence is thus done to the usage of the language, which is better satisfied by the explanation of Ralbag (among modern expositors, Ges., Arnh., Vaih., Stick., Hlgst.): and what the unfortunate one possesses they seize; but this עַל = עַל אֲשֶׁר directly as object is impossible. The passage, Deut. 7:25, cited by Schultens in its favour, is of a totally different kind.

But throughout the Semitic dialects the verb לחָבַ also signifies "to destroy, to treat injuriously" (e.g., Arab. el-châbil, a by-name of Satan); it

occurs in this signification in Job 34:31, and according to the analogy of עַל הֵרַע, 1 Kings 17:20, can be construed with על as well as with לְ. The poet, therefore, by this construction will have intended to distinguish the one חבל from the other, Job 22:6, 24:3; and it is with Umbreit to be translated: they bring destruction upon the poor; or better: they take undue advantage of those who otherwise are placed in trying circumstances.

The subjects of v. 10 are these עניים, who are made serfs, and become objects of merciless oppression, and the poet here in v. 10a indeed repeats what he has already said almost word for word in v. 7a (comp. Job 31:19); but there the nakedness was the general calamity of a race oppressed by subjugation, here it is the consequence of the sin of merces retenta laborum, which cries aloud to heaven, practised on those of their own race: they slink away (הֹלֵךְ, as Job 30:28) naked (nude), without (מִבְּלִי = בְּלִי, as perhaps sine = absque) clothing, and while suffering hunger they carry the sheaves (since their masters deny them what, according to Deut. 25:4, shall not be withheld even from the beasts). Between their walls (רֹתְשׁוּ like שָׁרוֹת, Jer. 5:10, Chaldee שׁוּרַיָּא), i.e., the walls of their masters who have made them slaves, therefore under strict oversight, they press out the oil (יַצָּהִירוּ, ἅπ. γεγρ.), they tread the wine-vats (יְקָבִים, lacus), and suffer thirst withal (fut. consec. according to Ew. § 342, a), without being allowed to quench their thirst from the must which runs out of the presses (גִּתּוֹת, torcularia, from which the verb דָּרַךְ is here transferred to the vats). Böttch. translates: between their rows of trees, without being able to reach out right or left; but that is least of all suitable with the olives. Carey correctly explains: "the factories or the garden enclosures of these cruel slaveholders." This reference of the word to the wall of the enclosure is more suitable than to walls of the press-house in particular. From tyrannical oppression in the country,203 Job now passes over to the abominations of discord and was in the cities.

Ver. 12a. It is natural, with Umbr., Ew., Hirz., and others, to read מֵתִים like the Peschito; but as mîte in Syriac, so also מתים in Hebrew as a noun everywhere signifies the dead (Arab. mauta), not the dying, mortals (Arab. mâtûna); wherefore Ephrem interprets the praes. "they groan" by the perf. "they have groaned." The pointing מָתִים, therefore, is quite correct; but the accentuation which, by giving Mehupach Zinnorith to מעיר, and Asla legarmeh to מתים, places the two words in a genitival relation, is hardly correct: in the city of men, i.e., the inhabited, thickly-populated city, they groan; not: men (as Rosenm. explains, according to Gen. 9:6, Prov. 11:6) groan; for just because מָתִים appeared to be too inexpressive as a subject, this accentuation seems to have been preferred. It is also possible that the signification fierce anger (Hos. 11:9), or anguish (Jer. 15:8), was combined with עִיר, comp. Arab. gayrt, jealousy, fury (= קִנְאָה), of which, however, no trace is anywhere visible.204 With Jer., Symm., and Theod., we take מתים as the sighing ones themselves; the feebleness of the subject disappears if we explain the passage according to such passages as Deut. 2:34, 3:6, comp. Judg. 20:48: it is the male inhabitants that are intended, whom any conqueror would put to the sword; we have therefore translated men (men of war), although "people" (Job 11:3) also would not have been unsuitable according to the ancient use of the word. נָאַק is intended of the groans of the dying, as Jer. 51:52, Ezek. 30:24, as v. 12b also shows: the soul of those that are mortally wounded cries out. חֲלָלִים signifies not merely the slain and already dead, but, according to its etymon, those who are pierced through those who have received their death-blow; their soul cries out, since it does not leave the body without a struggle. Such things happen without God preventing them. תִּפְלָה לֹא־יָשִׂים, He observeth not the abomination, either = ישׂים לא בלבו, Job 22:22 (He layeth it not to heart), or, since the phrase occurs nowhere elliptically, = על לבו ישׂים לא, Job 1:8, 34:23) He does not direct His heart, His attention to it), here as elliptical, as in Job 4:20, Isa. 41:20. True, the latter phrase

is never joined with the acc. of the object; but if we translate after בְּ שִׂים, Job 4:18: non imputat, He does not reckon such תפלה, i.e., does not punish it, בָּם (בָּהֶם) ought to be supplied, which is still somewhat liable to misconstruction, since the preceding subject is not the oppressors, but those who suffer oppression. תִּפְלָה is properly insipidity (comp. Arab. tafila, to stink), absurdity, self-contradiction, here the immorality which sets at nought the moral order of the world, and remains nevertheless unpunished. The Syriac version reads תְּפִלָּה, and translates, like Louis Bridel (1818): et Dieu ne fait aucune attention à leur prière.

13 Others are those that rebel against the light,
They will know nothing of its ways,
And abide not in its paths.
14 The murderer riseth up at dawn,
He slayeth the sufferer and the poor,
And in the night he acteth like a thief.
15 And the eye of the adulterer watcheth for the twilight;
He thinks: "no eye shall recognise me,"
And he putteth a veil before his face.

Job 24:13–15. With הֵמָּה begins a new turn in the description of the moral confusion which has escaped God's observation; it is to be translated neither as retrospective, "since they" (Ewald), nor as distinctive, "they even" (Böttch.), i.e., the powerful in distinction from the oppressed, but "those" (for המה corresponds to our use of "those," אֵלֶּה to "these"), by which Job passes on to another class of evil-disposed and wicked men. Their general characteristic is, that they shun the light. Those who are described in vv. 14f. are described according to their general characteristic in v. 13; accordingly it is not to be interpreted: those belong to the enemies of the light, but: those are, according to their very nature, enemies of the light. The Beth is the so-called Beth essent.; הָיוּ (comp. Prov. 3:26) affirms what they are become by their own inclination, or as what they are fashioned, viz., as ἀποστάται φωτός (Symm.); מָרַד (on the root מר, vid., on Job 23:2) signifies properly to push one's self against anything, to lean upon, to rebel; מֹרֵד therefore signifies one who strives against another, one who is obstinate (like the Arabic mârid, merîd, comp. mumâri, not conformable to the will of another). The improvement אוֹר מֹרְדֵי (not with Makkeph, but with Mahpach of mercha mahpach. placed between the two words, vid., Bär's Psalterium, p. x.) assumes the possibility of the construction with the acc., which occurs at least once, Josh. 22:19. They are hostile to the light, they have no familiarity with its ways (הִכִּיר, as v. 17, Ps. 142:5, Ruth 2:19, to take knowledge of anything, to interest one's self in its favour), and do not dwell (יָשְׁבוּ, Jer. reversi sunt, according to the false reading יָשֻׁבוּ) in its paths, i.e., they neither make nor feel themselves at home there, they have no peace therein. The light is the light of day, which, however, stands in deeper, closer relation to the higher light, for the vicious man hateth τὸ φῶς, John 3:20, in every sense; and the works which are concealed in the darkness of the night are also ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, Rom. 13:12 (comp. Isa. 29:15), in the sense in which light and darkness are two opposite principles of the spiritual world. It need not seem strange that the more minute description of the conduct of these enemies of the light now begins with לָאוֹר. It is impossible that this should mean: still in the darkness of the night (Stick.), prop. towards the light, when it is not yet light. Moreover, in biblical Hebrew, אוֹר does not signify evening, in which sense it occurs in Talmudic Hebrew (Pesachim 1a, Seder olam rabba, c. 5, שביעי אור, vespera septima), like אוֹרְתָּא (= נָשֶׁף) in Talmudic Aramaic. The meaning, on the contrary, is that towards daybreak (comp. אור הבקר, Gen. 44:3), therefore with early morning, the murderer rises up, to go about his work, which veils itself in darkness (Ps. 10:8–10) by day, viz., to slay (comp. on יָקוּם … יִקְטֹל, Ges. § 142, 3, c) the unfortunate and the poor, who pass by defenceless and alone. One has to supply the idea of the ambush in which the waylayer lies in wait; and it is certainly inconvenient that it is not expressed.

The antithesis וּבַלַּיְלָה, v. 14c, shows that nothing but primo mane is meant by לָאוֹר. He who in the

day-time goes forth to murder and plunder, at night commits petty thefts, where no one whom he could attack passes by. Stickel translates: to slay the poor and wretched, and in the night to play the thief; but then the subjunctivus וִיהִי ought to precede (vid., e.g., Job 13:5), and in general it cannot be proved without straining it, that the voluntative form of the future everywhere has a modal signification. Moreover, here יְהִי does not differ from Job 18:12, 20:23, but is only a poetic shorter form for יִהְיֶה: in the night he is like a thief, i.e., plays the part of the thief. And the adulterer's eye observes the darkness of evening (vid., Prov. 7:9), i.e., watches closely for its coming on (שָׁמַר, in the usual signification observare, to be on the watch, to take care, observe anxiously), since he hopes to render himself invisible; and that he may not be recognised even if seen, he puts on a mask. פָּנִים סֵתֶר is something by which his countenance is rendered unrecognisable (LXX ἀποκρυβὴ προσώπου), like the Arab. sitr, sitâreh, a curtain, veil, therefore a veil for the face, or, as we say in one word borrowed from the Arabic mascharat, a farce (masquerade): the mask, but not in the proper sense.205

16 In the dark they dig through houses,
By day they shut themselves up,
They will know nothing of the light.

17 For the depth of night is to them even as the dawn of the morning,
For they know the terrors of the depth of night.

Job 24:16–17. The handiwork of the thief, which is but slightly referred to in v. 14c, is here more particularly described. The indefinite subj. of חָתַר, as is manifest from what follows, is the band of thieves. The בְּ, which is elsewhere joined with חתר (to break into anything), is here followed by the acc. בָּתִּים (to be pronounced bâttim, not bottim),206 as in the Talmudic, שִׁנּוֹ חָתַר, to pick one's teeth (and thereby to make them loose), b. Kidduschin, 24 b. According to the Talmud, Ralbag, and the ancient Jewish interpretation in general, v. 16b is closely connected to בתים: houses which they have marked by day for breaking into, and the mode of its accomplishment; but חָתַם nowhere signifies designare, always obsignare, to seal up, to put under lock and key, Job 14:17, 9:7, 37:7; according to which the Piel, which occurs only here, is to be explained: by day they seal up, i.e., shut themselves up for their safety (לָמוֹ is not to be accented with Athnach, but with Rebia mugrasch): they know not the light, i.e., as Schlottm. well explains: they have no fellowship with it; for the biblical יָדַע, γινώσκειν, mostly signifies a knowledge which enters into the subject, and intimately unites itself with it. In v. 17 one confirmation follows another. Umbr. and Hirz. explain: for the morning is to them at once the shadow of death; but יַחְדָּו, in the signification at the same time, as we have taken יַחַד in Job 17:16 (nevertheless of simultaneousness of time), is unsupportable: it signifies together, Job 2:11, 9:32; and the arrangement of the words יַחְדָּו … לָמוֹ (to them together) is like Isa. 9:20, 31:3, Jer. 46:12. Also, apart from the erroneous translation of the יחדו, which is easily set aside, Hirzel's rendering of v. 17 is forced: the morning, i.e., the bright day, is to them all as the shadow of death, for each and every one of them knows the terrors of the daylight, which is to them as the shadow of death, viz., the danger of being discovered and condemned. The interpretation, which is also preferred by Olshausen, is far more natural: the depth of night is to them as the dawn of the morning (on the precedence of the predicate, comp. Amos 4:13 and 5:8: walking in the darkness of the early morning), for they are acquainted with the terrors of the depth of night, i.e., they are not surprised by them, but know how to anticipate and to escape them. Ch. 38:15 also, where the night, which vanishes before the rising of the sun, is called the "light" of the evil-doer, favours this interpretation (not the other, as Olsh. thinks). The accentuation also favours it; for is בקר had been the subj., and were to be translated: the morning is to them the shadow of death, it ought to have been accented צלמות למו בקר, Dechî, Mercha, Athnach. It is, however, accented Munach, Munach, Athnach, and the second Munach stands as the

deputy of Dechî, whose value in the interpunction it represents; therefore לֹמוֹ בקר is the predicate: the shadow of death is morning to them. From the plur. the description now, with יַכִּיר, passes into the sing., as individualizing it. בַּלָּהוֹת constr. of בַּלָּהוֹת, is without a Dagesh in the second consonant. Mercier admirably remarks here: sunt ei familiares et noti nocturni terrores, neque eos timet aut curat, quasi sibi cum illis necessitudo et familiaritas intercederet et cum illis ne noceant foedus aut pactum inierit. Thus by their skill and contrivance they escape danger, and divine justice allows them to remain undiscovered and unpunished,—a fact which is most incomprehensible.

It is now time that this thought was once again definitely expressed, that one may not forget what these accumulated illustrations are designed to prove. But what now follows in vv. 18–21 seems to express not Job's opinion, but that of his opponents. Ew., Hirz., and Hlgst. regard vv. 18–21, 22–25, as thesis and antithesis. To the question, What is the lot that befalls all these evil-doers? Job is thought to give a twofold answer: first, to v. 21, an ironical answer in the sense of the friends, that those men are overtaken by the merited punishment; then from v. 22 is his own serious answer, which stands in direct contrast to the former. But (1) in vv. 18–21 there is not the slightest trace observable that Job does not express his own view: a consideration which is also against Schlottman, who regards vv. 18–21 as expressive of the view of an opponent. (2) There is no such decided contrast between vv. 18–21 and 22–25, for vv. 19 and 24 both affirm substantially the same thing concerning the end of the evil-doer. In like manner, it is also not to be supposed, with Stick., Löwenth., Böttch., Welte, and Hahn, that Job, outstripping the friends, as far as v. 21, describes how the evil-doer certainly often comes to a terrible end, and in vv. 22ff. how the very opposite of this, however, is often witnessed; so that this consequently furnishes no evidence in support of the exclusive assertion of the friends. Moreover, v. 24 compared with v. 19, where there is nothing to indicate a direct contrast, is opposed to it; and v. 22, which has no appearance of referring to a direct contrast with what has been previously said, is opposed to such an antithetical rendering of the two final strophes. V. 22 might more readily be regarded as a transition to the antithesis, if vv. 18–21 could, with Eichh., Schnurr., Dathe, Umbr., and Vaih., after the LXX, Syriac, and Jerome, be understood as optative: "Let such an one be light on the surface of the water, let … be cursed, let him not turn towards," etc., but v. 18a is not of the optative form; and 18c, where in that case אל־יפנה would be expected, instead of לא־יפנה, shows that 18b, where, according to the syntax, the optative rendering is natural, is nevertheless not to be so rendered. The right interpretation is that which regards both vv. 18–21 and 22ff. as Job's own view, without allowing him absolutely to contradict himself. Thus it is interpreted, e.g., by Rosenmüller, who, however, as also Renan, errs in connecting v. 18 with the description of the thieves, and understands v. 18a of their slipping away, 18b of their dwelling in horrible places, and 18c of their avoidance of the vicinity of towns.

18 For he is light upon the surface of the water;
Their heritage is cursed upon the earth;
He turneth no more in the way of the vineyard.
19 Drought, also heat, snatch away snow water—
So doth Sheôl those who have sinned.
20 The womb forgetteth him, worms shall feast on him,
He is no more remembered;
So the desire of the wicked is broken as a tree—
21 He who hath plundered the barren that bare not,
And did no good to the widow.

Job 24:18–21. The point of comparison in v. 18a is the swiftness of the disappearing: he is carried swiftly past, as any light substance on the surface of the water is hurried along by the

swiftness of the current, and can scarcely be seen; comp. Job 9:26: "My days shoot by as ships of reeds, as an eagle which dasheth upon its prey," and Hos. 10:7, "Samaria's king is destroyed like a bundle of brushwood (LXX, Theod., φρύγανον) on the face of the water," which is quickly drawn into the whirlpool, or buried by the approaching wave.207 But here the idea is not that of being swallowed up by the waters, as in the passage in Hosea, but, on the contrary, of vanishing from sight, by being carried rapidly past by the rush of the waters. If, then, the evil-doer dies a quick, easy death, his heritage (חֶלְקָה, from חָלַק, to divide) is cursed by men, since no one will dwell in it or use it, because it is appointed by God to desolation on account of the sin which is connected with it (vid., on Job 15:28); even he, the evil-doer, no more turns the way of the vineyard (פָּנָה, with דֶּרֶךְ, not an acc. of the obj., but as indicating the direction = אֶל־דֶּרֶךְ; comp. 1 Sam. 13:18 with v. 17 of the same chapter), proudly to inspect his wide extended domain, and overlook the labourers. The curse therefore does not come upon him, nor can one any longer lie in wait for him to take vengeance on him; it is useless to think of venting upon him the rage which his conduct during life provoked; he is long since out of reach in Sheôl.

That which Job says figuratively in v. 18a, and in Job 21:13 without a figure: "in a moment they go down to Sheôl," he expresses in v. 19 under a new figure, and, moreover, in the form of an emblematic proverb (vid., Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie, xiv. 696), according to the peculiarity of which, not כֵּן, but either only the copulative Waw (Prov. 25:25) or nothing whatever (Prov. 11:22), is to be supplied before חָטְאוּ שאול. חָטָאוּ is virtually an object: eos qui peccarunt. V. 19b is a model-example of extreme brevity of expression, Ges. § 155, 4, b. Sandy ground (צִיָּה, arid land, without natural moisture), added to it (גַּם, not: likewise) the heat of the sun—these two, working simultaneously from beneath and above, snatch away (גָּזְלוּ, cogn. גָּזַר, root גז, to cut, cut away, tear away; Arab. jzr, fut. i, used of sinking, decreasing water) שֶׁלֶג מַיִם, water of (melted) snow (which is fed from no fountain, and therefore is quickly absorbed), and Sheôl snatches away those who have sinned (= גָּזְלָה חָטָאוּ אֶת־אֲשֶׁר). The two incidents are alike: the death of those whose life has been a life of sin, follows as a consequence easily and unobserved, without any painful and protracted struggle. The sinner disappears suddenly; the womb, i.e., the mother that bare him, forgets him (רֶחֶם, matrix = mater; according to Ralbag: friendship, from רָחַם, to love tenderly; others: relationship, in which sense Arab. raḥimun = رَحِم is used), worms suck at him (מָתָק for מָתָקוּ, according to Ges. § 147, a, sugit eum, from which primary notion of sucking comes the signification to be sweet, Job 21:33: Syriac, metkat ennun remto; Ar. imtasahum, from the synonymous Arab. maṣṣa = מצץ, מצה, מזה), he is no more thought of, and thus then is mischief (abstr. pro concr. as Job 5:16) broken like a tree (not: a staff, which עֵץ never, not even in Hos. 4:12, directly, like the Arabic 'asa, 'asât, signifies). Since עַוְלָה is used personally, וגו׳ רֹעֶה, v. 21, can be connected with it as an appositional permutative. His want of compassion (as is still too often seen in the present day in connection with the tyrannical conduct of the executive in Syria and Palestine, especially on the part of those who collected the taxes) goes the length of eating up, i.e., entirely plundering, the barren, childless (Gen. 11:30; Isa. 54:1), and therefore helpless woman, who has no sons to protect and defend her, and never showing favour to the widow, but, on the contrary, thrusting her away from him. There is as little need for regarding the verb רָעָה here, with Rosenm. after the Targ., in the signification confringere, as cognate with רָעַע, רָצַץ, as conversely to change תְּרֹעֵם, Ps. 2:9, into תִּרְעֵם; it signifies depascere, as in Job 20:26, here in the sense of depopulari. On the form יֵיטִיב for יֵטִיב, vid., Ges. § 70, 2, rem.; and on the transition from the part. to the v. fin., vid., Ges. § 134, rem. 2. Certainly the memory of such an one is not affectionately cherished; this is equally true with what Job maintains in Job 21:32, that the memory of the evil-doer is immortalized by monuments. Here the allusion

is to the remembrance of a mother's love and sympathetic feeling. The fundamental thought of the strophe is this, that neither in life nor in death had he suffered the punishment of his evil-doing. The figure of the broken tree (broken in its full vigour) also corresponds to this thought; comp. on the other hand what Bildad says, Job 18:16: "his roots dry up beneath, and above his branch is lopped off" (or: withered). The severity of his oppression is not manifest till after his death.

In the next strophe Job goes somewhat further. But after having, in vv. 22, 23, said that the life of the ungodly passes away as if they were the favoured of God, he returns to their death, which the friends, contrary to experience, have so fearfully described, whilst it is only now and then distinguished from the death of other men by coming on late and painlessly.

22 And He preserveth the mighty by His strength;

Such an one riseth again, though he despaired of life.

23 He giveth him rest, and he is sustained,

And His eyes are over their ways.

24 They are exalted—a little while,—then they are no more,

And they are sunken away, snatched away like all others,

And as the top of the stalk they are cut off.—

25 And if it is not so, who will charge me with lying,

And make my assertion worthless?

Job 24:22–25. Though it becomes manifest after their death how little the ungodly, who were only feared by men, were beloved, the form of their death itself is by no means such as to reveal the retributive justice of God. And does it become at all manifest during their life? The Waw, with which the strophe begins, is, according to our rendering, not adversative, but progressive. God is the subject. מָשַׁךְ, to extend in length, used elsewhere of love, Ps. 36:11, 109:12, and anger, Ps. 85:6, is here transferred to persons: to prolong, preserve long in life. אַבִּירִים are the strong, who bid defiance not only to every danger (Ps. 76:6), but also to all divine influences and noble impulses (Isa. 46:12). These, whose trust in their own strength God might smite down by His almighty power, He preserves alive even in critical positions by that very power: he (the אַבִּיר) stands up (again), whilst he does not trust to life, i.e., whilst he believes that he must succumb to death (הֶאֱמִין as Ps. 27:13, comp. Genesis, S. 368; יוֹחַי, Aramaic form, like מִלַּיִן, Job 4:2, 12:11; the whole is a contracted circumstantial clause for וגו׳ לֹא והוא). He (God) grants him לָבֶטַח, in security, viz., to live, or even directly: a secure peaceful existence, since לבטח is virtually an object, and the לָ is that of condition (comp. לָרֹב, Job 26:3). Thus Hahn, who, however, here is only to be followed in this one particular, takes it correctly: and that he can support himself, which would only be possible if an inf. with לָ had preceded. Therefore: and he is supported or he can support himself, i.e., be comforted, though this absolute use of נִשָּׁעַן cannot be supported; in this instance we miss עַל־טוּבוֹ, or some such expression (Job 8:15). God sustains him and raises him up again: His eyes (נֵיהוּעֵי = עֵינָיו) are (rest) on the ways of these men, they stand as it were beneath His special protection, or, as it is expressed in Job 10:3: He causes light to shine from above upon the doings of the wicked. "They are risen up, and are conscious of the height (of prosperity)—a little while, and they are no more." Thus v. 24a is to be explained. The accentuation רומו with Mahpach, מעט with Asla legarmeh (according to which it would have to be translated: they stand on high a short time), is erroneous. The verb רוּם signifies not merely to be high, but also to rise up, raise one's self, e.g., Prov. 11:11, and to show one's self exalted, here extulerunt se in altum or exaltati sunt; according to the form of writing רֹומּוּ, רוּם is treated as an Ayin Waw verb med. O, and the Dagesh is a so-called Dag. affecuosum (Olsh. § 83, b), while רֹמּוּ (like רֹבּוּ, Gen. 49:23) appears to assume the form of a double Ayin verb med. O, consequently רָמֹּם (Ges. § 67, rem. 1).

מְעַט, followed by Waw of the conclusion, forms a clause of itself, as more frequently וְ מְעַט עוֹד (yet a little while, then …), as, e.g., in an exactly similar connection in Ps. 37:10; here, however, not expressive of the sudden judgment of the ungodly, but of their easy death without a struggle (εὐθανασία): a little, then he is not (again a transition from the plur. to the distributive or individualizing sing.). They are, viz., as v. 24b further describes, bowed down all at once (an idea which is expressed by the perf.), are snatched off like all other men. הֻמְּכוּ is an Aramaizing Hophal -form, approaching the Hoph. of strong verbs, for הוּמַכּוּ (Ges. § 67, rem. 8), from מָכַךְ, to bow one's self (Ps. 106:43), to be brought low (Eccl. 10:18); comp. Arab. mkk, to cause to vanish, to annul. יִקָּפְצוּן (for which it is unnecessary with Olsh. to read יִקָּבְצוּן, after Ezek. 29:5) signifies, according to the primary signification of קפץ, comprehendere, constringere, contrahere (cogn. קבץ, קמץ, קמט, comp. supra, p. 481): they are hurried together, or snatched off, i.e., deprived of life, like the Arabic qbḍh allâh (אלהים קפצו) and passive qubiḍa, equivalent to, he has died. There is no reference in the phrase to the componere artus, Gen. 49:33; it is rather the figure of housing (gathering into the barn) that underlies it; the word, however, only implies seizing and drawing in. Thus the figure which follows is also naturally (comp. קֹמֶץ, Arab. qabḍat, manipulus) connected with what precedes, and, like the head of an ear of corn, i.e., the corn-bearing head of the wheat-stalk, they are cut off (by which one must bear in mind that the ears are reaped higher up than with us, and the standing stalk is usually burnt to make dressing for the field; vid., Ges. Thes. s.v. קשׁ208).

On יִמָּלוּ (fut. Niph. = יִמַּלּוּ), vid., on Job 14:2, 18:16; the signification praedicuntur, as observed above, is more suitable here than marcescunt (in connection with which signification Job 5:26 ought to be compared, and the form regarded as fut. Kal). Assured of the truth, in conformity with experience, of that which has been said, he appeals finally to the friends: if it be not so (on אֵפוֹא = אֵפוֹ in conditional clauses, vid., Job 9:24), who (by proving the opposite) is able to charge me with lying and bring to nought (לְאַל = לְאַיִן, Ew. § 321, b, perhaps by אַל being conceived of as originally infin. from אָלַל (comp. אֱלִיל), in the sense of non-existence, Arab. 'l-'adam) my assertion?

The bold accusations in the speech of Eliphaz, in which the uncharitableness of the friends attains its height, must penetrate most deeply into Job's spirit. But Job does not answer like by like. Even in this speech in opposition to the friends, he maintains the passionless repose which has once been gained. Although the misjudgment of his character has attained its height in the speech of Eliphaz, his answer does not contain a single bitter personal word. In general, he does not address them, not as though he did not wish to show respect to them, but because he has nothing to say concerning their unjust and wrong conduct that he would not already have said, and because he has lost all hope of his reproof taking effect, all hope of sympathy with his entreaty that they would spare him, all hope of understanding and information on their part.

In the first part of the speech (Job 23) he occupies himself with the mystery of his own suffering lot, and in the second part (Job 24) with the reverse of this mystery, the evil-doers' prosperity and immunity from punishment. How is he to vindicate himself against Eliphaz, since his lament over his sufferings as unmerited as accounted by the friends more and more as defiant obstinacy (מרי), and consequently tends to bring him still deeper into that suspicion which he is trying to remove? His testimony concerning himself is of no avail; for it appears to the friends more self-delusive, hypocritical, and sinful, the more decidedly he maintains it; consequently the judgment of God can alone decide between him and his accusers. But while the friends accuse him by word of mouth, God himself is pronouncing sentence against him by His acts,—his affliction is a de facto accusation of God against him. Therefore, before the judgment of God can become a vindication of his affliction against the friends, he must first of

all himself have defended and proved his innocence in opposition to the Author of his affliction. Hence the accusation of the friends, which in the speech of Eliphaz is become more direct and cutting than heretofore, must urge on anew with all its power the desire in Job of being able to bring his cause before God.

At the outset he is confident of victory, for his consciousness does not deceive him; and God, although He is both one party in the cause and judge, is influenced by the irresistible force of the truth. Herein the want of harmony in Job's conception of God, the elevation of which into a higher unity is the goal of the development of the drama, again shows itself. He is not able to think of the God who pursues him, the innocent one, at the present time with suffering, as the just God; on the other hand, the justice of the God who will permit him to approach His judgment throne, is to him indisputably sure: He will attend to him, and for ever acquit him. Now Job yields to the arbitrary power of God, but then he will rise by virtue of the justice and truth of God. His longing is, therefore, that the God who now afflicts him may condescend to hear him: this seems to him the only way of convincing God, and indirectly the friends, of his innocence, and himself of God's justice. The basis of this longing is the desire of being free from the painful conception of God which he is obliged to give way to. For it is not the darkness of affliction that enshrouds him which causes Job the intensest suffering, but the darkness in which it has enshrouded God to him,—the angry countenance of God which is turned to him. But if this is sin, that he is engaged in a conflict concerning the justice of the Author of his affliction, it is still greater that he indulges evil thoughts respecting the Judge towards whose throne of judgment he presses forward. He thinks that God designedly avoids him, because He is well aware of his innocence; now, however, he will admit no other thought but that of suffering him to endure to the end the affliction decreed. Job's suspicion against God is as dreadful as it is childish. This is a profoundly tragic stroke. It is not to be understood as the sarcasm of defiance; on the contrary, as one of the childish thoughts into which melancholy bordering on madness falls. From the bright height of faith to which Job soars in Job 19:25ff. he is here again drawn down into the most terrible depth of conflict, in which, like a blind man, he gropes after God, and because he cannot find Him thinks that He flees before him lest He should be overcome by him. The God of the present, Job accounts his enemy; and the God of the future, to whom his faith clings, who will and must vindicate him so soon as He only allows himself to be found and seen—this God is not to be found! He cannot get free either from his suffering or from his ignominy. The future for him is again veiled in a twofold darkness.

Thus Job does not so much answer Eliphaz as himself, concerning the cutting rebukes he has brought against him. He is not able to put them aside, for his consciousness does not help him; and God, whose judgment he desires to have, leaves him still in difficulty. But the mystery of his lot of affliction, which thereby becomes constantly more torturing, becomes still more mysterious from a consideration of the reverse side, which he is urged by Eliphaz more closely to consider, terrible as it may be to him. He, the innocent one, is being tortured to death by an angry God, while for the ungodly there come no times of punishment, no days of vengeance: greedy conquerors, merciless rulers, oppress the poor to the last drop of blood, who are obliged to yield to them, and must serve them without wrong being helped by the right; murderers, who shun the light, thieves, and adulterers, carry on their evil courses unpunished; and swiftly and easily, without punishment overtaking them, or being able to overtake them, Sheôl snatches them away, as heat does the melted snow; even God himself preserves the oppressors long in the midst of extreme danger, and after a long life, free from care and laden with honour, permits them to die a natural death, as a ripe ear of corn is cut off. Bold in the certainty of the truth of his assertion, Job meets the friends: if it is not so, who will convict me as a liar?! What answer will they give? They cannot long disown the

mystery, for experience outstrips them. Will they therefore solve it? They might, had they but the key of the future state to do it with! But neither they nor Job were in possession of that, and we shall therefore see how the mystery, without a knowledge of the future state, struggled through towards solution; or even if this were impossible, how the doubts which it excites are changed to faith, and so are conquered.

JOB 25

Bildad's Third Speech

[Then began Bildad the Shuhite, and said:]

2 Dominion and terror are with Him,
He maketh peace in His high places.
3 Is there any number to His armies,
And whom doth not His light surpass?
4 How could a mortal be just with God,
And how could one born of woman be pure?
5 Behold, even the moon, it shineth not brightly,
And the stars are not pure in His eyes.
6 How much less mortal man, a worm,
And the son of man, a worm!

Job 25:2–6. Ultimum hocce classicum, observes Schultens, quod a parte triumvirorum sonuit, magis receptui canentis videtur, quam praelium renovantis. Bildad only repeats the two commonplaces, that man cannot possibly maintain his supposedly perverted right before God, the all-just and all-controlling One, to whom, even in heaven above, all things cheerfully submit, and that man cannot possibly be accounted spotlessly pure, and consequently exalted above all punishment before Him, the most holy One, before whom even the brightest stars do not appear absolutely pure. הַמְשֵׁל is an inf. abs. made into a substantive, like הַשְׁקֵט; the Hiph. (to cause to rule), which is otherwise causative, can also, like Kal, signify to rule, or properly, without destroying the Hiphil - signification, to exercise authority (vid., on Job 31:18); המשל therefore signifies sovereign rule. עֹשֶׂה, with הוּא to be supplied, which is not unfrequently omitted both in participial principal clauses (Job 12:17ff., Ps. 22:29, Isa. 26:3, 29:8, 40:19, comp. Zech. 9:12, where אני is to be supplied) and in partic. subordinate clauses (Ps. 7:10, 55:20, Hab. 2:10), is an expression of the simple praes., which is represented by the partic. used thus absolutely (including the personal pronoun) as a proper tense-form (Ew. § 168, c, 306, d). Schlottman refers עשׂה to ופחד המשל; but the analogy of such attributive descriptions of God is against it. Umbreit and Hahn connect בִּמְרוֹמָיו with the subject: He in His heights, i.e., down from His throne in the heavens. But most expositors rightly take it as descriptive of the place and object of the action expressed: He establishes peace in His heights, i.e., among the celestial beings immediately surrounding Him. This, only assuming the abstract possibility of discord, might mean: facit magestate sua ut in summa pace et promptissima obedientia ipsi ministrent angeli ipsius in excelsis (Schmid). But although from Job 4:18, 15:15, nothing more than that even the holy ones above are neither removed from the possibility of sin nor the necessity of a judicial authority which is high above them, can be inferred; yet, on the other hand, from Job 3:8, 9:13 (comp. 26:12f.), it is clear that the poet, in whose conception, as in scripture generally, the angels and the stars stand in the closest relation, knows of actual, and not merely past, but possibly recurring, instances of hostile dissension and titanic rebellion among the celestial powers; so that שׁלום עשׂה, therefore, is intended not merely of a harmonizing reconciliation among creatures which have been contending one against another, but of an actual restoration of the equilibrium that had been disturbed through self-will, by an act of mediation and the exercise of judicial authority on the part of God.

Ver. 3. Instead of the appellation מְרוֹמָיו, which reminds one of Isa. 24:21, —where a like peacemaking act of judgment on the part of God is promised in reference to the spirit-host of the heights that have been working seductively among the nations on earth,—גְּדוּדָיו, of similar meaning to צְבָאָיו, used elsewhere, occurs in this

verse. The stars, according to biblical representation, are like an army arrayed for battle, but not as after the Persian representation—as an army divided into troops of the Ahuramazdâ and Angramainyus (Ahriman), but a standing army of the children of light, clad in the armour of light, under the guidance of the one God the Creator (Isa. 40:26, comp. the anti-dualistic assertion in Isa. 45:7). The one God is the Lord among these numberless legions, who commands their reverence, and maintains unity among them; and over whom does not His light arise? Umbr. explains: who does not His light, which He communicates to the hosts of heaven, vanquish (עַל קוּם in the usual warlike meaning: to rise against any one); but this is a thought that is devoid of purpose in this connection. אורהו with the emphatic suff. êhu (as Job 24:23, עֵינֵיהוּ) at any rate refers directly to God: His light in distinction from the derived light of the hosts of heaven. This distinction is better brought out if we interpret (Merc., Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm., and others): over whom does (would) not His light arise? i.e., all receive their light from His, and do but reflect it back. But יָזְרַח = יָקוּם cannot be justified by Job 11:17. Therefore we interpret with Ew. and Hlgst. thus: whom does not His light surpass, or, literally, over whom (i.e., which of these beings of light) does it not rise, leaving it behind and exceeding it in brightness (יָקוּם as synon. of יָרוּם)? How then could a mortal be just with God, i.e., at His side or standing up before Him; and how could one of woman born be spotless! How could he (which is hereby indirectly said) enter into a controversy with God, who is infinitely exalted above him, and maintain before Him a moral character faultless, and therefore absolutely free from condemnation! In the heights of heaven God's decision is revered; and should man, the feeble one, and born flesh of flesh (vid., Job 14:1), dare to contend with God? Behold, עַד־יָרֵחַ (עַד, as usually when preceded by a negation, adeo, ne … quidem, e.g., Ex. 14:28, comp. Nah. 1:10, where J. H. Michaelis correctly renders: adeo up spinas perplexitate aequent, and אֶל used in the same way, Job 5:5, Ew. § 219, c), even as to the moon, it does not (ולא with Waw apod., Ges. § 145, 2, although there is a reading לֹא without וְ) shine bright, לֹא יַאֲהִיל = לֹא יָהֵל, from אָהַל = הָלַל.209 Thus LXX, Targ. Jer., and Gecatilia translate; whereas Saadia translates: it turns not in (Arab. lâ ydchl), or properly, it does not pitch its tent, fix its habitation. But to pitch one's tent is אָהַל or אָהֵל, whence יָהֵל, Isa. 13:20, = יְאָהֵל; and what is still more decisive, one would naturally expect שָׁם יאהיל in connection with this thought. We therefore render אהל as a form for once boldly used in the scriptural language for הלל, as in Isa. 28:28 אָדַשׁ once occurs for וּשׁדּ. Even the moon is only a feeble light before God, and the stars are not clean in His eyes; there is a vast distance between Him and His highest and most glorious creatures—how much more between Him and man, the worm of the dust!

The friends, as was to be expected, are unable to furnish any solution of the mystery, why the ungodly often live and die happily; and yet they ought to be able to give this solution, if the language which they employ against Job were authorized. Bildad alone speaks in the above speech, Zophar is silent. But Bildad does not utter a word that affects the question. This designed omission shows the inability of the friends to solve it, as much as the tenacity with which they firmly maintain their dogma; and the breach that has been made in it, either they will not perceive or yet not acknowledge, because they think that thereby they are approaching too near to the honour of God. Moreover, it must be observed with what delicate tact, and how directly to the purpose in the structure of the whole, this short speech of Bildad's closes the opposition of the friends. Two things are manifest from this last speech of the friends: First, that they know nothing new to bring forward against Job, and nothing just to Job's advantage; that all their darts bound back from Job; and that, though not according to their judgment, yet in reality, they are beaten. This is evident from the fact that Bildad is unable to give any answer to Job's questions, but can only take up the one idea in Job's speech, that he confidently and boldly thinks of being able to approach God's throne of

judgment; he repeats with slight variation what Eliphaz has said twice already, concerning the infinite distance between man and God, Job 4:17–21, 15:14–16, and is not even denied by Job himself, Job 9:2, 14:4. But, secondly, the poet cannot allow us to part from the friends with too great repugnance; for they are Job's friends notwithstanding, and at the close we see them willingly obedient to God's instruction, to go to Job that he may pray for them and make sacrifice on their behalf. For this reason he does not make Bildad at last repeat those unjust incriminations which were put prominently forward in the speech of Eliphaz, Job 22:5–11. Bildad only reminds Job of the universal sinfulness of the human race once again, without direct accusation, in order that Job may himself derive from it the admonition to humble himself; and this admonition Job really needs, for his speeches are in many ways contrary to that humility which is still the duty of sinful man, even in connection with the best justified consciousness of right thoughts and actions towards the holy God.

JOB 26

Job's Second Answer.

[Then Job began, and said:]

2 How has thou helped him that is without power,

Raised the arm that hath no strength!

3 How hast thou counselled him that hath no wisdom,

And fully declared the essence of the matter!

4 To whom hast thou uttered words,

And whose breath proceeded from thee?

Job 26:2–4. Bildad is the person addressed, and the exclamations in vv. 2, 3 are ironical: how thy speech contains nothing whatever that might help me, the supposedly feeble one, in conquering my affliction and my temptation; me, the supposedly ignorant one, in comprehending man's mysterious lot, and mine! אֹ֫כֹחַ, according to the idea, is only equivalent to לוֹ כח (אין) לא לאשר, and לֹא־עֹז זְרוֹעַ equivalent to בלא־עז זרוע (לו עז לא); the former is the abstr. pro concreto, the latter the genitival connection—the arm of the no-power, i.e., powerless (Ges. § 152, 1). The powerless one is Job himself, not God (Merc., Schlottm.), as even the choice of the verbs, vv. 2b, 3a, shows. Respecting תּוּשִׁיָּה, which we have translated essentiality, duration, completion, we said, on Job 5:12, that it is formed from יֵשׁ (vid., Prov. 8:21), not directly indeed, but by means of a verb וָשַׁי (וָשָׁה), in the signification subsistere (comp. Arab. kân, and Syriac קום210); it is a Hophal -formation (like תּוּגָה), and signifies, so to speak, durability, subsistentia, substantia, ὑπόστασις, so that the comparison of ושי with אשׁשׁ, Arab. 'ss (whence אָשִׁישׁ, Arab. asîs, asâs, etc., fundamentum) is forced upon one, and the relationship to the Sanskrit as (asmi = εἰμί) can remain undecided. The observation of J. D. Michaelis211 to the contrary, Supplem. p. 1167: non placent in linguis ejusmodi etyma metaphysica nimis a vulgari sensu remota; philosophi in scholis ejusmodi vocabula condunt, non plebs, is removed by the consideration that תושׁיה, which out of Prov. and Job occurs only in Isa. 28:29, Mich 6:9, is a Chokma-word: it signifies here, as frequently, vera et realis sapientia (J. H. Michaelis). The speech of Bildad is a proof of poverty of thought, of which he himself gives the evidence. His words—such is the thought of v. 4—are altogether inappropriate, inasmuch as they have no reference whatever to the chief point of Job's speech; and they are, moreover, not his own, but the suggestion of another, and that not God, but Eliphaz, from whom Bildad has borrowed the substance of his brief declamation. Since this is the meaning of v. 4b, it might seem as though אֶת־מִי were intended to signify by whose assistance (Arnh., Hahn); but as the poet also, in Job 31:37, comp. Ezek. 43:10, uses הִגִּיד seq. acc., in the sense of explaining anything to any one, to instruct him concerning anything, it is to be interpreted: to whom hast thou divulged the words (LXX, τίνι ἀνήγγειλας ῥήματα), i.e., thinking and designing thereby to affect him?

In what follows, Job now continues the description of God's exalted rule, which Bildad had attempted, by tracing it through every department of creation; and thus proves by fact, that he is wanting neither in a recognition nor reverence of God the almighty Ruler.

5 —The shades are put to pain
Deep under the waters and their inhabitants.
6 Sheôl is naked before him,
And the abyss hath no covering.
7 He stretched the northern sky over the emptiness;
He hung the earth upon nothing.

Job 26:5–7. Bildad has extolled God's majestic, awe-inspiring rule in the heights of heaven, His immediate surrounding; Job continues the strain, and celebrates the extension of this rule, even to the depths of the lower world. The operation of the majesty of the heavenly Ruler extends even to the realm of shades; the sea with the multitude of its inhabitants forms no barrier between God and the realm of shades; the marrowless, bloodless phantoms or shades below writhe like a woman in travail as often as this majesty is felt by them, as, perhaps, by the raging of the sea or the quaking of the earth. On רְפָאִים, which also occurs in Phoenician inscriptions, vid., Psychol. S. 409; the book of Job corresponds with Ps. 88:11 in the use of this appellation. The sing. is not רְפָאִי (whence רפאים, as the name of a people), but רָפָא (רָפָה), which signifies both giants or heroes of colossal stature (from רפה = Arab. rafu'a, to be high), and the relaxed (from רפה, to be loose, like Arab. rafa'a, to soften, to soothe), i.e., those who are bodiless in the state after death (comp. חַלָּה, Isa. 14:10, to be weakened, i.e., placed in the condition of a rapha). It is a question whether יְחוֹלָלוּ be Pilel (Ges.) or Pulal (Olsh.); the Pul., indeed, signifies elsewhere to be brought forth with writing (Job 15:7); it can, however, just as well signify to be put in pain. On account of the reference implied in it to a higher causation here at the commencement of the speech, the Pul. is more appropriate than the Pil.; and the pausal â, which is often found elsewhere with Hithpael (Hithpal.), v. 14, Job 33:5, but never with Piel (Pil.), proves that the form is intended to be regarded as passive.

Ver. 6a. שְׁאוֹל is seemingly used as fem., as in Isa. 14:9b; but in reality the adj. precedes in the primitive form, without being changed by the gender of שְׁאוֹל. אֲבַדּוֹן alternates with שְׁאוֹל, like קֶבֶר in Ps. 88:12. As Ps. 139:8 testifies to the presence of God in Sheôl, so here Job (comp. Job 38:17, and especially Prov. 15:11) that Sheôl is present to God, that He possesses a knowledge which extends into the depths of the realm of the dead, before whom all things are γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα (Heb. 4:13). The following partt., v. 7, depending logically upon the chief subject which precedes, are to be determined according to Job 25:2; they are conceived as present, and indeed of God's primeval act of creation, but intended of the acts which continue by virtue of His creative power.

Ver. 7. By צָפוֹן many modern expositors understand the northern part of the earth, where the highest mountains and rocks rise aloft (accordingly, in Isa. 14:13, צפון ירכתי are mentioned parallel with the starry heights), and consequently the earth is the heaviest (Hirz., Ew., Hlgst., Welte, Schlottm., and others). But (1) it is not probable that the poet would first have mentioned the northern part of the earth, and then in v. 7b the earth itself—first the part, and then the whole; (2) נטה is never said of the earth, always of the heavens, for the expansion of which it is the stereotype word (נְטָהּ, Job 9:8, Isa. 40:22, 44:24, 51:13, Zech. 14:1, Ps. 104:2; נוטיהם, Isa. 42:5; נטה, Jer. 10:12, 51:15; נטו ידי, Isa. 45:12); (3) one expects some mention of the sky in connection with the mention of the earth; and thus is צפון,212 with Rosenm., Ges., Umbr., Vaih., Hahn, and Olsh., to be understood of the northern sky, which is prominently mentioned, because there is the pole of the vault of heaven, which is marked by the Pole-star, there the constellation of the greater Bear (עָשׁ, Job 9:9) formed by the seven bright stars, there (in the back of the bull, one of the northern constellations of the ecliptic) the group of the

Pleiades (כִּימָה), there also, below the bull and the twins, Orion (כְּסִיל). On the derivation, notion, and synonyms of תֹּהוּ, vid., Genesis, S. 93; here (where it may be compared with the Arab. tehîj-un, empty, and tîh, desert) it signifies nothing more than the unmeasurable vacuum of space, parall. בְּלִימָה, not anything = nothing (comp. modern Arabic lâsh, or even mâsh, compounded of Arab. lâ or mâ and šâ, a thing, e.g., bilâs, for nothing, ragul mâsh, useless men). The sky which vaults the earth from the arctic pole, and the earth itself, hang free without support in space. That which is elsewhere (e.g., Job 9:6) said of the pillars and foundations of the earth, is intended of the internal support of the body of the earth, which is, as it were, fastened together by the mountains, with their roots extending into the innermost part of the earth; for the idea that the earth rests upon the bases of the mountains would be, indeed, as Löwenthal correctly observes, an absurd inversion. On the other side, we are also not justified in inferring from Job's expression the laws of the mechanism of the heavens, which were unknown to the ancients, especially the law of attraction or gravitation. The knowledge of nature on the part of the Israelitish Chokma, expressed in v. 7, however, remains still worthy of respect. On the ground of similar passages of the book of Job, Keppler says of the yet unsolved problems of astronomy: Haec et cetera hujusmodi latent in Pandectis aevi sequentis, non antea discenda, quam librum hunc Deus arbiter seculorum recluserit mortalibus. From the starry heavens and the earth Job turns to the celestial and sub-celestial waters.

8 He bindeth up the waters in His clouds,
Without the clouds being rent under their burden.

9 He enshroudeth the face of His throne,
Spreading His clouds upon it.

10 He compasseth the face of the waters with bounds,
To the boundary between light and darkness.

Job 26:8–10. The clouds consist of masses of water rolled together, which, if they were suddenly set free, would deluge the ground; but the omnipotence of God holds the waters together in the hollow of the clouds (צֹרֵר, Milel, according to a recognised law, although it is also found in Codd. accented as Milra, but contrary to the Masora), so that they do not burst asunder under the burden of the waters (תַּחְתָּם); by which nothing more nor less is meant, than that the physical and meteorological laws of rain are of God's appointment. V. 9 describes the dark and thickly-clouded sky that showers down the rain in the appointed rainy season. אָחַז signifies to take hold of, in architecture to hold together by means of beams, or to fasten together (vid., Thenius on 1 Kings 6:10, comp. 2 Chron. 9:18, מְאֻחָזִים, coagmentata), then also, as usually in Chald. and Syr., to shut (by means of cross-bars, Neh. 7:3), here to shut off by surrounding with clouds: He shuts off פְּנֵי־כִסֵּה, the front of God's throne, which is turned towards the earth, so that it is hidden by storm-clouds as by a סֵכָּה, Job 36:29, Ps. 18:12. God's throne, which is here, as in 1 Kings 10:19, written כִּסֵּה instead of כִּסֵּא (comp. Arab. cursi, of the throne of God the Judge, in distinction from Arab. 'l-'arš, the throne of God who rules over the world213), is indeed in other respects invisible, but the cloudless blue of heaven is His reflected splendour (Ex. 24:10) which is cast over the earth. God veils this His radiance which shines forth towards the earth, עָנַן אָלָיו פַּרְשֵׁז, by spreading over it the clouds which are led forth by Him. פַּרְשֵׁז is commonly regarded as a Chaldaism for פִּרְשֵׁז (Ges. § 56, Olsh. § 276), but without any similar instance in favour of this vocalizaton of the 3 pr. Piel (Pil.). Although רַעֲנַן and שַׁאֲנַן, Job 15:32, 3:18, have given up the i of the Pil., it has been under the influence of the following guttural; and although, moreover, i before Resh sometimes passes into a, e.g., וַיַּרְא, it is more reliable to regard פַּרשז as inf. absol. (Ew. § 141, c): expandendo. Ges. and others regard this פרשז as a mixed form, composed from פרשׁ and פרז; but the verb פרשׁ (with Shin) has not the signification to expand, which is assumed in

connection with this derivation; it signifies to separate (also Ezek. 34:12, vid., Hitzig on that passage), whereas פרשׂ certainly signifies to expand (Job 36:29, 30); wherefore the reading פַּרְשֵׂז (with Sin), which some Codd. give, is preferred by Bär, and in agreement with him by Luzzatto (vid., Bär's Leket zebi, p. 244), and it seems to underlie the interpretation where פרשז עליו is translated by עליו (פָּרַשׂ) פרש, He spreadeth over it (e.g., by Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Ralbag). But the Talmud, b. Sabbath, 88 b (שכינתו מזיו שדי פירש עליו ועננו, the Almighty separated part of the splendour of His Shechina and His cloud, and laid it upon him, i.e., Moses, as the passage is applied in the Haggada), follows the reading פַּרְשֵׂז (with Shin), which is to be retained on account of the want of naturalness in the consonantal combination שז; but the word is not to be regarded as a mixed formation (although we do not deny the possibility of such forms in themselves, vid., supra, p. 468), but as an intensive form of פרשׂ formed by Prosthesis and an Arabic change of Sin into Shin, like Arab. frsḥ, frsd, fršṭ, which, being formed from Arab. frš = פָּרַשׂ (פָּרַשׂ), to expand, signifies to spread out (the legs).

Ver. 10 passes from the waters above to the lower waters. תַּכְלִית signifies, as in Job 11:7, 28:3, Neh. 3:21, the extremity, the extreme boundary; and the connection of תַּכְלִית אוֹר is genitival, as the Tarcha by the first word correctly indicates, whereas אור with Munach, the substitute for Rebia mugrasch In this instance (according to Psalter, ii. 503, § 2), is a mistake. God has marked out (חג, LXX ἐγύρωσεν) a law, i.e., here according to the sense: a fixed bound (comp. Prov. 8:29 with Ps. 104:9), over the surface of the waters (i.e., describing a circle over them which defines their circuit) unto the extreme point of light by darkness, i.e., where the light is touched by the darkness. Most expositors (Rosenm., Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm., and others) take עד־תכלית adverbially: most accurately, and refer חָג to אור as a second object, which is contrary to the usage of the language, and doubtful and unnecessary. Pareau has correctly interpreted: ad lucis usque tenebrarumque confinia; עִם in the local sense, not aeque ac, although it might also have this meaning, as e.g., Eccl. 2:16. The idea is, that God has appointed a fixed limit to the waters, as far as to the point at which they wash the terra firma of the extreme horizon, and where the boundary line of the realms of light and darkness is; and the basis of the expression, as Bouillier, by reference to Virgil's Georg. i. 240f., has shown, is the conception of the ancients, that the earth is surrounded by the ocean, on the other side of which the region of darkness begins.

11 The pillars of heaven tremble
And are astonished at His threatening.
12 By His power He rouseth up the sea,
And by His understanding He breaketh Rahab in pieces.
13 By His breath the heavens become cheerful;
His hand hath formed the fugitive dragon.

Job 26:11–13. The mountains towering up to the sky, which seem to support the vault of the sky, are called poetically "the pillars of heaven." יְרוֹפָפוּ is Pulal, like יְחוֹלָלוּ, v. 5; the signification of violent and quick motion backwards and forwards is secured to the verb רוּף by the Targ. הִתְפַּלֵּץ = אִתְרוֹפֶף, Job 9:6, and the Talm. רְפָרֵף of churned milk, blinding eyes (comp. עַיִן הֶרֶף, the twinkling of the eye, and Arab. rff, fut. i. o. nictare), flapping wings (comp. Arab. rff and rfrf, movere, motitare alas), of wavering thinking. גְּעָרָה is the divine command which looses or binds the powers of nature; the astonishment of the supports of heaven is, according to the radical signification of תָּמַהּ (cogn. שָׁמֵם), to be conceived of as a torpidity which follows the divine impulse, without offering any resistance whatever. That רָגַע, v. 12a, is to be understood transitively, not like Job 7:5, intransitively, is proved by the dependent (borrowed) passages, Isa. 51:15, Jer. 31:35, from which it is also evident that רגע cannot with the LXX be translated κατέπαυσεν. The verb combines in itself the opposite significations of starting up, i.e., entering into an excited state, and of being startled, from which the significations of stilling (Niph., Hiph.),

and of standing back or retreat (Arab. rj'), branch off. The conjecture גְּעַר after the Syriac version (which translates, go'ar bejamo) is superfluous. רַהַב, which here also is translated by the LXX τὸ κῆτος, has been discussed already on Job 9:13. It is not meant of the turbulence of the sea, to which מָחַץ is not appropriate, but of a sea monster, which, like the crocodile and the dragon, are become an emblem of Pharaoh and his power, as Isa. 51:9f. has applied this primary passage: the writer of the book of Job purposely abstains from such references to the history of Israel. Without doubt, רהב denotes a demoniacal monster, like the demons that shall be destroyed at the end of the world, one of which is called by the Persians akomano, evil thought, another taromaiti, pride. This view is supported by v. 13, where one is not at liberty to determine the meaning by Isa. 51:9, and to understand נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ, like תַּנִּין in that passage, of Egypt. But this dependent passage is an important indication for the correct rendering of חִלְּלָה. One thing is certain at the outset, that שְׁפָרָה is not perf. Piel = שִׁפְּרָה, and for this reason, that the Dagesh which characterizes Piel cannot be omitted from any of the six mutae; the translation of Jerome, spiritus ejus ornavit coelos, and all similar ones, are therefore false. But it is possible to translate: "by His spirit (creative spirit) the heavens are beauty, His hand has formed the flying dragon." Thus, in the signification to bring forth (as Prov. 25:23, 8:24f.), חללה is rendered by Rosenm., Arnh., Vaih., Welte, Renan, and others, of whom Vaih. and Renan, however, do not understand v. 13a of the creation of the heavens, but of their illumination. By this rendering vv. 13a and 13b are severed, as being without connection; in general, however, the course of thought in the description does not favour the reference of the whole of half of v. 13 to the creation. Accordingly, חללה is not to be taken as Pilel from חול (ליל), but after Isa. 57:9, as Poel from חלל, according to which the idea of v. 13a is determined, since both lines of the verse are most closely connected.

(רִיחַבָּ) בָּרִחַ נָחָשׁ is, to wit, the constellation of the Dragon,214 one of the most straggling constellations, which winds itself between the Greater and Lesser Bears almost half through the polar circle.

"Maximus hic plexu sinuoso elabitur Anguis
Circum perque duas in morem fluminis Arctos."
Virgil, Georg. i. 244f.

Aratus in Cicero, de nat. Deorum, ii. 42, describes it more graphically, both in general, and in regard to the many stars of different magnitudes which form its body from head to tail. Among the Arabs it is called el-hajje, the serpent, e.g., in Firuzabâdi: the hajje is a constellation between the Lesser Bear (farqadân, the two calves) and the Greater Bear (benât en-na'sch, the daughters of the bier), "or et-tanîn, the dragon, e.g., in one of the authors quoted by Hyde on Ulugh Beigh's Tables of the Stars, p. 18: the tanîn lies round about the north pole in the form of a long serpent, with many bends and windings." Thus far the testimony of the old expositors is found in Rosenmüller. The Hebrew name תְּלִי (the quiver) is perhaps to be distinguished from טְלִי and דְּלִי, the Zodiac constellations Aries and Aquarius.215 It is questionable how בָּרִחַ is to be understood. The LXX translates δράκοντα ἀποστάτην in this passage, which is certainly incorrect, since בריח beside נחשׁ may naturally be assumed to be an attributive word referring to the motion or form of the serpent. Accordingly, Isa. 27:1, ὄφιν φείγοντα is more correct, where the Syr. version is חַרְמָנָא חֲוְיָא, the fierce serpent, which is devoid of support in the language; in the passage before us the Syr. also has דַּעֲרַק חֲוְיָא, the fleeing serpent, but this translation does not satisfy the more neuter signification of the adjective. Aquila in Isaiah translates ὄφιν μόχλον, as Jerome translates the same passage serpentem vectem (whereas he translates coluber tortuosus in our passage), as though it were בְּרִיחַ; Symm. is better, and without doubt a substantially similar thought, ὄφιν συγκλείοντα, the serpent that joins by a bolt, which agrees with the traditional Jewish explanation, for the dragon in Aben-Ezra and

Kimchi (in Lex.)—after the example of the learned Babylonian teacher of astronomy, Mar-Samuel (died 257), who says of himself that the paths of the heavens are as familiar to him as the places of Nehardea216—is called עקלתון נחשׁ, because it is as though it were wounded, and בריח, because it forms a bar (מבריח) from one end of the sky to the other; or as Sabbatai Donolo (about 94), the Italian astronomer,217 expresses it: "When God created the two lights (the sun and moon) and the five stars (planets) and the twelve מזלות (the constellations of the Zodiac), He also created the תלי (dragon), to unite these heavenly bodies as by a weaver's beam (אורגים מנור), and made it stretch itself on the firmament from one end to another as a bar (כבריח), like a wounded serpent furnished with the head and tail." By this explanation בָּרִיחַ is either taken directly as בְּרִיחַ, vectis, in which signification it does not, however, occur elsewhere, or the signification transversus (transversarius) is assigned to the בָּרִיחַ (= barrîah) with an unchangeable Kametz,—a signification which it might have, for ברח Arab. brḥ signifies properly to go through, to go slanting across, of which the meanings to unite slanting and to slip away are only variations. בָּרִיחַ, notwithstanding, has in the language, so far as it is preserved to us, everywhere the signification fugitivus, and we will also keep to this: the dragon in the heavens is so called, as having the appearance of fleeing and hastening away. But in what sense is it said of God, that He pierces or slays it? In Isa. 51:9, where the תנין is the emblem of Egypt (Pharaoh), and 27:1, where בריח נחשׁ is the emblem of Assyria, the empire of the Tigris, the idea of destruction by the sword of Jehovah is clear. The present passage is to be explained according to Job 3:8, where לִוְיָתָן is only another name for בריח נחש (comp. Isa. 27:1). It is the dragon in the heavens which produces the eclipse of the sun, by winding itself round about the sun; and God must continually wound it anew, and thus weaken it, if the sun is to be set free again. That it is God who disperses the clouds of heaven by the breath of His spirit, the representative of which in the elements is the wind, so that the azure becomes visible again; and that it is He who causes the darkening of the sun to cease, so that the earth can again rejoice in the full brightness of that great light,—these two contemplations of the almighty working of God in nature are so expressed by the poet, that he clothes the second in the mythological garb of the popular conception.

In the closing words which now follow, Job concludes his illustrative description: it must indeed, notwithstanding, come infinitely short of the reality.

14 Behold, these are the edges of His ways,

And how do we hear only a whisper thereof!

But the thunder of His might—who comprehendeth it?

These (אֵלֶּה retrospective, as in Job 18:21) are only קְצוֹת, the extremest end-points or outlines of the ways of God, which Job has depicted; the wondrous fulness of His might, which extends through the whole creation, transcends human comprehension; it is only דָּבָר שֵׁמֶץ therefrom that becomes audible to us men. שֵׁמֶץ (שָׁמֶץ) is translated by Symm. here ψιθύρισμα, Job 4:12, ψιθυρισμός; the Arab. šamiṣa (to speak very quickly, mutter) confirms this idea of the word; Jerome's translation, vix. parvam stillam sermonis ejus (comp. Job 4:12, venas, tropical for parts), is doubly erroneous: the rendering of the שׁמץ has the antithesis of רַעַם against it, and דָּבָר is not to be understood here otherwise than in דְּבַר עֶרְוַת, Deut. 23:15, 24:1: shame of something = something that excites a feeling of shame, a whisper of something = some whisper. The notion "somewhat," which the old expositors attribute to שׁמץ, lies therefore in דבר. מה is exclamatory in a similar manner as in Ps. 89:48: how we hear (נִשְׁמַע, not נִשְׁמָע) only some whisper thereof (בּוֹ partitive, as e.g., Isa. 10:22), i.e., how little therefrom is audible to us, only as the murmur of a word, not loud and distinct, which reaches us!

As in the speech of Bildad the poet makes the opposition of the friends to fade away and cease altogether, as incapable of any further

counsel, and hence as conquered, so in Job's closing speech, which consists of three parts, Job 26, 27–28, 29–31, he shows how Job in every respect, as victor, maintains the field against the friends. The friends have neither been able to loose the knot of Job's lot of suffering, nor the universal distribution of prosperity and misfortune. Instead of loosing the knot of Job's lot of suffering, they have cut it, by adding to Job's heavy affliction the invention of heinous guilt as its ground of explanation; and the knot of the contradictions of human life in general with divine justice they have ignored, in order that they may not be compelled to abandon their dogma, that suffering everywhere necessarily presupposes sin, and sin is everywhere necessarily followed by suffering. Even Job, indeed, is not at present able to solve either one or other of the mysteries; but while the friends' treatment of these mysteries is untrue, he honours the truth, and keenly perceives that which is mysterious. Then he proves by testimony and an appeal to facts, that the mystery may be acknowledged without therefore being compelled to abandon the fear of God. Job firmly holds to the objective reality and the testimony of his consciousness; in the fear of God he places himself above all those contradictions which are unsolvable by and perplexing to human reason; his faith triumphs over the rationalism of the friends, which is devoid of truth, of justice, and of love.

Job first answers Bildad, Job 26. He characterizes his poor reply as what it is: as useless, and not pertinent in regard to the questions before them: it is of no service to him, it does not affect him, and is, moreover, a borrowed weapon. For he also is conscious of and can praise God's exalted and awe-inspiring majesty. He has already shown this twice, Job 9:4–10, 12:13–25, and shows here for the third time: its operation is not confined merely to those creatures that immediately surround God in the heavens; it extends, without being restrained by the sea, even down to the lower world; and as it makes the angels above to tremble, so there it sets the shades in consternation. From the lower world, Job's contemplation rises to the earth, as a body suspended in space without support; to the clouds above, which contain the upper waters without bursting, and veil the divine throne, of which the sapphire blue of heaven is the reflection; and then he speaks of the sea lying between Sheôl and heaven, which is confined within fixed bounds, at the extreme boundaries of which light passes over into darkness;—he celebrates all this as proof of the creative might of God. Then he describes the sovereign power of God in the realm of His creation, how He shakes the pillars of heaven, rouses the sea, breaks the monster in pieces, lights up the heavens by chasing away the clouds and piercing the serpent, and thus setting free the sun. But all these—thus he closes—are only meagre outlines of the divine rule, only a faint whisper, which is heard by us as coming from the far distance. Who has the comprehension necessary to take in and speak exhaustively of all the wonders of His infinite nature, which extends throughout the whole creation? From such a profound recognition and so glorious a description of the exaltation of God, the infinite distance between God and man is most clearly proved. Job has adequately shown that his whole soul is full of that which Bildad is anxious to teach him; a soul that only requires a slight impulse to make it overflow with such praise of God, as is not wanting in an universal perception of God, nor is it full of wicked devices. When therefore Bildad maintains against Job that no man is righteous before such an exalted God, Job ought indeed to take it as a warning against such unbecoming utterances concerning God as those which have escaped him; but the universal sinfulness of man is no ground of explanation for his sufferings, for there is a righteousness which avails before God; and of this, job, the suffering servant of God, has a consciousness that cannot be shaken.

JOB 27

Third Part.—The Transition to the Unravelment.

Job's Final Speech to the Friends.—Ch. 27–28

[Then Job continued to take up his proverb, and said:]

2 As God liveth, who hath deprived me of my right,

And the Almighty, who hath sorely saddened my soul—

3 For still all my breath is in me,

And the breath of Eloah in my nostrils—

4 My lips do not speak what is false,

And my tongue uttereth not deceit!

5 Far be it from me, to grant that you are in the right:

Till I die I will not remove my innocence from me.

6 My righteousness I hold fast, and let it not go:

My heart reproacheth not any of my days.

7 Mine enemy must appear as an evil-doer,

And he who riseth up against me as unrighteous.

Job 27:2–7. The friends are silent, Job remains master of the discourse, and his continued speech is introduced as a continued מָשָׁלוֹ שְׂאֵת (after the analogy of the phrase קול נשׂא), as in Num. 23:7 and further on, the oracles of Balaam. מָשָׁל is speech of a more elevated tone and more figurative character; here, as frequently, the unaffected outgrowth of an elevated solemn mood. The introduction of the ultimatum, as מִשׁל, reminds one of "the proverb (el-methel) seals it" in the mouth of the Arab, since in common life it is customary to use a pithy saying as the final proof at the conclusion of a speech.

Job begins with an asseveration of his truthfulness (i.e., the agreement of his confession with his consciousness) by the life of God. From this oath, which in the form bi-hajât allâh has become later on a common formula of assurance, R. Joshua, in his tractate Sota, infers that Job served God from love to Him, for we only swear by the life of that which we honour and love; it is more natural to conclude that the God by whom on the one hand, he believes himself to be so unjustly treated, still appears to him, on the other hand, to be the highest manifestation of truth. The interjectional clause: living is God! is equivalent to, as true as God liveth. That which is affirmed is not what immediately follows: He has set aside my right, and the Almighty has sorely grieved my soul (Raschi); but משׁפטי הסיר and נפשׁי המר are attributive clauses, by which what is denied in the form of an oath introduced by אִם (as Gen. 42:15, 1 Sam. 14:45, 2 Sam. 11:11, Ges. § 155, 2, f) is contained in v. 4; his special reference to the false semblance of an evil-doer shows that semblance which suffering casts upon him, but which he constantly repudiates as surely not lying, as that God liveth. Among moderns, Schlottm. (comp. Ges. § 150, 3), like most of the old expositors, translates: so long as my breath is in me, … my lips shall speak no wrong, so that vv. 3 and 4 together contain what is affirmed. By (1) כִּי indeed sometimes introduces that which shall happen as affirmed by oath, Jer. 22:5, 49:13; but here that which shall not take place is affirmed, which would be introduced first in a general form by כִּי explic. s. recitativum, then according to its special negative contents by אִם,—a construction which is perhaps possible according to syntax, but it is nevertheless perplexing; (2) it may perhaps be thought that "the whole continuance of my breath in me" is conceived as accusative and adverbial, and is equivalent to, so long as my breath may remain in me (עוד כל, as long as ever, like the Arab. cullama, as often as ever); but the usage of the language does not favour this explanation, for 2 Sam. 1:9, בי נפשׁי כל־עוד, signifies my whole soul (my full life) is still in me; and we have a third instance of this prominently placed כל per hypallagen in Hos. 14:3, עון כל־תשׂא, omnem auferas iniquitatem, Ew. § 289, a (comp. Ges. § 114, rem. 1). Accordingly, with Ew., Hirz., Hahn, and most modern expositors, we take v. 3 as a parenthetical confirmatory clause, by which Job

gives the ground of his solemn affirmation that he is still in possession of his full consciousness, and cannot help feeling and expressing the contradiction between his lot of suffering, which brand shim as an evil-doer, and his moral integrity. The נִשְׁמָתִי which precedes the רוח signifies, according to the prevailing usage of the language, the intellectual, and therefore self-conscious, soul of man (Psychol. S. 76f.). This is in man and in his nostrils, inasmuch as the breath which passes in and out by these is the outward and visible form of its being, which is in every respect the condition of life (ib. S. 82f.). The suff. of נשׁמתי is unaccented; on account of the word which follows being a monosyllable, the tone has retreated (אחור נסוג, to use a technical grammatical expression), as e.g., also in Job 19:25, 20:2, Ps. 22:20. Because he lives, and, living, cannot deny his own existence, he swears that his own testimony, which is suspected by the friends, and on account of which they charge him with falsehood, is perfect truth.

Ver. 4 is not to be translated: "my lips shall never speak what is false;" for it is not a resolve which Job thus strongly makes, after the manner of a vow, but the agreement of his confession, which he has now so frequently made, and which remains unalterable, with the abiding fact. Far be from me—he continues in v. 5—to admit that you are right (לִי חָלִילָה with unaccented ah, not of the fem., comp. Job 34:10, but of direction: for a profanation to me, i.e., let it be profane to me, Ew. § 329, a, Arab. hâshâ li, in the like sense); until I expire (prop.: sink together), I will not put my innocence (תֻּמָּה, perfection, in the sense of purity of character) away from me, i.e., I will not cease from asserting it. I will hold fast (as ever) my righteousness, and leave it not, i.e., let it not go or fall away; my heart does not reproach even one of my days. מִיָּמָי is virtually an obj. in a partitive sense: mon coeur ne me reproche pas un seul de mes jours (Renan). The heart is used here as the seat of the conscience, which is the knowledge possessed by the heart, by which it excuses or accuses a man (Psychol. S. 134); חָרַף (whence חֹרֶף, the season in which the fruits are gathered) signifies carpere, to pluck = to pinch, lash, inveigh against. Jos. Kimchi and Ralbag explain: my heart draws not back) from the confession of my innocence) my whole life long (as Maimonides explains נחרפת, Lev. 19:20, of the female slave who is inclined to, i.e., stands near to, the position of a free woman), by comparison with the Arabic inḥarafa, deflectere; it is not, however, Arab. ḥrf, but chrf, decerpere, that is to be compared in the tropical sense of the prevailing usage of the Hebrew specified. The old expositors were all misled by the misunderstood partitive מימי, which they translated ex (= inde a) diebus meis. There is in v. 7 no ground for taking יְהִי, with Hahn, as a strong affirmative, as supposed in Job 18:12, and not as expressive of desire; but the meaning is not: let my opponents be evil-doers, I at least am not one (Hirz.). The voluntative expresses far more emotion: the relation must be reversed; he who will brand me as an evil-doer, must by that very act brand himself as such, inasmuch as the מרשׁיע of a צדיק really shows himself to be a רשׁע, and by recklessly judging the righteous, is bringing down upon himself a like well-merited judgment. The כְּ is the so-called Caph veritatis, since כְּ, instar, signifies not only similarity, but also quality. Instead of קִימֵי, the less manageable, primitive form, which the poet used in Job 22:20 (comp. p. 483), and beside which קָם (קוֹם, 2 Kings 16:7) does not occur in the book, we here find the more usual form מִתְקוֹמְמִי (comp. Job 20:27).218

The description of the misfortune of the ungodly which now follows, beginning with כי, requires no connecting thought, as for instance: My enemy must be accounted as ungodly, on account of his hostility; I abhor ungodliness, for, etc.; but that he who regards him as a רשׁע is himself a רשׁע, Job shows from the fact of the רשׁע having no hope in death, whilst, when dying, he can give no confident hope of a divine vindication of his innocence.

8 For what is the hope of the godless, when He cutteth off,

When Eloah taketh away his soul?

9 Will God hear his cry
When distress cometh upon him?
10 Or can he delight himself in the Almighty,
Can he call upon Eloah at all times?
11 I will teach you concerning the hand of God,
I will not conceal the dealings of the Almighty.
12 Behold, ye have all seen it,
Why then do ye cherish foolish notions?

Job 27:8–12. In comparing himself with the רשׁע, Job is conscious that he has a God who does not leave him unheard, in whom he delights himself, and to whom he can at all times draw near; as, in fact, Job's fellowship with God rests upon the freedom of the most intimate confidence. He is not one of the godless; for what is the hope of one who is estranged from God, when he comes to die? He has no God on whom his hope might establish itself, to whom it could cling. The old expositors err in many ways respecting v. 8, by taking עבצ, abscindere (root בץ), in the sense of (opes) corradere (thus also more recently Rosenm. after the Targ., Syr., and Jer.), and referring יִשָּׁל to שָׁלָה in the signification tranquillum esse (thus even Blumenfeld after Ralbag and others). נַפְשׁוֹ is the object to both verbs, and נפשׁ בצע, abscindere animam, to cut off the thread of life, is to be explained according to Job 6:9, Isa. 38:12. נפשׁ שׁלה, extrahere animam (from שָׁלָה, whence שִׁלְיָה Arab. salan, the after-birth, cogn. שָׁלַל Arab. sll, נשׁל Arab. nsl, ntl, nšl), is of similar signification, according to another figure, wince the body is conceived of as the sheath (נִדְנָה, Dan. 7:15) of the soul219 (comp. Arab. sll in the universal signification evaginare ensem). The fut. apoc. Kal לִישׁ (= יִשָּׁל) is therefore in meaning equivalent to the intrans. יִשַּׁל, Deut. 28:40 (according to Ew. § 235, c, obtained from this by change of vowel), decidere; and Schnurrer's supposition that ישׁל, like the Arab. ysl, is equivalent to ישׁאל (when God demands it), or such a violent correction as De Lagarde's220 (when he is in distress יצק, when one demeans his soul with a curse בָּאָלָה יִשָּׁאֵל), is unnecessary.

The ungodly man, Job goes on to say, has no God to hear his cry when distress comes upon him; he cannot delight himself (יִתְעַנַּג, pausal form of יתענג, the primary form of יתענג) in the Almighty; he cannot call upon Eloah at any time (i.e., in the manifold circumstances of life under which we are called to feel the dependence of our nature). Torn away from God, he cannot be heard, he cannot indeed pray and find any consolation in God. It is most clearly manifest here, since Job compares his condition of suffering with that of a חנף, what comfort, what power of endurance, yea, what spiritual joy in the midst of suffering (התענג, as Job 22:26, Ps. 37:4, 11, Isa. 55:2, 58:13f.), which must all remain unknown to the ungodly, he can draw from his fellowship with God; and seizing the very root of the distinction between the man who fears God and one who is utterly godless, his view of the outward appearance of the misfortune of both becomes changed; and after having allowed himself hitherto to be driven from one extreme to another by the friends, as the heat of the controversy gradually cools down, and as, regaining his independence, he stands before them as their teacher, he now experiences the truth of docendo discimus in rich abundance. I will instruct you, says he, in the hand, i.e., the mode of action, of God (בְּ just as in Ps. 25:8, 12, 32:8, Prov. 4:11, of the province and subject of instruction); I will not conceal עִם־שַׁדַּי אֲשֶׁר, i.e., according to the sense of the passage: what are the principles upon which He acts; for that which is with (אִם) any one is the matter of his consciousness and volition (vid., on Job 23:10, p. 496).

Ver. 12a is of the greatest importance in the right interpretation of what follows from v. 13 onwards. The instruction which Job desires to impart to the friends has reference to the lot of the evil-doer; and when he says: Behold, ye yourselves have beheld (learnt) it all,—in connection with which it is to be observed that כֻּלְּכֶם אַתֶּם does not signify merely vos omnes, but vosmet ipsi omnes,—he grants to them what he appeared hitherto to deny, that the lot of the evil-doer, certainly in the rule, although not without exceptions, is such as they have said.

The application, however, which they have made of this abiding fact of experience, as and remains all the more false: Wherefore then (זֶה makes the question sharper) are ye vain (blinded) in vanity (self-delusion), viz., in reference to me, who do not so completely bear about the characteristic marks of a רשׁע? The verb הָבַל signifies to think and act vainly (without ground or connection), 2 Kings 17:15 (comp. ἐματαιώθησαν, Rom. 1:21); the combination הֶבֶל הָבַל is not to be judged of according to Ges. § 138, rem. 1, as it is also by Ew. § 281, a, but הָבָל may also be taken as the representative of the gerund, as e.g., עָרְיָה, Hab. 3:9.

In the following strophe Job now begins as Zophar (Job 20:29) concluded. He gives back to the friends the doctrine they have fully imparted to him. They have held the lot of the evil-doer before him as a mirror, that he may behold himself in it and be astounded; he holds it before them, that they may perceive how not only his bearing under suffering, but also the form of his affliction, is of a totally different kind.

13 This is the lot of the wicked man with God,

And the heritage of the violent which they receive from the Almighty:

14 If his children multiply, it is for the sword,

And his offspring have not bread enough.

15 His survivors shall be buried by the pestilence,

And his widows shall not weep.

16 If he heapeth silver together as dust,

And prepareth garments for himself as mire:

17 He prepareth it, and the righteous clothe themselves,

And the innocent divide the silver among themselves.

18 He hath built as a moth his house,

And as a hut that a watchman setteth up.

We have already had the combination רָשָׁע אָדָם for רָשָׁע אִישׁ in Job 20:29; it is a favourite expression in Proverbs, and reminds one of ἄνθρωπος ὀδίτης in Homer, and ἄνθρωπος σπείρων ἐχθρόὸ ἔμπορος, in the parables Matt. 13. Psik (Pasek) stands under רשׁע, to separate the wicked man and God, as in Prov. 15:29 (Norzi). לָמוֹ, exclusively peculiar to the book of Job in the Old Testament (here and Job 29:21, 38:40, 40:4), is ָ rendered capable of an independent position by means of מו = מה, Arab. mâ. The sword, famine, and pestilence are the three punishing powers by which the evil-doer's posterity, however numerous it may be, is blotted out; these three, חֶרֶב, רָעָב, and מָוֶת, appear also side by side in Jer. 15:2; מָוֶת, instead of מְמוֹתֵי, diris mortibus, is (as also Jer. 18:21) equivalent to בֶּרֶד in the same trio, Jer. 14:12; the plague is personified (as when it is called by an Arabian poet umm el-farit, the mother of death), and Vavassor correctly observes: Mors illos sua sepeliet, nihil praeterea honoris supremi consecuturos. Böttcher (de inferis, § 72) asserts that במות can only signify pestilentiae tempore, or better, ipso mortis momento; but since בְּ occurs by the passive elsewhere in the sense of ab or per, e.g., Num. 36:2, Hos. 14:4, it can also by נקבר denote the efficient cause. Olshausen's correction לֹא במות יקברו, they will not be buried when dead (Jer. 16:4), is still less required; "to be buried by the pestilence" is equivalent to, not to be interred with the usual solemnities, but to be buried as hastily as possible.

Ver. 15b (common to our poet and the psalm of Asaph, 78:64, which likewise belongs to the Salomonic age) is also to be correspondingly interpreted: the women that he leaves behind do not celebrate the usual mourning rites (comp. Gen. 23:2), because the decreed punishment which, stroke after stroke, deprives them of husbands and children, prevents all observance of the customs of mourning, and because the shock stifles the feeling of pity. The treasure in gold which his avarice has heaped up, and in garments which his love of display has gathered together, come into the possession of the righteous and the innocent, who are spared when these three powers of judgment sweep away the evil-doer and his family. Dust and dirt (i.e., of the streets, חוצות)

are, as in Zech. 9:3, the emblem of a great abundance that depreciates even that which is valuable. The house of the ungodly man, though a palace, is, as the fate of the fabric shows, as brittle and perishable a thing, and can be as easily destroyed, as the fine spinning of a moth, עָשׁ (according to the Jewish proverb, the brother of the סָס), or even the small case which it makes from remnants of gnawed articles, and drags about with it; it is like a light hut, perhaps for the watchman of a vineyard (Isa. 1:8), which is put together only for the season during which the grapes are ripening.221

19 He lieth down rich, and doeth it not again,
He openeth his eyes and—is no more.
20 Terrors take hold of him as a flood;
By night a tempest stealeth him away.
21 The east wind lifteth him up, that he departeth,
And hurleth him forth from his place.
22 God casteth upon him without sparing,
Before His hand he fleeth utterly away.
23 They clap their hands at him,
And hiss him away from his place.

Job 27:19–23. The pointing of the text יֶאֱסֹף ולא is explained by Schnurr., Umbr., and Stick.: He goes rich to bed and nothing is taken as yet, he opens his eyes and nothing more is there; but if this were the thought intended, it ought at least to have been נֶאֱסָף אַיִן, since לֹא signifies non, not nihil; and Stickel's translation, "while nothing is carried away," makes the fut. instead of the praet., which was to be expected, none the more tolerable; also אסף can indeed signify to gather hastily together, to take away (e.g., Isa. 33:4), when the connection favours it, but not here, where the first impression is that רשׁע is the subj. both to יאסף ולא and to ואיננו. Böttcher's translation, "He lieth down rich and cannot be displaced," gives the words a meaning that is ridiculed by the usage of the language. On the other hand, יֶאֱסֹף ולא can signify: and he is not conveyed away (comp. e.g., Jer. 8:2, Ezek. 29:5; but not Isa. 57:1, where it signifies to be swept away, and also not Num. 20:26, where it signifies to be gathered to the fathers), and is probably intended to be explained after the pointing that we have, as Rosenm. and even Ralbag explain it: "he is not conveyed away; one opens his eyes and he is not;" or even as Schlottm.: "he is not conveyed away; in one moment he still looks about him, in the next he is no more;" but the relation of the two parts of the verse in this interpretation is unsatisfactory, and the preceding strophe has already referred to his not being buried. Since, therefore, only an unsuitable, and what is more, a badly-expressed thought, is gained by this reading, it may be that the expression should be regarded with Hahn as interrogative: is he not swept away? This, however, is only a makeshift, and therefore we must see whether it may not perhaps be susceptible of another pointing. Jerome transl.: dives cum dormierit, nihil secum auferet; the thought is not bad, but מָאוּמָה is wanting, and לֹא alone does not signify nihil. Better LXX (Ital., Syr.): πλούσιος κοιμηθήσεται καὶ ου᾽ προσθήσει. This translation follows the form of reading יֹאסִיף = יֹסִיף, gives a suitable sense, places both parts of the verse in the right relation, and accords with the style of the poet (vid., Job 20:9, 40:5); and accordingly, with Ew., Hirz., and Hlgst., we decide in favour of this reading: he lieth down to sleep rich, and he doeth it no more, since in the night he is removed from life and also from riches by sudden death; or also: in the morning he openeth his eyes without imagining it is the last time, for, overwhelmed by sudden death, he closes them for ever. Vv. 20a and 20b are attached crosswise (chiastisch) to this picture of sudden destruction, be it by night or by day: the terrors of death seize him (sing. fem. with a plur. subj. following it, according to Ges. § 146, 3) like a flood (comp. the floods of Belial, Ps. 18:5), by night a whirlwind (סוּפָה גְּנָבַתּוּ, as Job 21:18) carrieth him away. The Syriac and Arabic versions add, as a sort of interpolation: as a fluttering (large white) night-moth,—an addition which no one can consider beautiful.

Ver. 21 extends the figure of the whirlwind. In Hebrew, even when the narrative has reference to Egyptian matters (Gen. 41:23), the קָדִים

which comes from the Arabian desert is the destructive, devastating, and parching wind κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν.222 וְיִלְּךָ֖ signifies peribit (ut pereat), as Job 14:20, 19:10. שֹׁעֲרֹ֑ו (comp. סוּפָה, O storm-chased one) is connected with the accus. of the person pursued, as in Ps. 58:10. The subj. of וְיַשְׁלַ֥ךְ, v. 22, is God, and the verb stands without an obj.: to cast at any one (shoot), as Num. 35:22 (for the figure, comp. Job 16:13); LXX correctly: ἐπιῤῥίψει (whereas Job 18:7, σφάλαι = ותכשילהו). The gerundive with יִבְרַ֣ח lays stress upon the idea of the exertion of flight: whithersoever he may flee before the hand of God, every attempt is in vain. The suff. êmo, v. 23a, both according to the syntax and the matter, may be taken as the plural suff.; but the fact that כַּפָּ֣ימֹו can be equivalent to כַּפָּיו (comp. Ps. 11:7), יִמֹּ֣ושָׁ֣ךְ to עָלָיו (comp. Job 20:23, 22:2), as לָמֹו is equivalent to לוֹ (vid., Isa. 44:15, 53:8), is established, and there is no reason why the same may not be the case here. The accumulation of the terminations êmo and ômo gives a tone of thunder and a gloomy impress to this conclusion of the description of judgment, as these terminations frequently occur in the book of Psalms, where moral depravity is mourned and divine judgment threatened (e.g., in Ps. 17, 49, 58, 59, 73). The clapping of hands (כַּפַּ֣יִם שָׂפַ֑ק = סָפַק, Lam. 2:15, comp. תָּקַע, Nah. 3:19) is a token of malignant joy, and hissing (שָׁרַק, Zeph. 2:15, Jer. 49:17) a token of scorn. The expression in v. 23b is a pregnant one. Clapping of hands and hissing accompany the evil-doer when merited punishment overtakes him, and chases him forth from the place which he hitherto occupied (comp. Job 8:18).

Earlier expositors have thought it exceedingly remarkable that Job, in Job 27:13–23, should agree with the assertions of the three friends concerning the destiny of the ungodly and his descendants, while he has previously opposed them on this point, Job 12:6, 21, 24. Kennicott thinks the confusion is cleared away by regarding Job 26:2–27:12 as Job's answer to the third speech of Bildad, 27:13ff. as the third speech of Zophar, and 28 (to which the superscription 27:1 belongs) as Job's reply thereto; but this reply begins with כִּי, and is specially appropriate as a striking repartee to the speech of Zophar. Stuhlmann (1804) makes this third speech of Zophar begin with 27:11, and imagines a gap between 27:10 and 27:11; but who then are the persons whom Zophar addresses by "you"? The three everywhere address themselves to Job, while here Zophar, contrary to custom, would address himself not to him, but, according to Stuhlmann's exposition, to the others with reference to Job. Ch. 28 Stuhlmann removes and places after Job 25 as a continuation of Bildad's speech; Zophar's speech therefore remains unanswered, and Zophar may thank this critic not only for allowing him another opportunity of speaking, but also for allowing him the last word. Bernstein (Keil-Tzschirner's Analekten, Bd. i. St. 3) removes the contradiction into which Job seems to fall respecting himself in a more thorough manner, by rejecting the division Job 27:7–28:28, which is certainly indissolubly connected as a whole, as a later interpolation; but there is no difference of language and poetic spirit here betraying an interpolator; and had there been one, even he ought indeed to have proceeded on the assumption that such an insertion should be appropriate to Job's mouth, so that the task of proving its relative fitness, from his standpoint at least, remains. Hosse (1849) goes still further: he puts Job 27:10, 31:35–37, 38:1, etc., together, and leaves out all that comes between these passages. There is then no transition whatever from the entanglement to the unravelment. Job's final reply, Job 27–28, with the monologue Job 29–31, in which even a feeble perception must recognise one of the most essential and most beautiful portions of the dramatic whole, forms this transition.

Eichhorn (in his translation of Job, 1824), who formerly (Allgem. Bibliothek der bibl. Lit. Bd. 2) inclined to Kennicott's view, and Böckel (2nd edition, 1804) seek another explanation of the difficulty, by supposing that in Job 27:13–23 Job reproduces the view of the friends. But in v. 11 Job announces the setting forth of his own view; and the supposition that with זֶ֤ה חֵלֶק־אָדָ֨ם רָ֭שָׁע he does not begin the enunciation of his own view,

but that of his opponents, is refuted by the consideration that there is nothing by which he indicates this, and that he would not enter so earnestly into the description if it were not the feeling of his heart. Feeling the worthlessness of these attempted solutions, De Wette (Einleitung, § 288), with his customary spirit of criticism with which he depreciates the sacred writers, turns against the poet himself. Certainly, says he, the division Job 27:11–28:28 is inappropriate and self-contradictory in the mouth of Job; but this wan to clearness, not to say inconsistency, must be brought against the poet, who, despite his utmost endeavour, has not been able to liberate himself altogether from the influence of the common doctrine of retribution.

This judgment is erroneous and unjust. Umbreit (2nd edition, S. 261 [Clark's edition, 1836, ii. 122]) correctly remarks, that "without this apparent contradiction in Job's speeches, the interchange of words would have been endless;" in other words: had Job's standpoint been absolutely immoveable, the controversy could not possibly have come to a well-adjusted decision, which the poet must have planned, and which he also really brings about, by causing his hero still to retain an imperturbable consciousness of his innocence, but also allowing his irritation to subside, and his extreme harshness to become moderated. The latter, in reference to the final destiny of the godless, is already indicated in Job 24, but is still more apparent here in Job 27, and indeed in the following line of thought: "As truly as God lives, who afflicts me, the innocent one, I will not incur the guilt of lying, by allowing myself to be persuaded against my conscience to regard myself as an evil-doer. I am not an evil-doer, but my enemy who regards me and treats me as such must be accounted wicked; for how unlike the hopelessness and estrangement from God, in which the evil-doer dies, is my hope and entreaty in the midst of the heaviest affliction! Yea, indeed, the fate of the evil-doer is a different one from mine. I will teach it you; ye have all, indeed, observed it for yourselves, and nevertheless ye cherish such vain thoughts concerning me." What is peculiar in the description that then follows—a description agreeing in its substance with that of the three, and similar in its form—is therefore this, that Job holds up the end of the evil-doer before the friends, that form it they may infer that he is not an evil-doer, whereas the friends held it up before Job that he might infer from it that he is an evil-doer, and only by a penitent acknowledgment of this can he escape the extreme of the punishment he has merited. Thus in Job 27 Job turns their own weapon against the friends.

But does he not, by doing so, fall into contradiction with himself? Yes; and yet not so. The Job who has become calmer here comes into contradiction with the impassioned Job who had, without modification, placed the exceptional cases in opposition to the exclusive assertion that the evil-doer comes to a fearful end, which the friends advance, as if it were the rule that the prosperity of the evil-doer continues uninterrupted to the very end of his days. But Job does not come into collision with his true view. For how could he deny that in the rule the retributive justice of God is manifest in the cast of the evil-doer! We can only perceive his true opinion when we compare the views he here expresses with his earlier extreme antitheses: hitherto, in the heat of the controversy, he has opposed that which the friends onesidedly maintained by the direct opposite; now he has got upon the right track of thought, in which the fate of the evil-doer presents itself to him from another and hitherto mistaken side,—a phase which is also but imperfectly appreciated in Job 24; so that now at last he involuntarily does justice to what truth there is in the assertion of his opponent. Nevertheless, it is not Job's intention to correct himself here, and to make an admission to the friends which has hitherto been refused. Hirzel's explanation of this part inclines too much to this erroneous standpoint. On the contrary, our rendering accords with that of Ewald, who observes (S. 252f. 2nd edition, 1854) that Job here maintains in his own favour, and against them, what the friends

directed against him, since the hope of not experiencing such an evil-doer's fate becomes strong in him: "Job is here on the right track for more confidently anticipating his own rescue, or, what is the same thing, the impossibility of his perishing just as if he were an evil-doer." Moreover, how well designed is it that the description vv. 24ff. is put into Job's mouth! While the poet allows the friends designedly to interweave lines taken from Job's misfortunes into their descriptions of the evil-doer's fate, in Job's description not one single line is found which coincides with his own lot, whether with that which he has already experience, or even with that which his faith presents to him as in prospect. And although the heavy lot which has befallen him looks like the punitive suffering of the evil-doer, he cannot acknowledge it as such, and even denies its bearing the marks of such a character, since even in the midst of affliction he clings to God, and confidently hopes for His vindication. With this rendering of Job 27:13ff. all doubts of its genuineness, which is indeed admitted by all modern expositors, vanish; and, far from charging the poet with inconsistency, one is led to admire the undiminished skill with which he brings the idea of the drama by concealed ways to its goal.

But the question still comes up, whether Job 28:1, opening with כִּי, does not militate against this genuineness. Hirzel and others observe, that this כי introduces the confirmation of Job 27:12b: "But wherefore then do ye cherish such vain imaginations concerning me? For human sagacity and perseverance can accomplish much, but the depths of divine wisdom are impenetrable to man." But how is it possible that the כי, Job 28:1, should introduce the confirmation of Job 27:12b, passing over Job 27:13–23? If it cannot be explained in any other way, it appears that Job 27:13–23 must be rejected. There is the same difficulty in comprehending it by supplying some suppressed thought, as e.g., Ewald explains it: For, as there may also be much in the divine dealings that is dark, etc.; and Hahn: Because evil-doers perish according to their desert, it does not necessarily follow that every one who perishes is an evil-doer, and that every prosperous person is godly, for—the wisdom of God is unsearchable. This mode of explanation, which supposes, between the close of Job 27 and the beginning of Job 28, what is not found there, is manifestly forced; and in comparison with it, it would be preferable, with Stickel, to translate כי "because," and take Job 28:1, 2 as the antecedent to v. 3. Then after Job 27 a dash might be made; but this dash would indicate an ugly blank, which would be no honour to the poet. Schlottmann explains it more satisfactorily. He takes Job 27:13ff. as a warning addressed to the friends, lest they bring down upon themselves, by their unjust judgment, the evil-doer's punishment which they have so often proclaimed. If this rendering of Job 27:13ff. were correct, the description of the fate of the evil-doer would be influenced by an underlying thought, to which the following statement of the exalted nature of the divine wisdom would be suitably connected as a confirmation. We cannot, however, consider this rendering as correct. The picture ought to have been differently drawn, if it had been designed to serve as a warning to the friends.

It has a different design. Job depicts the revelation of the divine justice which is exhibited in the issue of the life of the evil doer, to teach the friends that they judge him and his lot falsely. To this description of punishment, which is intended thus and not otherwise, Job 28 with its confirmatory כי must be rightly connected. If this were not feasible, one would be disposed, with Pareau, to alter the position of Job 28, as if it were removed from its right place, and put it after Job 26. But we are cautioned against such a violent measure, by the consideration that it is not evident from Job 26 why the course of thought in Job 28, which begins with כי, should assume the exact form in which we find it; whereas, on the other hand, it was said in Job 27 that the ungodly heaps up silver, כסף, like dust, but that the innocent who live to see his fall divide this silver, כסף, among themselves; so that when in Job 28:1 it continues: כי יֵשׁ לכסף מוצא, there is a connection

of thought for which the way has been previously prepared.

If we further take into consideration the fact of Job 28 being only an amplification of the one closing thought to which everything tends, viz., that the fear of God is man's true wisdom, then Job 28, also in reference to this its special point, is suitably attached to the description of the evil-doer's fate, Job 27:13ff. The miserable end of the ungodly is confirmed by this, that the wisdom of man, which he has despised, consists in the fear of God; and Job thereby at the same time attains the special aim of his teaching, which is announced at Job 27:11 by אתכם אורה ביד־אל: viz., he has at the same time proved that he who retains the fear of God in the midst of his sufferings, though those sufferings are an insoluble mystery, cannot be a רשׁע. This design of the conformation, and that connection of thought, which should be well noted, prove that Job 28 stands in its original position. And if we ponder the fact, that Job has depicted the ungodly as a covetous rich man who is snatched away by sudden death from his immense possession of silver and other costly treasures, we see that Job 28 confirms the preceding picture of punitive judgment in the following manner: silver and other precious metals come out of the earth, but wisdom, whose value exceeds all these earthly treasures, is to be found nowhere within the province of the creature; God alone possesses it, and from God alone it comes; and so as man can and is to attain to it, it consists in the fear of the Lord, and the forsaking of evil. This is the close connection of Job 28 with what immediately precedes, which most expositors since Schultens have missed, by transferring the central point to the unsearchableness of the divine wisdom which rules in the world; whereas Bouiller correctly observes that the whole of Job 28 treats not so much of the wisdom of God as of the wisdom of man, which God, the sole possessor of wisdom, imparts to him: omnibus divitiis, fluxis et evanidis illis possessio praeponderat sapientiae, quae in pio Dei cultu et fuga mali est posita. The view of von Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, i. 96, 2nd edit.) accords with this: "If Job 28:1, where a confirmatory or explanatory כי forms the transition, is taken together with 28:12, where another part of the speech is introduced with a Waw, and finally with Job 28:28, where this is rounded off, as forming the unity of one thought: it thus proves that the final destruction of the godless, who is happy and prosperous in worldly things, is explained by the fact that man can obtain every kind of hidden riches by his own exertion and courage, but not the wisdom which is not indigenous to this outward world, but is known to God alone, and is to be learned from Him only; and the teaching concerning it is: behold, the fear of God, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding."

Before we now pass on to the detailed exposition of Job 28, we may perhaps here, without anticipating, put the question. Whence has the poet obtained the knowledge of the different modes of mining operations which is displayed in Job 28:1ff., and which has every appearance of being the result of personal observation? Since, as we have often remarked already, he is well acquainted with Egypt, it is most natural that he derived this his knowledge from Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula. The ruins of mines found there show that the Sinaitic peninsula has been worked as a mining district from the earliest times. The first of these mining districts is the Wadi Nasb, where Lepsius (Briefe, S. 338) found traces of old smelting-places, and where also Graul and his companions, having their attention drawn to it by Wilkinson's work, searched for the remains of a mine, and found at least traces of copper slag, but could see nothing more (Reise, ii. 202). E. Rüppell explored the spot at the desire of the Viceroy Mehemed Ali, and Russegger with less successful result (vid., the particular sin Ritter's Erdkunde, xiv. 784–788).223 A second mining district is denoted by the ruins of a temple of Hathor, on the steep terrace of the rising ground Sarbut (Serâbît) el-châdim, which stretches out into a spacious valley. This field of ruins, with its many lofty columns within the still recognisable area of a temple, and round

about it, gives the impression of a large burying-ground, and it is described and represented as such by Carsten Niebuhr (Reise, 235, Tafel xliv.). In February 1854, Graul (Reise, ii. 203) and Tischendorf spent a short time upon this eminence of the desert, which is hard to climb, and abounds in monuments. It produced a strong impression upon us—says the latter (Aus dem heiligen Lande, S. 35)—as we tarried in the midst of the grotesque forms of these monuments, while the setting sun cast its deep red gleam over the wild terrific-looking copper rocks that lay around in their varied shades, now light, now dark. That these copper rocks were worked in ancient days, is proved by the large black heaps of slag which Lepsius (Briefe, S. 338) discovered to the east and west of the temple. Moreover, in the inscriptions Hathor bears the by-name "Queen of Mafkat," i.e., the copper country (mafka, copper, with the feminine post-positive article t). It even bears this name on the monuments in the Wadi maghâra, one of the side-gorges of the Wadi mucatteb (i.e., the Written Valley, valley full of inscriptions). These signs of another ancient mining colony belong almost entirely to the earliest Egyptian antiquity, while those on Sarbut el-châdim extend back only to Amenemha III, consequently to the last dynasty of the old kingdom. Even the second king of the fifth dynasty, Snefru, and indeed his predecessor (according to Lepsius, his successor) Chufu—that Χέοψ who built the largest pyramid—appear here as conquerors of foreign peoples, and the mountainous district dedicated to Hathor is also called Mafka.t. The remains of a mine, discovered by J. Wilson, at the eastern end of the north side of the Wady mucatteb, also belongs to this copper country: they lie near the road, but in back gorges; there is a very high wall of rock of granite or porphyry, which is penetrated by dark seams of metal, which have been worked out from above downwards, thus forming artificial caverns, pits, and shafts; and it may be inferred that the yield of ore was very abundant, and, from the simplicity of the manner of working, that it is of very great antiquity. This art of mining thus laid open, as Ritter says,224 furnishes the most important explanation of Job's remarkable description of mining operations.

As to Egypt itself, it has but few places where iron-ore was obtained, and it was not very plentiful, as iron occurs much more rarely than bronze on the tombs, although Wilkinson has observed important copper mines almost as extensive as the copper country of Sinai: we only, however, possess more exact information concerning the gold mines on the borders of Upper Egypt. Agatharchides mentions them in his Periplus; and Diodorus (iii. 11ff.) gives a minute description of them, from which it is evident that mining in those days was much the same as it was with us about a hundred years ago: we recognise in it the day and night relays, the structure of shafts, the crushing and washing apparatus, and the smelting-place.225 There are the gold mines of Nubia, the name of which signifies the gold country, for NOYB is the old Egyptian name for gold. From the time of Sethoshi I, the father of Sesostris, we still possess the plan of a gold mine, which Birch (Upon a historical tablet of Rameses II of the XIX dynasty, relating to the gold mines of Aethiopia) has first of all correctly determined. Moreover, on monuments of all ages frequent mention is made of other metals (silver, iron, lead), as of precious stones, with which e.g., harps were ornamented; the diamond can also be traced. In the Papyrus Prisse, which Chabas has worked up under the title Le plus ancien livre du monde, Phtha-hotep, the author of this moral tractate, iv. 14, says: "Esteem my good word more highly than the (green) emerald, which is found by slaves under the pebbles."226 The emerald-hills near Berenice produced the emerald.

But if the scene of the book of Job is to be sought in Idumaea proper (Gebal) or in Hauran, there were certainly mines that were nearer than the Egyptian. In Phunon (Phinon), between Petra and Zoar, there were pits from which copper (χαλκοῦ μέταλλα, aeris metalla) was obtained even to the time of Moses, as may be inferred from the fact of Moses having

erected the brazen serpent there (Num. 21:9f., comp. 33:42f.), and whither, during the persecutions of the Christians in the time of the emperors, many witnesses for the faith were banished, that they might fall victims to the destructive labour of pit life (Athanasius extravagantly says: ἔνθα καὶ φονεὺς καταδικαζόμενος ὀλίγας ἡμέρας μόγις δύναται ζῆσαι).227 But Edrîsi also knew of gold and silver mines in the mountains of Edom, the 'Gebel esh-Sherâ (Arab. 'l-šrât), i.e., שֵׂעִיר הַר. According to the Onomasticon, זָהָב דִּי, Deut. 1:1 (LXX καταχρύσεα), indicates such gold mines in Arabia Petraea; and Jerome (under Cata ta chrysea 228) observes on that passage: sed et metallo aeris Phaeno, quod nostro tempore corruit, montes venarum auri plenos olim fuisse vicinos existimant. Eupolemus' account (in Euseb. praep. ix. 30) of an island Οὐρφῆ, rich in gold, in the Red Sea, does not belong here; for by the red sea, ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα,229 it is not the Arabian Gulf that is meant; and the reference of the name of the range of hills Telûl ed-dhahab in ancient Gilead to gold mines rests only on hearsay up to the present time. But it is all the more worthy of mention that traces of former copper mines are still found on the Lebanon (vid., Knobel on Deut. 8:9); that Edrîsi (Syria, ed. Rosenm. p. 12) was acquainted with the existence of a rich iron mine near Beirut; and that, even in the present day, the Jews who dwell in Deir el-kamar, on the Lebanon, work the iron on leases, and especially forge horse-shoes from it, which are sent all over Palestine.230

The poet of the book of Job might therefore have learned mining in its diversified modes of operation from his own observation, both in the kingdom of Egypt, which he had doubtless visited, and also in Arabia Petraea and in the Lebanon districts, so as to be able to put a description of them into the mouth of his hero. It is unnecessary, with Stickel, to give the preference to the mining of Arabia proper, where iron and lead are still obtained, and where, according to ancient testimony, even gold is said to have been worked at one time. "Since he places his hero in the country east of Jordan, the poet may in v. 2 have thought chiefly of the mines of the Iron mountain (τὸ σιδηροῦν καλούμενον ὄρος, Jos. Bell. iv. 8, 2), which is also called the 'cross mountain,' el-mi'râd, because it runs from west to east, while the Gebel 'Aglûn stretches from north to south. It lies between the gorges of the Wâdî Zerkâ and Wâdî 'Arabûn, begins at the mouths of the two Wâdîs in the Ghôr, and ends in the east with a precipitous descent towards the town of Gerash, which from its height, and being seen from afar, is called the Negde (נַגְדָּה). The ancient worked-out iron mines lie on the south declivity of the mountain south-west of the village of Burmâ, and about six miles from the level bed of the Wâdî Zerkâ. The material is a brittle, red, brown, and violet sandstone, which has a strong addition of iron. It also contains here and there a large number of small shells, where it is then considerably harder. Of these ancient mines, some which were known in Syria under the name of the 'rose mines,' ma'âdin el-ward, were worked by Ibrahim Pasha from 1835 till 1839; but when, in 1840, Syria reverted to Turkey, this mining, which had been carried on with great success, because there was an abundance of wood for the smelting furnaces, ceased. A large forest, without a proprietor, covers the back and the whole north side of this mountain down to the bed of the Wâdî 'Arabûn; and as no tree has been cut down in it for centuries, the thicket, with the fallen and decaying stems, gives one an idea of a primeval forest. We passed through the forest from Kefrengi to Burmâ in June 1860. Except North Gilead, in which the Iron mountain is situated, no other province of Basan admits of a mine; they are exclusively volcanic, their mountains are slag, lava, and basalt; and probably the last-mentioned kind of stone owes its name to the word Βασάλτις, the secondary form of Βασάλτις (= Basan)."—Wetzst.

JOB 28

28:1 For there is a mine for the silver,
And a place for gold which they fine.
2 Iron is taken out of the dust,

And he poureth forth stone as copper.

3 He hath made an end of darkness,

And he searcheth all extremities

For the stone of darkness and of the shadow of death.

4 He breaketh away a shaft from those who tarry above:

There, forgotten by every foot,

They hang and swing far from men. 231

Job 28:1–4. According to the most natural connection demonstrated by us, Job desires to show that the final lot of the rich man is well merited, because the treasures which he made the object of his avarice and pride, though ever so costly, are still earthy in their nature and origin. Therefore he begins with the most precious metals, with silver, which has the precedence in reference to Job 27:16f., and with gold. מוֹצָא without any secondary notion of fulness (Schultens) signifies the issuing place, i.e., the place fro which anything naturally comes forth (Job 38:27), or whence it is obtained (1 Kings 10:28); here in the latter sense of the place where a mineral is found, or the mine, as the parall. מָקוֹם, the place where the gold comes forth, therefore a gold mine. According to the accentuation (Rebia mugrasch, Mercha, Silluk), it is not to be translated: and a place for the gold where they refine it; but: a place for the gold which they refine. זָקַק, to strain, filter, is the technical expression for purifying the precious metals from the rock that is mingled with them (Mal. 3:3) by washing. The pure gold or silver thus obtained is called מְזֻקָּק (Ps. 12:7; 1 Chron. 28:18, 29:4). Diodorus, in his description of mining in Upper Egypt (Job 3:11ff.), after having described the operation of crushing the stone to small fragments,232 proceeds: “Then artificers take the crushed stone and lay it on a broad table, which is slightly inclined, and pour water over it; this washes away the earthy parts, and the gold remains on the slab. This operation is repeated several times, the mass being at first gently rubbed with the hand; then they press it lightly with thin sponges, and thus draw off all that is earthy and light, so that the gold dust is left quite clean. And, finally, other artificers take it up in a mass, shake it in an earthen crucible, and add a proportionate quantity of lead, grains of salt, and a little tin and barley bran; they then place a close-fitting cover over the crucible, and cement it with clay, and leave it five days and nights to seethe constantly in the furnace. After this they allow it to cool, and then finding nothing of the flux in the crucible, they take the pure gold out with only slight diminution.” The expression for the first of these operations, the separation of the gold from the quartz by washing, or indeed sifting (straining, Seihen), is זָקַק; and for the other, the separation by exposure to heat, or smelting, is צָרַף.

Ver. 2. From the mention of silver and gold, the description passes on to iron and ore (copper, cuprum = aes Cyprium). Iron is called בַּרְזֶל, not with the noun-ending el like כַּרְמֶל (thus Ges., Olsh., and others), but probably expanded from בַּז (Fürst), like שַׁרְבִּיט from שַׁבְּיט = שֵׁבֶט, סַמְפִּיר from סַפִּיר, βάλσαμον from בָּשָׂם, since, as Pliny testifies, the name of basalt (iron-marble) and iron are related,233 and copper is called נְחֹשֶׁת, for which the book of Job (Job 20:24, 28:2, 40:18, 41:19; comp. even Lev. 26:19) always has נְחוּשָׁה (aereum = aes, Arab. nuhâs). Of the iron it is said that it is procured from the עָפָר, by which the bowels of the earth are meant here, as the surface of the earth in Job 41:25; and of copper it is said that they pour out the stone into copper (vid., Ges. § 139, 2), i.e., smelt copper from it: יָצוּק as Job 29:6, fundit, here with a subj. of the most general kind: one pours; on the contrary, Job 41:15f. partic. of יָצַק. V. 3 distinctly shows that it is the bowels of the earth from which these metals are obtained: he (man) has made an end of the darkness, since he turns out and lights up the lightless interior of the earth; and לְכָל־תַּכְלִית, to every extremity, i.e., to the remotest depths, he searches out the stone of deep darkness and of the shadow of death, i.e., hidden in the deepest darkness, far beneath the surface of the earth (vid., on Job 10:22; and comp. Pliny, h. n. xxxiii. proaem. of mining: imus in viscera ejus [terrae] et in sede Manium opes quaerimus). Most expositors

(Hirz., Ew., Hahn, Schlottm., and others) take לכל־תכלית adverbially, "to the utmost" or "most closely," but vid., on Job 26:10; לתכלית might be used thus adverbially, but לכל־תכלית is to be explained according to לכל־רוח, Ezek. 5:10 (to all the winds).

Ver. 4. Job now describes the operation of mining more minutely; and it is worthy of observation that the last-mentioned metal, with which the description is closely connected, is copper. נַחַל, which signifies elsewhere a valley, the bed of a river, and the river itself, like the Arab. wâdin (not from נָחַל = נָהַל, to flow on, as Ges. Thes. and Fürst, but from נָחַל, root חל to hollow, whence נְחִילָה = חָלִיל, a flute, as being a hollowed musical instrument), signifies here the excavation made in the earth, and in fact, as what follows shows, in a perpendicular direction, therefore the shaft. Nasse contends for the signification "valley," by which one might very well conceive of "the working of a surface vein:" "By this mode of working, a small shaft is made in the vein (consequently in a perpendicular direction), and the ore is worked from both sides at once. At a short distance from the first shaft a second is formed, and worked in the same way. Since thus the work progresses lengthwise, a cutting becomes formed in the mountain which may well be compared to a deep valley, if, as is generally the case where the stone is firm and the ways are almost perpendicular, the space that is hewn out remains open (that is, not broken in or filled in)." But if נחל everywhere else denotes a valley with its watercourse, it has not necessarily a like signification in mining technology. It signifies, perhaps not without reference to its usual signification, the shafts open above and surrounded by walls of rock (in distinction from the more or less horizontal galleries or pit-ways, as they were cut through the excavated rocks in the gold mines of Upper Egypt, often so crooked that, as Diodorus relates, the miners, provided with lights on their forehead, were always obliged to vary the posture of the body (according to the windings of the galleries); and מֵעִם־גָּר, away from him who remains above, shows that one is to imagine these shafts as being of considerable depth,; but what follows even more clearly indicates this: there forgotten (הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים with the demonstrative art. as Job 26:5, Ps. 18:31, 19:11, Ges. § 109 ad init.) of (every) foot (that walks above), they hang (comp. Rabb. מְדֻלְדָּל, pendulus 234) far from men, hang and swing or are suspended: comp. Pliny, h. n. xxxiii. 4, 21, according to Sillig's text: is qui caedit funibus pendet, ut procul intuenti species no ferarum quidem sed alitum fiat. Pendentes majori ex parte librant et linias itineri praeducunt. דָּלַל has here the primary signification proper also to the Arab. dll, deorsum pendēre; and עַנּוּ is related to נוּד, as nuere, νεύειν, to nutare. The מני of מַנִּי־רָגֶל, taken strictly, does not correspond to the Greek ὑπό, neither does it form an adverbial secondary definition standing by itself: far away from the foot; but it is to be understood as מן is also used elsewhere after נשׁכח, Deut. 31:21, Ps. 31:13: forgotten out of the mouth, out of the heart; here: forgotten away from the foot, so that this advances without knowing that there is a man beneath; therefore: totally vanished from the remembrance of those who pass by above. מֵאֱנוֹשׁ is not to be connected with נָעוּ (Hahn, Schlottm.), but with דַּלּוּ, for Munach is the representative of Rebia mugrasch, according to Psalter, ii. 503, § 2; and דלו is regularly Milel, whereas Isa. 38:14 is Milra without any evident reason. The accentuation here follows no fixed law with equally regulated exceptions (vid., Olsh. § 233, c).

Moreover, the perception that v. 4 speaks of the shaft of the mine, and the descent of the miners by a rope, is due to modern exegesis; even Schultens, who here exclaims: Cimmeriae tenebrae, quas me exsuperaturum vix sperare ausim, perceived the right thing, but only imperfectly as yet. By נחל he understands the course or vein of the metal, where it is embedded; and, since he understands גר after the Arab. 'garr, foot of the mountain, he translates: rumpit (homo) alveum de pede montis. Rosenm., on the other hand, correctly translates: canalem deorsum actum ex loco quo versatur homo. Schlottm. understands by gr the miner himself dwelling as a stranger in his

loneliness; and if we imagine to ourselves the mining districts of the peninsula of Sinai, we might certainly at once conceive the miners' dwellings themselves which are found in the neighbourhood of the shaft in connection with מעם־גר. But in and for itself גר signifies only those settled (above), without the secondary idea of strangers.

5 The earth—from it cometh forth bread,
And beneath it is turned up like fire.
6 The place of the sapphire are its stones,
And it containeth gold ore.
7 The way, that no bird of prey knoweth,
And the eye of the hawk hath not gazed at,
8 Which the proud beast of prey hath not trodden,
Over which the lion hath not walked.

Job 28:5–6. Ver. 5 is not to be construed as Rosenm.: ad terram quod attinet, ex qua egreditur panis, quod subtus est subvertitur quasi igne; nor with Schlottm.: (they swing) in the earth, out of which comes bread, which beneath one turns about with fire; for v. 5a is not formed so that the Waw of וְתַחְתֶּיהָ could be Waw apod., and אֶרֶץ cannot signify "in the interior of the earth" as locativus; on the contrary, it stands in opposition to תחתיה, that which is beneath the earth, as denoting the surface of the earth (the proper name of which is אֲדָמָה, from the root דם, with the primary notion of a flat covering). They are two grammatically independent predicates, the first of which is only the foil of the other: the earth, out of it cometh forth bread (לֶחֶם as Ps. 104:14), and beneath it (the surface of the earth) = that which lies beneath it (ותחתיה only virtually a subj. in the sense of תְּיוֹתֶיהָוַתַּחְתֶּיהָ, since תַּחְתֵּי occurs only as a preposition), is turned about (comp. the construction of the sing. of the verb with the plur. subj. Job 30:15) as (by) fire Instar ignis, scil. subvertentis); i.e., the earth above furnishes nourishment to man, but that not satisfying him, he also digs out its inward parts (comp. Pliny, h. n. xxxiii. proaem.: in sede Manium opes quaerimus, tanquam parum benigna fertilique quaqua calcatur), since this is turned or tossed about (comp. מַהְפֵּכָה, the special word for the overthrow of Sodom by fire) by mining work, as when fire breaks out in a house, or even as when a volcanic fire rumbles within a mountain (Castalio: agunt per magna spatia cuniculos et terram subeunt non secus ac ignis facet ut in Aetna et Vesuvio). The reading במו (Schlottm.) instead of כמו is natural, since fire is really used to blast the rock, and to separate the ore from the stone; but, with the exception of Jerome, who has arbitrarily altered the text (terra, de qua oriebatur panis in loco suo, igni subversa est), all the old translations reproduce כמו, which even Nasse, in opposition to von Veltheim, thinks suitable: Man's restless search, which rummages everything through, is compared to the unrestrainable ravaging fire.

Ver. 6 also consists of two grammatically independent assertions: the place (bed) of the sapphire is its rock. Must we refer לוֹ to סַפִּיר, and translate: "and it contains fine dust of gold" (Hirz., Umbr., Stick., Nasse)? It is possible, for Theophrastus (p. 692, ed. Schneider) says of the sapphire it is ὥσπερ χρυσόπαστος, as it were covered with gold dust or grains of gold; and Pliny, h. n. xxxvii. 9, 38f.: Inest ei (cyano) aliquando et aureus pulvis qualis in sapphiris, in iis enim aurum punctis conlucet, which nevertheless does not hold good of the proper sapphire, but of the azure stone (lapis lazuli) which is confounded with it, a variegated species of which, with gold, or rather with iron pyrites glittering like gold, is specially valued.235 But Schultens rightly observes: vix cerdiderim, illum auratilem pulvisculum sapphiri peculiari mentione dignum; and Schlottm.: such a collateral definition to ספיר, expressed in a special clause (not a relative one), has something awkward about it. On the other hand, זָהָב עֲפָרֹת is a perfectly suitable appellation of gold ore. "The earth, which is in itself black," says Diodorus in the passage quoted before, "is interspersed with veins of marble, which is of such pre-eminent whiteness, that its brilliance surpasses everything that glitters, and from it the overseers of the mine prepare gold with a large number of workmen." And further on, of the

heating of this gold ore he says: "the hardest auriferous earth they burn thoroughly in a large fire; thus they make it soft, so that it can be worked by the hand." זהב עפרת is a still more suitable expression for such auriferous earth and ore than for the nuggets of ἄπυρος χρυσός (i.e., unsmelted) of the size of a chestnut, which, according to Diodorus, ii. 50, are obtained in mines in Arabia (μεταλλεύεται). But it is inadmissible to refer לו to man, for the clause would then require to be translated: and gold ore is to him = he has, while it is the rather intended to be said that the interior of the earth has gold ore. לו is therefore, with Hahn and Schlottm., to be referred to מָקוֹם: and this place of the sapphire, it contains gold. The poet might have written לָהּ but לו implies that where the sapphire is found, gold is also found. The following נָתִיב (with Dechî), together with the following relative clause, is connected with אֲבָנֶיהָ, or even with מקום, which through v. 6b is become the chief subj.: the place of the sapphire and of the gold is the rock of the bowels of the earth,—a way, which, etc., i.e., such a place is the interior of the earth, accessible to no living being of the earth's surface except to man alone. The sight of the bird of prey, the עַיִט, ἀετός, and of the אַיָּה, i.e., the hawk or kite, reaches from above far and wide beneath;236 the sons of pride, שָׁחַץ (also Talmud. arrogance, ferocia, from שָׁחַץ = Arab. šachaṣa, to raise one's self, not: fatness, as Meier, after Arab. šachuṣa, to be fat, thick), i.e., the beasts of prey, especially the lion, שַׁחַל (vid., on Job 4:10, from שָׁחַל, Arab. sḥl, to roar, Arab. of the ass, comp. the Lat. rudere used both of the lion and of the ass), seek the most secret retreat, and shun no danger; but the way by which man presses forward to the treasures of the earth is imperceptible and inaccessible to them.

9 He layeth his hand upon the pebbles;
He turneth up the mountains from the root.
10 He cutteth canals through the rocks;
And his eye seeth all kinds of precious things.
11 That they may not leak, he dammeth up rivers;
And that which is hidden he bringeth to light.
12 But wisdom, whence is it obtained?
And where is the place of understanding?

Job 28:9–12. Beneath, whither no other being of the upper world penetrates, man puts his hand upon the quartz or rock. חַלָּמִישׁ (perhaps from חלם, to be strong, firm: Arabic, with the reduplication resolved, chalnubûs, like עַכָּבִישׁ, Arab. 'ancabûth, vid., Jesurun, p. 229) signifies here the quartz, and in general the hard stone; בְּ יָד שָׁלַח something like our "to take in hand" of an undertaking requiring strong determination and courage, which here consists in blasting and clearing away the rock that contains no ore, as Pliny, h. n. xxxiii. 4, 21, describes it: Occursant … silices; hos igne et aceto rumpunt, saepius vero, quoniam id cuniculos vapore et fumo strangulat, caedunt fractariis CL libras ferri habentibus egeruntque umeris noctibus ac diebus per tenebras proxumis tradentes; lucem novissimi cernunt. Further: he (man, devoted to mining) overturns (subvertit according to the primary signification of הפך, Arab. 'fk, 'ft, to turn, twist) mountains from the roots. The accentuation הפך with Rebia mugrasch, משרשׁ with Mercha, is false; it is, according to Codd. and old editions, to be accented הפך with Tarcha, משרשׁ with Munach, and to be translated accordingly: subvertit a radice montes (for Munach is the transformation of a Rebia mugrasch), not a radice montium. Blasting in mining which lays bare the roots (the lowest parts) of the mountains is intended, the conclusion of which—the signal for the flight of the workmen, and the effective crash—is so graphically described by Pliny in the passage cited above: Peracto opere cervices fornicum ab ultumo cadunt; dat signum ruina eamque solus intellegit in cacumine ejus montis vigil. Hic voce, nutu evocari jubet operas pariterque ipse devolat. Mons fractus cadit ab sese longe fragore qui concipi humana mente non possit eque efflatu incredibili spectant victores ruinam naturae.

The meaning of v. 10 depends upon the signification of the יְאֹרִים. It is certainly the most

natural that it should signify canals. The word is Egyptian; aur in the language of the hieroglyphs signifies a river, and especially the Nile; wherefore at the close of the Laterculus of Eratosthenes the name of the king, Φρουορῶ (Φουορῶ), is explained by ἤτοι Νεῖλος. If water-canals are intended, they may be either such as go in or come away. In the first case it may mean water let in like a cataract over the ruins of the blasted auriferous rock, the corrugi of Pliny: Alius par labor ac vel majoris impendi: flumina ad lavandam hanc ruinam jugis montium obiter duxere a centesimo plerumque lapide; corrugos vocant, a corrivatione credo; mille et hic labores. But בְּקֵעַ is not a suitable word for such an extensive and powerful flooding with water for the purpose of washing the gold. It suits far better to understand the expression of galleries or ways cut horizontally in the rock to carry the water away. Thus von Veltheim explains it: "The miner makes ways through the hard rock into his section [in which the perpendicular shaft terminates], guides the water which is found in abundance at that depth through it [i.e., the water as the bottom of the pit that hinders the progress of the work], and is able [thus v. 10b naturally is connected with what precedes] to judge of the ore and fragments that are at the bottom, and bring them to the light. This mode of mining by constantly forming one gallery under the other [so that a new gallery is made under the pit that is worked out by extending the shaft, and also freeing this from water by making another outlet below the previous one] is the oldest of all, of which anything certain is known in the history of mining, and the most natural in the days when they had no notion of hydraulics." This explanation is far more satisfactory than that of Herm. Sam. Reimarus, of the "Wolfenbütteler Fragmente" (in his edition of the Neue Erkl. des B. Hiob, by John Ad. Hoffmann, 1734, iv. S. 772): "He breaks open watercourses in the rocks. What the miners call coming upon water, is when they break into a fissure from which strong streams of water gush forth. The miner not only knows how to turn such water to good account, but it is also a sign that there are rich veins of ore near at hand, as there is the most water by these courses and fissures. Hence follows: and then his eye sees all kinds of precious things." But there is no ground for saying that water indicates rich veins of ore, and בקע is much more appropriate to describe the designed formation of courses to carry off the water than an accidental discovery of water in course of the work; moreover, יארים is as appropriate to the former as it is inappropriate to the latter explanation, for it signifies elsewhere the arms of the Nile, into which the Nile is artificially divided; and therefore it may easily be transferred to the horizontal canals of the mine cut through the hard rock (or through the upper earth). Nevertheless, although the water plays an important part in mining operations, by giving rise to the greatest difficulties, as it frequently happens that a pit is deluged with water, and must be abandoned because no one can get down to it: it is improbable that v. 10 as well as v. 11 refers to this; we therefore prefer to understand יְאֹרִים as meaning the (horizontal) courses (galleries or drifts) in which the ore is dug,—a rendering which is all the more possible, since, on the one hand, in Coptic jaro (Sahidic jero) signifies the Nile of Egypt (phiaro ente chêmi); on the other, ior (eioor) signifies a ditch, διώρυξ (comp. Isa. 33:21, יארים, LXX διώρυχες), vid., Ges. Thes. Thus also v. 10b is consistently connected with what precedes, since by cutting these cuniculi the courses of the ore (veins), and any precious stones that may also be embedded there, are laid bare.

Ver. 11a. Contrary to the correct indication of the accentuation, Hahn translates: he stops up the droppings of the watercourses; מִבְּכִי has Dechî, and is therefore not to be connected with what follows as a genitive. But Reimarus' translation: from the drops he connects the streams, is inadmissible. "The trickling water," he observes, "is carefully caught in channels by the miners for use, and is thus brought together from several parts of the reservoir and the water-wheel. What Pliny calls corrugus, corrivatio,." On the contrary, Schlottm. remarks that חבשׁ cannot signify such a connection, i.e.,

gathering together of watercourses; it occurs elsewhere only of hunting, i.e., binding up wounds. Nevertheless, although חבשׁ cannot directly signify "to collect," the signification coercere (Job 34:17), which is not far from this idea,—as is evident from the Arab. ḥibs (ḥabs), a dam or sluice for collecting water, and Arab. maḥbas 'l-mâ', a reservoir, cistern,—is easily transferable to water, in the sense of binding = catching up and accumulating. But it is contrary to the form of the expression that מבכי, with this use of חבשׁ, should denote the materia ex qua, and that נְהָרוֹת should be referred to the miry ditches in which "the crushed ore is washed, for the purpose of separating the good from the worthless." On the contrary, from the form of the expression, it is to be translated: a fletu (not e fletu) flumina obligat, whether it be that a fletu is equivalent to ne flent s. stillent (Simeon Duran: יזלו שלא), or obligat equivalent to cohibet (Ralbag: מֵהַזָּלָה). Thus von Veltheim explains the passage, since he here, as in v. 10, understands the channels for carrying off the water. "The miner covers the bottom with mire, and fills up the crevices so exactly [i.e., he besmears it, where the channel is broken through, with some water-tight substance, e.g., clay], that it may entirely carry off the water that is caught by it out of the pit [in which the shaft terminates], and not let it fall through the fissures [crevices] to the company of miners below [to the vein that lies farther down]; then the miner can descend still deeper [since the water runs outwards and does not soak through], and bring forth the ore that lies below the channel." This explanation overlooks the fact that יארים is used in v. 10, whereas v. 11 has נהרות. It is not probable that these are only interchangeable expressions for the channels that carry off the water. יארים is an appropriate expression for it, but not נהרות, which as appropriately describes the conflux of water in the mine itself.

The meaning of v. 11a is, that he (the miner) binds or stops the watercourses which his working out of the pit has interfered with and injured, so that they may not leak, i.e., that they may not in the least ooze through, whether by building up a wall or by collecting the water that streams forth in reservoirs (Arab. mahbas) or in the channels which carry it outwards,—all these modes of draining off the water may be included in v. 11a, only the channel itself is not, with von Veltheim, to be understood by נהרות, but the concourse of the water which, in one way or the other, is rendered harmless to the pit-work, so that he (the miner), as v. 11b says, can bring to light (לָאוֹר = אוֹר) whatever precious things the bowels of the earth conceals (תַּעֲלֻמָה, according to Kimchi and others, with euphonic Mappik, as according to the Masora כבכורה Isa. 28:4, גשׁמה Ezek. 22:24, and also וגלה Zech. 4:2, only לכינוי ולא הקריאה לתפארת, i.e., they have Mappik only for euphony, not as the expression of the suff.).

With the question in v. 12 the description of mining attains the end designed: man can search after and find out silver, gold, and others metals and precious stones, by making the foundations of the earth accessible to him; but wisdom, whence shall be obtain it, and which (וְאֵיזֶה, according to another reading וְאֵי־זֶה) is the place of understanding? הַחָכְמָה has the art. to give prominence to its transcendency over the other attainable things. חכמה is the principal name, and בִּינָה interchanges with it, as תְּבוּנָה, Prov. 8:1, and other synonyms in which the Chokma literature abounds elsewhere in Prov. 1–9. בינה is properly the faculty of seeing through that which is distinguishable, consisting of the possession of the right criteria; חכמה, however, is the perception, in general, of things in their true nature and their final causes.

13 A mortal knoweth not its price,
And it is not found in the land of the living.
14 The abyss saith: It is not in me,
And the sea saith: It is not with me.
15 Pure gold cannot be given for it,
And silver cannot be weighed as its price;
16 And it is not outweighed with fine gold of Ophir,
With the precious onyx and the sapphire.

Job 28:13–16. It is self-evident that wisdom is found nowhere directly present and within a limited space, as at the bottom of the sea, and cannot be obtained by a direct exchange by means of earthly treasures. It is, moreover, not this self-evident fact that is denied here; but the meaning is, that even if a man should search in every direction through the land of the living, i.e., (as e.g., Ps. 52:7) the world—if he should search through the תְּהוֹם, i.e., the subterranean waters that feed the visible waters (vid., Gen. 39:25)—if he should search through the sea, the largest bounded expanse of this water that wells up from beneath—yea, even if he would offer all riches and precious things to put himself in possession of the means and instruments for the acquirement of wisdom,—wisdom, i.e., the profoundest perception of the nature of things, would still be beyond him, and unattainable. עֶרֶךְ, v. 13, an equivalent (from עָרַךְ, to range beside, to place at the side of), interchanges with מְחִיר (from מָחַר, cogn. מָהַר, מָכַר, mercari). סְגוֹר is גּוּרָם זָהָב, 1 Kings 6:20 and freq., which hardly signifies gold shut up = carefully preserved, rather: closed = compressed, unmixed; Targ. סְנִין דְּהַב, aurum colatum (purgatum). Ewald compares Arab. sajara, to seethe, heat; therefore: heated, gained by smelting. On the other hand, כֶּתֶם from כָּתַם, Arab. ktm, occulere, seems originally to denote that which is precious, then precious gold in particular, LXX χρυσίῳ Ωφείρ, Cod. Vat. and Cod. Sinaiticus, Σωφίρ (Egyptized by prefixing the Egyptian sa, part, district, side, whence e.g., sa-rēs, the upper country, and sa-hēt, the lower country, therefore = sa-ofir, land of Ophir). שֹׁהַם is translated here by the LXX ὄνυξ (elsewhere σαρδόνυξ or σάρδιος), of which Pliny, h. n. xxxvii. 6, 24, appealing to Sudeines, says, in gemma esse candorem unguis humanii similitudinem; wherefore Knobel, Rödiger, and others, compare the Arab. sâhim, which, however, does not signify pale, but lean, and parched by the heat, with which, in hot countries at least, not pallor, but, on the contrary, a dark brown-black colour, is identified (Fl.). Arab. musahham, striped (Mich.), would be more appropriate, since the onyx is marked through by white veins; but this is a denom. from sahm, a dart, prop. darted, and is therefore wide of the mark. On the etymology of סַפִּיר, vid., Jesurun, p. 61. Nevertheless both שֹׁהַם and סַפִּיר are perhaps foreign names, as the name of the emerald (vid., ib. p. 108), which is Indian (Sanskr. marakata, or even marakta); and, on the other hand, it is called in hieroglyph (determined by the stone) uot, the green stone (in Coptic p. auannēse, the green colour) (Lauth).

The transcendent excellence of wisdom above the most precious earthly treasures, which the author of the introduction to the book of Proverbs briefly describes, Prov. 3:14f., is now drawn out in detail.

17 Gold and glass are not equal to it,
Nor is it exchanged for jewels of gold.
18 Pearls and crystal are not to be mentioned,
And the acquisition of wisdom is beyond corals.
19 The topaz of Ethiopia is not equal to it,
It is not outweighed by pure fine gold.
20 Whence, then, cometh wisdom,
And which is the place of understanding?

Job 28:17–20. Among the separate חפצים, Prov. 3:15, which are here detailed, apart from זהב, glass has the transparent name זְכוּכִית, or, as it is pointed in Codd., in old editions, and by Kimchi, זְכוֹכִית, with Cholem (in the dialects with ג instead of ך). Symm. indeed translates crystal, and in fact the ancient languages have common names for glass and crystal; but the crystal is here called גָּבִישׁ, which signifies prop., like the Arab. 'gibs, ice; κρύσταλλος also signifies prop. ice, and this only in Homer, then crystal, exactly as the cognate קֶרַח unites both significations in itself. The reason of this homonymy lies deeper than in the outward similarity,—the ancients really thought the crystal was a product of the cold; Pliny, xxxvii. 2, 9, says: non alibi certe reperitur quam ubi maxume hibernae nives rigent, glaciemque esse certum est, unde nomen Graeci dedere. The Targ. translates גבישׁ by בֵּירוּלִין, certainly in the sense of the Arabico-Persic bullûr (bulûr), which signifies crystal, or

even glass, and moreover is the primary word for βήρυλλος, although the identical Sanskrit word, according to the laws of sound, vaidurja (Pali, velurija), is, according to the lexicons, a name of the lapis lazuli (Persic, lagurd). Of the two words רָאמוֹת and פְּנִינִים, the one appears to mean pearls and the other corals; the ancient appellations of these precious things which belong to the sea are also blended; the Persic mergân (Sanskr. mangara) unites the signification pearl and coral in itself. The root פן, Arab. fn, which has the primary notion of pushing, especially of vegetation (whence Arab. fann, a branch, shoot, prop. motion; French, jet), and Lam. 4:7, where snow and milk, as figures of whiteness (purity), are placed in contrast with פנינים as a figure of redness, favour the signification corals for פנינים. The Coptic be nôni, which signifies gemma, favours (so far as it may be compared) corals rather than pearls. And the fact that ראמות, Ezek. 27:16, appears as an Aramaean article of commerce in the market of Tyre, is more favourable to the signification pearls than corals; for the Babylonians sailed far into the Indian Ocean, and brought pearls from the fisheries of Bahrein, perhaps even from Ceylon, into the home markets (vid., Layard, New Discoveries, 536). The name is perhaps, from the Western Asiatic name of the pearl,237 mutilated and Hebraized.238

The name of the פִּטְדָה of Ethiopia appears to be derived from τόπαζ by transposition; Pliny says of the topaz, xxxvii. 8, 32, among other passages; Juba Topazum insulam in rubro mari a continenti stadiis CCC abesse dicit, nebulosam et ideo quaesitam saepius navigantibus; ex ea causa nomen accepisse: topazin enim Troglodytarum lingua significationem habere quaerendi. This topaz, however, which is said to be named after an island of the same name, the Isle of Serpents in Agatharchides and Diodorus, is, according to Pliny, yellowish green, and therefore distinct from the otherwise so-called topaz. To make a candid confession, we grope about everywhere in the dark here, and the ancient versions are not able to help us out of our difficulty.239 The poet lays everything under contribution to illustrate the thought, that the worth of wisdom exceeds the worth of the most valuable earthly thing; besides which, in מפנינים חכמה מָשְׁךָ, "the acquisition or possession (from מָשַׁךְ, Arab. msk, to draw to one's self, to take hold of) of wisdom is above corals," there is an indication that, although not by the precious things of the earth, still in some way or other, wisdom can be possessed, so that consequently the question repeated at the end of the strophe will not remain unanswered. This is its meaning: now if wisdom is not to be found in any of the places named, and is not to be attained by any of the means mentioned, whence can man hope to attain it, and whither must he turn to find it? for its existence is certain, and it is an indisputable need of man that he should partake of it.

21 It is veiled from the eyes of all living,
And concealed from the fowls of heaven.
22 Destruction and death say:
With our ears we heard a report of it.—
23 Elohim understandeth the way to it,
And He—He knoweth its place.
24 For He looketh to the ends of the earth,
Under the whole heaven He seeth.

Job 28:21–24. No living created being (כָּל־חַי, as Job 12:10, 30:23) is able to answer the question; even the birds that fly aloft, that have keener and farther-seeing eyes than man, can give us no information concerning wisdom; and the world at least proclaims its existence in a rich variety of its operations, but in the realm of Abaddon and of death below (comp. the combination ואבדון שאול, Prov. 15:11, ἅδου καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, Apoc. 1:18) it is known only by an indistinct hearsay, and from confused impressions. Therefore: no creature, whether in the realm of the living or the dead, can help us to get wisdom. There is but One who possesses a perfect knowledge concerning wisdom, namely Elohim, whose gave extends to the ends of the earth, and who sees under the whole heaven, i.e., is everywhere present (תַּחַת, definition of place, not equivalent to תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר; comp. on Job 24:9b), who therefore, after the removal of everything earthly (sub-celestial),

alone remains. And why should He with His knowledge, which embraces everything, not also know the way and place of wisdom? Wisdom is indeed the ideal, according to which He has created the world.

25 When He appointed to the wind its weight,
And weighed the water according to a measure,
26 When He appointed to the rain its law,
And the course to the lightning of the thunder:
27 Then He saw it and declared it,
Took it as a pattern and tested it also,
28 And said to man: Behold, the fear of the Lord is wisdom,
And to depart from evil is understanding.

Job 28:25–28. It is impracticable to attach the inf. לַעֲשׂוֹת to v. 24 as the purpose, because it is contrary to the meaning; but it is impossible, according to the syntax, to refer it to v. 27 as the purpose placed in advance, or to take it in the sense of perfecturus, because in both instances it ought to have been יְתַכֵּן instead of תְּכֵן, or at least וְתִכֵּן with the verb placed first (vid., Job 37:15). But even the temporal use of ל in לִפְנוֹת at the turn (of morning, of evening, e.g., Gen. 24:63) cannot be compared, but לעשׂות signifies perficiendo = quum perficeret (as e.g., 2 Sam. 18:29, mittendo = quum mitteret), it is a gerundival inf. Nägelsb. S. 197f., 2nd edition); and because it is the past that is spoken of, the modal inf. can be continued in the perf., Ges. § 132, rem. 2. The thought that God, when He created the world, appointed fixed laws of equable and salutary duration, he particularizes by examples: He appointed to the wind its weight, i.e., the measure of its force or feebleness; distributed the masses of water by measure; appointed to the rain its law, i.e., the conditions of its development and of its beginning; appointed the way, i.e., origin and course, to the lightning (חֲזִיז from חָזַז, Arab. ḥzz, secare). When He thus created the world, and regulated what was created by laws, then He perceived (רָאָהּ with He Mappic. according to the testimony of the Masora) it, wisdom, viz., as the ideal of all things; then He declared it, enarravit, viz., by creating the world, which is the development and realization of its substance; then He gave it a place הֱכִינָהּ (for which Döderl. and Ewald unnecessarily read הֱבִינָהּ), viz., to create the world after its pattern, and to commit the arrangement of the world as a whole to its supreme protection and guidance; then He also searched it out or tested it, viz., its demiurgic powers, by setting them in motion to realize itself.

If we compare Prov. 8:22–31 with this passage, we may say: the חכמה is the divine ideal-world, the divine imagination of all things before their creation, the complex unity of all the ideas, which are the essence of created things and the end of their development. "Wisdom," says one of the old theologians,240 "is a divine imagination, in which the ideas of the angels and souls and all things were seen from eternity, not as already actual creatures, but as a man beholds himself in a mirror." It is not directly one with the Logos, but the Logos is the demiurg by which God has called the world into existence according to that ideal which was in the divine mind. Wisdom is the impersonal model, the Logos the personal master-builder according to that model. Nevertheless the notions, here or in the alter cognate portion of Scripture, Prov. 8:22–31, are not as yet so distinct as the New Testament revelation of God has first of all rendered possible. In those days, when God realized the substance of the חכמה, this eternal mirror of the world, in the creation of the world, He also gave man the law, corresponding to which he corresponds to His idea and participates in wisdom. Fearing the supreme Lord (אֲדֹנָי) only here in the book of Job, one of the 134 ודאין, i.e., passages, where אדני is not merely to be read instead of יהוה, but is actually written241), and renouncing evil (סוּר מֵרָע, according to another less authorized mode of writing מֵרַע),—this is man's share of wisdom, this is his relative wisdom, by which he remains in connection with the absolute. This is true human φιλοσοφία, in contrast to all high-flown and profound speculations; comp. Prov. 3:7, where, in like manner, "fear Jehovah" is placed

side by side with "depart from evil," and Prov. 16:6, according to which it is rendered possible מרע סור, to escape the evil of sin and its punishment by fearing God. "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom" (Prov. 1:7; comp. Ps. 111:10) is the symbolum, the motto and uppermost principle, of that Israelitish Chokma, whose greatest achievement is the book of Job. The whole of Job 28 is a minute panegyric of this principle, the materials of which are taken from the far-distant past; and it is very characteristic, that, in the structure of the book, this twenty-eighth chapter is the clasp which unites the half of the δέσις with the half of the λύσις, and that the poet has inscribed upon this clasp that sentence, "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom." But, moreover, Job's closing speech, which ends in this celebration of the praise of the חכמה, also occupies an important position, which must not be determined, in the structure of the whole.

After Job has refuted Bildad, and, continuing his description, has celebrated in such lofty strains the majesty of God, it can hardly be expected that the poet will allow Zophar to speak fore the third time. Bildad is unable to advance anything new, and Zophar has already tried his utmost to terrify Job for the second time; besides, Job's speech furnishes no material for a reply (a motive which is generally overlooked), unless the controversy were designed to ramble on into mere personalities. Accordingly the poet allows Job to address the friends once more, but no longer in the extreme and excited tone of the previous dialogue, but, since the silence of the friends must produce a soothing impression on Job, tempering him to gentleness and forbearance, in a tone of confession conscious of victory, yet altogether devoid of haughty triumph,—a confession in which only one single word of reproach (Job 27:12b) escapes him. Ch. 27–28 contain this confession—Job's final address to his friends.

Job once again most solemnly asserts his innocence before the friends; all attempts on the part of the friends to entice or to extort from him a confession which is against his conscience, have therefore been in vain: joyous and victorious he raises his head, invincible, even to death, in the conviction of that which is a fact of his consciousness that cannot be got rid of by denial. He is not an evil-doer; accordingly he must stand convicted as an evil-doer who treats him as such. For although he is not far from death, and is in sore vexation, he has not manifested the hopelessness and defection from God in which the evil-doer passes away. Job has indeed even expressed himself despondingly, and complained of God's wrath; but the true essence of his relation to God came to light in such words as Job 16:19–21, 17:9, 19:25–27. If the friends had not been blind to such brilliant aspirations of his life in God, how could they regard him as a godless man, and his affliction as the punishment of such an one! His affliction has, indeed, no connection with the terrible end of the evil-doer. Job here comes before the friends with the very doctrine they have so frequently advanced, but infatuated with the foolish notion that it is suited to his case. He here gives it back to them, to show them that it is not suited to him. He also does not deny, that in the rule the evil-doer meets a terrible end, although he has hitherto disputed the assertion of the friends, because of the exclusiveness with which it was maintained by them. His counter-assertion respecting the prosperity of the evil-doer, which from the beginning was not meant by him so exclusively as the friends meant theirs respecting the misfortune of the evil-doer, is here indirectly freed from the extreme appearance of exclusiveness by Job himself, and receives the necessary modification. Job does not deny, yea, he here brings it under the notice of the friends, that the sword, famine, and pestilence carry off the descendants of the evil-doer, and even himself; that his possessions at length fall into the hands of the righteous, and contain within themselves the germ of destruction from the very first; that God's curse pursues, and suddenly destroys, the godless rich man himself. Thus it comes to pass; for while silver and other precious things come from the depths of the earth, wisdom, whose

worth far transcends all earthly treasures, is to be found with no created being, but is with God alone; and the fear of God, to avoid evil, is the share of wisdom to which man is directed according to God's primeval decree.

The object of the section, Job 28, is primarily to confirm the assertion concerning the judgment that befalls the evil-doer, Job 27:13–23; the confirmation is, however, at the same time, according to the delicately laid plan of the poet, a glorious general confession, in which Job's dialogue with the friends comes to a close. This panegyric of wisdom (similar to Paul's panegyric of charity, 1 Cor. 13) is the presentation of Job's predominant principle, and as such, is like a song of triumph, with which, without vain-glory, he closes the dialogue in the most appropriate manner. If God's life has such a basis, it is not possible that his affliction should be the punishment of an ungodly man. And if the fear of God is the wisdom appointed to man, he also teaches himself that, though unable to see through the mystery of his affliction, he must still hold on to the fear of God, and teaches the friends that they must do the same, and not lay themselves open to the charge of injustice and uncharitableness towards him, the suffering one, in order to solve the mystery. Job's conclusion, which is first intended to show that he who does not fear God is overtaken by the merited fate of a fool who rebels against God's moral government, shows at the same time that the afflictive lot of those who fear God must be judged of in an essentially different manner from that of the ungodly.

We may imagine what impression these last words of Job to the friends must have made upon them. Since they were obliged to be silent, they will not have admitted that they are vanquished, although the drying up of their thoughts, and their involuntary silence, is an actual proof of it. But does Job make them feel this oppressively? Now that they are become so insignificant, does he read them a severe lecture? does he in general act towards them as vanquished? No indeed, but solemnly, and without vaunting himself over his accusers, he affirms his innocence; earnestly, but in a winning manner, he admonishes them, by tempering and modifying what was vehement and extreme in his previous replies. He humbly submits himself to the divine wisdom, by setting the fear of God, as man's true wisdom, before himself and the friends as their common aim. Thus he utters "the loftiest words, which must surprise the opponents as they exhibit him as the not merely mighty, but also wonderfully calm and modest conqueror, who here for the first time wears the crown of true victory, when, in outward victory conquering himself, he struggles on towards a more exalted clearness of perception."

JOB 29

Job's Monologue.—Ch. 29–31

First Part

[Then Job continued to take up his proverb, and said:]

2 O that I had months like the times of yore,
Like the days when Eloah protected me,
3 When He, when His lamp, shone above my head,
By His light I went about in the darkness;
4 As I was in the days of my vintage,
When the secret of Eloah was over my tent,
5 When the Almighty was still with me,
My children round about me;
6 When my steps were bathed in cream,
And the rock beside me poured forth streams of oil.

Job 29:2–6. Since the optative מִי־יִתֵּן (comp. on Job 23:3) is connected with the acc. of the object desired, Job 14:4, 31:31, or of that respecting which anything is desired, Job 11:5, it is in itself possible to explain: who gives (makes) me like the months of yore; but since, when מִי־יִתְּנֵנִי occurs elsewhere, Isa. 27:4, Jer. 9:1, the suff. is meant as the dative (= לִי מִי־יִתֵּן, Job 31:35), it is also here to be explained: who gives me (= O that one would give me, O that I had) like (instar) the months of yore, i.e.,

months like those of the past, and indeed those that lie far back in the past; for יַרְחֵי־קֶדֶם means more than עָבְרוּ (אֲשֶׁר) יְרָחִים. Job begins to describe the olden times, that he wishes back, with the virtually genitive relative clause: "when Eloah protected me" (Ges. § 116, 3). It is impossible to take בְּהִלּוֹ as Hiph.: when He caused to shine (Targ. בְּאַנָּרוּתֵיהּ); either בַּהֲהִלּוֹ (Olsh.) or even בָּהִלּוֹ (Ew. in his Comm.) ought to be read then. On the other hand, וְהִלּ can be justified as the form for inf. Kal of הָלַל (to shine, vid., Job 25:5) with a weakening of the a to i (Ew. § 255, a), and the suff. may, according to the syntax, be taken as an anticipatory statement of the object: when it, viz., His light, shone above my head; comp. Ex. 2:6 (him, the boy), Isa. 17:6 (its, the fruit-tree's, branches), also 29:23 (he, his children); and Ew. § 309, c, also decides in its favour. Nevertheless it commends itself still more to refer the suff. of בהלו to אֱלוֹהַּ (comp. Isa. 60:2, Ps. 50:2), and to take נֵרוֹ as a corrective, explanatory permutative: when He, His lamp, shone above my head, as we have translated. One is at any rate reminded of Isa. 60 in connection with v. 3; for as בהלו corresponds to יזרח there, so לאורו corresponds to לְאוֹרֵךְ in the 3rd v. of the same: by His light I walked in darkness (חֹשֶׁךְ locative = בַּחֹשֶׁךְ), i.e., rejoicing in His light, which preserved me from its dangers (straying and falling).

In v. 4 כַּאֲשֶׁר is not a particle of time, but of comparison, which was obliged here to stand in the place of the כְּ, which is used only as a preposition. And חָרְפִּי (to be written thus, not חָרְפִּי with an aspirated פ) may not be translated " (in the days) of my spring," as Symm. ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός μου, Jer. diebus adolescentiae meae, and Targ. חֲרִיפוּתִי בְּיוֹמֵי, whether it be that חריפות here signifies the point, ἀκμή (from חרף, Arab. ḥrf, acuere), or the early time (spring time, from חרף, Arab. chrf, carpere). For in reference to agriculture חֹרֶף can certainly signify the early half of the year (on this, vid., Genesis, S. 270), inasmuch as sowing and ploughing time in Palestine and Syria is in November and December; wherefore Arab. chrîf signifies the early rain or autumn rain; and in Talmudic, חָרֵף, premature (ripe too early), is the opposite of אָפֵל, late, but the derivatives of חרף only obtain this signification connotative, for, according to its proper signification, חֹרֶף (Arab. chrîf with other forms) is the gathering time, i.e., the time of the fruit harvest (syn. אָסִיף), while the Hebr. אָבִיב (אֵב) corresponds to the spring in our sense. If Job meant his youth, he would have said אֲבִי בִימַי, or something similar; but as v. 5b shows, he meant his manhood, and this he calls his autumn as the season of maturity, or rather of the abundance of fruits (Schult.: aetatem virilem suis fructibus faetum et exuberantum),242 which, according to Olympiodorus, also with ὅτε ἤμην ἐπιβρίθων ὀδούς (perhaps καρπούς) of the LXX, is what is intended. Then the blessed fellowship of Eloah (סוֹד, familiarity, confiding, unreserved intercourse, Ps. 55:15, Prov. 3:32, comp. Ps. 25:14) ruled over his tent; the Almighty was still with him (protecting and blessing him), His נְעָרִים were round about him. It certainly does not mean servants (Raschi: משׁרתי), but children (as Job 1:19, 24:5); for one expects the mention of the blessing of children first of all (Ps. 127:3ff., 128:3). His steps (הֲלִיכָה, ἅπ. λεγ.) bathed then בְּחֶמְאָה = בַּחֲמָאָה, Job 20:17 (as שְׁאֵלָה = שַׁאֲלָה, 1 Sam. 1:17, and possibly גְּוָה = גֵּוָה), and the rocks poured forth, close by him, streams of oil (a figure which reminds one of Deut. 32:13). A rich blessing surrounded him wherever he tarried or went, and flowed to him wonderfully beyond desire and comprehension.

7 When I went forth to the gate of the city,
Prepared my seat in the market,
8 Then the young men hid themselves as soon as they saw me,
And the aged rose up, remained standing.
9 Princes refrained from speaking,
And laid their hand on their mouth.
10 The voice of the nobles was hidden,
And their tongue clave to their palate.

Job 29:7–10. When he left the bounds of his domain, and came into the city, he was everywhere received with the profoundest respect. From the facts of the case, it is

inadmissible to translate quum egrederer portam after Gen. 34:24, comp. infra, Job 31:34, for the district where Job dwelt is to be thought of as being without a gate. True, he did not dwell with his family in tents, i.e., pavilions of hair, but in houses; he was not a nomad (a wandering herdsman), or what is the same thing, a Beduin, otherwise his children would not have been slain in a stone house, Job 1:19. "The daughter of the duck," says an Arabian proverb, "is a swimmer," and the son of a Beduin never dwells in a stone house. He was, however, also, not a citizen, but a hadarî (חֲצֵרִי), i.e., a permanent resident, a large landowner and husbandman. Thus therefore שַׁעַר (for which Ew. after the LXX reads שַׁחַר: "when I went up early in the morning to the city") is locative, for שַׁעֲרָה (comp. הַשָּׂדֶה צֵא, go out into the field, Gen. 27:3): when he went forth to the gate above the city; or even, since it is natural to imagine the city as situated on an eminence: up to the city (so that צֵאת includes in itself by implication the notion of עֲלוֹת); not, however: to the gate near the city (Stick., Hahn), since the gate of a city is not situated near the city, but is part of the city itself. The gates of cities and large houses in Western Asia are vaulted entrances, with large recesses on either side, where people congregate for business and negotiations.243 The open space at the gate, which here, as in Neh. 8:1, 3, 16, is called רְחוֹב, i.e., the open space within the gate and by the gate, was the forum (Job 5:4).

Ver. 8. When Job came hither to the meeting of the tribunal, or the council of the elders of the city, within which he had a seat and a voice, the young men hid themselves, conscious of his presence (which εἰρομένῃ λέξει, or, is expressed paratactically instead of as a period), i.e., they retired into the background, since they feared his look of salutation;244 and old men (hoary heads) stood up, remained standing (ἀσυνδέτως, as Job 20:19, 28:4). קוּם signifies to stand up, עָמַד to advance towards any one and remain standing (comp. p. 438, note 1). They rose in order not to seat themselves until he was seated. שָׂרִים are magnates (proceres) of the city. These יִמְבָּמְלוּ עָצְרוּ, cohibebant verba (עצר with Beth of the obj., as Job 4:2, 12:15), and keeping a respectful silence, they laid their hand on their mouth (comp. 21:5). All stepped back and desisted from speaking before him: The speech of illustrious men (נְגִידִים from נגד, Arab. njd, to be visible, pleasant to the sight, comp. supra, p. 510) hid itself (not daring to be heard), and the tongue of the same clave (motionless) to their palate. We do not translate: as to the voice illustrious men hid themselves, for it is only the appearance produced by the attractional construction [Ges. § 148, 1] that has led to the rendering of קוֹל־נגידים as an acc. of closer definition (Schult., Hahn: quod ad vocem eminentium, comprimebantur). The verb is construed with the second member of the genitival expression instead of with the first, as with מספר, Job 15:20, 21:21, 38:21, and with ראשׁ, Job 22:12; a construction which occurs with קוֹל not merely in such exclamatory sentences as Gen. 4:10, Isa. 52:8, but also under other conditions, 1 Kings 1:41, comp. 14:6. This may be best called an attraction of the predicate by the second member of the compound subject, like the reverse instance, Isa. 2:11; and it is sometimes found even where this second member is not logically the more important. Thus Ew. transl.: "the voice of the nobles hides itself;" whereas Olsh., wrongly denying that the partt. in passages like Gen. 4:10, 1 Kings 1:41, are to be taken as predicative, wishes to read נחבא, which is the more inadmissible, as even the choice of the verb is determined by the attractional construction.

The strophe which follows tells how it came to pass that those in authority among the citizens submitted to him, and that on all sides the people were zealous to show him tokens of respect.

11 For an ear heard, and called me happy;
And an eye saw, and bear witness to me:
12 For I rescued the sufferer who cried for help,
And the orphan, and him that had no helper.

13 The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me,

And I made the widow's heart rejoice.

14 I put on justice, and it put me on;

As a robe and turban was my integrity.

Job 29:11–14. Thus imposing was the impression of his personal appearance wherever he appeared; for (כִּי explic.) the fulness of the blessing of the possession of power and of prosperity which he enjoyed was so extraordinary, that one had only to hear of it to call him happy, and that, especially if any one saw it with his own eyes, he was obliged to bear laudatory testimony to him. The futt. consec. affirm what was the inevitable consequence of hearing and seeing; הֶעִיד, seq. acc., is used like הִזְכִּיר in the signification of laudatory recognition. The expression is not brachylogical for לִי וַתָּעַד (vid., on Job 31:18); for from 1 Kings 21:10, 13, we perceive that העיד with the acc. of the person signifies to make any one the subject of assertion, whether he be lower or higher in rank (comp. the New Testament word, especially in Luke, μαρτυρεῖσθαι). It was, however, not merely the outward manifestation of his unusual prosperity which called forth such admiration, but his active benevolence united with the abundant resources at his command. For where there was a sufferer who cried for help he, relieved him, especially orphans and those who had no helper. לוֹ וְלֹא־עֹזֵר is either a new third object, or a closer definition of what precedes: the orphan and (in this state of orphanhood) helpless one. The latter is more probable both here and in the Salomonic primary passage, Ps. 72:12; in the other case לֹה אין־עזר ואשׁר might be expected.

Ver. 13. The blessing (בִּרְכַּת with closely closed penult.) of those who stood on the brink of destruction (אֹובֵד, interiturus, as Job 31:19, Prov. 31:6), and owed their rescue to him, came upon him; and the heart of the widow to whom he gave assistance, compensating for the assistance of her lost husband, he filled with gladness (הִרְנִין causative, as Ps. 65:9). For the primary attribute, the fundamental character of his way of thinking and acting, was צֶדֶק, a holding fast to the will of God, which before everything else calls for sympathizing love (root צדק, Arab. ṣdq, to be hard, firm, stiff, e.g., rumh-un sadq-un, according to the Kamus: a hard, firm, straight spear), and מִשְׁפָּט, judgment and decision in favour of right and equity against wrong and injustice. Righteousness is here called the garment which he put on (as Ps. 132:9, comp. Isa. 11:5, 59:17), and right is the robe and turban with which he adorns himself (comp. Isa. 61:10); as by Arabian poets noble attributes are also called garments, which God puts on any one, or which any one puts on himself (albasa).245 Righteousness is compared to the לבוּשׁ (corresponding to the thob, i.e., garment, indusium, of the nomads) which is worn on the naked body, justice to the צָנִיף, a magnificent turban (corresponding to the kefije, consisting of a thick cotton cloth, and fastened with a cord made of camel's hair), and the magnificent robe (corresponding to the second principal article of clothing, the 'abâ). The LXX, Jer., Syr., and Arab. wrongly refer וַיִּלְבָּשֵׁנִי to משׁפטי of the second half of the verse, while, on the contrary, it is said of צדק, per antanaclasin, that Job put this on, and this in turn put Job on, induit; for וילבשׁני, as the usage of the language, as we have it, elsewhere shows, does not signify: it (righteousness) clothed me well (Umbr.), or: adorned me (Ew., Vaih.), also not: it dressed me out (Schlottm.), but only: it put me on as a garment, i.e., it made me so its own, that my whole appearance was the representation of itself, as in Judg. 6:34 and twice in the Chronicles, of the Spirit of Jehovah it is said that He puts on any one, induit, when He makes any one the organ of His own manifestation.

15 I was eyes to the blind,

And feet was I to the lame.

16 I was a father to the needy,

And the cause of the unknown I found out,

17 And broke the teeth of the wicked,

And I cast the spoil forth out of his teeth.

Job 29:15–17. The less it is Job's purpose here to vindicate himself before the friends, the

more forcible is the refutation which the accusations of the most hard-hearted uncharitableness raised against him by them, especially by Eliphaz, Job 22, find everywhere here. His charity relieved the bodily and spiritual wants of others—eyes to the blind (לַעִוֵּר with Pathach), feet to the lame. A father was he to the needy, which is expressed by a beautiful play of words, as if it were: the carer for the care-full ones; or what perhaps corresponds to the primary significations of אָב and אֶבְיוֹן:246 the protector of those needing (seeking) protection. The unknown he did not regard as those who were nothing to him, but went unselfishly and impartially into the ground of their cause. לֹא־יָדַעְתִּי is an attributive clause, as Job 18:21, Isa. 55:5, 41:3, and freq., with a personal obj. (eorum) quos non noveram, for the translation causam quam nesciebam (Jer.) gives a tame, almost meaningless, thought. With reference to the suff. in אֲחָקְרֵהוּ, on the form ehu used seldom by Waw consec. (Job 12:4), and by the imper. (Job 40:11f.), chiefly with a solemn calm tone of speech, vid., Ew. § 250, c. Further: He spared not to render wrong-doers harmless, and snatched from them what they had taken from others. The cohortative form of the fut. consec., וַאֲשַׁבְּרָה, has been discussed already on Job 1:15, 19:20. The form מְתַלְּעוֹת is a transposition of מַלְתְּעוֹת, to render it more convenient for pronunciation, for the Arab. ṭl', efferre se, whence a secondary form, Arab. tl', although used of the appearing of the teeth, furnishes no such appropriate primary signification as the Arab. ldg, pungere, mordere, whence a secondary form, Arab. ltg; the Aethiopic maltâht, jawbone (maxilla), also favours מלתעה as the primary form. He shattered the grinders of the roguish, and by moral indignation against the robber he cast out of his teeth what he had stolen.

18 Then I thought: With my nest I shall expire,
And like the phoenix, have a long life.
19 My root will be open for water,
And the dew will lodge in my branches.
20 Mine honour will remain ever fresh to me,
And my bow will become young in my hand.

Job 29:18–20. In itself, v. 18b might be translated: "and like to the sand I shall live many days" (Targ., Syr., Arab., Saad., Gecat., Luther, and, among moderns, Umbr., Stick., Vaih., Hahn, and others), so that the abundance of days is compared to the multitude of the grains of sand. The calculation of the immense total of grains of sand (atoms) in the world was, as is known, a favourite problem of antiquity; and in the Old Testament Scriptures, the comprehensive knowledge of Solomon is compared to "the sand upon the sea-shore," 1 Kings 5:9, —how much more readily a long life reduced to days! comp. Ovid, Metam. xiv. 136–138; quot haberet corpora pulvis, tot mihi natales contingere vana rogavi. We would willingly decide in favour of this rendering, which is admissible in itself, although a closer definition like הַיָּם is wanting by כחול, if an extensive Jewish tradition did not secure the signification of an immortal bird, or rather one rising ever anew from the dead. The testimony is as follows: (1) b. Sanhedrin 108b, according to which חול is only another name for the bird אורשׁינא,247 of which the fable is there recorded, that when Noah fed the beasts in the ark, it sat quite still in its compartment, that it might not give more trouble to the patriarch, who had otherwise plenty to do, and that Noah wished it on this account the reward of immortality (יהא תמות דלא רעוא). (2) That this bird חול is none other than the phoenix, is put beyond all doubt by the Midrashim (collected in the Jalkut on Job, § 517). There it is said that Eve gave all the beasts to eat of the fruit of the forbidden tree, and that only one bird, the חול by name, avoided this death-food: "it lives a thousand years, at the expiration of which time fire springs up in its nest, and burns it up to about the size of an egg;" or even: that of itself it diminishes to that size, from which it then grows up again and continues to live (וחיה איברים ומתגדל וחוזר). (3) The Masora observes, that כחול occurs in two different significations (לישׁני בתרי), since in the present passage it does not, as elsewhere, signify sand. (4) Kimchi, in his Lex., says: "in a correct Jerusalem MS I found the observation:

למערבאי ובחלם לנהרדעי בשורק, i.e., וְכַחוּל according to the Nehardean (Babylonian) reading, וְכַחֹול according to the western (Palestine) reading;" according to which, therefore, the Babylonian Masoretic school distinguished וכחול in the present passage from וכחול, Gen. 22:17, even in the pronunciation. A conclusion respecting the great antiquity of this lexical tradition may be drawn (5) from the LXX, which translates ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος, whence the Italic sicut arbor palmae, Jerome sicut palma.

If we did not know from the testimonies quoted that חול is the name of the phoenix, one might suppose that the LXX has explained וכחול according to the Arab. nachl, the palm, as Schultens does; but by a comparison of those testimonies, it is more probable that the translation was ὥσπερ φοῖνιξ originally, and that ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος is an interpolation, for φοῖνιξ signifies both the immortal miraculous bird and the inexhaustibly youthful palm.248 We have the reverse case in Tertullian, de resurrectione carnis, c. xiii., which explains the passage in Psalms, 92:13, δίκαιος ὡς φοῖνιξ ἀνθήσει, according to the translation justus velut phoenix florebit, of the ales orientis or avis Arabiae, which symbolizes man's immortality.249 Both figures, that of the phoenix and that of the palm, are equally appropriate and pleasing in the mouth of Job; but apart from the fact that the palm everywhere, where it otherwise occurs, is called תָּמָר, this would be the only passage where it occurs in the book of Job, which, in spite of its richness in figures taken from plants, nowhere mentions the palm,—a fact which is perhaps not accidental.250 On the contrary, we must immediately welcome a reference to the Arabico-Egyptian myth of the phoenix, that can be proved, in a book which also otherwise thoroughly blends things Egyptian with Arabian, and the more so since (6) even the Egyptian language itself supports חוֹל or חוּל as a name of the phoenix; for ΑΛΛΩΪΗ ΑΛΛΟΗ is explained in the Coptico-Arabic glossaries by es-semendel (the Arab. name of the phoenix, or at least a phoenix-like bird, that, like the salamander, semendar, cannot be burned), and in Kircher by avis Indica, species Phoenicis. 251 חול is Hebraized from this Egyptian name of the phoenix; the word signifies rotation (comp. Arab. haul, the year; haula, round about), and is a suitable designation of the bird that renews its youth periodically after many centuries of life: quae reparat seque ipsa reseminat ales (Ovid), not merely beginning a new life, but also bringing in a new great year: conversionem anni magni (Pliny); in the hieroglyphic representations it has the circle of the sun as a crown. In the full enjoyment of the divine favour and blessing, and in the consciousness of having made a right use of his prosperity, Job hoped φοίνικος ἔτη βιοῦν (Lucian, Hermot. 53), to use a Greek expression, and to expire or die עִם־קִנִּי, as the first half of the verse, now brought into the right light, says. Looking to the form of the myth, according to which Ovid sings:

Quassa cum fulvâ substravit cinnama myrrhâ,

Se super imponit finitque in odoribus aevum,

it might be translated: together with my nest (Umbr., Hirz., Hlgst.); but with the wish that he may not see any of his dear ones die before himself, there is at the same time connected the wish, that none of them should survive him, which is in itself unnatural, and diametrically opposed to the character of an Arab, who in the presence of death cherishes the twofold wish, that he may continue to live in his children (a proverb says: men chalaf el-weled el-fâlih ma mât, he who leaves a noble child behind him is not dead), and that he may die in the midst of his family. Expressly this latter wish, עם־קני signifies: with = in my nest, i.e., in the bosom of my family, not without reference to the phoenix, which, according to the form of the myth in Herodotus, Pliny, Clemens, and others, brings the remains of its father in a nest or egg of myrrh to Heliopolis, into the sacred precincts of the temple of the sun, and thus pays him the last and highest tribute of respect. A different but similar version if given in Horapollo ii. 57, according to which the young bird came forth from the blood of its sire, σὺν τῷ πατρὶ πορεύεται εἰς τὴνἩλίου πόλιν τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ὃς καὶ παραγενόμενος ἐκεῖ ἅμα τῇ ἠλίου

ἀνατολῇ τελευτᾷ. The father, therefore, in death receives the highest tribute of filial respect; and it is this to which the hope of being able to die with (in) his nest, expressed by Job, refers.

The following substantival clause, v. 19a, is to be understood as future, like the similar clause, v. 16a, as perfect: my root—so I hoped—will remain open (unclosed) towards the water, i.e., it will never be deficient of water in its vicinity, that it may plentifully supply the stem and branches with nourishment, and dew will lodge on my branches, i.e., will descend nightly, and remain upon them to nourish them. אֱלֵי (corresponding to the Arab. ila, originally ilai) occurs only in the book of Job, and here for the fourth and last time (comp. Job 3:22, 5:26, 15:22). קָצִיר does not signify harvest here, as the ancient expositors render it, but, like Job 14:9, 18:16, a branch, or the intertwined branches. The figure of the root and branch, the flow of vitality downwards and upwards, is the counterpart of Job 18:16. In v. 20 a substantival clause also comes first, as in vv. 19, 16 (for the established reading is חָדָשׁ, not חָדַשׁ), and a verbal clause follows: his honour—so he hoped—should continue fresh by him, i.e., should abide with him in undiminished value and splendour. It is his honour before God and men that is intended, not his soul (Hahn); כָּבוֹד, δόξα, certainly is an appellation of the נֶפֶשׁ (Psychol. S. 98), but חָדָשׁ is not appropriate to it as predicate. By the side of honour stands manliness, or the capability of self-defence, whose symbol is the bow: and my bow should become young again in my hand, i.e., gain ever new strength and elasticity. It is unnecessary to supply כֹּחַ (Hirz., Schlottm., and others). The verb חלף, Arab. chlf, signifies, as the Arab. shows, properly to turn the back, then to go forth, exchange; the Hiph. to make progress, to cause something new to come into the place of the old, to grow young again. These hopes introduced with וְאֹמַר were themselves an element of his former happiness. Its description can therefore be continued in connection with the ואמר without any fresh indication.

21 They hearkened to me and waited,
And remained silent at my decision.
22 After my utterance they spake not again,
And my speech distilled upon them.
23 And they waited for me as for the rain,
And they opened their mouth wide for the latter rain.
24 I smiled to them in their hopelessness,
And the light of my countenance they cast not down.
25 I chose the way for them, and sat as chief,
And dwelt as a king in the army,
As one that comforteth the mourners.

Job 29:21–25. Attentive, patient, and ready to be instructed, they hearkened to him (this is the force of לְ שָׁמַע), and waited, without interrupting, for what he should say. וְיִחֲלוּ, the pausal pronunciation with a reduplication of the last radical, as Judg. 5:7, חָדְלוּ (according to correct texts), Ges. § 20, 2, c; the reading of Kimchi, וְיִחֲלוּ, is the reading of Ben-Naphtali, the former the reading of Ben-Ascher (vid., Norzi). If he gave counsel, they waited in strictest silence: this is the meaning of וְיִדְּמוּ (fut. Kal of דָּמַם); לְמוֹ, poetic for לְ, refers the silence to its outward cause (vid., on Hab. 3:16). After his words non iterabant, i.e., as Jerome explanatorily translates: addere nihil audebant, and his speech came down upon them relieving, rejoicing, and enlivening them. The figure indicated in תִּטֹּף is expanded in v. 23 after Deut. 32:2: they waited on his word, which penetrated deeply, even to the heart, as for rain, מָטָר, by which, as v. 23b, the so-called (autumnal) early rain which moistens the seed is prominently thought of. They open their mouth for the late rain, מַלְקוֹשׁ (vid., on Job 24:6), i.e., they thirsted after his words, which were like the March or April rain, which helps to bring to maturity the corn that is soon to be reaped; this rain frequently fails, and is therefore the more longed for. פֶּה פָּעַר is to be understood according to Ps. 119:131, comp. 81:11; and one must consider, in connection with it, what raptures the beginning of the

periodical rains produces everywhere, where, as e.g., in Jerusalem, the people have been obliged for some time to content themselves with cisterns that are almost dried to a marsh, and how the old and young dance for joy at their arrival!

In v. 24a a thought as suited to the syntax as to the fact is gained if we translate: "I smiled to them—they believed it not," i.e., they considered such condescension as scarcely possible (Saad., Raschi, Rosenm., De Wette, Schlottm., and others); אֶשְׂחַק is then fut. hypotheticum, as Job 10:16, 20:24, 22:27f., Ew. § 357, b. But it does not succeed in putting v. 24b in a consistent relation to this thought; for, with Aben-Ezra, to explain: they did not esteem my favour the less on that account, my respect suffered thereby no loss among them, is not possible in connection with the biblical idea of "the light of the countenance;" and with Schlottm. to explain: they let not the light of my countenance, i.e., token of my favour, fall away, i.e., be in vain, is contrary to the usage of the language, according to which פָּנִים הִפִּיל signifies: to cause the countenance to sink (gloomily, Gen. 4:5), whether one's own, Jer. 3:12, or that of another. Instead of פָּנַי we have a more pictorial and poetical expression here, פְּנֵי אוֹר: light of my countenance, i.e., my cheerfulness (as Prov. 16:15). Moreover, the אליהם אשחק, therefore, furnishes the thought that he laughed, and did not allow anything to dispossess him of his easy and contented disposition. Thus, therefore, those to whom Job laughed are to be thought of as in a condition and mood which his cheerfulness might easily sadden, but still did not sadden; and this their condition is described by יַאֲמִינוּ לֹא (a various reading in Codd. and editions is וְלֹא), a phrase which occurred before (Job 24:22) in the signification of being without faith or hope, despairing (comp. הֶאֱמִין, to gain faith, Ps. 116:10),—a clause which is not to be taken as attributive (Umbr., Vaih.: who had not confidence), but as a neutral or circumstantial subordinate clause (Ew. § 341, a). Therefore translate: I smiled to them, if they believed not, i.e., despaired; and however despondent their position appeared, the cheerfulness of my countenance they could not cause to pass away. However gloomy they were, they could not make me gloomy and off my guard. Thus also v. 25a is now suitably attached to the preceding: I chose their way, i.e., I made the way plain, which they should take in order to get out of their hopeless and miserable state, and sat as chief, as a king who is surrounded by an armed host as a defence and as a guard of honour, attentive to the motion of his eye; not, however, as a sovereign ruler, but as one who condescended to the mourners, and comforted them (נָחַם Piel, properly to cause to breathe freely). This peaceful figure of a king brings to mind the warlike one, Job 15:24. כַּאֲשֶׁר is not a conj. here, but equivalent to אשׁר כאישׁ, ut (quis) qui; consequently not: as one comforts, but: as he who comforts; LXX correctly: ὃν τρόπον παθεινοὺς παρακαλῶν. The accentuation (כאשׁר Tarcha, אבלים Munach, ינחם Silluk) is erroneous; כאשׁר should be marked with Rebia mugrasch, and אבלים with Mercha-Zinnorith.

From the prosperous and happy past, absolutely passed, Job now turns to the present, which contrasts so harshly with it.

JOB 30

The Second Part of the Monologue

1 And now they who are younger than I have me in derision,
Those whose fathers I disdained
To set with the dogs of my flock.
2 Yea, the strength of their hands, what should it profit me?
They have lost vigour and strength.
3 They are benumbed from want and hunger,
They who gnaw the steppe,
The darkness of the wilderness and waste;
4 They who pluck mallows in the thicket,
And the root of the broom is their bread.

Job 30:1–4. With וְעַתָּה, which also elsewhere expresses the turning-point from the premises to the conclusion, from accusation to the threat of punishment, and such like, Job here begins to

bewail the sad turn which his former prosperity has taken. The first line of the verse, which is marked off by Mercha-Mahpach, is intentionally so disproportionately long, to form a deep and long breathed beginning to the lamentation which is now begun. Formerly, as he has related in the first part of the monologue, an object of reverential fear to the respectable youth of the city (Job 29:8), he is now an object of derision (עַל שָׂחַק, to laugh at, distinct from אֶל שָׂחַק, Job 29:24, to laugh to, smile upon) to the young good-for-nothing vagabonds of a miserable class of men. They are just the same אֲרֵץ עֲנִיֵּי, whose sorrowful lot he reckons among the mysteries of divine providence, so difficulty of solution (Job 24:4b -8). The less he belongs to the merciless ones, who take advantage of the calamities of the poor for their own selfish ends, instead of relieving their distress as far as is in their power, the more unjustifiable is the rude treatment which he now experiences from them, when they who meanly hated him before because he was rich, now rejoice at the destruction of his prosperity. Younger than he in days (לְיָמִים as Job 32:4, with לְ of closer definition, instead of which the simple acc. was inadmissible here, comp. on Job 11:9) laugh at him, sons of those fathers who were so useless and abandoned that he scorned (לְ מָאַס, comp. מִן מָאַס, 1 Sam. 15:26) to entrust to them even a service so menial as that of the shepherd dogs. Schult., Rosenm., and Schlottm. take עִם שִׁית for עַל שִׁית, praeficere, but that ought to be just simply על שׁית; עם שׁית signifies to range beside, i.e., to place alike, to associate; moreover, the oversight of the shepherd dogs is no such menial post, while Job intends to say that he did not once consider them fit to render such a subordinate service as is that of the dogs which help the shepherds.

And even the strength of their (these youths') hands (גַּם is referable to the suff. of יְדֵיהֶם: even; not: now entirely, completely, as Hahn translates), of what use should it be to him: (לָמָּה not cur, but ad quid, quorsum, as Gen. 25:32, 27:46.) They are enervated, good-for-nothing fellows: כָּלַח is lost to them (עָלֵימוֹ trebly emphatic: it is placed in a prominent position, has a pathetic suff., and is עַל for לְ, 1 Sam. 9:3). The signif. senectus, which suits Job 5:26, is here inapplicable, since it is not the aged that are spoken of, but the young; for that "old age is lost to them" would be a forced expression for the thought—which, moreover, does not accord with the connection—that they die off early. One does not here expect the idea of senectus or senectus vegeta, but vigor, as the Syriac ('ushino) and Arabic also translate it. May not כָּלַח perhaps be related to כֹּחַ, as שַׁאֲנָן to שַׁלְאֲנָן, the latter being a mixed form from שַׁאֲנָן and שָׁלֵו, the former from כֹּחַ and לֵחַ, fresh juicy vigour, or as we say: pith and marrow (Saft and Kraft)? At all events, if this is somewhat the idea of the word, it may be derived from כָּלָה = כָּלַח (LXX συντέλεια), or some other way (vid., on Job 5:26): it signifies full strength or maturity.252

With v. 3a begins a new clause. It is גַּלְמוּד, not גַּלְמוּדִים, because the book of Job does not inflect this Hebraeo-Arabic word, which is peculiar to it (besides only Isa. 49:21, גַּלְמוּדָה). It is also in Arab. more a substantive (stone, a mass) than an adj. (hard as stone, massive, e.g., Hist. Tamerlani in Schultens: Arab. 'l-ṣchr 'l-jlmûd, the hardest rock); and, similar to the Greek χέρσος (vid., Passow), it denotes the condition or attribute of rigidity, i.e., sterility, Job 3:7; or stiff as death, Job 15:34; or, as here, extreme weakness and incapability of working. The subj.: such are they, is wanting; it is ranged line upon line in the manner of a mere sketch, participles with the demonstrative article follow the elliptical substantival clause. The part. הָעֹרְקִים is explained by LXX, Targ., Saad. (Arab. fârrîn), and most of the old expositors, after עָרַק, Arab. 'araqa, fut. ya'riq, fugere, abire, which, however, gives a tame and—since the desert is to be thought of as the proper habitation of these people, be they the Seir remnant of the displaced Horites, or the Hauran "races of the clefts"—even an inappropriate sense. On the contrary, 'rq in Arab. (also Pael 'arreq in Syriac) signifies to gnaw; and this Arabic signification of a word exclusively peculiar to the book of Job (here and Job 30:17) is perfectly suitable. We do not, however, with Jerome, translate: qui rodebant in solitudine

(which is doubly false), but qui rodunt solitudinem, they gnaw the sunburnt parched ground of the steppe, stretched out there more like beasts than men (what Gecatilia also means by his Arab. lâzmû, adhaerent), and derive from it their scanty food. וּמְשֹׁאָה שׁוֹאָה אֶמֶשׁ is added as an explanatory, or rather further descriptive, permutative to צִיָּה. The same alliterative union of substantives of the same root occurs in Job 38:27, Zeph. 1:15, and a similar one in Nah. 2:11 (ומבוקה בוקה), Ezek. 6:14, 33:29 (ומשׁמה שׁמה); on this expression of the superlative by heaping up similar words, comp. Ew. § 313, c. The verb שָׁאָה has the primary notion of wild confused din (e.g., Isa. 17:12f.), which does not pass over to the idea of desolation and destruction by means of the intermediate notion of ruins that come together with a crash, but by the transfer of what is confusing to the ear to confusing impressions and conditions of all kinds; the desert is accordingly called also תֹּהוּ, Deut. 32:10, from תָּהָה = שָׁאָה (vid., Genesis, S. 93).

The noun אֶמֶשׁ signifies elsewhere adverbially, in the past night, to grow night-like, and in general yesterday, according to which it is translated: the yesterday of waste and desolation; or, retaining the adverbial form: waste and desolation are of yesterday = long since. It is undeniable that מֵאֶתְמוֹל and אֶתְמוֹל, Isa. 30:33, Mic. 2:8, are used in the sense pridem (not only to-day, but even yesterday); but our poet uses תְּמוֹל, Job 8:9, in the opposite sense, non pridem (not long since, but only of yesterday); and it is more natural to ask whether אמשׁ then has not here the substantival signification from which it has become an adverb, in the signification nightly or yesterday. Since it originally signifies yesterday evening or night, then yesterday, it must have the primary signification darkness, as the Arab. ams is also traceable to the primary notion of the sinking of the sun towards the horizon; so that, consequently, although the usage of Arabic does not allow this sense,253 it can be translated (comp. צַלְמָוֶת, Jer. 2:6), "the evening darkness (gloominess) of the waste and wilderness" (אֶמֶשׁ as regens, Ew. § 286, a). The Targ. also translated similarly, but take אמשׁ as a special attribute: רוּמְשָׁא הֵיךְ חֲשׁוֹכָא, "darkness like the late evening." Olshausen's conjecture of אֶרֶץ makes it easier, but puts a word that affirms nothing in the place of an expressive one.

Ver. 4 tells what the scanty nourishment is which the chill, desolate, and gloomy desert, with its steppes and gorges, furnishes them. מַלּוּחַ (also Talmudic, Syriac, and Arabic) is the orach, and indeed the tall shrubby orach, the so-called sea-purslain, the buds and young leaves of which are gathered and eaten by the poor. That it is not merely a coast plant, but grows also in the desert, is manifest from the narrative b. Kidduschin, 66a: "King Jannai approached כוחלית in the desert, and conquered sixty towns there [Ges. translates wrongly, captis LX talentis]; and on his return with great joy, he called all the orphans of Israel to him, and said: Our fathers ate מלוחים in their time when they were engaged with the building of the temple (according to Raschi: the second temple; according to Aruch: the tabernacle in the wilderness); we will also eat מלוחים in remembrance of our fathers! And ממלוחי were served up on golden tables, and they ate." The LXX translates, ἅλιμα (not: ἅλιμα); as in Athenaeus, poor Pythagoreans are once called ἅλιμα τρώγοντες καὶ κακὰ τοιαῦτα συλλέγοντες.254 The place where they seek for and find this kind of edible plant is indicated by עֲלֵי־שִׂיחַ. שִׂיחַ is a shrub in general, but certainly pre-eminently the Arab. šîḥ, that perennial, branchy, woody plant of uncultivated ground, about two-thirds of a yard high, and the same in diameter, which is one of the greatest blessings of Syria and of the steppe, since, with the exception of cow and camel's dung, it is often the only fuel of the peasants and nomads,—the principal, and often in a day's journey the only, vegetation of the steppe, in the shade of which, then everything else is parched, a scanty vegetation is still preserved.255

The poor in search of the purslain surround this Arab. šîḥ (shîh), and as v. 4b continues: the broom-root is their bread. Ges. understands לַחְמָם according to Isa. 47:14, where it is certainly the pausal form for לַחֲמַם ("there is not

a coal to warm one's self"), and that because the broom-root is not eatable. But why should broom-root and not broom brushwood be mentioned as fuel? The root of the steppe that serves as fuel, together with the shîh, is called gizl (from גזל, to tear out), not retem, which is the broom (and is extraordinarily frequent in the Belka). The Arabs, however, not only call Genista monosperma so, but also Chamaerops humilis, a degenerate kind of which produces a kind of arrow-root which the Indians in Florida use.256 לַחְמָם in the signification cibus eorum is consequently not incomprehensible. LXX (which throws vv. 4–6 into sad confusion): οἱ καὶ ῥίζας ξύλων ἐμασσῶντο.257 All the ancient versions translate similarly. One is here reminded of what Agatharchides says in Strabo concerning the Egyptio-Ethiopian eaters of the rush root and herb.258

5 They are driven forth from society,
They cry after them as after a thief.
6 In the most dismal valleys they must dwell,
In holes of the earth and in rocks.
7 Among the bushes they croak,
Under nettles are they poured forth,
8 Sons of fools, yea sons of base men:
They are driven forth out of the land!—

Job 30:5–8. If, coming forth from their lurking-places, they allow themselves to be seen in the villages of the plain or in the towns, they are driven forth from among men, e medio pelluntur (to use a Ciceronian phrase). גֵּו (Syr. gau, Arab. gaww, guww) is that which is internal, here the circle of social life, the organized human community. This expression also is Hebraeo-Arabic; for if one contrasts a house of district with what is outside, he says in Arabic, jûwâ wa-barrâ, guwwâ wa-berrâ, within and without, or Arab. 'l-jûwâ-nî wa-'l-brrâ-nî, el-guwwâni wa'l-berrâni, the inside and the outside. In v. 5b, כַּגַּנָּב, like the thief, is equivalent to, as after the thief, or since this generic Art. is not usual with us [Germ. and Engl.]: after a thief; French, on crie après eux comme après le voleur. In v. 6a, לִשְׁכֹּן is, according to Ges. § 132, rem. 1 (comp. on Hab. 1:17), equivalent to הָיוּ לִשְׁכֹּן, "they are to dwell" = they must dwell; it might also signify, according to the still more frequent usage of the language, habitaturi sunt; it here, however, signifies habitandum est eis, as לִבְלוֹם, Ps. 32:9, obturanda sunt. Instead of בַּעֲרוּץ with Shurek, the reading בַּעֲרוֹץ with Cholem (after the form סְגוֹר, Hos. 13:8) is also found, but without support. יְעֻרִים is either a substantive after the form גְּבוּל (Ges., as Kimchi), or the construct of עָרוּץ = נַעֲרָץ, feared = fearful, so that the connection of the words, which we prefer, is a superlative one: in horridissima vallium, in the most terrible valleys, as Job 41:22, acutissimae testarum (Ew., according to § 313, c). The further description of the habitation of this race of men: in holes (חֹרֵי = בְּחֹרֵי) of the earth (עָפָר, earth with respect to its constituent parts) and rocks (LXX τρῶγλαι πετρῶν), may seem to indicate the aborigines of the mountains of the district of Seir, who are called הַחֹרִים, τρωγλοδύνται (vid., Genesis, S. 507); but why not, which is equally natural, חַוָּרָן, Ezek. 47:16, 18, the "district of caverns," the broad country about Bosra, with the two Trachônes (τράχωνες), of which the smaller western, the Legâ, is the ancient Trachonitis, and with Ituraea (the mountains of the Druses)?259

As Job 6:5 shows, there underlies v. 7a a comparison of this people with the wild ass. The פֶּרֶא, ferâ, goes about in herds under the guidance of a so-called leader (vid., on Job 39:5), with which the poet in Job 24:5 compares the bands that go forth for forage; here the point of comparison, according to Job 6:5, is their bitter want, which urges from them the cry of pain; for יִנְהָקוּ, although not too strong, would nevertheless be an inadequate expression for their sermo barbarus (Pineda), in favour of which Schlottmann calls to mind Herodotus' (iv. 183) comparison of the language of the Troglodyte Ethiopians with the screech of the night-owl (τετρίγασι κατάπερ αι᾽ νυκτερίδες). Among bushes (especially the bushes of the shih, which affords them some nourishment and shade, and a green resting-place) one hears them, and hears from their words, although he cannot understand them

more closely, discontent and lamentation over their desperate condition: there, under nettles (חָרוּל, root חר, Arab. ḥrr, as urtica from urere), i.e., useless weeds of the desert, they are poured forth, i.e., spread about in disorder. Thus most moderns take ספח = שָׁפַד, Arab. sfḥ, comp. סָרוּחַ, profusus, Amos 6:4, 7, although one might also abide by the usual Hebrew meaning of the verb ספח (hardened from ספה), adjungere, associare (vid., Habak. S. 88), and with Hahn explain: under nettles they are united together, i.e., they huddle together. But neither the fut. nor the Pual (instead of which one would expect the Niph. or Hithpa.) is favourable to the latter interpretation; wherefore we decide in favour of the former, and find sufficient support for a Hebr.-Arabic ספח in the signification effundere from a comparison of Job 14:19 and the present passage. V. 8, by dividing the hitherto latent subject, tells what sort of people they are: sons of fools, profane, insane persons (vid., on Ps. 14:1); moreover, or of the like kind (גַּם, not אַף), sons of the nameless, ignobilium or infamium, since בְּלִי־שֵׁם is here an adj. which stands in dependence, not filii infamiae = infames (Hirz. and others), by which the second בני is rendered unlike the first. The assertion v. 8b may be taken as an attributive clause: who are driven forth …; but the shortness of the line and the prominence of the verb are in favour of the independence of the clause like an exclamation in its abrupt and halting form. נִכְּאוּ is Niph. of נָכָא = נָכָה (נָכַי), root נך, to hew, pierce, strike.260 On הָאָרֶץ, of arable land in opposition to the steppe, vid., on Job 18:17.

9 And now I am become their song,
And a by-word to them.
10 They avoid me, they flee far from me,
And spare not my face with spitting.
11 For my cord of life He hath loosed, and afflicted me,
Therefore they let loose the bridle recklessly.
12 The rabble presses upon my right hand,
They thrust my feet away,
And cast up against me their destructive ways.

Job 30:9–12. The men of whom Job complains in this strophe are none other than those in the preceding strophe, described from the side of their coarse and degenerate behaviour, as Job 24:4–8 described them from the side of the wrong which was practised against them. This rabble, constitutionally as well as morally degraded, when it comes upon Job's domain in its marauding expeditions, makes sport of the sufferer, whose former earnest admonitions, given from sympathizing anxiety for them, seemed to them as insults for which they revenge themselves. He is become their song of derision (נְגִינָתָם to be understood according to the dependent passage, Lam. 3:14, and Ps. 69:13), and is לְמִלָּה to them, their θρύλλημα (LXX), the subject of their foolish talk (מִלָּה - Arab. mille, not = melle, according to which Schultens interprets it, sum iis fastidio). Avoiding him, and standing at a distance from him, they make their remarks upon him; and if they come up to him, it is only for the sake of showing him still deeper scorn: a facie ejus non cohibent sputam. The expositors who explain that, contrary to all decent bearing, they spit in his presence (Eichh., Justi, Hirz., Vaih., Hlgst.), or with Fie! spit out before him (Umbr., Hahn, Schlottm.), overlook the fact of its being מִפָּנַי, not לְפָנַי. The expression as it stands can only affirm that they do not spare his face with spitting (Jer. correctly: conspuere non veruntur), so that consequently he is become, as he has complained in Job 17:6, a תֹּפֶת, an object of spitting (comp. also the declaration of the servant of Jehovah, Isa. 50:6, which stands in close connection with this declaration of Job, according to previous explanations).

It now becomes a question, Who is the subj. in v. 11a? The Chethib יִתְרוֹ demands an attempt to retain the previous subj. Accordingly, most moderns explain: solvit unusquisque eorum funem suum, i.e., frenum suum, quo continebatur antea a me (Rosenm., Umbr., Stick., Vaih., Hlgst., and others), but it is to be doubted whether יתר can mean frenum; it

signifies a cord, the string of a bow, and of a harp. The reconciliation of the signification redundantia, Job 22:20, and funis, is, in the idea of the root, to be stretched tight and long.261

Hirz. therefore imagines the loosing of the cord round the body, which served them as a girdle, in order to strike Job with it. But whether one decides in favour of the Chethib יתרו or of the Keri יתרי, the persons who insult Job cannot in any case be intended. The isolated sing. form of the assertion, while the rabble is everywhere spoken of in the plur., is against it; and also the כִּי, which introduces it, and after which Job here allows the reason to come in, why he is abandoned without any means of defence to such brutal misconduct. The subj. of v. 11a is God. If יתרו is read, it may not be interpreted: He hath opened = taken off the covering of His string (= bow) (Ew., Hahn, and similarly even LXX, Jer.), for יתר does not dignify the bow, but the string (Arab. muwattar, 'stretched, of a bow); and while פָּתַח, Ezek. 21:33 (usually שָׁלַף or הֵרִיק), can certainly be said of drawing a sword from its sheath, עֵרָה is the appropriate and usual word (vid., Hab. S. 164) for making bare the bow and shield. Used of the bow-string, פִּתֵּחַ signifies to loose what is strained, by sending the arrow swiftly forth from it, according to which, e.g., Elizabeth Smith translates: Because He hath let go His bow-string and afflicted me. One cannot, however, avoid feeling that וַיְעַנֵּנִי is not a right description of the effect of shooting with arrows, whereas an idea is easily gained from the Keri יתרי, to which the description of the effect corresponds. It has been interpreted: He has loosed my rein or bridle, by means of which I hitherto bound them and held them in check; but יתר in the signification rein or bridle, is as already observed, not practicable. Better Capellus: metaphora ducta est ab exarmato milite, cujus arcûs solvitur nervus sicque inermis redditur; but it is more secure, and still more appropriate to the ויעננני which follows, when it is interpreted according to Job 4:21: He has untied (loosened) my cord of life, i.e., the cord which stretched out and held up my tent (the body) (Targ. similarly: my chain and the threads of my cord, i.e., surely: my outward and inward stay of life), and bowled me down, i.e., deprived me of strength (comp. Ps. 102:24); or also: humbled me. Even in this his feebleness he is the butt of unbridled arrogance: and they let go the bridle before me (not לְפָנַי, in my presence, but מִפָּנַי, before me, before whom previously they had respect; מפני the same as Lev. 19:32), they cast or shake it off (שִׁלַּח as Job 39:3, synon. of הִשְׁלִיךְ; comp. 1 Kings 9:7 with 2 Chron. 7:20).

Is it now possible that in this connection פִּרְחָח can denote any else but the rabble of these good-for-nothing fellows? Ewald nevertheless understands by it Job's sufferings, which as a rank evil swarm rise up out of the ground to seize upon him; Hahn follows Ew., and makes these sufferings the subj., as even in v. 11b. But if we consider how Ew. translates: "they hung a bridle from my head;" and Hahn: "they have cast a bit before my face," this might make us tired of all taste for this allegorical mode of interpretation. The stump over which they must stumble is v. 13c, where all climax must be abandoned in order to make the words עזר לא למו intelligible in this allegorical connection. No indeed; פִּרְחָח (instead of which פַּרחח might be expected, as supra, Job 3:5, כַּמרירי for כְּמרירי) is the offspring or rabble of those fathers devoid of morals and honour, those צעירים of v. 1, whose laughing-stock Job is now, as the children of priests are called in Talmudic פִּרְחֵי כְהֻנָּה, and in Arabic farch denotes not only the young of animals, but also a rascal or vagabond. This young rabble rises עַל־יָמִין, on Job's right hand, which is the place of an accuser (Ps. 109:6), and generally one who follows him up closely and oppresses him, and they press him continually further and further, contending one foot's-breadth after another with him: שִׁלְּחוּ רַגְלַי, my feet thrust them forth, protrudunt (שִׁלַּח the same as Job 14:20). By this pressing from one place to another, a way is prepared for the description of their hostile conduct, which begins in v. 12c under the figure of a siege. The fut. consec. וַיָּסֹלּוּ, v. 12c, is not meant retrospectively like ויעננני, but places present with present in the connection of cause and effect (comp. Ew. 343, a). We must be misled by

the fact that ויסלו, Job 19:12 (which see), was said of the host of sufferings which come against Job; here it is those young people who cast up the ramparts of misfortune or burdensome suffering (אֵיד) against Job, which they wish to make him feel. The tradition, supported by the LXX, that Job had his seat outside his domain ἐπὶ τῆς κοπρίας, i.e., upon the mezbele, is excellently suited to this and the following figures. Before each village in Hauran there is a place where the households heap up the sweepings of their stalls, and it gradually reaches a great circumference, and a height which rises above the highest buildings of the village.262 Notwithstanding, everything is intelligible without this thoroughly Hauranitish conception of the scene of the history. Bereft of the protection of his children and servants, become an object of disgust to his wife, and an abhorrence to his brethren, forsaken by every attention of true affection, Job 19:13–19, Job lies out of doors; and in this condition, shelterless and defenceless, he is abandoned to the hideous malignant joy of those gipsy hordes which wander hither and thither.

13 They tear down my path,
They minister to my overthrow,
They who themselves are helpless.
14 As through a wide breach they approach,
Under the crash they roll onwards.
15 Terrors are turned against me,
They pursue my nobility like the wind,
And like a cloud my prosperity passed away.—

Job 30:13–15. They make all freedom of motion and any escape impossible to him, by pulling down, diruunt, the way which he might go. Thus is נָתְסוּ (cogn. form of נתץ, נתע, נתשׁ) to be translated, not: they tear open (proscindunt), which is contrary to the primary signification and the usage of the language. They, who have no helper, who themselves are so miserable and despised, and yet so feelingless and overbearing, contribute to his ruin. הועיל, to be useful, to do any good,to furnish anything effective (e.g., Isa. 47:12), is here united with לְ of the purpose; comp. לְ עָזַר, to help towards anything, Zech. 1:15. הָיָה (for which the Keri substitutes the primary form הַוָּה), as was already said on Job 6:2, is prop. hiatus, and then barathrum, pernicies, like הַוָּה in the signification cupiditas, prop. inhiatio. The verb הָוָה, Arab. hwy, also signifies delabi, whence it may be extended (vid., on Job 37:6) in like manner to the signification abyss (rapid downfall); but a suitable medium for the two significations, strong passion (Arab. hawa) and abyss (Arab. hâwije, huwwe, mahwa), is offered only by the signification of the root flare (whence hawâ, air). לָמוֹ עֹזֵר לֹא is a genuine Arabic description of these Idumaean or Hauranite pariahs. Schultens compares a passage of the Hamâsa: "We behold you ignoble, poor, laisa lakum min sâir-in-nâsi nasirun, i.e., without a helper among the rest of men." The interpretations of those who take לָמוֹ for לוֹ, and this again for לִי (Eichh., Justi), condemn themselves. It might more readily be explained, with Stick.: without any one helping them, i.e., with their own strong hand; but the thought thus obtained is not only aimless and tame, but also halting and even untrue (vid., Job 19:13ff.).

Ver. 14. The figure of a siege, which is begun with v. 12c and continued in v. 13, leaves us in no doubt concerning רָחָב פֶּרֶץ and שׁאָה. The Targ. translates: like the force of the far-extending waves of the sea, not as though פֶּרֶץ could in itself signify a stream of water, but taking it as = מַיִם פרץ, 2 Sam. 5:20 (synon. diffusio aquarum). Hitzig's translation:263 "like a broad forest stream they come, like a rapid brook they roll on," gives unheard-of significations to the doubtful words. In Job 16:14 we heard Job complain: He (Eloah) brake through me פרץ על־פני־פרץ, breach upon breach,—by the divine decrees of sufferings, which are completed in this ill-treatment which he receives from good-for-nothing fellows, he is become as a wall with a wide-gaping breach, through which they rush in upon him (instar rupturae, a concise mode of comparison instead of tanquam per rupt.), in order to get him entirely into their power as a plaything for their coarse passions. שׁאָה is the

crash of the wall with the wide breaches, and שֹׁאָה תַּחַת signifies sub fragore in a local sense: through the wall which is broken through and crashes above the assailants. There is no ground in v. 15a for dividing, with Umbreit, thus: He hath turned against me! Terrors drove away, etc., although this would not be impossible according to the syntax (comp. Gen. 49:22, צְעָדָה בָּנוֹת). It is translated: terrors are turned against me; so that the predicate stands first in the most natural, but still indefinite, personal form, Ges. § 147, a, although בַּלָּהוֹת might also be taken as the accus. of the object after a passive, Ges. § 143, 1. The subj. of v. 15b remains the same: they (these terrors) drive away my dignity like the wind; the construction is like Job 27:20, 14:19; on the matter, comp. Job 18:11. Hirz. makes כָּרוּחַ the subj.: quasi ventus aufert nobilitatem meam, in which case the subj. would be not so much ventus as similitudo venti, as when one says in Arabic, 'gâani kazeidin, there came to me one of Zeid's equals, for in the Semitic languages כְּ has the manner of an indeclinable noun in the signification instar. But the reference to בלהות is more natural; and Hahn's objection, that calamity does not first, if it is there, drive away prosperity, but takes the place of that which is driven away, is sophisticated and inadequate, since the object of the driving away here is not Job's prosperity, but Job's נְדִיבָה, appearance and dignity, by which he hitherto commanded the respect of others (Targ. רַבָּנוּתִי). The storms of suffering which pass over him take this nobility away to the last fragment, and his salvation—or rather, since this word in the mouth of an extra-Israelitish hero has not the meaning it usually otherwise has, his prosperous condition (from Arab. wasi'a, amplum esse)—is as a cloud, so rapidly and without trace (Job 7:9; Isa. 44:22), passed away and vanished. Observe the music of the expression עָבְרָה כְּעָב, which cannot be reproduced in translation.

16 And now my soul is poured out within me,
Days of suffering hold me fast.
17 The night rendeth my bones from me,
And my gnawers sleep not.
18 By great force my garment is distorted,
As the collar of my shirt it encompasseth me.
19 He hath cast me into the mire,
And I am in appearance as dust and ashes.

Job 30:16–19. With this third וְעַתָּה (vv. 1, 9) the elegiac lament over the harsh contrast between the present and the past begins for the third time. The dash after our translation of the second and fourth strophes will indicate that a division of the elegy ends there, after which it begins as it were anew. The soul is poured out within a man (עָלַי as Job 10:1, Psychol. S. 152), when, "yielding itself without resistance to sadness, it is dejected to the very bottom, and all its organization flows together, and it is dissolved in the one condition of sorrow"—a figure which is not, however, come about by water being regarded as the symbol of the soul (thus Hitzig on Ps. 42:5), but rather by the intimate resemblance of the representation of a flood of tears (Lam. 2:19): the life of the soul flows in the blood, and the anguish of the soul in tears and lamentations; and since the outward man is as it were dissolved in the gently flowing tears (Isa. 15:3), his soul flows away as it were in itself, for the outward incident is but the manifestation and result of an inward action. יְמֵי־עֹנִי we have translated days of suffering, for עֹנִי, with its verb and the rest of its derivatives, is the proper word for suffering, and especially the passion of the Servant of Jehovah. Days of suffering—Job complains—hold him fast; אָחַז unites in itself, like הֶחֱזִיק, the significations prehendere and prehensum tenere. In v. 17a we must not, with Arnh. and others, translate: by night it (affliction) pierces …, for עני does not stand sufficiently in the foreground to be the subject of what follows; it might sooner be rendered: by night it is pierced through (Targ., Rosenm., Hahn); but why is not לַיְלָה to be the subject, and נִקַּר consequently Piel (not Niph.)? The night has been personified already, Job 3:2; and in general, as Herder once said, Job is the brother of Ossian for personifications: Night (the restless night, Job 7:3f., in which every malady,

or at least the painful feeling of it, increases) pierces his bones from him, i.e., roots out his limbs (synon. בְּדִים, Job 18:13) so inwardly and completely. The lepra Arabica (Arab. 'l-brṣ, el-baras) terminates, like syphilis, with an eating away of the limbs, and the disease has its name Arab. judâm from jdm, truncare, mutilare: it feeds on the bones, and destroys the body in such a manner that single limbs are completely detached.

In v. 17b, LXX (νεῦρα), Parchon, Kimchi, and others translate עֹרְקִי according to the Targum. עַרְקִין (= גִּידִים), and the Arab. 'rûq, veins, after which Blumenf.: my veins are in constant motion. But עֹרְקַי in the sense of Job 30:3: my gnawers (Jer. qui me comedunt, Targ. יָתִי דְּמָעַסָן, qui me conculcant, conterunt), is far more in accordance with the predicate and the parallelism, whether it be gnawing pains that are thought of—pains are unnatural to man, they come upon him against his will, he separates them from himself as wild beasts—or, which we prefer, those worms (רִמָּה, Job 7:5) which were formed in Job's ulcers (comp. Aruch, עַרְקָא, a leech, plur. עַרְקָתָא, worms, e.g., in the liver), and which in the extra-biblical tradition of Job's decease are such a standing feature, that the pilgrims to Job's monastery even now-a-days take away with them thence these supposedly petrified worms of Job.264

Ver. 18a would be closely and naturally connected with what precedes if לְבוּשִׁי could be understood of the skin and explained: By omnipotence (viz., divine, as Job 23:6, Ew. § 270a) the covering of my body is distorted, as even Raschi: גלד אחר גלד משתנה, it is changed, by one skin or crust being formed after another. But even Schultens rightly thinks it remarkable that לְבוּשׁ, v. 18a, is not meant to signify the proper upper garment but the covering of the skin, but כֻּתֹּנֶת, ver. 18b, the under garment in a proper sense. The astonishment is increased by the fact that הִתְחַפֵּשׂ signifies to disguise one's self, and thereby render one's self unrecognisable, which leads to the proper idea of לְבוּשׁ, to a clothing which looks like a disguise. It cannot be cited in favour of this unusual meaning that לְבוּשׁ is used in Job 41:5 of the scaly skin of the crocodile: an animal has no other לְבוּשׁ but its skin. Therefore, with Ew., Hirz., and Hlgst., we take לְבוּשׁ strictly: "by (divine) omnipotence my garment is distorted (becomes unlike itself), like the collar of my shirt it fits close to me." It is unnecessary to take פִּיךָ as a compound praep.: according to (comp. Zech. 2:4, Mal. 2:9: "according as"), in the sense of כְּמוֹ, as Job 33:6, since כֻּתֹּנֶת פִּי is, according to the nature of the thing mentioned, a designation of the upper opening, by means of which the shirt, otherwise only provided with armholes (distinct from the Beduin shirt thôb, which has wide and long sleeves), is put on. Also, Ps. 133:2, מִדּוֹתָיו פִּי signifies not the lower edge, but the opening at the head (רֹאשׁ פִּי, Ex. 28:32) or the collar of the high priest's vestment (vid., the passage cited). Thus even LXX ὥσπερ τὸ περιστόμιον τοῦ χιτῶνός μου, and Jer.: velut capitio tunicae meae. True, Schlottm. observes against this rendering of v. 18, that it is unnatural according to substance, since on a wasted body it is not the outer garment that assumes the appearance of a narrow under one, but on the contrary the under garment assumes the appearance of a wide outer one. But this objection is not to the point. If the body is wasted away to a skeleton, there is an end to the rich appearance and beautiful flow which the outer garment gains by the full and rounded forms of the limbs: it falls down straight and in perpendicular folds upon the wasted body, and contributes in no small degree to make him whom one formerly saw in all the fulness of health still less recognisable than he otherwise is. יַאֲזְרֵנִי, cingit me, is not merely the falling together of the outer garment which was formerly filled out by the members of the body, but its appearance when the sick man wraps himself in it: then it girds him, fits close to him like his shirt-collar, lying round about the shrivelled figure like the other about a thin neck. On the terrible wasting away which is combined with hypertrophical formations in elephantiasis, vid., Job 7:15, and especially 19:20. The subject of v. 19 is God, whom v. 18 also describes as efficient cause: He has cast me

into, or daubed265 me with, mud, and I am become as (בְּ instead of the dat., Ew. § 221, a) dust and ashes. This is also intended pathologically: the skin of the sufferer with elephantiasis becomes first an intense red, then assumes a black colour; scales like fishes' scales are formed upon it, and the brittle, dark-coloured surface of the body is like a lump of earth.

20 I cry to Thee for help, and Thou answerest not;

I stand there, and Thou lookest fixedly at me.

21 Thou changest Thyself to a cruel being towards me,

With the strength of Thy hand Thou makest war upon me.

22 Thou raisest me upon the stormy wind,
Thou causest me to drive along

And vanish in the roaring of the storm.

23 For I know: Thou wilt bring me back to death,

Into the house of assembly for all living.

Job 30:20–23. If he cries for help, his cry remains unanswered; if he stands there looking up reverentially to God (perhaps עמד, with מִשְׁוַּע to be supplied, has the sense of desisting or restraining, as Gen. 29:35, 30:9), the troubling, fixed look of God, who looks fixedly and hostilely upon him, anything but ready to help (comp. Job 7:20, 16:9), meets his upturned eye. הִתְבֹּנֵן, to look consideringly upon anything, is elsewhere joined with אֶל, עַל, עַד, or even with the acc; here, where a motionless fixed look is intended, with בְּ (= fi). It is impossible to draw the לא, v. 20a, over to וַתִּתְבֹּנֶן (Jer., Saad., Umbr., Welte, and others), both on account of the Waw consec. (Ew. § 351a), and on account of the separation by the new antecedent עָמַדְתִּי. On the reading of two Codd. ותתכנן ("Thou settest Thyself against me"), which Houbigant and Ew. prefer, Rosenm. has correctly pronounced judgment: est potius pro mendo habenda. Instead of consolingly answering his prayer, and instead of showing Himself willing to help, God, who was formerly so kind towards him, changes towards him, His creature, into a cruel being, saevum (אַכְזָר in the book of Job only here and Job 41:2, where it signifies "foolhardy;" comp. לְאוֹיֵב in the dependent passage, Isa. 63:10), and makes war upon him (עָשָׂם as Job 16:9) by causing him to feel the strength of His omnipotent hand (יָד עֻצָּם as Deut. 8:17, synon. חָזָק).

It is not necessary in v. 22a to forsake the accentuation, and to translate: Thou raisest me up, Thou causest me go in the wind (Ew., Hirz., and others); the accentuation of חרו is indeed not a disjunctive Dechî, but a conjunctive Tarcha, but preceded by Munach, which, according to the rule, Psalter ii. 500, § 5, here, where two conjunctives come together, has a smaller conjunctive value. Therefore: elevas me in ventum, equitare facis me, viz., super ventum (Dachselt), for one does not only say עַל הִרְכִּיב, 1 Chron. 13:7, or לְ, Ps. 66:12, but also אֶל, 2 Sam. 6:3; and accordingly אֶל־רוּחַ תִּשָּׂאֵנִי is also not to be translated: Thou snatchest me into the wind or storm (Hahn, Schlottm.), but: Thou raisest me up to the wind or storm, as upon an animal for riding (Umbr., Olsh.). According to Oriental tradition, Solomon rode upon the east wind, and in Arabic they say of one who hurried rapidly by, racab al-genâhai er-rih, he rides upon the wings of the wind; in the present passage, the point of comparison is the being absolutely passively hurried forth from the enjoyment of a healthy and happy life to a dizzy height, whence a sudden overthrow threatens him who is unwillingly removed (comp. Ps. 102:11, Thou hast lifted me up and hurled me forth).

The lot which threatens him from this painful suspense Job expresses (v. 22b) in the puzzling words: תַּשִּׁיָּה וּתְמוֹגְגֵנִי. Thus the Keri, after which LXX transl. (if it has not read יְשׁוּעָתִי), καὶ ἀπέῤῥιψάς με ἀπὸ σωτηρίας. The modern expositors who follow the Keri, by taking ותמגגני for לי ותמגג (according to Ges. § 121, 4), translate: Thou causest counsel and understanding (Welte), happiness (Blumenf.), and the like, to vanish from me; continuance, existence, duration would be better (vid., Job

6:13, and especially on Job 26:3). The thought it appropriate, but the expression is halting. Jerome, who translates valide, points to the correct thing, and Buxtorf (Lex. col. 2342f.) by interpreting the not less puzzling Targum translation in fundamento = funditus or in essentia = essentialiter, has, without intending it, hit upon the idea of the Hebr. Keri; תֶּשְׁיָה is intended as a closer defining, or adverbial, accusative: Thou causest me to vanish as to existence, ita ut tota essentia pereat h.e. totaliter et omnino. Perhaps this was really the meaning of the poet: most completely, most thoroughly, altogether, like the Arab. ḥaqqan. But it is unfavourable to this Keri, that תּוּשִׁיָּה (from the verb וָשַׁי), as might be expected, is always written plene elsewhere; the correction of the תּשׁוה is violent, and moreover this form, correctly read, gives a sense far more consistent with the figure, v. 22a. Ges., Umbr., and Carey falsely read וֶהתְּשַׁ, terres me; this verb is unknown in Hebr., and even in Chaldee is only used in Ithpeal, אִשְׁתְּוִי (= Hebr. חָרַד); for a similar reason Böttcher's תִּשְׁוָה (which is intended to mean: in despair) is also not to be used. Even Stuhlmann perceived that תּשׁוה is equivalent to תְּשׁוּאָה; it is, with Ew. and Olsh., to be read תְּשָׁוָה (not with Pareau and Hirz. תְּשֵׁוָה without the Dag.), and this form signifies, as תּשׁואה, Job 36:29, from שׁוֹא = שָׁאָה, from which it is derived by change of consonants, the crash of thunder, or even the rumbling or roar as of a storm or a falling in (procellae sive ruinae). The meaning is hardly, that he who rides away upon the stormy wind melts and trickles down like drops of rain among the pealing of the thunder, when the thunder-storm, whose harbinger is the stormy wind, gathers; but that in the storm itself, which increases in fury to the howling of a tempest, he dissolves away. תְּשָׁוָה for בְּתְשָׁוָה, comp. Ps. 107:26: their soul melted away (dissolved) בְּרָעָה. The compulsory journey in the air, therefore, passes into nothing or nearly nothing, as Job is well aware, v. 23: "for I know: (without כִּי, as Job 19:25, Ps. 9:21) Thou wilt bring me back to death" (acc. of the goal, or locative without any sign). If תְּשִׁיבֵנִי is taken in its most natural signification reduces, death is represented as essentially one with the dust of death (comp. Job 1:21 with Gen. 3:19), or even with non-existence, out of which man is come into being; nevertheless הֵשִׁיב can also, by obliterating the notion of return, like redigere, have only the signification of the turn of destiny and change of condition that is effected. The assertion that שׁוּב always includes an "again," and retains it inexorably (vid., Köhler on Zech. 13:7, S. 239), is untenable. In post-biblical Hebrew, at least, it is certain that שׁוּב signifies not only "to become again," but also "to become," as Arab. 'âd is used as synon. of jâ'in, devenir. 266 With מָוֶת, the designation of the condition, is coupled the designation of the place: Hades (under the notion of which that of the grave is included) is the great involuntary rendezvous of all who live in this world.

24 Doth one not, however, stretch out the hand in falling,

Doth he not raise a cry for help on that account in his ruin?

25 Or have I not wept for him that was in trouble,

Hath not my soul grieved for the needy?—

26 For I hoped for good, then evil came;

I waited for light, and darkness came.

27 My bowels boiled without ceasing,

Days of misery met me.

Job 30:24–27. Most of the ancient versions indulge themselves in strange fancies respecting v. 24 to make a translatable text, or find their fancies in the text before them. The translation of the Targum follows the fancies of the Midrash, and places itself beyond the range of criticism. The LXX reads בי instead of בעי, and finds in v. 24 a longing for suicide, or death by the hand of another. The Syriac likewise reads בי, although it avoids this absurdity. Jerome makes an address of the assertion, and, moreover, also moulds the text under the influence of the Midrash. Aq., Symm., and Theod. strive after a better rendering than the LXX, but (to judge from the fragment in the Hexapla) without success. Saadia and Gecatilia wring a sense out of v. 24a, but at the expense

of the syntax, and by dragging v. 24b after it, contrary to the tenor of the words. The old expositors also advance nothing available. They mostly interpret it as though it were not להן, but להם (a reading which has been forced into the Midrash texts and some Codd. instead of the reading of the text that is handed down to us). Even Rosenm. thinks לָהֶן might, like the Ara. לְהוֹן, be equivalent to הֵמָּה; and Carey explains the enallage generis from the perhaps existing secondary idea of womanly fear, as 2 Sam. 4:6, הֵנָּה instead of הֵמָּה is used of the two assassins to describe them as cowards. But the Hebr. לָהֶן is fem.; and often as the enallage masc. pro fem. occurs, the enallage fem. pro masc. is unknown; הֵנָּה, 2 Sam. 4:6, is an adv. of place (vid., moreover, Thenius in loc.). It is just as absolutely inadmissible when the old expositors combine שׁוּעַ with יָשַׁע (וָשַׁע), or as e.g., Raschi with שְׁעֲשַׁע, and translate, "welfare" or "exhilaration" (refreshing). The signif. "wealth" would be more readily admissible, so that שׁוּעַ, as Aben-Ezra observes, would be the subst. to שׁוֹעַ, Job 34:19; but in Job 36:19 (which see), שׁוּעַ (as שׁוֹעַ Isa. 22:5) signifies a cry of distress (= שָׁוְעַ), and an attempt must be made here with this meaning before every other.

On the other hand comes the question whether בְּעִי is not perhaps to be referred to the verb בָּעָה, whether it be as subst. after the form מְרִי (Ralbag after the Targ.) or as part. pass. (Saad. Arab. gîr 'nnh lîs 'l-mbtgan, "only that it is not desired"). The verb does not, indeed, occur elsewhere in the book of Job, but is very consistent with its style, which so abounds in Aramaisms, and is at the same time so coloured with Arabic that we should almost say, its Hauranitish style.267 Thus taking בעי as one word, Ralbag transl.: prayer stretched not forth the hand, which is intended to mean: is not able to do anything, cannot cause the will of God to miscarry. This meaning is only obtained by great violence; but when Renan (together with Böckel and Carey, after Rosenm.) translates: Vaines prières! … il étend sa main; à quoi bon protester contre ses coups? the one may be measured with the other. If בעי is to be derived from בעה, it must be translated either: shall He, however, without prayer (sine imploratione), or: shall He, however, unimplored (non imploratus), stretch out His hand? The thought remains the same by both renderings of בעי, and suits as a vindication of the cry for help in the context. But בָּעָה, in the specific signification implorare, deprecari, is indeed the usage of the Targum, although strange to the Hebr., which is here so rich in synonyms; then, in the former case, לֹא for בלא is harsh, and in the other, בעי as part. pass. is too strong an Aramaism. We must therefore consider whether בְּעִי as עִי with the praep. בְּ gives a suitable sense. Since בְּ יָד שָׁלַח, e.g., Job 28:9 and elsewhere, most commonly means "to lay the hand on anything, stretch out the hand to anything," it is most natural to take בעי in dependence upon יָדוֹ יִשְׁלַח, and we really gain an impressive thought, if we translate: Only may He not stretch out His hand (to continue His work of destruction) to a heap of rubbish (which I am already become); but by this translation of v. 24a, v. 24b remains a glaring puzzle, insoluble in itself and in respect of the further course of the thought, for Schlottmann's interpretation, "Only one does not touch ruins, or the ruin of one is the salvation of another," which is itself puzzling, is no solution. The reproach against the friends which is said to lie in v. 24a is contrary to the character of this monologue, which is turned away from his human opponents; then שׁוּעַ does not signify salvation, and there is no "one" and "another" to be found in the text. We must therefore, against our inclination, give up this dependent relation of בעי, so that בְּעִי signifies either, upon a heap of rubbish, or, since this ought to be עַל־עִי: by the falling in; עִי (from עָוָה = 'iwj) can mean both: a falling in or overthrow (bouleversement) as an event, and ruins or rubbish as its result.

Accordingly Hirz. translates: Only upon the ruins (more correctly at least: upon ruins) one will not stretch out his hand, and Ew.: Only—does not one stretch out one's hand by one's overthrow? But this "only" is awkward. Hahn is of opinion that לֹא אַךְ may be taken in the signification not once, and translates: may one not for once raise one's hand by one's downfall;

but even this is lame, because then all connection with what precedes is wanting; besides, לֹא אַךְ does not signify ne quidem. The originally affirmative אַךְ has certainly for the most part a restrictive signification, which, as we observed on Job 18:21, is blended with the affirmative in Hebr., but it is also, as more frequently אָכֵן, used adversatively, e.g., Job 16:7, and in the combination לֹא אַךְ this adversative signification coincides with the restrictive, for this double particle signifies everywhere else: only not, however not, Gen. 20:12, 1 Kings 11:39, 2 Kings 12:14, 13:6, 23:9, 26. It would be more natural to translate, as we have stated above: only may be not, etc., but v. 24b puts in its veto against this. If, as Hirz., Ew., and Hahn also suppose, לֹא, v. 24a, is equivalent to הֲלֹא, so that the sentence is to be spoken with an interrogative accent, we must translate אַךְ as Jer. has done, by verumtamen. He knows that he is being hurried forth to meet death; he knows it, and has also already made himself so familiar with this thought, that the sooner he sees an end put to this his sorrowful life the better—nevertheless does one not stretch out one's hand when one is falling? This involuntary reaction against destruction is the inevitable result of man's instinct of self-preservation. It needs no proof that יד שׁלח can signify "to stretch out one's hand for help;" יִשְׁלַח is used with a general subj.: one stretches out, as Job 17:5, 21:22. With this determination of the idea of v. 24a, 24b is now also naturally connected with what precedes. It is not, however, to be translated, as Ew. and Hirz.: if one is in distress, is not a cry for help heard on account of it? If אִם were intended hypothetically, a continuation of the power of the interrogative לֹא from v. 24a would be altogether impossible. Hahn and Loch-Reischl rightly take אִם in the sense of an. It introduces another turn of the question: Does one, however, not stretch out one's hand to hasten the fall, or in his downfall (raise) a cry for help, or a wail, on that account? Döderlein's conjecture, לָחֵן for לָהֶן (praying "for favour"), deserves respectful mention, but it is not needed: לָהֶן signifies neutrally: in (under) such circumstances (comp. בָּהֶם, Job 22:21, Isa. 64:5), or is directly equivalent to לָהֵן, which (Ruth 1:13) signifies propterea, and even in biblical Chaldee, beside the Chaldee signif. sed, nisi, retains this Hebrew signif. (Dan. 2:6, 9, 4:24). פִּיד, which signifies dying and destruction (Talmud. in the peculiar signif.: that which is hewn or pecked open), synon. of אֵיד, has been already discussed on Job 12:5.

Ver. 25. The further progress of the thoughts seems to be well carried out only by our rendering of v. 24. The manifestation of feeling—Job means to say—which he himself felt at the misfortune of others, will be still permitted to him in his own misfortune, the seeking of compassion from the sympathising: or have I not wept for the hard of day? i.e., him whose lot in life is hard (comp. Arab. qasîy, durus, miser); did not my soul grieve for the needy? Here, also, לֹא from v. 25a continues its effect (comp. Job 3:10, 28:17); עָגַם is ἅπ. γεγρ., of like signification with אָגַם, whence אָגָם Isa. 19:10, גְּמָהַּא (sadness) b. Moëd katan 14b, Arab. agima, to feel disgust. If the relation of v. 25 to v. 24 is confirmatory, v. 26 and what follows refers directly to v. 24: he who felt sympathy with the sufferings of others will nevertheless dare in his own affliction to stretch out his hand for help in the face of certain ruin, and pour forth his pain in lamentation; for his affliction is in reality inexpressibly great: he hoped for good (for the future from his prosperous condition, in which he rejoiced),268 then came evil; and if I waited for light, deep darkness came. Ewald (§ 232, h) regards וַאֲיַחֵלָה as contracted from וָאִיחלה, but this shortening of the vowel is a pure impossibility. The former signifies rather καὶ ἤλπιζον or ἐβουλόμην ἐλπίζειν, the latter καὶ ἤλπισα, and that cohortative fut. logically forms a hypothetical antecedent, exactly like Job 19:18, if I desire to rise (אקומה), they speak against me (vid., Ew. § 357, b). In feverish heat and anxiety his bowels were set boiling (רָתַח as Job 41:23, comp. Talmud. רִתְחָן, a hot-headed fellow), and rested not (from this boiling). The accentuation Tarcha, Mercha, and Athnach is here incorrect; instead of Athnach, Rebia mugrasch is required. Days of affliction came

upon him (קִדֵּם as Ps. 18:6), viz., as a hostile power cutting off the previous way of his prosperity.

28 I wandered about in mourning without the sun;

I rose in the assembly, I gave free course to my complaint.

29 I am become a brother of the jackals

And a companion of ostriches.

30 My skin having become black, peels off from me,

And my bones are parched with dryness.

31 My harp was turned to mourning,

And my pipe to tones of sorrow.

Job 30:28–31. Several expositors (Umbr., Vaih., Hlgst.) understand קֹדֵר of the dirty-black skin of the leper, but contrary to the usage of the language, according to which, in similar utterances (Ps. 35:14, 38:7, 42:10, 43:2, comp. supra, Job 5:11), it rather denotes the dirty-black dress of mourners (comp. Arab. qddr, conspurcare vestem); to understand it of the dirty-black skin as quasi sordida veste (Welte) is inadmissible, since this distortion of the skin which Job bewails in v. 30 would hardly be spoken of thus tautologically. קדר therefore means in the black of the שַׂק, or mourning-linen, Job 16:15, by which, however, also the interpretation of חַמָּה בְּלֹא, "without sunburn" (Ew., Hirz.), which has gained ground since Raschi's day (השׁמשׁ שׁשׁזפתני לא), is disposed of; for "one can perhaps say of the blackness of the skin that it does not proceed from the sun, but not of the blackness of mourning attire" (Hahn). קדר also refutes the reading חֲמָה בלא in LXX Complut. (ἄνευ θυμοῦ),269 Syr., Jer. (sine furore), which ought to be understood of the deposition of the gall-pigment on the skin, and therefore of jaundice, which turns it (especially in tropical regions) not merely yellow, but a dark-brown. Hahn and a few others render בלא חמה correctly in the sense of בחשׁך, "without the sun having shone on him." Bereft of all his possessions, and finally also of his children, he wanders about in mourning (הִלֵּךְ as Job 24:10, Ps. 38:7), and even the sun had clothed itself in black to him (which is what השׁמשׁ קָדַר means, Joel 2:10 and freq.); the celestial light, which otherwise brightened his path, Job 29:3, was become invisible. We must not forget that Job here reviews the whole chain of afflictions which have come upon him, so that by v. 28a we have not to think exclusively, and also not prominently, of the leprosy, since הלכתי indeed represents him as still able to move about freely.

In v. 28b the accentuation wavers between Dechî, Munach, Silluk, according to which בַּקָּהָל אֲשַׁוֵּעַ belong together, which is favoured by the Dagesh in the Beth, and Tarcha, Munach, Silluk, according to which (because Munach, according to Psalter ii. 503, § 2, is a transformation of Rebia mugrasch) בַּקָּהָל קַמְתִּי belong together. The latter mode of accentuation, according to which בַקהל must be written without the Dag. instead of בַּקהל (vid., Norzi), is the only correct one (because Dechî cannot come in the last member of the sentence before Silluk), and is also more pleasing as to matter: I rose (and stood) in the assembly, crying for help, or more generally: wailing. The assembly is not to be thought of as an assembly of the people, or even tribunal (Ew.: "before the tribunal seeking a judge, with lamentations"), but as the public; for the thought that Job sought help against his unmerited sufferings before a human tribunal is absurd; and, moreover, the thought that he cried for help before an assembly of the people called together to take counsel and pronounce decisions is equally absurd. Welte, however, who interprets: I was as one who, before an assembled tribunal, etc., introduces a quasi of which there is no trace in the text. בַּקָּהָל must therefore, without pressing it further, be taken in the sense of publice, before all the world (Hirz.: comp. בָּקָהָל, ἐν φανερῷProv. 26:26); אֲשַׁוֵּעַ, however, is a circumstantial clause declaring the purpose (Ew. § 337, b; comp. De Sacy, Gramm. Arabe ii. § 357), as is frequently the case after קום, Job 16:8, Ps. 88:11, 102:14: surrexi in publico ut lamentarer, or lamentaturus, or lamentando. In this lament, extorted by the most intense pain, which he cannot hold back, however many may surround

him, he is become a brother of those תַּנִּים, jackals (canes aurei), whose dolorous howling produces dejection and shuddering in all who hear it, and a companion of יַעֲנָה בְּנוֹת, whose shrill cry is varied by wailing tones of deep melancholy.270 The point of comparison is not the insensibility of the hearers (Sforno), but the fellowship of wailing and howling together with the accompanying idea of the desert in which it is heard, which is connected with the idea itself (comp. Mic. 1:8).

Ver. 30. Now for the first time he speaks of his disfigurement by leprosy in particular: my skin (עוֹרִי, masc., as it is also used in Job 19:26, only apparently as fem.) is become black (nigruit) from me, i.e., being become black, has peeled from me, and my bones (עַצְמִי, construed as fem. like Job 19:20, Ps. 102:6) are consumed, or put in a glow (חָרָה, Milel, from חָרַר, as Ezek. 24:11) by a parching heat. Thus, then, his harp became mournful, and his pipe (וְעֻגָבִי with ג raphatum) the cry of the weepers; the cheerful music (comp. Job 21:12) has been turned into gloomy weeping and sobbing (comp. Lam. 5:15). Thus the second part of the monologue closes. It is somewhat lengthened and tedious; it is Job's last sorrowful lament before the catastrophe. What a delicate touch of the poet is it that he makes this lament, v. 31, die away so melodiously! One hears the prolonged vibration of its elegiac strains. The festive and joyous music is hushed; the only tones are tones of sadness and lament, mesto, flebile.

JOB 31

The Third Part of the Monologue

1 I have made a covenant with mine eyes,
And how should I fix my gaze upon a maiden!
2 What then would be the dispensation of Eloah from above,
And the inheritance of the Almighty from the heights—
3 Doth not calamity overtake the wicked,
And misfortune the workers of evil?
4 Doth He not see my ways
And count all my steps?

Job 31:1–4. After Job has described and bewailed the harsh contrast between the former days and the present, he gives us a picture of his moral life and endeavour, in connection with the character of which the explanation of his present affliction as a divinely decreed punishment becomes impossible, and the sudden overthrow of his prosperity into this abyss of suffering becomes to him, for the same reason, the most painful mystery. Job is not an Israelite, he is without the pale of the positive, Sinaitic revelation; his religion is the old patriarchal religion, which even in the present day is called dîn Ibrâhîm (the religion of Abraham), or dîn el-bedu (the religion of the steppe) as the religion of those Arabs who are not Moslem, or at least influenced by the penetrating Islamism, and is called by Mejânîshî el-hanîfîje (vid., supra, p. 362, note) as the patriarchally orthodox religion.271 As little as this religion, even in the present day, is acquainted with the specific Mohammedan commandments, so little knew Job of the specifically Israelitish. On the contrary, his confession, which he lays down in this third monologue, coincides remarkably with the ten commandments of piety (el-felâh) peculiar to the dîn Ibrâhîm, although it differs in this respect, that it does not give the prominence to submission to the dispensations of God, that teslîm which, as the whole of this didactic poem teaches by its issue, is the duty of the perfectly pious; also bravery in defence of holy property and rights is wanting, which among the wandering tribes is accounted as an essential part of the hebbet er-rîh (inspiration of the Divine Being), i.e., active piety, and to which it is similarly related, as to the binding notion of "honour" which was coined by the western chivalry of the middle ages.

Job begins with the duty of chastity. Consistently with the prologue, which the drama itself nowhere belies, he is living in monogamy, as at the present day the orthodox Arabs, averse to Islamism, are not addicted to Moslem polygamy. With the confession of

having maintained this marriage (although, to infer from the prologue, it was not an over-happy, deeply sympathetic one) sacred, and restrained himself not only from every adulterous act, but also from adulterous desires, his confessions begin. Here, in the middle of the Old Testament, without the pale of the Old Testament νόμος, we meet just that moral strictness and depth with which the Preacher on the mount, Matt. 5:27f., opposes the spirit to the letter of the seventh commandment. It is יִלְעֵינַי, not עִם־עֵינַי (comp. Job 40:28), designedly; עִם ברית כרת or אֶת is the usual phrase where two equals are concerned; on the contrary, לְ ברית כרת where two the superior—Jehovah, or a king, or conqueror—binds himself to another under prescribed conditions, or the covenant is made not so much by a mutual advance as by the one taking the initiative. In this latter case, the secondary notions of a promise given (e.g., Isa. 55:3), or even, as here, of a law prescribed, are combined with ברית כרת: "as lord of my senses I prescribed this law for my eyes" (Ew.). The eyes, says a Talmudic proverb, are the procuresses of sin (דחטאה סרסורי נינהו); "to close his eyes, that they may not feast on evil," is, in Isa. 33:15, a clearly defined line in the picture of him on whom the everlasting burnings can have no hold. The exclamation, v. 1b, is spoken with self-conscious indignation: Why should I … (comp. Joseph's exclamation, Gen. 39:9); Schultens correctly: est indignatio repellens vehementissime et negans tale quicquam committi par esse; the transition of the מה, Arab. mâ, to the expression of negation, which is complete in Arabic, is here in its incipient state, Ew. § 325, b. עַל הִתְבּוֹנֵן is intended to express a fixed and inspection (comp. אֶל, 1 Kings 3:21) gaze upon an object, combined with a lascivious imagination (comp. Sir. 9:5, παρθένον μὴ καταμάνθανε, and 9:8, άπόστρεψον όφθαλμὸν άπὸ γυναικὸς εύμόρφου καὶ μὴ καταμάνθανε κάλλος άλλότριον), a βλέπειν which issues in έπιθυμῆσαι αύτῆν, Matt. 5:28. Adulterium reale, and in fact two-sided, is first spoken of in the third strophe, here it is adulterium mentale and one-sided; the object named is not any maiden whatever, but any בְּתוּלָה, because virginity is ever to be revered, a most sacred thing, the holy purity of which Job acknowledges himself to have guarded against profanation from any lascivious gaze by keeping a strict watch over his eyes. The Waw of וּמָה is, as in v. 14, copulative: and if I had done it, what punishment might I have looked for?

The question, v. 2, is proposed in order that it may be answered in v. 3 again in the form of a question: in consideration of the just punishment which the injurer of female innocence meets, Job disavows every unchaste look. On חֵלֶק and נַחֲלָה used of allotted, adjudged punishment, comp. Job 20:29, 27:13; on נֵכָר, which alternates with אִיד (burden of suffering, misfortune), comp. Obad. v. 12, where in its stead נֵכָר occurs, as Arab. nukr, properly id quod patienti paradoxum, insuetum, intolerabile videtur, omne ingratum (Reiske). Conscious of the just punishment of the unchaste, and, as he adds in v. 4, of the omniscience of the heavenly Judge, Job has made dominion over sin, even in its first beginnings and motions, his principle.

The הוּא, which gives prominence to the subject, means Him who punishes the unchaste. By Him who observes his walk on every side, and counts (יִסְפּוֹר, plene, according to Ew. § 138, a, on account of the pause, but vid., the similar form of writing, Job 39:2, 18:15) all his steps, Job has been kept back from sin, and to Him Job can appeal as a witness.

5 If I had intercourse with falsehood,
And my foot hastened after deceit:
6 Let Him weigh me in the balances of justice,
And let Eloah know my innocence.
7 If my steps turned aside from the way,
And my heart followed mine eyes,
And any spot hath cleaved to my hands:
8 May I sow and another eat,
And let my shoots be rooted out.

Job 31:5–8. We have translated שָׁוְא (on the form vid., on Job 15:31, and the idea on Job 11:11) falsehood, for it signifies desolateness

and hollowness under a concealing mask, therefore the contradiction between what is without and within, lying and deceit, parall. מִרְמָה, deceit, delusion, imposition. The phrase עִם־שָׁוְא הָלַךְ is based on the personification of deceit, or on thinking of it in connection with the מתי־שׁוא (Job 11:11). The form וַתַּחַשׁ cannot be derived from חוּשׁ, from which it ought to be תָּחַשְׁוָ, like וַיָּסַר Judg. 4:18 and freq., וַיָּשַׂר (serravit) 1 Chron. 20:3, וַיָּעַט (increpavit) 1 Sam. 25:14. Many grammarians (Ges. § 72, rem. 9; Olsh. 257, g) explain the Pathach instead of Kametz as arising from the virtual doubling of the guttural (Dagesh forte implicitum), for which, however, no ground exists here; Ewald (§ 232, b) explains it by "the hastening of the tone towards the beginning," which explains nothing, since the retreat of the tone has not this effect anywhere else. We must content ourselves with the supposition that וַתַּחַשׁ is formed from a חָשָׁה having a similar meaning to חוּשׁ (חִישׁ), as also וַיַּעַט, 1 Sam. 15:19, comp. 14:32, is from a עָטָה of similar signification with עִיט. The hypothetical antecedent, v. 5, is followed by the conclusion, v. 6: If he have done this, may God not spare him. He has, however, not done it; and if God puts him to an impartial trial, He will learn his תֻּמָּה, integritas, purity of character. The "balance of justice" is the balance of the final judgment, which the Arabs call Arab. mîzân 'l-a'mâl, "the balance of actions (works)."272

Ver. 7 also begins hypothetically: if my steps (אַשֻּׁרַי) from אַשּׁוּר, which is used alternately with אָשׁוּר without distinction, contrary to Ew. § 260, b) swerve (תִּטָּה, the predicate to the plur. which follows, designating a thing, according to Ges. § 146, 3) from the way (i.e., the one right way), and my heart went after my eyes, i.e., if it followed the drawing of the lust of the eye, viz., to obtain by deceit or extortion the property of another, and if a spot (מאוּם, macula, as Dan. 1:4, = מוּם, Job 11:15; according to Ew., equivalent to מָחוּם, what is blackened and blackens, then a blemish, and according to Olsh., in לֹא … מָאוּמָה, like the French ne … point) clave to my hands: I will sow, and let another eat, and let my shoots be rooted out. The poet uses צֶאֱצָאִים elsewhere of offspring of the body or posterity, Job 5:25, 21:8, 27:14; here, however, as in Isaiah, with whom he has this word in common, Job 34:2, 42:5, the produce of the ground is meant. V. 8a is, according to John 4:37, a λόγος, a proverb. In so far as he may have acted thus, Job calls down upon himself the curse of Deut. 38:20f.: what he sows, let strangers reap and eat; and even when that which is sown does not fall into the hands of strangers, let it be uprooted.

9 If my heart has been befooled about a woman,

And if I lay in wait at my neighbour's door:

10 Let my wife grind unto another,

And let others bow down over her.

11 For this is an infamous act,

And this is a crime [to be brought before] judges;

12 Yea, it is a fire that consumeth to the abyss,

And should root out all my increase.

Job 31:9–12. As he has guarded himself against defiling virgin innocence by lascivious glances, so is he also conscious of having made no attempt to trespass upon the marriage relationship of his neighbour (רֵעַ as in the Decalogue, Ex. 20:17): his heart was not persuaded, or he did not allow his heart to be persuaded (נִפְתָּה like πείθεσθαι), i.e., misled, on account of a woman (אִשָּׁה as אִישׁ אֵשֶׁת, in post-bibl. usage, of another's wife), and he lay not in wait (according to the manner of adulterous lovers described at Job 24:15, which see) at his neighbour's door. We may here, with Wetzstein, compare the like-minded confession in a poem of Muhâdi ibn-Muhammel: Arab. mâ nabb klb 'l-jâr mnâ w-lâ 'awâ, i.e., "The neighbour's dog never barked (נבב, Beduin equivalent to נבח in the Syrian towns and villages) on our account (because we have gone by night with an evil design to his tent), and it never howled (being beaten by us, to make it cease its barking lest it should betray us)." In v. 10 follows the punishment which he wishes might overtake him in case he had acted thus: "may my wife grind to another," i.e., may she become his "maid behind the mill," Ex. 11:5, comp. Isa. 47:2,

who must allow herself to be used for everything; ἁλετρίς and a common low woman (comp. Plutarch, non posse suav. viv. c. 21, καὶ παχυσκελὴς ἁλετρὶς πρὸς μύλην κινουμένη) are almost one and the same. On the other hand, the Targ. (coeat cum alio), LXX (euphemistically ἁρέσαι ἑτέρῳ, not, as the Syr. Hexapl. shows, ἁλέσαι), and Jer. (scortum sit alterius), and in like manner Saad., Gecat., understand וְתִטְחַ directly of carnal surrender; and, in fact, according to the traditional opinion, b. Sota 10a: עבירה לשון אלא טחינה אין, i.e., "טחן everywhere in Scripture is intended of (carnal) trespass." With reference to Judg. 16:21 and Lam. 5:13 (where טָחוֹן, like Arab. ṭaḥûn, signifies the upper mill-stone, or in gen. the mill), this is certainly incorrect; the parallel, as well as Deut. 28:30, favours this rendering of the word in the obscene sense of μύλλειν, molere, in this passage, which also is seen under the Arab. synon. of grinding, Arab. dahaka (trudere); according to which it would have to be interpreted: let her grind to another, i.e., serve him as it were as a nether mill-stone. The verb טָחַן, used elsewhere (in Talmud.) of the man, would here be transferred to the woman, like as it is used of the mill itself as that which grinds. This rendering is therefore not refuted by its being תִּטְחַן and not תִּטְחֶן. Moreover, the word thus understood is not unworthy of the poet, since he designedly makes Job seize the strongest expressions. Among moderns, תטחן is thus tropically explained by Ew., Umbr., Hahn, and a few others, but most expositors prefer the proper sense, in connection with which molat certainly, especially with respect to v. 9b, is also equivalent to fiat pellex. It is hard to decide; nevertheless the preponderance of reasons seems to us to be on the side of the traditional tropical rendering, by the side of which v. 10b is not attached in progressive, but in synonymous parallelism: et super ea incurvent se alii, כָּרַע of the man, as in the phrase Arab. kr't 'l-mrât 'lâ 'l-rjl (curvat se mulier ad virum) of the acquiescence of the woman; אֲחֵרִין is a poetical Aramaism, Ew. § 177, a. The sin of adultery, in case he had committed it, ought to be punished by another taking possession of his own wife, for that (הוּא a neutral masc., Keri הִיא in accordance with the fem. of the following predicate, comp. Lev. 18:17) is an infamous act, and that (הִיא referring back to זִמָּה, Keri הוּא in accordance with the masc. of the following predicate) is a crime for the judges. On this wavering between הוּא and הִיא vid., Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 1863, s. v. הוּא, S. 225. זִמָּה is the usual Thora-word for the shameless subtle encroachments of sensual desires (vid., Saalschütz, Mosaisches Recht, S. 791f.), and פְּלִילִים עָוֹן (not עָוֹן), according to the usual view equivalent to crimen et crimen quidem judicum (however, on the form of connection intentionally avoided here, where the genitival relation might easily give an erroneous sense, vid., Ges. § 116, rem.), signifies a crime which falls within the province of the penal code, for which in v. 28 it is less harshly פְּלִילִי עָוֹן: a judicial, i.e., criminal offence. פְּלִילִים is, moreover, not the plur. of פְּלִילִי (Kimchi), but of פָּלִיל, an arbitrator (root פל, findere, dirimere).

The confirmatory clause, v. 12, is co-ordinate with the preceding: for it (this criminal, adulterous enterprise) is a fire, a fire consuming him who allows the sparks of sinful desire to rise up within him (Prov. 6:27f.; Sir. 9:8), which devours even to the bottom of the abyss, not resting before it has dragged him whom it has seized down with it into the deepest depth of ruin, and as it were melted him away, and which ought to root out all my produce (all the fruit of my labour).273 The function of בְּ is questionable. Ew. (§ 217, f) explains it as local: in my whole revenue, i.e., throughout my whole domain. But it can also be Beth objecti, whether it be that the obj. is conceived as the means of the action (vid., on Job 16:4, 5, 10, 20:20), or that, "corresponding to the Greek genitive, it does not express an entire full coincidence, but an action about and upon the object" (Ew. § 217, S. 557). We take it as Beth obj. in the latter sense, after the analogy of the so-called pleonastic Arab. b (e.g., qaraa bi-suwari, he has practised the act of reading upon the Suras of the Koran); and which ought to undertake the act of outrooting upon my whole produce.274

13 If I despised the cause of my servant and my maid,

When they contended with me:

14 What should I do, if God should rise up,

And if He should make search, what should I answer Him?

15 Hath not He who formed me in the womb formed him also,

And hath not One fashioned us in the belly?

Job 31:13–15. It might happen, as v. 13 assumes, that his servant or his maid (אָמָה, Arab. amatun, denotes a maid who is not necessarily a slave, 'abde, as Job 19:15, whereas שִׁפְחָה does not occur in the book) contended with him, and in fact so that they on their part began the dispute (for, as the Talmud correctly points out, it is not עִמָּם בְּרִיבִי, but עִמָּדִי בְּרִיבָם), but he did not then treat them as a despot; they were not accounted as res but personae by him, he allowed them to maintain their personal right in opposition to him. Christopher Scultetus observes here: Gentiles quidem non concedebant jus servo contra dominum, cui etiam vitae necisque potestas in ipsum erat; sed Iob amore justitiae libere se demisit, ut vel per alios judices aut arbitros litem talem curaret decidi vel sibi ipsi sit moderatus, ut juste pronuntiaret. If he were one who despised (מָאַסְתִּי not אֶמְאַס) his servants' cause: what should he do if God arose and entered into judgment; and if He should appoint an examination (thus Hahn correctly, for the conclusion shows that פקד is here a synon. of בחן Ps. 17:3, and חקר Ps. 44:22, Arab. fqd, V, VIII, accurate inspicere), what should he answer?

Ver. 15. The same manner of birth, by the same divine creative power and the same human agency, makes both master and servant substantially brethren with equal claims: Has not He who brought me forth in my mother's womb (also) brought forth him (this my servant or my maid), and has not One fashioned us in our mother's belly? אֶחָד, unus, viz., God, is the subj., as Mal. 2:10, הֲלֹא אָב (אֶחָד) (for the thought comp. Eph. 6:9), as it is also translated by the Targ., Jer., Saad., and Gecat.; whereas the LXX (ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κοιλίᾳ), Syr., Symm. (as it appears from his translation ἐν ὁμοίῳ τρόπῳ), construe אחד as the adj. to בָּרְחֶם, which is also the idea of the accentuation (Rebia mugrasch, Mercha, Silluk). On the other hand, it has been observed (also Norzi) that it ought to be הָאֶחָד according to this meaning; but it was not absolutely necessary, vid., Ges. § 111, 2, b. אחד also would not be unsuitable in this combination; it would, as e.g., in אחד חלום, not affirm identity of number, but of character. But אחד is far more significant, and as the final word of the strophe more expressive, when referred to God. The form וַיְכוֹנְנֻנוּ is to be judged of just like וַתְּמוּגֵנוּ, Isa. 54:6; either they are forms of an exceptionally transitive (as שׁוּב, Ps. 85:5, and in שׁבות שׁוב) use of the Kal of these verbs (vid., e.g., Parchon and Kimchi), or they are syncopated forms of the Pilel for וַיְכֹנְנֻנוּ, וַתְּמֹגְגֵנוּ, syncopated on account of the same letters coming together, especially in ויכננו (Ew. § 81, a, and most others); but this coincidence is sought elsewhere (e.g., Ps. 50:23, Prov. 1:28), and not avoided in this manner (e.g., Ps. 119:73). Beside this syncope וַיְכוֹנְנֻנוּ might also be expected, while according to express testimony the first Nun is raphatum: we therefore prefer to derive these forms from Kal, without regarding them, with Olsh., as errors in writing. The suff. is rightly taken by LXX, Targ., Abulwalid, and almost all expositors,275 not as singular (ennu = êhu), but as plural (ennu = ênu); The Babylonian school pointed וַיְכוֹנְנֻנוּ, like ממנו where it signifies a nobis, מִמֶּנּוּ (Psalter ii. 459, and further information in Pinsker's works, Zur Geschichte des Karaismus, and Ueber das sogen. assyrische Punktationssystem). Therefore: One, i.e., one and the same God, has fashioned us in the womb without our co-operation, in an equally animal way, which smites down all pride, in like absolute conditionedness.

16 If I held back the poor from what they desired,

And caused the eyes of the widow to languish,

17 And ate my morsel alone

Without letting the fatherless eat thereof:—

18 No indeed, from my youth he grew up to me as to a father,

And from my mother's womb I guided her—

Job 31:16–18. The whole strophe is the hypothetical antecedent of the imprecative conclusion, v. 22f., which closes the following strophe. Since מִמֶּנּוּ דָבָר מָנַע, cohibere aliquid ab aliquo (Job 22:7), is said as much in accordance with the usage of the language as מִדָּבָר מָנָעוֹ, cohibere aliquem ab aliquo (Num. 24:11, Eccl. 2:10), in the sense of denegare alicui aliquid, there is no reason for taking דַּלִּים מֵחֵפֶץ together as a genitival clause (a voto tenuium), as the accentuation requires it. On חֵפֶץ, vid., on Job 21:21; it signifies solicitude (what is ardently desired) and business, here the former: what is ever the interest and want of the poor (the reduced or those without means). From such like things he does not keep the poor back, i.e., does not refuse them; and the eyes of the widow he did not cause or allow to languish (כִּלָּה, to bring to an end, i.e., cause to languish, of the eyes, as Lev. 26:16, 1 Sam. 2:33); he let not their longing for assistance be consumed of itself, let not the fountain of their tears become dry without effect. If he had done the opposite, if he had eaten his bread (לֶחֶם פַּת = פַּת) alone, and not allowed the orphan to eat of it with him—but no, he had not acted thus; on the contrary (כִּי as Ps. 130:4 and frequently), he (the parentless one) grew up to him (גְּדָלַנִי = גְּדָל לִי, Ges. § 121, 4, according to Ew. § 315, b, "by the interweaving of the dialects of the people into the ancient form of the declining language;" perhaps it is more correct to say it is by virtue of a poetic, forced, and rare brevity of expression) as to a father (= לְאָב כְּמוֹ), and from his mother's womb he guided her, the helpless and defenceless widow, like a faithful child leading its sick or aged mother. The hyperbolical expression אִמִּי מִבֶּטֶן dates this sympathizing and active charity back to the very beginning of Job's life. He means to say that it is in-born to him, and he has exercised it ever since he was first able to do so. The brevity of the form גְּדָלַנִי, brief to incorrectness, might be removed by the pointing גִּדְּלַנִי (Olsh.): from my youth up he (the fatherless one) honoured me as a father; and גִּדְּלַנִי (instead of כִּבְּדַנִי would be explained by the consideration, that a veneration is meant that attributed a dignity which exceed his age to the נער who was not yet old enough to be a father. But גָּדַל signifies "to cause to grow" in such a connection elsewhere (parall. רוֹמֵם, to raise), wherefore LXX translates ἐξέτρεφον (גִּדַּלְתִּי); and גְּדָלַנִי has similar examples of the construction of intransitives with the acc. instead of the dat. (especially Zech. 7:5) in its favour: they became me great, i.e., became great in respect of me. Other ways of getting over the difficulty are hardly worth mentioning: the Syriac version reads כְּאֵב (pain) and אֲנָחוֹת; Raschi makes v. 18a, the idea of benevolence, the subj., and v. 18b (as מִדָּה, attribute) the obj. The suff. of אַלְמְנָתָהּ Schlottm. refers to the female orphan; but Job refers again to the orphan in the following strophe, and the reference to the widow, more natural here on account of the gender, has nothing against it. The choice of the verb (comp. Job 38:32) also corresponds to such a reference, since the Hiph. has an intensified Kal -signification here.276 From earliest youth, so far back as he can remember, he was wont to behave like a father to the orphan, and like a child to the widow.

19 If I saw one perishing without clothing,

And that the needy had no covering;

20 If his loins blessed me not,

And he did not warm himself from the hide of my lambs;

21 If I have lifted up my hand over the orphan,

Because I saw my help in the gate:

22 Let my shoulder fall out of its shoulder-blade,

And mine arm be broken from its bone;

23 For terror would come upon me, the destruction of God,

And before His majesty I should not be able to stand.

Job 31:19–23. On אוֹבֵד comp. on Job 4:11, 29:13; he who is come down from his right

place and is perishing (root בד, to separate, still perfectly visible through the Arab. bâda, ba'ida, to perish), or also he who is already perished, periens and perditus. The clause, v. 19b, forms the second obj. to אִם רָאִיתִי, which otherwise signifies si video, but here, in accordance with the connection, signifies si videbam. The blessing of the thankful (Job 29:13) is transferred from the person to the limbs in v. 20a, which need and are benefited by the warmth imparted. אִם־לֹא here is not an expression of an affirmative asseveration, but a negative turn to the continuation of the hypothetical antecedents. The shaking, הָנִיף, of the hand, v. 21a, is intended, like Isa. 11:15, 19:16 (comp. the Pilel, Job 10:32), Zech. 2:13, as a preparation for a crushing stroke. Job refrained himself from such designs upon the defenceless orphan, even when he saw his help in the gate, i.e., before the tribunal (Job 29:7), i.e., even when he had a certain prospect or powerful assistance there. If he has acted otherwise, his כָּתֵף, i.e., his upper arm together with the shoulder, must fall out from its שִׁכְמָם, i.e., the back which bears it together with the shoulder-blades, and his אֶזְרֹעַ, upper and lower arm, which is considered here according to its outward flesh, must be broken out of its קָנָה, tube, i.e., the reed-like hollow bone which gives support to it, i.e., be broken asunder from its basis (Syr. a radice sua), this sinning arm, which did not compassionate the naked, and mercilessly threatened the defenceless and helpless. The ת raphatum which follows in both cases, and the express testimony of the Masora, show that מִשְׁכָּמָה and מִקָּנָה have no Mappik. The He quiescens, however, is in both instances softened from the He mappic. of the suff., Ew. § 21, f. פַּחַד in v. 23 is taken by most expositors as predicate: for terror is (was) to me evil as God, the righteous judge, decrees it. But אֵלַי is not favourable to this. It establishes the particular thing which he imprecates upon himself, and that consequently which, according to his own conviction and perception, ought justly to overtake him out of the general mass, viz., that terror ought to come upon him, a divine decreed weight of affliction. אֵל אֵיד is a permutative of פַּחַד = פַּחַד אֱלֹהִים, and אֵלַי with Dechî equivalent to אֵלַי (יָבֹא) יִהְיֶה, comp. Jer. 2:19 (where it is to be interpreted: and that thou lettest no fear before me come over thee). Thus also v. 23b is suitably connected with the preceding: and I should not overcome His majesty, i.e., I should succumb to it. The מִן corresponds to the prae in praevalerem; שְׂאֵת (LXX falsely, λῆμμα, judgment, decision = מִשְׂא, Jer. pondus) is not intended otherwise than Job 13:11 (parall. פַּחַד as here).

24 If I made gold my confidence,
And said to the fine gold: O my trust;
25 If I rejoiced that my wealth was great,
And that my hand had gained much;—
26 If I saw the sunlight when it shone,
And the moon walking in splendour,
27 And my heart was secretly enticed,
And I threw them a kiss by my hand:
28 This also would be a punishable crime,
For I should have played the hypocrite to God above.

Job 31:24–28. Not only from covetous extortion of another's goods was he conscious of being clear, but also from an excessive delight in earthly possessions. He has not made gold his כֶּסֶל, confidence (vid., on כִּסְלָתְךָ, Job 4:6); he has not said to כֶּתֶם, fine gold (pure, Job 28:19, of Ophir, 28:16), מִבְטַחִי (with Dag. forte implicitum as Job 8:14, 18:14): object (ground) of my trust! He has not rejoiced that his wealth is great (רב, adj.), and that his hand has attained כַּבִּיר, something great (neutral masc. Ew. § 172, b). His joy was the fear of God, which ennobles man, not earthly things, which are not worthy to be accounted as man's highest good. He indeed avoided πλεονεξία as εἰλωλολατρεία (Col. 3:5), how much more the heathenish deification of the stars! אוֹר is here, as Job 37:21 and φάος in Homer, the sun as the great light of the earth. יָרֵחַ is the moon as a wanderer (from ארח = רח), i.e., night-wanderer (noctivaga), as the Arab. târik in a like sense is the name of the morning-star. The two words הֹלֵךְ רִיקָ describe with exceeding beauty the solemn majestic

wandering of the moon; יקר is acc. of closer definition, like תמים, Ps. 15:2, and this "brilliantly rolling on" is the acc. of the predicate to אֶרְאֶה, corresponding to the יָהֵל כִּי, "that (or how) it shoots forth rays" (Hiph. of הָלַל, distinct from יָהֵל Isa. 13:20), or even: that it shot forth rays (fut. in signif. of an imperf. as Gen. 48:17).

Ver. 27 proceeds with futt. consec. in order to express the effect which this imposing spectacle of the luminaries of the day and of the night might have produced on him, but has not. The Kal וַיִּפְתְּ is to be understood as in Deut. 11:16 (comp. ib. iv. 19, נִדַּח): it was enticed, gave way to the seducing influence. Kissing is called נָשַׁק as being a joining of lip to lip. Accordingly the kiss by hand can be described by לָפָה יָד נָשְׁקָה; the kiss which the mouth gives the hand is to a certain extent also a kiss which the hand gives the mouth, since the hand joins itself to the mouth. Thus to kiss the hand in the direction of the object of veneration, or also to turn to it the kissed hand and at the same time the kiss which fastens on it (as compensation for the direct kiss, 1 Kings 19:18, Hos. 13:2), is the proper gesture of the προσκύνησις and adoratio mentioned; comp. Pliny, h. n. xxviii. 2, 5; Inter adorandum dexteram ad osculum referimus et totum corpus circumagimus. Tacitus, Hist. iii. 24, says that in Syria they value the rising sun; and that this was done by kissing the hand (τὴν χεῖρα κύσαντες) in Western Asia as in Greece, is to be inferred from Lucians Περὶ ὁρχήσεως, c. xvii.277 In the passage before us Ew. finds an indication of the spread of the Zoroaster doctrine in the beginning of the seventh century B.C., at which period he is of opinion the book of Job was composed, but without any ground. The ancient Persian worship has no knowledge of the act of adoration by throwing a kiss; and the Avesta recognises in the sun and moon exalted genii, but created by Ahuramazda, and consequently not such as are to be worshipped as gods. On the other hand, star-worship is everywhere the oldest and also comparatively the purest form of heathenism. That the ancient Arabs, especially the Himjarites, adored the sun, שֶׁמֶשׁ, and the moon, שִׁין (סִין, whence סִינַי, the mountain dedicated to the moon), as divine, we know from the ancient testimonies,278 and many inscriptions279 which confirm and supplement them; and the general result of Chwolsohn's280 researches is unimpeachable, that the so-called Sabians (Arab. ṣâbîwn with or without Hamza of the Jê), of whom a section bore the name of worshippers of the sun, shemsîje, were the remnant of the ancient heathenism of Western Asia, which lasted into the middle ages. This heathenism, which consisted, according to its basis, in the worship of the stars, was also spread over Syria, and its name, usually combined with הַשָּׁמַיִם צְבָא (Deut. 4:19), perhaps is not wholly devoid of connection with the name of a district of Syria, צוֹבָה אֲרַם; certainly our poet found it already there, where he heard the tradition about Job, and in his hero presents to us a true adherent of the patriarchal religion, who had kept himself free from the influence of the worship of the stars, which was even in his time forcing its way among the tribes.

It is questionable whether v. 28 is to be regarded as a conclusion, with Umbr. and others, or as a parenthesis, with Ew., Hahn, Schlottm., and others. We take it as a conclusion, against which there is no objection according to the syntax, although strictly it is only a confirmation (vid., vv. 11, 23) of an implied imprecatory conclusion: therefore it is (would be) also a judicial misdeed, i.e., one to be severely punished, for I should have played the hypocrite to God above (מִמַּעַל לָאֵל, recalling the universal Arabic expression allah ta'âla, God, the Exalted One) by making gold and silver, the sun and moon my idols. By פְּלִילִי both the sins belonging to the judgment-seat of God, as in ἔνοχος τῷ συνεδρίῳ, Matt. 5:22, are not referred to a human tribunal, but only described κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον as punishable transgressions of the highest grade. לְ כִחֵשׁ signifies to play the hypocrite to any one, whereas to disown any one is expressed by כחשׁ בְּ. His worship of God would have been hypocrisy, if he had disowned in secret the God whom he acknowledged openly and outwardly.

Now follow strophes to which the conclusion is wanting. The single imprecatory conclusion which yet follows (v. 40), is not so worded that it might avail for all the preceding hypothetical antecedents. There are therefore in these strophes no conclusions that correspond to the other clauses. The inward emotion of the confessor, which constantly increases in fervour the more he feels himself superior to his accusers in the exemplariness of his life hitherto, struggles against this rounding off of the periods. A "yea then—!" is easily supplied in thought to these strophes which per aposiopesin are devoid of conclusions.

29 If I rejoiced over the destruction of him who hated me,

And became excited when evil came upon him—

30 Yet I did not allow my palate to sin

By calling down a curse upon his life.

Job 31:29, 30. The aposiopesis is here manifest, for v. 29 is evidently equal to a solemn denial, to which v. 30 is then attached as a simple negative. He did not rejoice at the destruction (פִּיד, Arab. fêd, 281 as Job 12:5, 30:24) of his enemy who was full of hatred towards him (מְשַׂנְאִי, elsewhere also שֹׂנְאִי), and was not excited with delight (הִתְעֹרֵר, to excite one's self, a description of emotion, whether it be pleasure, or as Job 17:8, displeasure, as a not merely passive but moral incident) if calamity came upon him, and he did not allow his palate (חֵךְ as the instrument of speech, like Job 6:30) to sin by asking God that he might die as a curse. Love towards an enemy is enjoined by the Thora, Ex. 23:4, but it is more or less with a national limitation, Lev. 19:18, because the Thora is the law of a people shut out from the rest of the world, and in a state of war against it (according to which Matt. 5:43 is to be understood); the books of the Chokma, however (comp. Prov. 24:17, 25:21), remove every limit from the love of enemies, and recognise no difference, but enjoin love towards man as man. With v. 30 this strophe closes. Among modern expositors, only Arnh. takes in v. 31 as belonging to it: "Would not the people of my tent then have said: Would that we had of his flesh?! we have not had enough of it," i.e., we would eat him up both skin and hair. Of course it does not mean after the manner of cannibals, but figuratively, as Job 19:22; but in a figurative sense "to eat any one's flesh" in Semitic is equivalent to lacerare, vellicare, obtrectare (vid., on Job 19:22, and comp. also Sur. xlix. 12 of the Koran, and Schultens' Erpenius, pp. 592f.), which is not suitable here, as in general this drawing of v. 31 to v. 29f. is in every respect, and especially that of the syntax, inadmissible. It is the duty of beneficence, which Job acknowledges having practised, in v. 31f.

31 If the people of my tent were not obliged to say:

Where would there be one who has not been satisfied with his flesh?!—

32 The stranger did not lodge out of doors,

I opened my door towards the street.

Job 31:31, 32. Instead of אָמְרוּ, it might also be יֹאמְרוּ (dicebant); the perf., however, better denotes not merely what happens in a general way, but what must come to pass. The "people of the tent" are all who belong to it, like the Arab. ahl (tent, metonym. dwellers in the tent), here pre-eminently the servants, but without the expression in itself excluding wife, children, and relations. The optative מִי־יִתֵּן, so often spoken of already, is here, as in v. 35, Job 14:4, 29:2, followed by the acc. objecti, for נִשְׂבָּע is part. with the long accented ā (quis exhibebit or exhibeat non saturatum), and מִבְּשָׂרוֹ is not meant of the flesh of the person (as even the LXX in bad taste renders: that his maids would have willingly eaten him, their kind master, up from love to him), but of the flesh of the cattle of the host. Our translation follows the accentuation, which, however, perhaps proceeds from an interpretation like that of Arnheim given above. His constant and ready hospitality is connected with the mention of his abundant care and provision for his own household. It is unnecessary to take אֹרַח, with the ancient versions, for אֹרֵחַ, or so to read it; לָאֹרַח signifies towards the street, where

travellers are to be expected, comp. Pirke aboth i. 5: "May thy house be open into the broad place (לָרְוָחָה), and may the poor be thy guests." The Arabs pride themselves on the exercise of hospitality. "To open a guest-chamber" is the same as to establish one's own household in Arabic. Stories of judgments by which the want of hospitality has been visited, form an important element of the popular traditions of the Arabs.282

33 If I have hidden my wickedness like Adam,
Concealing my guilt in my bosom,
34 Because I feared the great multitude
And the contempt of families affrighted me,
So that I acted secretly, went not out of the door.—

Job 31:33, 34. Most expositors translate כְּאָדָם: after the manner of men; but appropriate as this meaning of the expression is in Ps. 82:7, in accordance with the antithesis and the parallelism (which see), it would be as tame here, and altogether expressionless in the parallel passage Hos. 6:7283—the passage which comes mainly under consideration here—since the force of the prophetic utterance: "they have כאדם transgressed the covenant," consists in this, "that Israel is accused of a transgression which is only to be compared to that of the first man created: here, as there, a like transgression of the expressed will of God" (von Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. 412f.); as also, according to Rom. 5:14, Israel's transgression is that fact in the historical development of redemption which stands by the side of Adam's transgression. And the mention of Adam in Hosea cannot surprise one, since he also shows himself in other respects to be familiar with the contents of Genesis, and to refer back to it (vid., Genesis, S. 11–13). Still much less surprising is such a reference to primeval history in a book that belongs to the literature of the Chokma (vid., Introduction, § 2). The descent of the human race from a single pair, and the fall of those first created, are, moreover, elements in all the ancient traditions; and it is questionable whether the designation of men by beni Adama (children of Adam), among the Moslems, first sprang from the contact of Judaism and Christianity, or whether it was not rather an old Arabic expression. Therefore we translate with Targ., Schult., Boullier, Rosenm., Hitz., Kurtz, and von Hofm.: if I have hidden (disowned) like Adam my transgression. The point of comparison is only the sinner's dread of the light, which became prominent as the prototype for every succeeding age in Adam's hiding himself. The לִטְמֹן which follows is meant not so much as indicating the aim, as gerundive (abscondendo); on this use of the inf. constr. with לְ, vid., Ew. § 280, d. חֹב, bosom, is ἁπ. γεγρ.; Ges. connects it with the Arab. habba, to love; it is, however, to be derived from the חב, occulere, whence chabîbe, that which is deep within, a deep valley (comp. חָבָא, chabaa, with their derivatives); in Aramaic it is the common word for the Hebr. חֵיק.

Ver. 34a. With כִּי follows the motive which Job might have had for hiding himself with his sin: he has been neither an open sinner, nor from fear of men and a feeling of honour a secret sinner. He cherished within him no secret accursed thing, and had no need for playing the hypocrite, because he dreaded (עָרַץ only here with the acc. of the obj. feared) the great multitude of the people (רַבָּה not adv. but adj.; הָמוֹן with Mercha-Zinnorith, consequently fem., as עַם sometimes, Ew. § 174, b), and consequently the moral judgment of the people; and because he feared the stigma of the families, and therefore the loss of honour in the higher circles of society, so that as a consequence he should have kept himself quiet and retired, without going out of the door. One might think of that abhorrence of voluptuousness, with which, in the consciousness of its condemnatory nature, a man shuts himself up in deep darkness; but according to v. 33 it is in general deeds that are intended, which Job would have ground for studiously concealing, because if they had become known he would have appeared a person to be scouted and despised: he could frankly and freely meet any person's gaze, and

had no occasion to fear the judgment of men, because he feared sin. He did nothing which he should have caused for carefully keeping from the light of publicity. And yet his affliction is to be accounted as the punishment of hidden sin! as proof that he has committed punishable sin, which, however, he will not confess!

35 O that I had one who would hear me!

Behold my signature—the Almighty will answer me—

And the writing which my opponent hath written!

36 Truly I will carry it upon my shoulder,

I will wind it about me as a crown.

37 The number of my steps I will recount to Him,

As a prince will I draw near to Him.

Job 31:35–37. The wish that he might find a ready willing hearer is put forth in a general way, but, as is clear in itself, and as it becomes manifest from what follows, refers to Him who, because it treats of a contradiction between the outward appearance and the true but veiled fact, as searcher of the heart, is the only competent judge. It may not be translated: et libellum (the indictment, or even: the reply to Job's self-defence) scribat meus adversarius (Dachselt, Rosenm., Welte)—the accentuation seems to proceed from this rendering, but it ought to be סֵפֶר וְכָתַב; if כָּתַב governed by יַעֲנֵנִי were intended to be equivalent to יִכְתֹּב, and referred to God, the longing would be, as it runs, an unworthy and foolish one—nor: (O that I had one who would hear me …) and had the indictment, which my adversary has written (Ew., Hirz., Schlottm.)—for וספר is too much separated from יִתֵּן מִי by what intervenes—in addition to which comes the consideration that the wish, as it is expressed, cannot be referred to God, but only to the human opponent, whose accusations Job has no occasion to wish to hear, since he has already heard amply sufficient even in detail. Therefore הֵן (instead of הֵן with a conjunctive accent, as otherwise with Makkeph) will point not merely to תָּוִי, but also to liber quem scripsit adversarius meus as now lying before them, and the parenthetical יַעֲנֵנִי שַׁדַּי will express a desire for the divine decision in the cause now formally prepared for trial, ripe for discussion. By תָּוִי, my sign, i.e., my signature (comp. Ezek. 9:4, and Arab. tiwa, a branded sign in the form of a cross), Job intends the last word to his defence which he has just spoken, Job 31; it is related to all his former confessions as a confirmatory mark set below them; it is his ultimatum, as it were, the letter and seal to all that he has hitherto said about his innocence in opposition to the friends and God. Moreover, he also has the indictment of the triumvirate which has come forward as his opponent in his hands. Their so frequently repeated verbal accusations are fixed as if written; both—their accusation and his defence—lie before him, as it were, in the documentary form of legal writings. Thus, then, he wishes an observant impartial hearer for this his defence; or more exactly: he wishes that the Almighty may answer, i.e., decide. Hahn interprets just as much according to the syntax, but understanding by תוי the witness which Job carries in his breast, and by וגו׳ ספר the testimony to his innocence written by God in his own consciousness; which is inadmissible, because, as we have often remarked already, ריבי איש (comp. Job 16:21) cannot be God himself.

In v. 36 Job now says how he will appear before Him with this indictment of his opponent, if God will only condescend to speak the decisive word. He will wear it upon his shoulder as a mark of his dignity (comp. Isa. 22:22, 9:5), and wind it about him as a magnificent crown of diadems intertwined and heaped up one above another (Apoc. 19:12, comp. Köhler on Zech. 6:11)—confident of his victory at the outset; for he will give Him, the heart-searcher, an account of all his steps, and in the exalted consciousness of his innocence, he will approach Him as a prince (קָרֵב intensive of Kal). How totally different from Adam, who was obliged to be drawn out of his hiding-place, and tremblingly, because conscious of guilt, underwent the examination of the omniscient God! Job is not conscious of cowardly and slyly hidden sins; no

secret accursed thing is cherished in the inmost recesses of his heart and home.

38 If my field cry out against me,

And all together its furrows weep;

39 If I have devoured its strength without payment,

And caused the soul of its possessor to expire:

40 May thistles spring up instead of wheat,

And darnel instead of barley.

Job 31:38–40. The field which he tills has no reason to cry out on account of violent treatment, nor its furrows to weep over wrong done to them by their lord.284 אֲדָמָה, according to its radical signification, is the covering of earth which fits close upon the body of the earth as its skin, and is drawn flat over it, and therefore especially the arable land; תֶּלֶם (Arab. telem, not however directly referable to an Arab. root, but as also other words used in agriculture, probably borrowed from the North Semitic, first of all the Aramaic or Nabataic), according to the explanation of the Turkish Kamus, the "ditch-like crack which the iron of the ploughman tears in the field," not the ridge thrown up between every two furrows (vid., on Ps. 65:11). He has not unlawfully used (which would be the reason of the crying and weeping) the usufruct of the field (כֹּחַ meton., as Gen. 4:12, of the produce, proportioned to its capability of production) without having paid its value, by causing the life to expire from the rightful owner, whether slowly or all at once (Jer. 15:9). The wish in v. 40 is still stronger than in vv. 8, 12: there the loss and rooting out of the produce of the field is desired, here the change of the nature of the land itself; the curse shall and must come upon it, if its present possessor has been guilty of the sin of unmerciful covetousness, which Eliphaz lays to his charge in Job 22:6–9.

According to the view of the Capuchin Bolducius (1637), this last strophe, vv. 38–40, stood originally after v. 8, according to Kennicott and Eichhorn after v. 25, according to Stuhlmann after v. 34. The modern expositors retain it in its present position. Hirzel maintains the counter arguments: (1) that none of the texts preserved to us favour the change of position; (2) that it lay in the plan of the poet not to allow the speeches of Job to be rounded off, as would be the case by vv. 35–37 being the concluding strophe, but to break off suddenly without a rhetorical conclusion. If now we imagine the speeches of Elihu as removed, God interrupts Job, and he must cease without having come to an end with what he had to say. But these counter arguments are an insufficient defence: for (1) there is a number of admitted misplacements in the Old Testament which exceed the Masora (e.g., 1 Sam. 13:1, Jer. 27:1), and also the LXX (e.g., 1 Sam. 17:12, באנשׁים, LXX ἐν ἀνδράσιν, instead of בשׁנים); (2) Job's speech would gain a rhetorical conclusion by vv. 38–40, if, as Hirzel in contradiction of himself supposes, vv. 35–37 ought to be considered as a parenthesis, and v. 40 as a grammatical conclusion to the hypothetical clauses from v. 24 onwards. But if this strange view is abandoned, it must be supposed that with v. 38 Job intends to begin the assertion of his innocence anew, and is interrupted in this course of thought now begun, by Jehovah. But it is improbable that one has to imagine this in the mind of such a careful poet. Also the first word of Jehovah, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel with words without knowledge?" Job 38:2, is much more appropriate to follow directly on Job 31:37 than Job 31:40; for a new course of thought, which Jehovah's appearing interrupts, begins with v. 35; and the rash utterance, v. 37, is really a "darkening of the divine decree." For by declaring he will give an account to God, his judge, concerning each of his steps, and approach Him like a prince, Job does not merely express the injustice of the accusations raised by his human opponents, but he casts a reflection of injustice upon the divine decree itself, inasmuch as it appears to him to be a de facto accusation of God.

Nevertheless, whether Elihu's speeches are not be put aside as not forming an original portion of the book, or not, the impression that vv. 38–40 follow as stragglers, and that vv. 35–37

would form a more appropriate close, and a more appropriate connection for the remonstrance that follows, whether it be Jehovah's or Elihu's, remains. For the assertion in vv. 38–40 cannot in itself be considered to be a justifiable boldness; but in vv. 35–37 the whole condition of Job's inner nature is once more mirrored forth: his longing after God, by which Satan's prediction is destroyed; and his overstepping the bounds of humility, on account of which his affliction, so far as it is of a tentative character, cannot end before it is also become a refining fire to him. Therefore we cannot refrain from the supposition that it is with vv. 38–40 just as with Isa. 38:21f. The LXX also found these two verses in this position; they belong, however, after Isa. 38:6, as is clear in itself, and as is evident from 2 Kings 20:7f. There they are accidentally omitted, and are now added at the close of the narration as a supplement. If the change of position, which is there an oversight, is considered as too hazardous here, vv. 35–37 must be put in the special and close relation to the preceding strophe indicated by us in the exposition, and vv. 38–40 must be regarded as a final rounding off (not as the beginning of a fresh course of thought); for instead of the previous aposiopeses, this concluding strophe dies away, and with it the whole confession, in a particularly vigorous, imprecative conclusion.

Let us once more take a review of the contents of the three sharply-defined monologues. After Job, in Job 27–38, has closed the controversy with the friends, in the first part to this trilogy, Job 29, he wishes himself back in the months of the past, and describes the prosperity, the activity, for the good of his fellow-men, and the respect in which he at that time rejoiced, when God was with him. It is to be observed here, how, among all the good things of the past which he longs to have back, Job gives the pre-eminence to the fellowship and blessing of God as the highest good, the spring and fountain of every other. Five times at the beginning of Job 29 in diversified expressions he described the former days as a time when God was with him. Look still further from the beginning of the monologue to its close, to the likewise very expressive ינחם אבלים כאשׁר. The activity which won every heart to Job, and toward which he now looks back so longingly, consisted of works of that charity which weeps with them that weep, and rejoices not in injustice, Job 29:12–17. The righteousness of life with which Job was enamoured, and which manifested itself in him, was therefore charity arising from faith (Liebe aus Glauben). He knew and felt himself to be in fellowship with God; and from the fulness of this state of being apprehended of God, he practised charity. He, however, is blessed who knows himself to be in favour with God, and in return loves his fellow-men, especially the poor and needy, with the love with which he himself is loved of God. Therefore does Job wish himself back in that past, for now God has withdrawn from him; and the prosperity, the power, and the important position which were to him the means for the exercise of his charity, are taken from him.

This contrast of the past and present is described in Job 30, which begins with ועתה. Men who have become completely animalized, rough hordes driven into the mountains, with whom he sympathized, but without being able to help them as he had wished, on account of their degeneracy,—these mock at him by their words and acts. Now scorn and persecution for the sake of God is the greatest honour of which a man can be accounted worthy; but, apart from the consideration that this idea could not yet attain its rightful expression in connection with the present, temporal character of the Old Testament, it was not further from any one than from him who in the midst of his sufferings for God's sake regards himself, as Job does now, as rejected of God. That scorn and his painful and loathesome disease are to him a decree of divine wrath; God has, according to his idea, changed to a tyrant; He will not hear his cry for help. Accordingly, Job can say that his welfare as a cloud is passed away. He is conscious of having had pity on those who needed help, and yet he himself finds no pity now, when he implores pity like one who, seated upon a heap of rubbish, involuntarily

stretches forth his hand for deliverance. In this gloomy picture of the present there is not even a single gleam of light; for the mysterious darkness of his affliction has not been in the slightest degree lighted up for Job by the treatment the friends have adopted. Also he is as little able as the friends to think of suffering and sin as unconnected, for which very reason his affliction appears to him as the effect of divine wrath; and the sting of his affliction is, that he cannot consider this wrath just. From the demand made by his faith, which here and there breaks through his conflict, that God cannot allow him to die the death of a sinner without testifying to his innocence, Job nowhere attains the conscious conclusion that the motive of his affliction is love, and not wrath.

In the third part of the speech (Job 31), which begins with the words, "I had made a covenant," etc., without everywhere going into the detail of the visible conjunction of the thought, Job asserts his earnest struggle after sanctification, by delivering himself up to just divine punishment in case his conduct had been the opposite. The poet allows us to gain a clear insight into that state of his hero's heart, and also of his house, which was well-pleasing to God. Not merely outward adultery, even the adulterous look; not merely the unjust acquisition of property and goods, but even the confidence of the heart in such things; not merely the share in an open adoration of idols, but even the side-glance of the heart after them, is accounted by him as condemnatory. He has not merely guarded himself from using sinful curses against his enemies, but he has also not rejoiced when misfortune overtook them. As to his servants, even when he has had a dispute with any of them, he has not forgotten that master and servant, without distinction of birth, are creatures of one God. Towards orphans, from early youth onwards, he has practised such tender love as if he were their father; towards widows, as if he were their son. With the hungry he has shared his bread, with the naked his clothes; his subordinates had no reason to complain of niggardly sustenance; his house always stood open hospitably to the stranger; and, as the two final strophes affirm: he has not hedged in any secret sin, anxious only not to appear as a sinner openly, and has not drawn forth wailings and tears from the ground which he cultivated by avarice and oppressive injustice. Who does not here recognise a righteousness of life and endeavour, the final aim of which is purity of heart, and which, in its relation to man, flows forth in that love which is the fulfilling of the law? The righteousness of which Job (Job 29:14) says, he has put it on like a garment, and it has put him on, is essentially the same as that which the New Testament Preacher on the mount enjoins. As the work of an Israelitish poet, Job 31 is a most important evidence in favour of the assertion, that a life well-pleasing to God is not, even in the Old Testament, absolutely limited to the Israelitish nation, and that it enjoins a love which includes man as man within itself, and knows of no distinction.

If, now, Job can lay down the triumphant testimony of such a genuine righteousness of life concerning himself, in opposition to men's misconstruction, the contrast of his past and present becomes for the first time mysterious; but we are also standing upon the extreme boundary where the knot that has been tied must be untied. The injustice done to Job in the accusations which the friends bring against him must be laid bare by the appearance of accusation on the part of God, which his affliction casts upon him, being destroyed. With the highest confidence in a triumphant issue, even before the trial of his cause, Job longs, in the concluding words, vv. 35–37, for the judicial decision of God. As a prince he will go before the Judge, and bind his indictment like a costly diadem upon his brow. For he is certain that he has not merited his affliction, that neither human nor divine accusation can do anything against him, and that he will remain conqueror—as over men, so over God Himself.

Thus has the poet, in this threefold monologue of Job, prepared the way for the catastrophe, the unravelment of the knot of the drama. But

will God enter into a controversy respecting His cause with Job? This is contrary to the honour of God; and that Job desires it, is contrary to the lowliness which becomes him towards God. On this very account God will not at once acknowledge Job as His servant: Job will require first of all to be freed from the sinful presumption concerning God with which he has handled the problem of his sufferings. But he has proved himself to be a servant of God, in spite of the folly into which he has fallen; the design of Satan to tear him away from God is completely frustrated. Thus, therefore, after he has purified himself from his sin into which, both in word and thought, he has allowed himself to be drawn by the conflict of temptation, Job must be proved to be the servant of God in opposition to the friends.

But before God Himself appears in order to bring about the unravelment, there follow still four speeches, Job 32–37, of a speaker, for whose appearance the former part of the drama has in no way prepared us. It is also remarkable that they are marked off from the book of Job, as far as we have hitherto read, by the formula אִיּוֹב דִּבְרֵי תַּמּוּ, are ended the words of Job. Carey is of the opinion that these three words may possibly be Job's own closing dixi. According to Hahn, the poet means to imply by them that Job has now said all that he intended to say, so that it would now have been the friends' turn to speak. These views involve a perplexity like that of those who think that Ps. 72:20 must be regarded as a constituent part of the Psalm. As in that position the words, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are finished," are as a memorial-stone between the original collection and its later extensions, so this איוב דברי תמו, which is transferred by the LXX (καὶ ἐπαύσατοἸὼβ ῥήμασιν) to the historical introduction of the Elihu section, seems to be an important hint in reference to the origin of the book of Job in its present form. Since Job has come to an end with his speeches, and is silent at the four speeches of a new speaker, although they strongly enough provoke him to reply; according to the idea of the poet, Elihu's appearance is to be regarded as belonging to the catastrophe itself. And since a hasty glance at the speeches of Jehovah shows that they do not say anything concerning the motive and object of Job's affliction, these speeches of Elihu, in so far as they seem to be an integral part of the whole, as they cast light upon this dark point, will therefore prove in the midst of the action of the drama, what we know already from the prologue, that Job's affliction has not the wrath of God as its motive power, nor the punishment of Job as ungodly for its object. If the four speeches really furnish this, it is still not absolutely decisive in favour of their forming originally a part of the book. For it would be even possible that a second poet might have added a part, in harmony with its idea, to the work of the first. What we expect, moreover, is the mark of the same high poetic genius which we have hitherto regarded with amazement. But since we are now passing on the the exposition of these speeches, it must be with the assumption that they have a like origin with the whole, and that they also really belong to this whole with which they are embodied, in the place where they now stand. We shall only be able to form a conclusive judgment concerning the character of their form, the solution of their problem, and the manner of their composition, after the exposition is completed, by then taking a comprehensive and critical review of the impressions produced, and our observations.

JOB 32

FOURTH PART.—THE UNRAVELMENT

The Speeches of Elihu Which Prepare the Way for the Unravelment.—Ch. 32–37

Historical Introduction to the Section

Job 32–42. A short introduction in historical prose, which introduces the speaker and justifies his appearance, opens the section. It is not, like the prologue and epilogue, accented as prose; but, like the introductions to the speeches and the clause, Job 31:40 extra, is taken up in the network of the poetical mode of accentuation, because a change of the mode of accentuation in the middle of the book, and

especially in a piece of such small compass, appeared awkward. The opposition of the three has exhausted itself, so that in that respect Job seems to have come forth out the controversy as conqueror.

Vv. 1–3. So these three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in his own eyes. And the wrath of Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram, was kindled: against Job was his wrath kindled, because he justified himself at the expense of God. And against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they found no answer, and condemned Job.

Job 32:1–3. The name of the speaker is אֱלִיהוּא (with Mahpach), son of בָּרַכְאֵל (with Munach) the בּוּזִי (with Zarka). The name Elihu signifies "my God is He," and occurs also as an Israelitish name, although it is not specifically Israelitish, like Elijah (my God is Jehovah). Bârach'el (for which the mode of writing בַּרַכְאֵל with Dag. implic. is also found) signifies "may God bless!" (Olsh. § 277, S. 618); for proper names, as the Arabian grammarians observe, can be formed both into the form of assertory clauses (ichbâr), and also into the form of modal (inshâ); the name בָּרכאל is in this respect distinguished from the specifically Israelitish name בָּרֻכְיָה (Jehovah blesseth). The accompanying national name defines the scene; for on the one side בּוּז and עוּץ, according to Gen. 22:21, are the sons of Nahor, Abraham's brother, who removed with him (though not at the same time) from Ur Casdim to Haran, therefore by family Aramaeans; on the other side, בּוּז, Jer. 25:23, appears as an Arab race, belonging to the פֵּאָה קְצוּצֵי (comp. Jer. 9:25, 49:32), i.e., to the Arabs proper, who cut the hair of their heads short all round (περιτρόχαλα, Herodotus iii. 8), because wearing it long was accounted as disgraceful (vid., Tebrîzi in the Hamâsa, p. 459, l. 10ff.). Within the Buzite race, Elihu sprang from the family of רָם. Since רם is the name of the family, not the race, it cannot be equivalent to אֲרָם (like רַמִּים, 2 Chron. 22:5, = ארמים), and it is therefore useless to derive the Aramaic colouring of Elihu's speeches from design on the part of the poet. But by making him a Buzite, he certainly appears to make him an Aramaean Arab, as Aristeas in Euseb. praep. ix. 25 calls him Ἐλιοῦν τὸν Βαραχιὴλ τὸν Ζωβίτην (from צובה ארם). It is remarkable that Elihu's origin is given so exactly, while the three are described only according to their country, without any statement of father or family. It would indeed be possible, as Lightfoot and Rosenm. suppose, for the poet to conceal his own name in that of Elihu, or to make allusion to it; but an instance of this later custom of Oriental poets is found nowhere else in Old Testament literature.

The three friends are silenced, because all their attempts to move Job to a penitent confession that his affliction is the punishment of his sins, have rebounded against this fact, that he was righteous in his own eyes, i.e., that he imagined himself righteous; and because they now (שָׁבַת of persons, in distinction from חדל, has the secondary notion of involuntariness) know of nothing more to say. Then Elihu's indignation breaks forth in two directions. First, concerning Job, that he justified himself מֵאֱלֹהִים, i.e., not a Deo (so that He would be obliged to account him righteous, as Job 4:17), but prae Deo. Elihu rightly does not find it censurable in Job, that as a more commonly self-righteous man he in general does not consider himself a sinner, which the three insinuate of him (Job 15:14, 25:4), but that, declaring himself to be righteous, he brings upon God the appearance of injustice, or, as Jehovah also says further on, Job 40:8, that he condemns God in order that he may be able to maintain his own righteousness. Secondly, concerning the three, that they have found no answer by which they might have been able to disarm Job in his maintenance of his own righteousness at the expense of the divine justice, and that in consequence of this they have condemned Job. Hahn translates: so that they should have represented Job as guilty; but that they have not succeeded in stamping the servant of God as a רשׁע, would wrongly excite Elihu's displeasure. And Ewald translates: and that they had nevertheless condemned him (§ 345, a); but even this was not the real main defect of their opposition. The

fut. consec. describes the condemnation as the result of their inability to hit upon the right answer; it was a miserable expedient to which they had recourse. According to the Jewish view, אֶת־אִיּוֹב וַיַּרְשִׁיעוּ is one of the eighteen תקוני סופרי (correctiones scribarum), since it should be את־האלהים וירשיעו. But it is not the friends who have been guilty of this sin of הַרְשִׁיעַ against God, but Job, Job 40:8, to whom Elihu opposes the sentence לא־ירשיע אל, Job 34:12. Our judgment of another such tiqqûn, Job 7:20, was more favourable. That Elihu, notwithstanding the inward conviction to the contrary by which he is followed during the course of the controversial dialogue, now speaks for the first time, is explained by what follows.

Vv. 4–6. And Elihu had waited for Job with words, for they were older than he in days. And Elihu saw that there was no answer in the mouth of the three men, then his wrath was kindled. And Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite began, and said.

Job 32:4–6. He had waited (perf. in the sense of the plusquamperf., Ew. § 135, a) for Job with words (בִּדְבָרִים as elsewhere בְּמִלִּין), i.e., until Job should have spoken his last word in the controversial dialogue. Thus he considered it becoming on his part, for they (הֵמָּה, illi, whereas אֵלֶּה according to the usage of the language is hi) were older (seniores) than he in days (לְיָמִים as v. 6, less harsh here, instead of the acc. of closer definition, Job 15:10, comp. 11:9). As it now became manifest that the friends made no reply to Job's last speeches for want of the right solution of problem, and therefore also Job had nothing further to say, he believes that he may venture, without any seeming want of courtesy, to give utterance to his long-restrained indignation; and Elihu (with Mahpach) the son of Barach'el (Mercha) the Buzite (with Rebia parvum) began and spoke (וַיֹּאמַר not with Silluk, but Mercha mahpach., and in fact with Mercha on the accented penult., as Job 3:2, and further).

Elihu's First Speech.—Ch. 32:6b–33

Schema: 5. 6. 10. 6. 10. | 6. 8. 10. 13. 8. 6. 10. 10.

6b I am young in days, and ye are hoary,

Therefore I stood back and was afraid

To show you my knowledge.

7 I thought: Let age speak,

And the multitude of years teach wisdom.

Job 32:6–7. It becomes manifest even here that the Elihu section has in part a peculiar usage of the language. זָחַל in the signification of Arab. zḥl, cogn. with Arab. dḥl, דָּחַל, to frighten back;285 and עַע for דַּעַת (here and vv. 10, 17, Job 36:3, 37:16) occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament; עַל־כֵּן (comp. לָכֵן, Job 42:3) is used only by Elihu within the book of Job. יָמִים, days = fulness of days, is equivalent to advanced age, old age with its rich experience. רַב with its plural genitive is followed (as כֹּל usually is) by the predicate in the plur.; it is the attraction already described by מספר, Job 15:10, 21:21, Ges. § 148, 1.

8 Still the spirit, it is in mortal man,

And the breath of the Almighty, that giveth them understanding.

9 Not the great in years are wise,

And the aged do not understand what is right.

10 Therefore I say: O hearken to me,

I will declare my knowledge, even I.

Job 32:8–10. The originally affirmative and then (like אוּלָם) adversative אָכֵן also does not occur elsewhere in the book of Job. In contradiction to biblical psychology, Rosenm. and others take v. 8 as antithetical: Certainly there is spirit in man, but … The two halves of the verse are, on the contrary, a synonymous ("the spirit, it is in man, viz., that is and acts") or progressive parallelism) thus according to the accents: "the spirit, even that which is in man, and …"). It is the Spirit of God to which man owes his life as a living being, according to Job 33:4; the spirit of man is the principle of life creatively wrought, and indeed breathed into him, by the Spirit of God; so that with regard to the author it can be just as much God's רוּחַ or נְשָׁמָה, Job 34:14, as in respect of the possessor: man's רוח or נשמה. All man's life, his thinking as well as his bodily life, is effected by this

inwrought principle of life which he bears within him, and all true understanding, without being confined to any special age of life, comes solely from this divinely originated and divinely living spirit, so far as he acts according to his divine origin and basis of life. רַבִּים are here (as the opposite of צעירים, Gen. 25:23) grandes = grandaevi (LXX πολυχρόνιοι). לֹא governs both members of the verse, as Job 3:10, 28:17, 30:24f. Understanding or ability to form a judgment is not limited to old age, but only by our allowing the πνεῦμα to rule in us in its connection with the divine. Elihu begs a favourable hearing for that of which he is conscious. דַּעַ, and the Hebr.-Aramaic חָוָה, which likewise belong to his favourite words, recur here.

11 Behold, I waited upon your words,
Hearkened to your perceptions,
While ye searched out replies.
12 And I attended closely to you,
Yet behold: there was no one who refuted Job,
Who answered his sentences, from you.
13 Lest ye should say: "We found wisdom,
God is able to smite him, not man!"
14 Now he hath not arranged his words against me,
And with your sentences I will not reply to him.

Job 32:11–14. He has waited for their words, viz., that they might give utterance to such words as should tend to refute and silence Job. In what follows, עַד still more emphatically than לְ refers this aim to that to which Elihu had paid great attention: I hearkened to your understandings, i.e., explanations of the matter, that, or whether, they came forth, (I hearkened) to see if you searched or found out words, i.e., appropriate words. Such abbreviated forms as אָזְין = אַאֲזִין (comp. מֵיזִין = מַיְזִין for מַאֲזִין, Prov. 17:4, Ges. § 68, rem. 1, if it does not signify nutriens, from זוּן) we shall frequently meet with in this Elihu section. In v. 12, 12a evidently is related as an antecedent to what follows: and I paid attention to you (עָדֵיכֶם contrary to the analogy of the cognate praep. instead of עֲדֵיכֶם, moreover for אֲלֵיכֶם, with the accompanying notion: intently, or, according to Aben-Duran: thoroughly, without allowing a word to escape me), and behold, intently as I paid attention: no one came forward to refute Job; there was no one from or among you who answered (met successfully) his assertions. Every unbiassed reader will have an impression of the remarkable expressions and constructions here, similar to that which one has in passing from the book of the Kings to the characteristic sections of the Chronicles. The three, Elihu goes on to say, shall not indeed think that in Job a wisdom has opposed them—a false wisdom, indeed—which only God and not any man can drive out of the field (נָדַף, Arab. ndf, discutere, dispellere, as the wind drives away chaff or dry leaves); while he has not, however (וְלֹא followed directly by a v. fin. forming a subordinate clause, as Job 42:3, Ps. 44:18, and freq., Ew. § 341, a), arrayed (עָרַךְ in a military sense, Job 33:5; or forensic, 23:4; or even as Job 37:19, in the general sense of proponere) words against him (Elihu), i.e., utterances before which he would be compelled to confess himself affected and overcome. He will not then also answer him with such opinions as those so frequently repeated by them, i.e., he will take a totally different course from theirs in order to refute him.

15 They are amazed, they answer no more,
Words have fled from them.
16 And I waited, for they spake not,
For they stand still, they answer no more.
17 Therefore I also will answer for my part,
I will declare my knowledge, even I.

Job 32:15–17. In order to give a more rapid movement and an emotional force to the speech, the figure asyndeton is introduced in v. 15, as perhaps in Jer. 15:7, Ew. § 349, a. Most expositors render הֶעְתִּיקוּ passively, according to the sense: they have removed from them, i.e., are removed from them; but why may העתיק not signify, like Gen. 12:8, 26:22, to move away, viz.,

the tent = to wander on (Schlottm.)? The figure: words are moved away (as it were according to an encampment broken up) from them, i.e., as we say: they have left them, is quite in accordance with the figurative style of this section. It is unnecessary to take וְהוֹחַלְתִּי, v. 16a, with Ew. (§ 342, c)2 and Hirz. as perf. consec. and interrogative: and should I wait, because they speak no more? Certainly the interrog. part. sometimes disappears after the Waw of consequence, e.g., Ezek. 18:13, 24 (and will he live?); but by what would והוחלתי be distinguished as perf. consec. here? Hahn's interpretation: I have waited, until they do not speak, for they stand …, also does not commend itself; the poet would have expressed this by עד ידברו לא, while the two כי, especially with the poet's predilection for repetition, appear to be co-ordinate. Elihu means to say that he has waited a long time, surprised that the three did not speak further, and that they stand still without speaking again. Therefore he thinks the time is come for him also to answer Job. אַעֲנָה cannot be fut. Kal, since where the 1 fut. Kal and Hiph. cannot be distinguished by the vowel within the word (as in the Ayin Awa and double Ayin verbs), the former has an inalienable Segol; it is therefore 1 fut. Hiph., but not as in Eccl. 5:19 in the signification to employ labour upon anything (LXX περισπᾶν), but in an intensive Kal signification (as הֶזְעִיק for זָעַק, Job 35:9, comp. on Job 31:18): to answer, to give any one an answer when called upon. Ewald's supposedly proverbial: I also plough my field! (§ 192, c, Anm. 2) does unnecessary violence to the usage of the language, which is unacquainted with this הֶעֱנָה, to plough. It is perfectly consistent with Elihu's diction, that חֶלְקִי beside אֲנִי as permutative signifies, "I, my part," although it might also be an acc. of closer definition (as pro parte mea, for my part), or even—which is, however, less probable—acc. of the obj. (my part). Elihu speaks more in the scholastic tone of controversy than the three.

18 For I am full of words,

The spirit of my inner nature constraineth me.

19 Behold, my interior is like wine which is not opened,

Like new bottles it is ready to burst.

20 I will speak, that I may gain air,

I will open my lips and reply.

21 No, indeed, I will accept no man's person,

And I will flatter no man.

22 For I understand not how to flatter;

My Maker would easily snatch me away.

Job 32:18–22. The young speaker continues still further his declaration, promising so much. He has a rich store of מִלִּים, words, i.e., for replying. מָלֵתִי defective for מָלֵאתִי, like יָצָתִי for יָצָאתִי, Job 1:21; whereas מָלוּ, Ezek. 28:6, is not only written defectively, but is also conjugated after the manner of a Lamed He verb, Ges. § § 23, 3, 74, rem. 4, 75, 21, c. The spirit of his inner nature constrains him, since, on account of its intensity and the fulness of this interior, it struggles to break through as through a space that is too narrow for it. בֶּטֶן, as Job 15:2, 35, not from the curved appearance of the belly, but from the interior of the body with its organs, which serve the spirit life as the strings of a harp; comp. Arab. batn, the middle or interior; bâtin, inwardly (opposite of zâhir, outwardly). His interior is like wine יִפָּתֵחַ לֹא, which, or (as an adverbial dependent clause) when it is not opened, i.e., is kept closed, so that the accumulated gas has no vent, LXX δεδεμένος (bound up), Jer. absque spiraculo; it will burst like new bottles. יִבָּקֵעַ is not a relative clause referring distributively to each single one of these bottles (Hirz. and others), and not an adverbial subordinate clause (Hahn: when it will explode), but predicate to בִּטְנִי: his interior is near bursting like new bottles (אֹבוֹת masc. like נֹאדוֹת, Josh. 9:13), i.e., not such as are themselves new (ἀσκοὶ καινοί, Matt. 9:17, for these do not burst so easily), but like bottles of new wine, which has to undergo the action of fermentation, LXX ὥσπερ φυσητὴρ (Cod. Sinait.1 φυσητής) χαλκέως, i.e., חרשׁים whence it is evident that a bottle and also a pair of bellows were called אוֹב). Since he will now yield to his irresistible impulse, in order that he may

obtain air or free space, i.e., disburdening and ease (לִי וְיִרְוַח), he intends to accept no man's person, i.e., to show partiality to no one (vid., on Job 13:8), and he will flatter no one. כִּנָּה signifies in all three dialects to call any one by an honourable name, to give a surname, here with אֶל, to speak fine words to any one, to flatter him. This Elihu is determined he will not do; for אֲכַנֶּה יָדַעְתִּי לֹא, I know not how to flatter (French, je ne sais point flatter), for כַּנּוֹת or לְכַנּוֹת; comp. the similar constructions, Job 23:3 (as Esth. 8:6), 10:16, 1 Sam. 2:3, Isa. 42:21, 51:1, Ges. 142, 3, c; also in Arabic similar verbs, as "to be able" and "to prepare one's self," are thus connected with the fut. without a particle between (e.g., anshaa jef'alu, he began to act). Without partiality he will speak, flattery is not his force. If by flattery he should deny the truth, his Maker would quickly carry him off. כִּמְעַט followed by subjunct. fut.: for a little (with disjunctive accent, because equivalent to haud multum abest quin), i.e., very soon indeed, or easily would or might …; יִשָּׂאֵנִי (as Job 27:21) seems designedly to harmonize with עֹשֵׂנִי.

JOB 33

33:1 But nevertheless, O Job, hear my speeches,

And hearken to all my words.

2 Behold now, I have opened my mouth,

My tongue speaketh in my palate.

3 Sincere as my heart are my utterances,

And knowledge that is pure my lips declare.

Job 33:1–3. The issue of the impartial discussion which Elihu designs to effect, is subject to this one condition, that Job listens to it, and observes not merely this or that, but the whole of its connected contents; and in this sense וְאוּלָם, which is used just as in Job 1:11, 11:5, 12:7, 13:4, 14:18, 17:10, in the signification verumtamen, stands at the head of this new turn in his speech. Elihu addresses Job, as none of the previous speakers have done, by name. With הִנֵּה־נָא (as Job 13:18), he directs Job's observation to that which he is about to say: he has already opened his mouth, his tongue is already in motion,—circumstantial statement, which solemnly inaugurate what follows with a consciousness of its importance. Job has felt the absence of אִמְרֵי־שֶׁר, Job 6:25, in the speeches of the three; but Elihu can at the outset ensure his word being "the sincerity of his heart," i.e., altogether heartily well meant: and—thus it would be to be translated according to the accentuation—the knowledge of my lips, they (my lips) utter purely. But "the knowledge of the lips" is a notion that seems strange with this translation, and בָּרוּר is hardly intended thus adverbially. דַּעַת, contrary to the accentuation, is either taken as the accusative of the obj., and בָּרוּר as the acc. of the predicate (masc. as Prov. 2:10, 14:6): knowledge my lips utter pure; or interpreted, if one is not willing to depart from the accentuation, with Seb. Schmid: scientiam labiorum meorum quod attinet (the knowledge proceeding from my lips), puram loquentur sc. labia mea. The notions of purity and choice coincide in ברור (comp. Arab. ibtarra, to separate one's self; asfa, to prove one's self pure, and to select). The perff., vv. 2f., describe what is begun, and so, as relatively past, extending into the present.

4 The Spirit of God hath made me,

And the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.

5 If thou canst, answer me,

Prepare in my presence, take thy stand!

6 Behold, I am like thyself, of God,

Formed out of clay am I also.

7 Behold, my terror shall not affright thee,

And my pressure shall not be heavy upon thee.

Job 33:4–7. He has both in common with Job: the spirituality as well as the earthliness of man's nature; but by virtue of the former he does not, indeed, feel himself exalted above Job's person, but above the present standpoint taken up by Job; and in consideration of this, Job need not fear any unequal contest, nor as before God, Job 9:34, 13:21, in order that he may be able to defend himself against Him, make it a stipulation that His majesty may not terrify him. It is man's twofold origin which

Elihu, vv. 4, 6, gives utterance to in harmony with Gen. 2:7: the mode of man's origin, which is exalted above that of all other earthly beings that have life; for the life of the animal is only the individualizing of the breath of the Divine Spirit already existing in matter. The spirit of man, on the contrary (for which the language has reserved the name נְשָׁמָה), is an inspiration directly coming forth from God the personal being, transferred into the bodily frame, and therefore forming a person.286 In the exalted consciousness of having been originated by the Spirit of God, and being endowed with life from the inbreathed breath of the Almighty, Elihu stands invincible before Job: if thou canst, refute me (הֵשִׁיב with acc. of the person, as Job 33:32); array thyself (עֶרְכָה for עִרְכָה, according to Ges. 63, rem. 1) before me (here with the additional thought of מִלְחָמָה, as Job 23:4, in a forensic sense with מִשְׁפָּט), place thyself in position, or take thy post (imper. Hithpa. with the ah less frequent by longer forms, Ew. § 228, a).

On the other side, he also, like Job, belongs to God, i.e., is dependent and conditioned. הֵן־אֲנִי is to be written with Segol (not Ssere); לָאֵל is intended like לוֹ, Job 12:16; and פִּיךָ signifies properly, according to thine utterance, i.e., standard, in accordance with, i.e., like thee, and is used even in the Pentateuch (e.g., Ex. 16:21) in this sense pro ratione; כפי, Job 30:18, we took differently. He, Elihu, is also nipped from the clay, i.e., taken from the earth, as when the potter nips off a piece of his clay (comp. Aram. קְרַץ, a piece, Arab. qurs, a bread-cake, or a dung-cake, vid., supra, p. 449, from qarasa, to pinch off, take off, cogn. qarada, to gnaw off, cut off, p. 512). Thus, therefore, no terribleness in his appearing will disconcert Job, and his pressure will not be a burden upon him. By a comparison of Job 13:21a, it might seem that אַכַּפִּי is equivalent to כַּפִּי (LXX ἡ χείρ μου), but כָּבֵד is everywhere connected only with יָד, never with כַּף; and the ἀπ. γεγρ. is explained according to Prov. 16:26, where אָכַף signifies to oppress, drive (Jer. compulit), and from the dialects differently, for in Syr. ecaf signifies to be anxious about anything (ecaf li, it causes me anxiety, curae mihi est), and in Arab. accafa, to saddle, ucâf, Talmud. אוּכָף, a saddle, so that consequently the Targ. translation of אַכַּפִּי by טוּנִי, my burden, and the Syr. by אוכפני, my pressing forward (Arabic version iqbâli, my touch), are supported, since אֶכֶף signifies pressure, heavy weight, load, and burden; according to which it is also translated by Saad. (my constraint), Gecat. (my might). It is therefore not an opponent who is not on an equality with him by nature, with whom Job has to do. If he is not able to answer him, he will have to be considered as beaten.

8 Verily thou hast said in mine ears,
And I heard the sound of thy words:
9 "I am pure, without transgression;
"Spotless am I, and I have no guilt.
10 "Behold, He findeth malicious things against me,
"He regardeth me as His enemy;
11 "He putteth my feet in the stocks,
"He observeth all my paths."
12 Behold, therein thou art not right, I will answer thee,
For Eloah is too exalted for man.

Job 33:8–12. With אָמַרְתָּ אַךְ Elihu establishes the undeniable fact, whether it be that אַךְ is intended as restrictive (only thou hast said, it is not otherwise than that thou …), or as we have translated, according to its primary meaning, affirmative (forsooth, it is undeniable). To say anything בְּאָזְנָי of another is in Hebrew equivalent to not saying it secretly, and so as to be liable to misconstruction, but aloud and distinctly. In v. 9, Elihu falls back on Job's own utterances, as Job 9:21, אני תם; 16:17, זכה תפלתי; 12:4, where he calls himself תמים צדיק, comp. 10:7, 13:18, 23, 23:10ff., 27:5f., Job 29, 31. The expression חַף, tersus, did not occur in the mouth of Job; Geiger connects חף with the Arab. hanîf (vid., on Job 13:15); it is, however, the adj. of the Semitic verb חַף, Arab. ḥff, to rub off, scrape off; Arab. to make smooth by scraping off the hair; Targ., Talm., Syr., to make smooth by washing and rubbing (after which Targ. שְׁזִיג,

lotus).287 אָנֹכִי has here, as an exception, retained its accentuation of the final syllable in pause. In v. 10 Elihu also makes use of a word that does not occur in Job's mouth, viz., נוּאוֹתִי, which, according to Num. 14:34, signifies "alienation," from נוּא (הֵנִיא), to hinder, restrain, turn aside, abalienare, Num. 32:7; and according to the Arab. na'a (to rise heavily),288 III to lean one's self upon, to oppose any one; it might also signify directly, "hostile risings;" but according to the Hebr. it signifies grounds and occasions for hostile aversion. Moreover, Elihu here recapitulates what Job has in reality often in meaning said, e.g., Job 10:13–17; and v. 10b are his own words, Job 13:24, לְךָ לְאוֹיֵב וּתְחַשְּׁבֵנִי; 19:11, כִּצְרִיו לוֹ וַיְחַשְּׁבֵנִי; 30:21, לִי לְאַכְזָר תִּהְפָּךְ. In like manner, v. 11 is a verbatim quotation from Job 13:27; יָשֵׂם is poetic contracted fut. for יְשִׂים. It is a principal trait of Job's speeches which Elihu here makes prominent: his maintenance of his own righteousness at the expense of the divine justice. In v. 12 he first of all refutes this צַשֵּׁק מֵאֱלֹהִים נַפְשׁוֹ in general. The verb צָדַק does not here signify to be righteous, but to be in the right (as Job 11:2, 13:18)—the prevailing signification in Arabic (sadaqa, to speak the truth, be truthful). זֹאת (with Munach, not Dechî) is acc. adv.: herein, in this case, comp. on Job 19:26. מִן הָרָב is like Deut. 14:24 (of the length of the way exceeding any one's strength), but used, as nowhere else, of God's superhuman greatness; the Arabic version has the preposition Arab. 'an in this instance for מִן. God is too exalted to enter into a defence of Himself against such vainglorying interwoven with accusations against Him. And for this reason Elihu will enter the lists for God.

13 Why hast thou contended against Him,
That He answereth not concerning all His doings?
14 Yet no—in one way God speaketh,
And in two, only one perceiveth it not.
15 In the dream, in a vision of the night,
When deep sleep falleth upon men,
In slumberings upon the bed:
16 Then He openeth the ear of men,
And sealeth admonition for them,
17 That He may withdraw man from mischief,
And hide pride from man;
18 That He may keep back his soul from the pit,
And his life from the overthrow of the sword.

Job 33:13–18. Knowing himself to be righteous, and still considering himself treated as an enemy by God, Job has frequently inquired of God, Why then does He treat him thus with enmity, Job 7:20, and why has He brought him into being to be the mark of His attack? Job 10:18. He has longed for God's answer to these questions; and because God has veiled Himself in silence, he has fallen into complain against Him, as a ruler who governs according to His own sovereign arbitrary will. This is what Elihu has before his mind in v. 13. רִיב (elsewhere in the book of Job with עִם or the acc. of the person with whom one contends) is here, as Jer. 12:1 and freq., joined with אֶל and conjugated as a contracted Hiph. (רִיבוֹתָ instead of רַבְתָּ, Ges. § 73, 1); and עָנָה with the acc. signifies here: to answer anything (comp. Job 32:12, 40:2, and especially 9:3); the suff. does not refer back to אֱנוֹשׁ of the preceding strophe (Hirz., Hahn), but to God. דְּבָרָיו are the things, i.e., facts and circumstances of His rule; all those things which are mysterious in it He answers not, i.e., He answers concerning nothing in this respect (comp. לֹא כֹל, Job 34:27), He gives no kind of account of them (Schnurr., Ges., and others). כִּי, v. 14a, in the sense of imo, is attached to this negative thought, which has become a ground of contention for Job: yet no, God does really speak with men, although not as Job desires when challenged and in His own defence. Many expositors take בְּאַחַת and בִּשְׁתַּיִם after LXX, Syr., and Jer., in the signification semel, secundo (thus also Hahn, Schlottm.); but semel is אַחַת, whereas באחת is nowhere equivalent to אחת בפעם, for in Num. 10:4 it signifies with one, viz., trumpet; Prov. 28:18, on one, viz., of the many ways; Jer. 10:8, in one, i.e., in like folly (not: altogether, at once, which כְּאֶחָד, Syr. bachdo, signifies); then further on it is not

twice, but two different modes or means of divine attestation, viz., dreams and sicknesses, that are spoken of; wherefore it is rightly translated by the Targ. una loquela, by Pagn. uno modo, by Vatabl., Merc., una via. The form of the declaration: by one—by two, is that of the so-called number-proverbs, like Job 5:19. In diverse ways or by different means God speaks to mortal man—he does not believe it, it is his own fault if he does perceive it. יְשׁוּרֶנָּה לֹא, which is correctly denoted as a separate clause by Rebia mugrasch, is neither with Schlottm. to be regarded as a circumstantial clause (without one's …), nor with Vatablus and Hahn as a conditional clause (if one does not attend to it), nor with Montanus and Piscator as a relative clause (to him who does not observe it), but with Tremellius as a co-ordinate second predicative clause without a particle (one might expect אֲשֶׁר): he (mortal man) or one observes it not (שׁוּר with neut. suff. exactly like Job 35:13).

Vv. 15ff. Elihu now describes the first mode in which God speaks to man: He Himself comes forward as a witness in man's sleep, He makes use of dreams or dream-like visions, which come upon one suddenly within the realm of nocturnal thought (vid., Psychol. S. 282f.), as a medium of revelation—a usual form of divine revelation, especially in the heathen world, to which positive revelation is wanting. The reading בְּחֶזְיוֹן (Codd., LXX, Syr., Symm., Jer.), as also the accentuation of the בחלום with Mehupach Legarme, proceeds from the correct assumption, that vision of the night and dream are not coincident notions; moreover, the detailing v. 15, is formed according to Job 4:13. In this condition of deep or half sleep, revelat aurem hominum, a phrase used of the preparation of the ear for the purpose of hearing by the removal of hindrances, and, in general, of confidential communication, therefore: He opens the ear of men, and seals their admonition, i.e., the admonition that is wholesome and necessary for them. Elihu uses בְּ חָתַם here and Job 37:7 as בְּעַד חָתַם is used in Job 9:7: to seal anything (to seal up), comp. Arab. ḥîm, σφραγίζειν, in the sense of infallible attestation and confirmation (John 6:27), especially (with Arab. b) of divine revelation or inspiration, distinct in meaning from Arab. chtm, σφραγίζειν, in the proper sense. Elihu means that by such dreams and visions, as rare overpowering facts not to be forgotten, God puts the seal upon the warning directed to them which, sent forth in any other way, would make no such impression. Most ancient versions (also Luther) translate as though it were יְחִתֵּם (LXX ἐξεφόβησεν αὐτούς). מֹסָר is a secondary form to מוּסָר, Job 36:10, which occurs only here. Next comes the fuller statement of the object of the admonition or warning delivered in such an impressive manner. According to the text before us, it is to be explained: in order that man may remove (put from himself) mischief from himself (Ges. § 133, 3); but this inconvenient change of subject is avoided, if we supply a מ to the second, and read ממעשׂה אדם, as LXX ἀποστρέψαι ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ (which does not necessarily presuppose the reading ממעשׂהו), Targ. ab opere malo; Jer. not so good; ab his quae fecit. מַעֲשֶׂה signifies facinus, an evil deed, as 1 Sam. 20:19, and פֹּעַל, Job 36:9, evil-doing. The infin. constr. now passes into the v. fin., which would be very liable to misconstruction with different subjects: and in order that He (God) may conceal arrogance from man, i.e., altogether remove from him, unaccustom him to, render him weary of. the sin of pride (גֵּוֶה from גְּוֶה = גָּאָה, as Job 22:29, according to Ges., Ew., Olsh., for גַּאֲוָה = גְּאֲוָה). Here everything in thought and expression is peculiar. Also חַיָּה, v. 18b (as vv. 22, 28), for חַיִּים (v. 30) does not occur elsewhere in the book of Job, and the phrase עָבַר בַּשֶּׁלַח here and Job 36:12 (comp. בַּשֶּׁלַח עָבַר, v. 28) nowhere else in the Old Testament. שֶׁלַח (Arab. silâh, a weapon of offence, opp. metâ', a weapon of defence) is the engine for shooting, from שָׁלַח, emmittere, to shoot; and בשׁלח עבר is equivalent to השׁלח בעד נפל, Joel 2:8, to pass away by (precipitate one's self into) the weapon for shooting. To deliver man from sin, viz., sins of carnal security and imaginary self-importance, and at the same time from an early death, whether natural or violent, this is the disciplinary design which God has in view in

connection with this first mode of speaking to him; but there is also a second mode.

19 He is chastened also with pain upon his bed,
And with the unceasing conflict of his limbs;
20 And his life causeth him to loathe bread,
And his soul dainty meat.
21 His flesh consumeth away to uncomeliness,
And his deranged limbs are scarcely to be seen.
22 Then his soul draweth near to the grave,
And his life to the destroyers.

Job 33:19–22. Another and severer lesson which God teaches man is by painful sickness: he is chastened with pain (בְּ of the means) on his bed, he and the vigorous number of his limbs, i.e., he with this hitherto vigorous (Raschi), or: while the multitude of his limbs is still vigorous (Ew). Thus is the Keri וְרֹב to be understood, for the interpretation: and the multitude of his limbs with unceasing pain (Arnh. after Aben-Ezra), is unnatural. But the Chethib is far more commendable: and with a constant tumult of his limbs (Hirz. and others). V. 19b might also be taken as a substantival clause: and the tumult of his limbs is unceasing (Umbr., Welte); but that taking over of בְּ from במכאוב is simpler and more pleasing. רִיב (opposite of שָׁלוֹם, e.g., Ps. 38:4) is an excellent description of disease which consists in a disturbance of the equilibrium of the powers, in the dissolution of their harmony, in the excitement of one against another (Psychol. S. 287). אֶתָּן for אֵיתָן belongs to the many defective forms of writing of this section. In v. 20 we again meet a Hebraeo-Arabic hapaxlegomenon. זְהֵם from זָהַם. In Arab. zahuma signifies to stink, like the Aram. זְהַם (whence זוּהַם, dirt and stench), zahama to thrust back, restrain, after which Abu Suleiman Daûd Alfâsi, in his Arabic Lexicon of the Hebrew, interprets: "his soul thrusts back (נפסה תזהם) food and every means of life,"289 beside which the suff. of וְזַהֲמָתוֹ is taken as an anticipation of the following object (vid., on Job 29:3): his life feels disgust at it, at bread, and his soul at dainty meat. The Piel has then only the intensive signification of Kal (synon. תִּעֵב, Ps. 107:18), according to which it is translated by Hahn with many before him. But if the poet had wished to be so understood, he would have made use of a less ambiguous arrangement of the words, חיתו לחם וזהמתו. We take זְהֵם with Ew. § 122, b, as causative of Kal, in which signification the Piel, it is true, occurs but rarely, yet it does sometimes, instead of Hiph.; but without translating, with Hirz., חיה by hunger and נפשׁ by appetite, which gives a confused thought. Schlottm. appropriately remarks: "It is very clearly expressed, as the proper vital power, the proper ψυχή, when it is inwardly consumed by disease, gives one a loathing for that which it otherwise likes as being a necessary condition of its own existence." Thus it is: health produces an appetite, sickness causes nausea; the soul that is in an uninjured normal state longs for food, that which is severely weakened by sickness turns the desire for dainties into loathing and aversion.

Ver. 21a. The contracted future form יִכֶל, again, like יָשֶׂם, v. 11a, is poetic instead of the full form: his flesh vanishes מֵרֹאִי, from sight, i.s. so that it is seen no longer; or from comeliness, i.e., so that it becomes unsightly; the latter (comp. 1 Sam. 16:12 with Isa. 53:2, ולא־מראה) might be preferred. In v. 21b the Keri corrects the text to וְשֻׁפּוּ, et contrita sunt, whereas the Chethib is to be read וּשְׁפִי, et contritio. The verb שָׁפָה, which has been explained by Saadia from the Talmudic,290 signifies conterere, comminuere; Abulwalîd (in Ges. Thes.) interprets it here by suhifet wa-baradet, they are consumed and wasted away, and explains it by כֻּתְּתוּ. The radical notion is that of scraping, scratching, rubbing away (not to be interchanged with Arab. sf', ספה, which, starting from the radical notion of sweeping away, vanishing, comes to have that of wasting away; cognate, however, with the above Arab. sḥf, whence suhâf, consumption, prop. a rasure of the plumpness of the body). According to the Keri, v. 21b runs: and his bones (limbs) are shattered (fallen away), they are not seen, i.e., in their wasting away and shrivelling up they have lost their former pleasing form. Others, taking the bones

in their strict sense, and שׁפה in the signification to scrape away = lay bare, take ראו לא as a relative clause, as Jer. has done: ossa quae tecta fuerant nudabuntur (rather nudata sunt), but this ought with a change of mood to be וַיְשֻׁפּוּ … ראו לא. To the former interpretation corresponds the unexceptionable Chethib: and the falling away of his limbs are not seen, i.e., (per attractionem) his wasting limbs are diminished until they are become invisible. רֵאוּ is one of the four Old Testament words (Gen. 43:26, Ezra 8:18, Lev. 23:17) which have a Dagesh in the Aleph; in all four the Aleph stands between two vowels, and the dageshing (probably the remains of a custom in the system of pointing which has become the prevailing one, which, with these few exceptions, has been suffered to fall away) is intended to indicate that the Aleph is here to be carefully pronounced as a guttural (to use an Arabic expression, as Hamza), therefore in this passage ru-'û. 291 Thus, then, the soul (the bearer of the life of the body) of the sick man, at last succumbing to this process of decay, comes near to the pit, and his life to the מְמִתִים, destroying angels (comp. Ps. 78:49, 2 Sam. 24:16), i.e., the angels who are commissioned by God to slay the man, if he does not anticipate the decree of death by penitence. To understand the powers of death in general, with Rosenm., or the pains of death, with Schlottm. and others, does not commend itself, because the Elihu section has a strong angelological colouring in common with the book of Job. The following strophe, indeed, in contrast to the יממית, speaks of an angel that effects deliverance from death.

23 If there is an angel as mediator for him,
One of a thousand,
To declare to man what is for his profit:
24 He is gracious to him, and saith:
Deliver him, that he go not down to the pit—
I have found a ransom.

Job 33:23, 24. The former case, vv. 15–18, was the easier; there a strengthening of the testimony of man's conscience by a divine warning, given under remarkable circumstances, suffices. This second case, which the LXX correctly distinguishes from the former (it translates v. 19, πάλιν δὲ ἤλεγξεν αὐτὸν ἐν μαλακίᾳ ἐπὶ κοίτης), is the more difficult: it treats not merely of a warning against sin and its wages of death, but of a deliverance from the death itself, to which the man is almost abandoned in consequence of sin. This deliverance, as Elihu says, requires a mediator. This course of thought does not admit of our understanding the מַלְאָךְ of a human messenger of God, such as Job has before him in Elihu (Schult., Schnurr., Boullier, Eichh., Rosenm., Welte), an "interpreter of the divine will, such as one finds one man among a thousand to be, a God-commissioned speaker, in one word: a prophet" (von Hofmann in Schriftbew. i. 335f.). The מלך appears not merely as a declarer of the conditions of the deliverance, but as a mediator of this deliverance itself. And if the מְמִתִים, v. 22b, are angels by whom the man is threatened with the execution of death, the מלאך who comes forward here for him who is upon the brink of the abyss cannot be a man. We must therefore understand מלאך not as in Job 1:14, but as in Job 4:18; and the more surely so, since we are within the extra-Israelitish circle of a patriarchal history. In the extra-Israelitish world a far more developed doctrine of angels and demons is everywhere found than in Israel, which is to be understood not only subjectively, but also objectively; and within the patriarchal history after Gen. 16, that (אלהים) יהוה מלאך appears, who is instrumental in effecting the progress of the history of redemption, and has so much the appearance of the God of revelation, that He even calls himself God, and is called God. He it is whom Jacob means, when (Gen. 48:15f.), blessing Joseph, he distinguishes God the Invisible, God the Shepherd, i.e., Leader and Ruler, and "the Angel who delivered (הַגֹּאֵל) me from all evil;" it is the Angel who, according to Ps. 34:8, encampeth round about them that fear God, and delivereth them; "the Angel of the presence" whom Isaiah in the Thephilla, ch. lxiii. 7ff., places beside Jehovah and His Holy

Spirit as a third hypostasis. Taking up this perception, Elihu demands for the deliverance of man from the death which he has incurred by his sins, a superhuman angelic mediator. The "Angel of Jehovah" of primeval history is the oldest prefigurement in the history of redemption of the future incarnation, without which the Old Testament history would be a confused quodlibet of premises and radii, without a conclusion and a centre; and the angelic form is accordingly the oldest form which gives the hope of a deliverer, and to which it recurs, in conformity to the law of the circular connection between the beginning and end, in Mal. 3:1.

The strophe begins without any indication of connection with the preceding: one would expect וְאִם or אִם אָז, as we felt the absence of אַךְ in v. 14, and לָכֵן in Job 32:17. We might take מֵלִיץ מַלְאָךְ together as substantive and epitheton; the accentuation, however, which marks both מלאך and מליץ with Rebia magnum (in which case, according to Bär's Psalterium, p. xiv., the second distinctive has somewhat less value than the first), takes מלאךְ as subj., and מליץ as predicate: If there is then for him (עליו, pro eo, Ew. § 217, 9) an angel as מליץ, i.e., mediator; for מליץ signifies elsewhere an interpreter, Gen. 42:23; a negotiator, 2 Chron. 32:31; a God-commissioned speaker, i.e., prophet, Isa. 43:27; —everywhere (if it is not used as in Job 16:20, in malam parte) the shades of the notion of this word are summarized under the general notion of internuncius, and therefore of mediator (as the Jewish name of the mediating angel מטטרון, probably equivalent to mediator, not μετάθρονος, which is no usable Greek word). The Targ. translates by פרקליטא, παράκλητος (opp. קטיגור, κατήγοροὸ κατήγωρ). Therefore: if an angel undertakes the mediatorial office for the man, and indeed one of a thousand, i.e., not any one whatever of the thousands of the angels (Deut. 33:2, Ps. 68:18, Dan. 7:10, comp. Tobit 12:15, εἰς ἑκ τῶν ἑπτὰ), but one who soars above the thousands, and has not his equal among them (as Eccl. 7:28). Hirz. and Hahn altogether falsely combine: one of the thousands, whose business it is to announce … The accentuation is correct, and that forced mode of connection is without reason or occasion. It is the function of the מלאך itself as מליץ, which the clause which expresses the purpose affirms: if an angel appears for the good of the man as a mediator, to declare to him יָשְׁרוֹ, his uprightness, i.e., the right, straight way (comp. Prov. 14:2), in one word: the way of salvation, which he has to take to get free of sin and death, viz., the way of repentance and of faith (trust in God): God takes pity on the man … Here the conclusion begins; Rosenm. and others erroneously continue the antecedent here, so that what follows is the intercession of the angel; the angel, however, is just as a mediator who brings about the favour of God, and therefore not the חֹנֵן himself. He renders pardon possible, and brings the man into the state for receiving it.

Therefore: then God pardons, and says to His angel: Deliver him from the descent to the pit, I have found a ransom. Instead of פָּדָעֵהוּ, it would be admissible to read פְּרָעֵהוּ, let him free (from פרע, Arab. frg), if the angel to whom the command is given were the angel of death. פָּדַע is a cognate form, perhaps dialectic, with פָּדָה, root פד (as יפע, יפה, Arab. wf', wfy, from the common root יף, וף).292 The verb מָצָא (מְטָא) signifies to come at, Job 11:7, to attain something, and has its first signification here, starting from which it signifies the finding on the part of the seeker, and then when weakened finding without seeking. One is here reminded of Heb. 9:12, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. כֹּפֶר (on this word, vid., Hebräerbrief, S. 385, 740), according to its primary notion, is not a covering = making good, more readily a covering = cancelling (from כָּפַר, Talmud. to wipe out, away), but, as the usual combination with עַל shows, a covering of sin and guilt before wrath, punishment, or execution on account of guilt, and in this sense λύτρον, a means of getting free, ransom-money. The connection is satisfied if the repentance of the chastened one (thus e.g., also von Hofm.) is understood by this ransom, or better, his affliction, inasmuch as it has brought him to repentance. But wherefore should the mediatorship of the angel be

excluded from the notion of the כֹּפֶר. Just this mediatorship is meant, inasmuch as it puts to right him who by his sins had worked death, i.e., places him in a condition in which no further hindrance stands in the way of the divine pardon. If we connect the mediating angel, like the angel of Jehovah of the primeval history, with God Himself, as then the logos of this mediating angel to man can be God's own logos communicated by him, and he therefore as מליץ, God's speaker (if we consider Elihu's disclosure in the light of the New Testament), can be the divine Logos himself, we shall here readily recognise a presage of the mystery which is unveiled in the New Testament: "God was in Christ, and reconciled the world unto Himself." A presage of this mystery, flashing through the darkness, we have already read in Job 17:3 (comp. Job 16:21; and, on the other hand, in order to see how this anticipation is kindled by the thought of the opposite, Job 9:33). The presage which meets us here is like another in Ps. 107—a psalm which has many points of coincidence with the book of Job—where in v. 20 we find, "He sent His word, and healed them."293 At any rate, Elihu expresses it as a postulate, that the deliverance of man can only be effected by a superhuman being, as it is in reality accomplished by the man who is at the same time God, and from all eternity the Lord of the angels of light.

The following strophe now describes the results of the favour wrought out for man by the מליץ מלאך.

25 His flesh swelleth with the freshness of youth,

He returneth to the days of his youth.

26 If he prayeth to Eloah, He showeth him favour,

So that he seeth His face with joy,

And thus He recompenseth to man his uprightness.

27 He singeth to men and saith:

"I had sinned and perverted what was straight,

"And it was not recompensed to me.

28 "He hath delivered my soul from going down into the pit,

"And my life rejoiceth in the light."

Job 33:25–28. Misled by the change of the perf. and fut. in v. 25, Jer. translates 25a: consumta est caro ejus a suppliciis; Targ.: His flesh had been weakened (אִתְחֲלִישׁ), or made thin (אִתְקְלִישׁ), more than the flesh of a child; Raschi: it had become burst (French אשקושא, in connection with which only פּשׁ appears to have been in his mind, in the sense of springing up, prendre son escousse) from the shaking (of disease). All these interpretations are worthless; נֹעַר, peculiar to the Elihu section in the book of Job (here and Job 36:14), does not signify shaking, but is equivalent to נְעֻרִים (Job 13:26, 31:18); and רֻטָּשׁ is in the perf. only because the passive quadriliteral would not so easily accommodate itself to inflexion (by which all those asserted significations, which suit only the perf. sense, fall to the ground). The Chateph instead of the simple Sehevâ is only in order to give greater importance to the passive u. But as to the origin of the quadriliteral (on the four modes of the origin of roots of more than three radicals, vid., Jesurun, pp. 160–166), there is no reason for regarding it as a mixed form derived from two different verbs: it is formed just like פִּרְשֵׁז (from פָּרַשׁ, by Arabizing = פָּרַשׁ) with a sibilant termination from רָטַב = רָטַף, and therefore signifies to be (to have been made) over moist or juicy. However, there is yet another almost more commendable explanation possible. In Arab. ṭrfš signifies to recover, prop. to grow green, become fresh (perhaps from tarufa, as in the signification to blink, from tarafa). From this Arab. tarfasha, or even from a Hebr. טִרְפֵּשׁ,294 pinguefacere (which may with Fürst be regarded as springing from טָפַשׁ, to be fleshy, like כִּרְבֵּל, כִּרְסֵם), רִטָּפַשׁ might have sprung by transposition. In a remarkable manner one and the same idea is attained by all these ways: whether we regard וטפשׁ as a mixed form from רטב and טפשׁ, or as an extended root-form from one or other of these verbs, it is always according to the idea: a superabundance of fresh healthfulness. The מְנֹעָר or מִן is chiefly

regarded as comparative: more than youth, i.e., leaving this behind, or exceeding it, Ew. § 221, a; but v. 25b, according to which he who was hitherto sick unto death actually renews his youth, makes it more natural to take the מִן as causal: it swells from youth or youthfulness. In this description of the renovation which the man experiences, it is everywhere assumed that he has taken the right way announced to him by the mediating angel. Accordingly, v. 26a is not intended of prayer that is heard, which resulted in pardon, but of prayer that may be heard continually, which results from the pardon: if he prays to Eloah (fut. hypotheticum as Job 22:27, vid., on 29:24), He receives him favourably (רָצָה, Arab. raḍiya, with ב, Arab. b, to have pleasure in any one, with the acc. eum gratum vel acceptum habere), and he (whose state of favour is now established anew) sees God's countenance (which has been hitherto veiled from him, Job 34:29) with rejoicing (as Ps. 33:3 and freq.), and He (God) recompenses to the man his uprightness (in his prolonged course of life), or prop., since it is not וַיְשַׁלֵּם, but וַיָּשֶׁב, He restores on His part his relation in accordance with the order of redemption, for that is the idea of צדקה; the word has either a legal or a so-to-speak evangelical meaning, in which latter, used of God (as so frequently in Isaiah II), it describes His rule in accordance with His counsel and order of redemption; the primary notion is strict observance of a given rule.

In v. 27a the favoured one is again the subj. This change of person, without any indication of the same, belongs to the peculiarities of the Hebrew, and, in general, of the Oriental style, described in the Geschichte der jüd. Poesie, S. 189 [History of Jewish Poetry]; the reference of וַיַּרְא, as Hiph., to God, which is preferred by most expositors, is consequently unnecessary. Moreover, the interpretation: He causes his (the favoured one's) countenance to behold joy (Umbr., Ew.), is improbable as regards the phrase (נראה) ה׳ פני ראה, and also syntactically lame; and the interpretation: He causes (him, the favoured one) to behold His (the divine) countenance with joy (Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm., and others), halts in like manner, since this would be expressed by וַיַּרְאֵהוּ (וַיַּרְאֶנּוּ). By the reference to psalmody which follows in v. 27 (comp. Job 36:24), it becomes natural that we should understand v. 26b according to such passages in the Psalms as Ps. 90:2, 67:2, 17:15. יָשֹׁר is a poetically contracted fut. after the manner of a jussive, for יָשׁוּר; and perhaps it is a dialectic form, for the Kal שׁוּר = שִׁיר occurs only besides in 1 Sam. 18:6 as Chethîb. With עַל (comp. Prov. 25:20) it signifies to address a song to any one, to sing to him. Now follows the psalm of the favoured one in outline; v. 28 also belongs to it, where the Keri (Targ. Jer.), without any evident reason whatever, gets rid of the 1 pers. (LXX, Syr.). I had sinned—he says, as he looks back ashamed and thankful—and perverted what was straight (comp. the confession of the penitent, Ps. 106:6), לִי שָׁוָה וְלֹא, et non aequale factum s. non aequatum est mihi, 295 i.e., it has not been recompensed to me according to my deserts, favour instead of right is come upon me. שָׁוָה (Arab. sawâ) is intended neutrally, not so that God would be the subj. (LXX καὶ οὐκ ἄξια ἤτασέ με ὧν ἥμαρτον). Now follows, v. 28, the positive expression of the favour experienced. The phrase בשׁחת עבר, after the analogy of בשׁלח עבר above, and also חַיָּה for חַיִּים, are characteristic of the Elihu section. Beautiful is the close of this psalm in nuce: "and my life refreshes itself (ראה בְּ as Job 20:17 and freq.) in the light," viz., in the light of the divine countenance, which has again risen upon me, i.e., in the gracious presence of God, which I am again become fully conscious of.

29 Behold, God doeth all
Twice, thrice with man,
30 To bring back his soul from the pit,
That it may become light in the light of life.
31 Listen, O Job, hearken to me;
Be silent and let me speak on.
32 Yet if thou hast words, answer me;
Speak, for I desire thy justification.
33 If not, hearken thou to me;
Be silent and I will teach thee wisdom.

Job 33:29–33. After having described two prominent modes of divine interposition for the moral restoration and welfare of man, he adds, vv. 29f., that God undertakes (observe the want of parallelism in the distich, v. 29) everything with a man twice or thrice (asyndeton, as e.g., Isa. 17:6, in the sense of bis terve) in order to bring back his soul from the pit (שַׁחַת, here for the fifth time in this speech, without being anywhere interchanged with שְׁאוֹל or another synonym, which is remarkable), that it, having hitherto been encompassed by the darkness of death, may be, or become, light (לְאוֹר, inf. Niph., syncopated from לְהֵאוֹר, Ew. § 244, b) in the light of life (as it were bask in the new and restored light of life)—it does not always happen, for these are experiences of no ordinary kind, which interrupt the daily course of life; and it is not even repeated again and again constantly, for if it is without effect the first time, it is repeated a second or third time, but it has an end if the man trifles constantly with the disciplinary work of grace which designs his good. Finally, Elihu calls upon Job quietly to ponder this, that he may proceed; nevertheless, if he has words, i.e., if he thinks he is able to advance any appropriate objections, he is continually to answer him (הֵשִׁיב with acc. of the person, as v. 5), for he (Elihu) would willingly justify him, i.e., he would gladly be in the position to be able to acknowledge Job to be right, and to have the accusation dispensed with. Hirz. and others render falsely: I wish thy justification, i.e., thou shouldst justify thyself; in this case נַפְשְׁךָ ought to be supplied, which is unnecessary: חָפֵץ, without a change of subject, has the inf. constr. here without לְ, as it has the inf. absol. in Job 13:3, and צָדֵק signifies to vindicate (as Job 32:2), or acknowledge to be in the right (as the Piel of צָדַק, v. 12), both of which are blended here. The LXX, which translates θέλω γὰρ δικαιωθῆναί σε, has probably read צְדָקֶךָ (Ps. 35:27). If it is not so (אִם־אַיִן as Gen. 30:1), viz., that he does not intend to defend himself with reference to his expostulation with God on account of the affliction decreed for him, he shall on his part (אַתָּה) listen, shall be silent and be further taught wisdom.

Quasi hac ratione Heliu sanctum Iob convicerit! exclaims Beda, after a complete exposition of this speech. He regards Elihu as the type of the false wisdom of the heathen, which fails to recognise and persecutes the servant of God: Sunt alii extra ecclesiam, qui Christo ejusque ecclesiae similiter adversantur, quorum imaginem praetulit Balaam ille ariolus, qui et Elieu sicut patrum traditio habet (Balaam and Elihu, one person—a worthless conceit repeated in the Talmud and Midrash), qui contra ipsum sanctum Iob multa improbe et injuriose locutus est, in tantum ut etiam displiceret in una ejus et indisciplinata loquacitas. 296 Gregory the Great, in his Moralia, expresses himself no less unfavourably at the conclusion of this speech:297 Magna Eliu ac valde fortia protulit, sed hoc unusquisque arrogans habere proprium solet, quod dum vera ac mystica loquitur subito per tumorem cordis quaedam inania et superba permiscet. He also regards Elihu as an emblem of confident arrogance, yet not as a type of a heathen philosopher, but of a believing yet vain and arrogant teacher. This tone in judging of Elihu, first started by Jerome, has spread somewhat extensively in the Western Church. In the age of the Reformation, e.g., Victorin Strigel takes this side: Elihu is regarded by him as exemplum ambitiosi oratoris qui plenus sit ostentatione et audacia inusitate sine mente. Also in the Greek Eastern Church such views are not wanting. Elihu says much that is good, and excels the friends in this, that he does not condemn Job; Olympiodorus adds, πλὴν οὐκ ἐνόησε τοῦ δικαίου τὴν διάνοιαν, but he has not understood the true idea of the servant of God!298

In modern times, Herder entertains the same judgment. Elihu's speech, in comparison with the short, majestic, solemn language of the Creator, he calls "the weak rambling speech of a boy." "Elihu, a young prophet"—he says further on his Geist der Ebr. Poesie, where he expounds the book of Job as a composition—"arrogant, bold, alone wise, draws fine pictures without end or aim; hence no one answers him, and he stands there merely as a shadow."299 Among

the latest expositors, Umbreit (Edition 2, 1832) consider's Elihu's appearance as "an uncalled-for stumbling in of a conceited young philosopher into the conflict that is already properly ended; the silent contempt with which one allows him to speak is the merited reward of a babbler." In later years Umbreit gave up this depreciation of Elihu.300 Nevertheless Hahn, in his Comm. zu Iob (1850), has sought anew to prove that Elihu's speeches are meant indeed to furnish a solution, but do not really do so: on the contrary, the poet intentionally represents the character of Elihu as that "of a most conceited and arrogant young man, boastful and officious in his undeniable knowingness." The unfavourable judgments have been carried still further, inasmuch as an attempt has even been made to regard Elihu as a disguise for Satan in the organism of the drama;301 but it may be more suitable to break off this unpleasant subject than to continue it.

In fact this dogmatic criticism of Elihu's character and speeches produces a painful impression. For, granted that it might be otherwise, and the poet really had designed to bring forward in these speeches of Elihu respecting God's own appearing an incontrovertible apology for His holy love, as a love which is at work even in such dispensations of affliction as that of Job: what offence against the deep earnestness of this portion of Holy Scripture would there be in this degradation of Elihu to an absurd character, in that depreciation of him to a babbler promising much and performing little! But that the poet is really in earnest in everything he puts into Elihu's mouth, is at once shown by the description, Job 33:13–30, which forms the kernel of the contents of the first speech. This description of the manifold ways of the divine communication to man, upon a contrite attention to which his rescue from destruction depends, belongs to the most comprehensive passages of the Old Testament; and I know instances of the powerful effect which it can produce in arousing from the sleep of security and awakening penitence. If one, further, casts a glance at the historical introduction of Elihu, Job 32:1–5, the poet there gives no indication that he intends in Elihu to bring the odd character of a young poltroon before us. The motive and aim of his coming forward, as they are there given, are fully authorized. If one considers, further, that the poet makes Job keep silence at the speeches of Elihu, it may also be inferred therefrom that he believes he has put answers into Elihu's mouth by which he must feel himself most deeply smitten; such truths as Job 32:13–30, drawn from the depths of moral experience, could not have been put forth if Job's silence were intended to be the punishment of contempt.

These counter-considerations also really affect another possible and milder apprehension of the young speaker, inasmuch as, with von Hofmann, the gravitating point of the book of Job is transferred to the fact of the Theophany as the only satisfactory practical solution of the mystery of affliction: it is solved by God Himself coming down and acknowledging Job as His servant. Elihu—thus one can say from this point of view—is not one of Job's friends, whose duty it was to comfort him; but the moral judgment of man's perception of God is made known by this teacher, but without any other effect than that Job is silent. There is one duty towards Job which he has not violated, for he has not to fulfil the duty of friendship: The only art of correct theorizing is to put an opponent to silence, and to have spoken to the wind is the one punishment appropriate to it. This milder rendering also does not satisfy; for, in the idea of the poet, Elihu's speeches are not only a thus negative, but the positive preparation for Jehovah's appearing. In the idea of the poet, Job is silent because he does not know how to answer Elihu, and therefore feels himself overcome.302 And, in fact, what answer should he give to this first speech? Elihu wishes to dispute Job's self-justification, which places God's justice in the shade, but not indeed in the friends' judging, condemnatory manner: he wishes to dispute Job's notion that his affliction proceeds from a hostile purpose on the part of God, and sets himself here, as there, a perfectly correct task, which he seeks to accomplish by

directing Job to regard his affliction, not indeed as a punishment from the angry God, but as a chastisement of the God who desires his highest good, as disciplinary affliction which is intended to secure him against hurtful temptation to sin, especially to pride, by salutary humiliation, and will have a glorious issue, as soon as it has in itself accomplished that at which it aims.

It is true one must listen very closely to discover the difference between the tone which Elihu takes and the tone in which Eliphaz began his first speech. But there is a difference notwithstanding: both designate Job's affliction as a chastisement (מוסר), which will end gloriously, if he receives it without murmuring; but Eliphaz at once demands of him humiliation under the mighty hand of God; Elihu, on the contrary, makes this humiliation lighter to him, by setting over against his longing for God to answer him, the pleasing teaching that his affliction in itself is already the speech of God to him,—a speech designed to educate him, and to bring about his spiritual well-being. What objection could Job, who has hitherto maintained his own righteousness in opposition to affliction as a hostile decree, now raise, when it is represented to him as a wholesome medicine reached forth to him by the holy God of love? What objection could Job now raise, without, in common, offensive self-righteousness, falling into contradiction with his own confession that he is a sinful man, Job 14:4, comp. 13:26? Therefore Elihu has not spoken to the wind, and it cannot have been the design of the poet to represent the feebleness of theory and rhetoric in contrast with the convincing power which there is in the fact of Jehovah's appearing.

But would it be possible, that from the earliest times one could form such a condemnatory, depreciating judgment concerning Elihu's speeches, if it had not been a matter of certainty with them? If of two such enlightened men as Augustine and Jerome, the former can say of Elihu: ut primas partes modestiae habuit, ita et sapientiae, while the latter, and after his example Bede, can consider him as a type of a heathen philosophy hostile to the faith, or of a selfishly perverted spirit of prophecy: they must surely have two sides which make it possible to form directly opposite opinions concerning them. Thus is it also in reality. On the one side, they express great, earnest, humiliating truths, which even the holiest man in his affliction must suffer himself to be told, especially if he has fallen into such vainglorying and such murmuring against God as Job did; on the other side, they do not give such sharply-defined expression to that which is intended characteristically to distinguish them from the speeches of the friends, viz., that they regard Job not as רשׁע, and his affliction not as just retribution, but as a wholesome means of discipline, that all misunderstanding would be excluded, as all the expositors who acknowledge themselves unable to perceive an essential difference between Elihu's standpoint and the original standpoint of the friends, show. But the most surprising thing is, that the peculiar, true aim of Job's affliction, viz., his being proved as God's servant, is by no means thoroughly clear in them. From the prologue we know that Job's affliction is designed to show that there is a piety which also retains its hold on God amid the loss of all earthly goods, and even in the face of death in the midst of the darkest night of affliction; that it is designed to justify God's choice before Satan, and bring the latter to ruin; that it is a part of the conflict with the serpent, whose head cannot be crushed without its sting being felt in the heel of the conqueror; in fine, expressed in New Testament language, that it falls under the point of view of the cross (σταυρός), which has its ground not so much in the sinfulness of the sufferer, as in the share which is assigned to him in the conflict of good with evil that exists in the world. It cannot be supposed that the poet would, in the speeches of Elihu, set another design in opposition to the design of Job's affliction expressed in the prologue; on the contrary, he started from the assumption that the one design does not exclude the other, and in connection with the imperfectness of the

righteousness even of the holiest man, the one is easily added to the other; but it was not in his power to give expression to both grounds of explanation of Job's affliction side by side, and thus to make this intermediate section "the beating heart"303 of the whole. The aspect of the affliction as a chastisement so greatly preponderates, that the other, viz., as a trial or proving, is as it were swallowed up by it. One of the old writers304 says, "Elihu proves that it can indeed be that a man may fear and honour God from the heart, and consequently be in favour with God, and still be heavily visited by God, either for a trial of faith, hope, and patience, or for the revelation and improvement of the sinful blemishes which now and then are also hidden from the pious." According to this, both aspects are found united in Elihu's speeches; but in this first speech, at least, we cannot find it.

There is another poet, whose charisma does not come up to that of the older poet, who in this speech pursues the well-authorized purpose not only of moderating what is extreme in Job's speeches, but also of bringing out what is true in the speeches of the friends.305 While the book of Job, apart from these speeches, presents in the Old Testament way the great truth which Paul, Rom. 8:1, expresses in the words, οὐδέν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, this other poet has given expression at the same time, in the connection of the drama, to the great truth, 1 Cor. 11:32, κρινόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ δυρίου παιδευόμεθὰ ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. That it is another poet, is already manifest from his inferior, or if it is preferred, different, poetic gift. True, A. B. Davidson has again recently asserted, that by supporting it by such observations, the critical question is made "a question of subjective taste." But if these speeches and the other parts of the book are said to have been written by one poet, there is an end to all critical judgment in such questions generally. One cannot avoid the impression of the distance between them; and if it be suppressed for a time, it will nevertheless make itself constantly felt. But do the prophecies of Malachi stand lower in the scale of the historical development of revelation, because the Salomonic glory of prophetic speech which we admire in Isaiah is wanting in them? Just as little do we depreciate the spiritual glory of these speeches, when we find the outward glory of the rest of the book wanting in them. They occupy a position of the highest worth in the historical development of revelation and redemption. They are a perfecting part of the canonical Scriptures. In their origin, also, they are not much later;306 indeed, I venture to assert that they are by a contemporary member even of the Chokma-fellowship from which the book of Job has its rise. For they stand in like intimate relation with the rest of the book to the two Ezrahite Psalms, 88, 89; they have, as to their doctrinal contents, the fundamental features of the Israelitish Chokma in common; they speak another and still similar Aramaizing and Arabizing language (hebraicum arabicumque sermonem et interdum syrum, as Jerome expresses it in his Praef. in l. Iobi); in fact, we shall further on meet with linguistic signs that the poet who wrote this addition has lived together with the poet of the book of Job in one spot beyond the Holy Land, and speaks a Hebrew bearing traces of a like dialectic influence.

JOB 34

Elihu's Second Speech

2 Hear, ye wise men, my words,
And ye experienced ones, give ear to me!
3 For the ear trieth words,
As the palate tasteth by eating.
4 Let us find out what is right,
Let us explore among ourselves what is good.

Job 34:2–4. After his first speech Elihu has made a brief pause; now since Job is silent, he begins anew. ויאמר ויען, LXX correctly, here as in all other instances where the phrase occurs: ὑπολαβὼν λέγει, taking up the word he said. The wise and the knowing (Arab. 'ulamâ), whose attention he bespeaks, are not Job and

the three (Umbr., Hahn), who are indeed a party, and as such a subject for the arbitrative appearance of Elihu; also not every one capable of forming a judgment (Hirz.); but those in the circle of spectators and listeners which, as is assumed, has assembled round the disputants (Schlottm.). In v. 3 Elihu does not expressly mean his own ear, but that of the persons addressed: he establishes his summons to prove what he says by the general thought brought over from Job 12:11, and as there (comp. Job 5:7, 11:12), clothed in the form of the emblematic proverb,—that as there is a bodily, so there is also a mental organ of sense which tries its perceptions. לֶאֱכֹל is not intended as expressing a purpose (ad vescendum), but as a gerundive (vescendo). The phrase מִשְׁפָּט בָּחַר, occurring only here, signifies neither to institute a search for the purpose of decision (Schult. and others), since בחר does not signify to decide upon anything, nor to investigate a cause (Hahn), which would be נבחנה, but to test and choose what is right, δοκιμάζειν καὶ τὸ καλὸν κατέχειν, 1 Thess. 5:21, after which the parallel runs: cognoscamus inter nos (i.e., in common) quid bonum.

5 For Job hath said: "I am guiltless,
"And God hath put aside my right.
6 "Shall I lie in spite of my right,
"Incurable is mine arrow without transgression."
7 Where is there a man like Job,
Who drinketh scorning like water,
8 And keepeth company with the workers of iniquity,
And walketh with wicked men,
9 So that he saith: "A man hath no profit
"From entering into fellowship with God"?!

Job 34:5–7. That in relation to God, thinking of Him as a punishing judge, he is righteous or in the right, i.e., guiltless (צָדַקְתִּי with Pathach in pause, according to Ew. § 93, c, from צָדַק = צָדַק, but perhaps, comp. Prov. 24:30, Ps. 102:26, because the Athnach is taken only as of the value of Zakeph), Job has said verbatim in Job 13:18, and according to meaning, Job 23:10, 27:7, and throughout; that He puts aside his right (the right of the guiltless, and therefore not of one coming under punishment): Job 27:2. That in spite of his right (עַל, to be interpreted, according to Schultens' example, just like Job 10:7, 16:17), i.e., although right is on his side, yet he must be accounted a liar, since his own testimony is belied by the wrathful form of his affliction, that therefore the appearance of wrong remains inalienably attached to him, we find in idea in Job 9:20 and freq. Elihu makes Job call his affliction חִצִּי, i.e., an arrow sticking in him, viz., the arrow of the wrath of God (on the objective suff. comp. on Job 23:2), after Job 6:4, 16:9, 19:11; and that this his arrow, i.e., the pain which it causes him, is incurably bad, desperately malignant without (יְבָל as Job 8:11) פֶּשַׁע, i.e., sins existing as the ground of it, from which he would be obliged to suppose they had thrust him out of the condition of favour, is Job's constant complaint (vid., e.g., Job 13:23f.). Another utterance of Job closely connected with it has so roused Elihu's indignation, that he prefaces it with the exclamation of astonishment: Who is a man like Job, i.e., where in all the world (מִי as 2 Sam. 7:23) has this Job his equal, who … The attributive clause refers to Job; "to drink scorn (here: blasphemy) like water," is, according to Job 15:16, equivalent to to give one's self up to mockery with delight, and to find satisfaction in it. לְחֶבְרָה אָרַח, to go over to any one's side, looks like a poeticized prose expression. לְלֶכֶת is a continuation of the אָרַח, according to Ew. § 351, c, but not directly in the sense "and he goes," but, as in the similar examples, Jer. 17:10, 44:19, 2 Chron. 7:17, and freq., in the sense of: "he is in the act of going;" comp. on Job 36:20 and Hab. 1:17. The utterance runs: a man does not profit, viz., himself (on the use of סָכַן of persons as well as of things, vid., on Job 22:2), by his having joyous and familiar intercourse (בִּרְצֹתוֹ, as little equivalent to בְּרוּץ as in Ps. 50:18) with God. Job has nowhere expressly said this, but certainly the declaration in Job 9:22, in connection with the repeated complaints concerning the anomalous distribution of human destinies

(vid., especially Job 21:7ff., 24:1ff.), are the premises for such a conclusion. That Elihu, in vv. 7f., is more harsh against Job than the friends ever were (comp. e.g., the well-measured reproach of Eliphaz, Job 15:4), and that he puts words into Job's moth which occur nowhere verbatim in his speeches, is worked up by the Latin fathers (Jer., Philippus Presbyter, Beda,307 Gregory) in favour of their unfavourable judgment of Elihu; the Greek fathers, however, are deprived of all opportunity of understanding him by the translation of the LXX (in which μυκτηρισμόν signifies the scorn of others which Job must swallow down, comp. Prov. 26:6), which here perverts everything.

10 Therefore, men of understanding, hearken to me!

Far be it from god to do evil,

And the Almighty to act wrongfully.

11 No indeed, man's work He recompenseth to him,

And according to man's walk He causeth it to be with him.

Job 34:10, 11. "Men of heart," according to Psychol. S. 249, comp. 254, is equivalent to νοήμονες or νοηροί (LXX συνετοὶ καρδίας). The clause which Elihu makes prominent in the following reply is the very axiom which the three defend, perfectly true in itself, but falsely applied by them: evil, wrong, are inconceivable on the part of God; instead of וּלְשַׁדַּי it is only וְשַׁדַּי in the second member of the verse, with the omission of the praep.—a frequent form of ellipsis, particularly in Isaiah (Is. 15:8, 28:6, 48:14, 61:7, comp. Ezek. 25:15). Far removed from acting wickedly and wrongfully, on the contrary He practises recompense exactly apportioned to man's deeds, and ever according to the walk of each one (אֹרַח like דֶּרֶךְ or דַּרְכֵי, e.g., Jer. 32:19, in an ethical sense) He causes it to overtake him, i.e., to happen to him (הִמְצִיא only here and Job 37:13). The general assertion brought forward against Job is now proved.

12 Yea verily God acteth not wickedly,

And the Almighty perverteth not the right.

13 Who hath given the earth in charge to Him?

And who hath disposed the whole globe?

14 If He only set His heart upon Himself,

If He took back His breath and His inspiration to Himself:

15 All flesh would expire together,

And man would return to dust.

Job 34:12–15. With אָמְנָם אַף (Yea verily, as Job 19:4, "and really") the counter- assertion of v. 11 is repeated, but negatively expressed (comp. Job 8:3). הַרְשִׁיעַ signifies sometimes to act as רָשָׁע, and at others to be set forth and condemned as a רשׁע; here, as the connection requires, it is the former. V. 13 begins the proof. Ewald's interpretation: who searcheth, and Hahn's: who careth for the earth beside Him, are hazardous and unnecessary. פָּקַד with עַל of the person and the acc. of the thing signifies: to enjoin anything as a duty on any one, to entrust anything to any one, Job 36:23, Num. 4:27, 2 Chron. 36:23; therefore: who has made the earth, i.e., the care of it, a duty to Him? אַרְצָה (Milel) is not to be refined into the meaning "to the earth" (as here by Schultens and a few others, Isa. 8:23 by Luzzatto: he hath smitten down, better: dishonoured, to the earth with a light stroke), but is poetically equivalent to אֶרֶץ, as לַיְלָה (comp. modern Greek ἡ νύχθα) is in prose equivalent to לַיִל. V. 13b is by no means, with Ew. and Hahn, to be translated: who observes (considers) the whole globe, שִׂים as v. 23, Job 4:20, 24:12—the expression would be too contracted to affirm that no one but God bestowed providential attention upon the earth; and if we have understood v. 13a correctly, the thought is also inappropriate. A more appropriate thought is gained, if עָלָיו is supplied from v. 13a: who has enjoined upon Him the whole circle of the earth (Saad., Gecat., Hirz., Schlottm.); but this continued force of the עליו into the second independent question is improbable in connection with the repetition of מִי. Therefore: who has appointed, i.e., established (שָׂם as Job 38:5, Isa. 44:7),—a still somewhat more suitable thought, going logically further, since the one giving the charge

ought to be the lord of him who receives the commission, and therefore the Creator of the world. This is just God alone, by whose וּרְוַח and נְשָׁמָה the animal world as well as the world of men (vid., 32:8, 33:4) has its life, v. 14: if He should direct His heart, i.e., His attention (לֵב שִׂים אֶל, as Job 2:3), to Himself (emphatic: Himself alone), draw in (אָסַף as Ps. 104:29; comp. for the matter Eccl. 12:7, Psychol. S. 406) to Himself His inspiration and breath (which emanated from Him or was effected by Him), all flesh would sink together, i.e., die off at once (this, as it appears, has reference to the taking back of the animal life, רוח), and man would return (this has reference to the taking back of the human spirit, נשׁמה) to dust (עַל instead of אֶל, perhaps with reference to the usual use of the עַל־עָפָר, Job 17:16, 20:11, 21:26).

Only a few modern expositors refer אֵלָיו, as Targ. Jer. and Syr., to man instead of reflexively to God; the majority rightly decide in favour of the idea which even Grotius perceived: si sibi ipsi tantum bonus esse (sui unius curam habere) vellet. אִם followed by the fut. signifies either si velit (LXX εἰ βούλοιτο), as here, or as more frequently, si vellet, Ps. 50:12, 139:8, Obad. v. 4, Isa. 10:22, Amos 9:2–4. It is worthy of remark that, according to Norzi's statement, the Babylonian texts presented יָשִׁיב, v. 14a, as Chethîb, ישׂים as Kerî (like our Palestine text, Dan. 11:18), which a MS of De Rossi, with a Persian translation, confirms; the reading gives a fine idea: that God's heart is turned towards the world, and is unclosed; its ethical condition of life would then be like its physical ground of life, that God's spirit dwells in it; the drawing back of the heart, and the taking back to Himself of the spirit, would be equivalent to the exclusion of the world from God's love and life. However, ישׂים implies the same; for a reference of God's thinking and willing to Himself, with the exclusion of the world, would be just a removal of His love. Elihu's proof is this: God does not act wrongly, for the government of the world is not a duty imposed upon Him from without, but a relation entered into freely by Him: the world is not the property of another, but of His free creative appointment; and how unselfishly, how devoid of self-seeking He governs it, is clear from the fact, that by the impartation of His living creative breath He sustains every living thing, and does not, as He easily might, allow them to fall away into nothingness. There is therefore a divine love which has called the world into being and keeps it in being; and this love, as the perfect opposite of sovereign caprice, is a pledge for the absolute righteousness of the divine rule.

16 And oh understand now, hear this;
Hearken to the sound of my words.
17 Would one who hateth right also be able to subdue?
Or wilt thou condemn the All-just?
18 Is it becoming to say to a king: Worthless One!?
Thou evil-doer! to princes?
19 To Him who accepteth not the person of rulers,
And regardeth not the noble before the poor:
For they are all the work of His hands.
20 In a moment they die, and at midnight
The people are overthrown and perish,
And they put aside the mighty—not by the hand of man.

Job 34:16–20. This strophe contains several grammatical rarities. At first sight it appears that v. 16a ought to be translated: "and if there is understanding (viz., to thee = if thou hast), then hear this." But בִּינָה is accented as Milel and with Mercha, and can therefore not be a substantive (Hirz., Hahn, and others); for the retreat of the accent would be absolutely incomprehensible, and instead of a conjunctive, a distinctive, viz., Dechî, ought to be expected. Several of the old expositors, therefore, interpret with Nolde: quod quum ita sit, intellige; but this elliptical וְאִם, well as it might also be used for Job 21:4, is unsupportable; the Makkeph between the two words is also against it, which rather arises from the assumption that בִּינָה is the imperat., and אִם as an exception, like Gen. 23:13, is an optative particle joined to the

imper. 2 instead of to the fut.: "and if thou shouldst observe" (= וְאִם־תָּבִין). To translate v. 17a with Schultens: num iram osor judicii frenabit, is impracticable on account of the order of the words, and gives a thought that is inappropriate here. אַף is a particle, and the fut. is potentialis: is it also possible that an enemy of right should govern? (חָבַשׁ, imperio coercere, as אָצַר 1 Sam. 9:17, אָסַר Ps. 105:22); right and government are indeed mutually conditioned, without right everything would fall into anarchy and confusion. In v. 17b this is applied to the Ruler of the world: or (וְאִם, an, as Job 8:3, 21:4, 40:9) wilt thou condemn the mighty just One, i.e., the All-just? As Elihu calls God כֹּחַ שַׂגִּיא, Job 37:23, as the Almighty, and as the Omniscient One, דֵּעִים תְּמִים, Job 37:16, so here as the All-just One, רַבִּי צַדִּיק. The two adjectives are put side by side ἀσυνδέτως, as is frequently the case in Arabic, and form one compound idea, Ew. § 270, d.

Ver. 18a. The interrogative הֲ is joined to the inf., not, however, as Job 40:2 (num litigare cum Deo castigator, scil. vult), with the inf. absol., but with the inf. constr.; the form אֱמֹר for אֱמֹר occurs also in Prov. 25:7, and is also otherwise not rare, especially in combination with particles, e.g., בַּאֲכֹל, Num. 26:10, Olsh. § 160, b. 308 It is unnecessary to suppose that the inf. constr., which sometimes, although rarely, does occur (Ges. § 131, rem. 2), is used here instead of the inf. absol.; it is thus, as after טוֹב, e.g., Judg. 9:2 (הַמָּשֹׁל), Prov. 24:7, Ps. 133:1, and Ps. 40:6 after אַיִן, used as n. actionis, since הֲ in a pregnant sense is equivalent to num licet (הֲטוֹב), if one does not prefer, with Olsh., to suppose an aposiopesis: " (dare one be so bold as) to say to a king: Thou worthless one! Thou evil-doer! to princes?" The reading הָאֹמֵר is an unnecessary lightening of the difficulty. It were a crimen laesae, if one reproached a king with being unjust, and therefore thereby denied him the most essential requisite of a ruler; and now even Him (Merc. correctly supplies tanto minus ei) who does not give the preference to the person (פְּנֵי נָשָׂא as Job 13:8, 32:21) of princes, and does not (with preference) regard (on נָכַר vid., on Job 21:29, also here Piel, and according to the statement of the Masora, Milel, for an acknowledged reason which can be maintained even in remarkable instances, like Deut. 10:5 in ויהיו, Ezek. 32:26 in מחללי, whereas 1 Sam. 23:7 is Milra) the rich before (לִפְנֵי in the sense of prae) the poor! therefore the King of kings, who makes no partial distinction, because the king and the beggar are the work of His hands: they stand equally near to Him as being His creatures, and He is exalted above both alike as their Creator, this order and partiality are excluded;—what a nota bene against the doctrine of the decretum absolutum, which makes the love of the Creator a partial love, and turns this love, which in its very nature is perfect love, into caprice! In v. 20 Elihu appeals to human history in favour of this impartiality of the Ruler of the world. It may there appear as though God with partiality suffered rulers and peoples in authority in the world to do as they please; but suddenly they die away, and in fact in the middle of the night (here Mercha-mahpach), the individuals of a great people (thus must עָם be understood in accordance with the prominently-placed plur. predicate, Ges. § 146, 1) tremble and perish; and they remove (וְיָסִירוּ instead of the passive, as Job 4:20 and frequently) the mighty—לֹא־בָיָד. It is not the hand of man which does this, but an invisible higher power (which, if it is called יד, only bears this name per anthropomorphismum); comp. Dan. 2:34, בִּידַיִן לָא; Dan. 8:25, בְּאֶפֶס יָד; and also Job 20:26, like the New Testament use of οὐ χειροποίητος. The subj. of v. 20a are the previously mentioned princes. The division according to the accents may be received with hesitation, since the symmetry of the sticks, which it restores, is not unfrequently wanting in the Elihu section. V. 20c refers back to the possessors of power, and in the interval, v. 20b describes the fate of those who belong to the people which has become subservient to their lust of conquest, for עָם cannot signify "in crowds" (Ew., Hahn); it is therefore, and especially when mentioned as here between princes and rulers, the people, and in fact, in distinction from גוי, the people together forming a state.

21 For His eyes are upon the ways of each one,
And He seeth all his steps.
22 There is no darkness nor shadow of death
Wherein the workers of iniquity might hide themselves.
23 For He needeth not long to regard a man
That he may enter into judgment with God.

Job 34:21–23. As the preceding strophe showed that God's creative order excludes all partiality, so this strophe shows that His omniscience qualifies Him to be an impartial judge. He sees everything, nothing can escape His gaze; He sees through man without being obliged to wait for the result of a judicial investigation. שִׂים with עַל does not here signify: to lay upon (Saad., Gecat.), but as Job 37:15, and as with אֶל (v. 14) or בְּ (Job 23:6); to direct one's attention (supply לִבּוֹ, Job 1:8) towards anything; the fut. has here a modal signification; עוֹד is used as e.g., Gen. 46:29: again and again, continuously; and in the clause expressive of purpose it is אֶל־אֵל (instead of אֵלָיו, a very favourite combination used throughout the whole book, Job 5:8, 8:5, 13:3, and so on) from the human standpoint: He, the all-seeing One, needs not to observe him long that he should enter into judgment with God—He knows him thoroughly before any investigation takes place, which is not said without allusion to Job's vehement longing to be able to appear before God's tribunal.

24 He breaketh the mighty in pieces without investigation
And setteth others in their place.
25 Thus He seeth through their works,
And causeth their overthrow by night, thus they are crushed.
26 He smiteth them after the manner of evil-doers
In the sight of the public.
27 For for such purpose are they fallen away from Him
And have not considered any of His ways,
28 To cause the cry of the poor to come up to Him,
And that He should hear the cry of the needy.

Job 34:24–28. He makes short work (לֹא־חֵקֶר for לְאֵבֶ, as Job 12:24, 38:26: without research, viz., into their conduct, which is at once manifest to Him; not: in an incomprehensible manner, which is unsuitable, and still less: innumerabiles, as Jer., Syr.) with the mighty (כַּבִּירִים, Arab. kibâr, kubarâ), and in consequence of this (fut. consec.) sets up (constituit) others, i.e., better and worthier rulers (comp. אַחֵר, Job 8:19, Isa. 55:15), in their stead. The following לָכֵן is not equivalent to לכן אשׁר, for which no satisfactory instance exists; on the contrary, לכן here, as more frequently, introduces not the real consequence (Job 20:2), but a logical inference, something that directly follows in and with what precedes (corresponding to the Greek ἄρα, just so, consequently), comp. Job 42:3, Isa. 26:14, 61:7, Jer. 2:33, 5:2, Zech. 11:7 (vid., Köhler in loc.). Thus, then, as He hereby proves, He is thoroughly acquainted with their actions (מַעְבָּד, nowhere besides in the book of Job, an Aramaizing expression for מעשׂה). This abiding fact of divine omniscience, inferred from the previously-mentioned facts, then serves again in its turn, in v. 25b, as the source of facts by which it is verified. לַיְלָה is by no means an obj. The expositions: et inducit noctem (Jer.), He walks in the night in which He has veiled Himself (Umbr.), convertit eos in noctem (Syr., Arab.), and such like, all read in the two words what they do not imply. It is either to be translated: He throws them by night (לילה as Job 27:20) upon the heaps (הָפַךְ as Prov. 12:7), or, since the verb has no objective suff.: He maketh a reformation or overthrow during the night, i.e., creates during the night a new order of things, and they who stood at the head of the former affairs are crushed by the catastrophe.

Ver. 26. The following רְשָׁעִים תַּחַת cannot signify: on the place of the evil-doers, i.e., in the place where evil-doers are punished (Hirz., Hahn, and others), for תַּחַת (תַּחְתִּי) only has this signification

with the suff. (vid., on Hab. 3:16); but not otherwise than: in the evil-doers' stead, taking them and treating them as such, as Jer. has correctly translated: quasi impios (comp. Isa. 10:4, Jerome, cum interfectis). The place first mentioned afterwards is not exactly the usual place of judgment, but any place whatever where all can see it. There He smites those who hitherto held positions of eminence, as of unimpeachable honour, like the common criminal; סָפַק, Arab. ṣfq, complodere, and then ictu resonante percutere, as the likewise cognate Arab. sf' signifies first to box the ear (as Arab. sfq = ṣfq), then so to strike that it smacks. As little as לָכֵן, v. 25a, was = אשׁר לכן, just so little is וְעַל־כֵּ֫ן אֲשֶׁר, v. 27a, = אשׁר על־כן (vid., on the other hand what is said on Gen. 18:5 concerning כִּי־עַל־כֵּן). Elihu wishes to say that they endure such a destiny of punishment, because they therefore, i.e., in order to suffer such, have turned aside from following after God, and have not thought on all His ways, i.e., guidings, by which He manifested Himself to them: they have thus sought to cause the cry of the poor to come (Jer. well renders: ut pervenire facerent ad eum) before Him (עָלָיו, perhaps with the idea of urging forward = לְפָנָיו or בְּאָזְנָיו), and that He may hear the cry of the lowly (construction exactly like Job 33:17), i.e., have sought to bring forth His avenging justice by injustice that cries aloud to heaven.

29 If He, however, maketh peace, who will then condemn?

And if He hideth His countenance—who then can behold Him?—

Both concerning numbers and individuals together:

30 That godless men reign not,

That they be not nets to the people.

31 For one, indeed, saith to God,

"I have been proud, I will not do evil;

32 "What I see not, show Thou me;

"If I have done wrong, I will do it no more"!?—

Job 34:29–32. If God makes peace (יַשְׁקִיט as Ps. 94:13, comp. Isa. 14:7, הארץ שָׁקְטָה־כל, viz., after the overthrow of the tyrant) in connection with such crying oppression of the poor, who will then condemn Him without the rather recognising therein His comprehensive justice? The conjecture יַרְעִישׁ309 is not required either here or 1 Sam. 14:47 (where הרשׁיע signifies to punish the guilty); עַיֵּרְשׁ is also not to be translated turbabit (Rosenm.), since רָשַׁע (Arab. rs', rsg) according to its primitive notion does not signify "to be restless, to rage," but "to be relaxed, hollow" (opposite of צדק, Arab. ṣdq, to be hard, firm, tight). Further: If God hides His countenance, i.e., is angry and punishes, who can then behold Him, i.e., make Him, the veiled One, visible and claim back the favour withdrawn? The Waw of וּמִי, if one marks off the periods of the paratactic expression, is in both cases the Waw of conclusion after hypothetical antecedents, and. v. 29b refers to Job's impetuous challenging of God. Thus exalted above human controversy and defiance, God rules both over the mass and over individuals alike. יַחַד gives intensity of the equality thus correlatively (et—et) expressed (Targ., Syr.); to refer it to אדם as generalizing (LXX, Jer. et super omnes homines), is forbidden by the antithesis of peoples and individuals. To the thought, that God giveth rest (from oppressors) and hides His countenance (from the oppressors and in general those who act wrongly), two co-ordinate negative final clauses are attached: in order that godless men may not rule (מִמְּלֹךְ, as e.g., 2 Kings 23:33, Keri), in order that they may no longer be (מִהְיוֹת = ם, under the influence of the notion of putting aside contained in the preceding final clause, therefore like Isa. 7:8 מעם, 24:2 מעיר, Jer. 48:2 מגוי, and the like) snares of the people, i.e., those whose evil example and bad government become the ruin of the community.

In v. 31a the view of those who by some jugglery concerning the laws of the vowel sounds explain הֲאָמַר as imper. Niph. (= הֵאָמֵר), be it in the sense of לְהֵאָמֵר, dicendum est (Rosenm., Schlottm., and others, after Raschi), or even in the unheard-of reflexive signification: express thyself (Stick., Hahn), is to be rejected. The syncopated form of the infin. בְּהָרֵג, Ezek. 26:15,

does not serve as a palliation of this adventurous imperative. It is, on the contrary, אָמַר with הֲ interrog., as Ezek. 28:9 הֲאָמֹר, and probably also הֲאָמוּר Mic. 2:7 (vid., Hitz.). A direct exhortation to Job to penitence would also not be in place here, although what Elihu says is levelled against Job. The כִּי is confirmatory. Thus God acts with that class of unscrupulous men who abuse their power for the destruction of their subjects: for he (one of them) says (or: has said, from the standpoint of the execution of punishment) to God, etc. Ew. differently: "for one says thus to God even: I expiate what I do not commit," by understanding the speech quoted of a defiance which reproachfully demands an explanation. It is, however, manifestly a compendious model confession. And since Elihu with כי establishes the execution of punishment from this, that it never entered the mind of the חָנֵף אָדָם thus to humble himself before God, so נָשָׂאתִי here cannot signify: I have repented (put up with and had to bear what I have deserved); on the contrary, the confession begins with the avowal: I have exalted myself (נָשָׂא, se efferre, in Hos. 13:1, Ps. 89:10), which is then followed by the vow: I will not (in the future) do evil (חָבַל synon. עָוָה, as Neh. 1:7, and probably also supra, Job 24:9), and the entreaty, v. 32: beside that which I behold (elliptical object-clause, Ew. § 333, b), i.e., what lies beyond my vision (= נִסְתָּרוֹת or עֲלֻמִים, Ps. 19:13, 90:8, unacknowledged sins), teach me; and the present vow has reference to acknowledged sins and sins that have still to be acknowledged: if I have done wrong, I will do it no more. Thus speaking—Elihu means—those high ones might have anticipated the punishment of the All-just God, for favour instead of wrath cannot be extorted, it is only reached by the way of lowly penitence.

33 Shall He recompense it as thou wilt? For thou hast found fault,
So that thou hast to determine, not I,
And what thou knowest speak out!
34 Men of understanding will say to me,
And a wise man who listeneth to me:
35 "Job speaketh without knowledge,
"And his words are without intelligence."
36 O would that Job were proved to the extreme
On account of his answers after the manner of evil men;
37 For he addeth transgression to his sin,
Among us he clappeth
And multiplieth his speeches against God.

Job 34:33–37. The question put to Job, whether then from him or according to his idea (מֵעִמְּךָ in עִם as Job 23:10, 27:11, which see) shall God recompense it (viz., as this "it" is to be understood according to v. 32b: man's evil-doing and actions in general), Elihu proves from this, that Job has despised (shown himself discontented with it) the divine mode of recompense, so that therefore (this second כִּי signifies also nam, but is, because extending further on account of the first, according to the sense equivalent to ita ut) he has to choose (seek out) another mode of recompense, not Elihu (who is perfectly satisfied with the mode with which history furnishes us); which is then followed by the challenge (דַּבֵּר not infin., but as Job 32:33): what (more corresponding to just retribution) thou knowest, speak out then! Elihu on his part knows that he does not stand alone against Job, the censurer of the divine government of the world, but that men of heart (understanding) and (every) wise man who listens to him will coincide with him in the opinion that Job's talk is devoid of knowledge and intelligence (on the form of writing הַשְׂכֵּיל as Jer. 3:15, vid., Ges. § 53, rem. 2).

In v. 36f. we will for the present leave the meaning of אבי undecided; יְבָחֵן is certainly intended as optative: let Job be tried to the extreme or last, i.e., let his trial by affliction continue until the matter is decided (comp. Hab. 1:4), on account of the opposition among men of iniquity, i.e., after the manner of such (on this Beth of association comp. בְּקֹשְׁשִׁים, Job 36:14), for to חַטָּאת, by which the purpose of his affliction is to be cleared up, he adds פָּשַׁע, viz., the wickedness of blasphemous speeches:

among us (therefore without fear) he claps (viz., his hands scornfully together, יִסְפּוֹק only here thus absolute instead of יַכֶּפְיו יִשְׁפֹּק, Job 27:23, comp. בשׁפק Job 36:18 with ספקו 20:22310) and multiplies (יַרֵב, fut. apoc. Hiph. as Job 10:17, and instead of the full fut., as יִשֹׂר, Job 33:27) his speeches against God, i.e., exceeds himself in speeches which irreverently dictate to and challenge God.

But we now ask, what does that אָבִי, v. 36a, signify? According to the accentuation with Rebia, it appears to be intended to signify pater mi (Jer.), according to which Saad. (jâ rabbî) and Gecat. (munchiî, my Creator) translate it. This would be the only passage where an Old Testament saint calls God אבי; elsewhere God is called the Father of Israel, and Israel as a people, or the individual comprehending himself with the nation, calls Him אבינו. Nevertheless this pater mi for Elihu would not be inappropriate, for what the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. 12:7, says to believers on the ground of Prov. 3:11: εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, ye suffer for the purpose of paternal discipline, is Elihu's fundamental thought; he also calls God in Job 32:22, 36:3, which a like reference to himself, עשׂני and פעלי—this ejaculatory "my Father!" especially in conjunction with the following wish, remains none the less objectionable, and only in the absence of a more agreeable interpretation should we, with Hirz., decide in its favour. It would be disproportionately repulsive if v. 36f. still belonged to the assenting language of another, and Elihu represented himself as addressed by אבי (Wolfson, Maur.). Thus, therefore, אבי must be taken somehow or other interjectionally. It is untenable to compare it with אֲבוֹי, Prov. 23:29, for ואבוי אוי (Arab. âh wa-âwâh) is "ah! and alas!" The Aramaic בייא בייא, vae vae (Buxtorf, col. 294), compared by Ges. to בִּי, signifies just the same. The Targ. translates צַבֵּינָא, I wish; after which Kimchi, among moderns, Umbr., Schlottm., Carey, and others derive אָבִי from אָבָה, a wish (after the form קָצָה, חָזָה), but the participial substantival-form badly suits this signification, which is at once improbable according to the usage of the language so far as we at present know it. This interpretation also does not well suit the בִּי, which is to be explained at the same time. Ewald, § 358, a, regards אָבִי as the fuller form of בִּי, and thinks אבי is dialectic = לָבִי = לָוִי = לוּ, but this is an etymological leger-demain. The two Schultens (died 1750 and 1793) were on the right track when they traced back אבי to בוא, but their interpretation: rem eo adducam ut (אבי = אביא, as it is certainly not unfrequently written, e.g., 1 Kings 21:29, with the assumption of a root בי cognate with בא), is artificial and without support in the usage of the language and in the syntax. Körber and Simonis opened up the right way, but with inadequate means for following it out, by referring (vid., Ges. Thes. s.v. בִּי) to the formula of a wish and of respect, bawwâk allah, which, however, also is bajjâk. The Kamus interprets bajjâk, though waveringly, by bawwâk, the meaning of which (may he give thee a resting-place) is more transparent. In an annotated Codex of Zamachschari hajjâk allah wa-bajjâk is explained: God preserve thy life and grant thee to come to a place of rest, bawwaaka (therefore Arab. bawâ = bawa'a) menzilan. That אָבִי (as also בִּי) is connected with this bajjâk since the latter is the Piel -form of an old verb bajja (vid., supra, p. 559), which with the forms Arab. bâ'a (whence Arab. bî'at, a sheltering house) and Arab. bw' (bwâ) has one root similar in signification with בוא, the following contributions of Wetzstein will show.

In elucidation of the present passage he observes: The expressions abî tebî, jebî; nebî, tebû, jebû, are so frequent in Damascus, that they very soon struck me, and on my first inquiry I always received the same answer, that they are a mutilation of Arab. 'bgy, abghi, I desire, etc. [vid. supra, p. 580], until one day a fugitive came into the consulate, and with these words, abî wâlidêk, seized me in that part of the body where the Arabs wear the girdle (zunnâr), a symbolic action by which one seeks some one's protection. Since the word here could not be equivalent to abghi ("I desire" thy parents), I turned to the person best acquainted with the idiom of the country, the scribe Abderrahmân el-Mîdâni, which father had been a wandering

minstrel in the camps for twenty years; and he explained to me that abghi only signifies "I desire;" on the contrary, abî, "I implore importunately, I pray for God's sake," and the latter belongs to a defective verb, Arab. bayya, from which, except the forms mentioned, only the part. anâ bâj, "I come as a suppliant," and its plur. nahn bâjin, is used. The poet Musa Rârâ from Krêje in the south of Hauran, who lived with me six months in Damascus in order to instruct me in the dialect of his district, assured me that among the Beduins also the perf. forms bît, bînâ (I have, we have entreated), and the fut. forms tabîn (thou, woman …), jaben (they, the women …), and taben (ye women …), are used. In the year 1858, in the course of a journey in his native country, I came to Dîmâs, whither they had brought two strange Beduins who had been robbed of their horses in that desert (Sahra Dîmâs), and one of them had at the same time received a mortal gunshot-wound. As I can to these men, who were totally forsaken, the wounded man began to express his importunate desire for a surgeon with the words jâ shêch nebî 'arabak, "Sir, we claim the protection of thy Arabs," i.e., we adjure thee by thy family. Naturally abî occurs most frequently. It generally has its obj. in the acc., often also with the praepos. Arab. 'ly, exactly like Arab. dchl (to enter, to flee anywhere and hide), which is its correct synonym and usual substitute in common life. It is often used without an obj., and, indeed, very variously. With women it is chiefly the introduction to a question prompted by curiosity, as: abî (ah, tell me), have you really betrothed your daughter? Or the word is accompanied by a gesture by the five fingers of the right hand, with the tips united, being stretched out towards the hasty or impatient listener, as if one wished to show some costly object, when abî signifies as much as: I pray thee wait till I have shown thee this precious thing, i.e., allow me to make one more remark to thee in reference to the matter. Moreover, בִּי (probably not corrupted from אָבִי, but a derived nomen concretum in the sense of dachîl or mustagîr, one seeking protection, protégé, after the form אִי, צִי, from בוה = בוא) still exists unaltered in Hauran and in the steppe. The Beduin introduces an important request with the words anâ bî ahlak, I am a protégé of thy family, or anâ bî 'irdak, I trust to thine honour, etc.; while in Damascus they say, anâ dachîl ahlak, harîmak, aulâdak, etc. The Beduin women make use of this bî in a weakened signification, in order to beg a piece of soap or sugar, and anâ bî lihjetak, I pray by thy beard, etc., is often heard.

If now we combine that אָבִי of Elihu with abghi (from Arab. bgâ, Hebr. בָּעָה, Aram. בְּעָא, fut. יִבְעֵי, as בִּי with בָּעִי) or with abî = אָבָא, from the verb bajja = בוא (בי),311 it always remains a remarkable instance in favour of the Arabic colouring of the Elihu section similar to the rest of the book,—a colouring, so to speak, dialectically Hauranitish; while, on the other hand, even by this second speech, one cannot avoid the impression of a great distance between it and the rest of the book: the language has a lofty tone, without its special harshness, as there, being the necessary consequence of a carefully concentrated fulness of thought; moreover, here in general the usual regularity of the strophe-lines no longer prevails, and also the usual symmetrical balance of thought in them.

If we confine our attention to the real substance of the speech, apart from the emotional and rough accessories, Elihu casts back the reproach of injustice which Job has raised, first as being contradictory to the being of God, Job 34:10f.; then he seeks to refute it as contradicting God's government, and this he does (1) apagogically from the unselfish love with which God's protecting care preserves the breath of every living thing, while He who has created all things might bring back all created things to the former non-existence, Job 34:12–15; (2) by induction from the impartial judgment which He exercises over princes and peoples, and from which it is inferred that the Ruler of the world is also all-just, Job 34:16–20. From this Elihu proves that God can exercise justice, and from that, that He is omniscient, and sees into man's inmost nature without any

judicial investigation, Job 34:21–28; inaccessible to human accusation and human defiance, He rules over peoples and individuals, even over kings, and nothing turns His just punishment aside but lowly penitence blended with the prayer for the disclosure of unperceived sin, Job 34:29–32. For in His retributive rule God does not follow the discontented demands of men arrogant and yet devoid of counsel, Job 34:33. It is worthy of recognition, that Elihu does not here coincide with what has been already said (especially Job 12:15ff.), without applying it to another purpose; and that his theodicy differs essentially from that proclaimed by the friends. It is not derived from mere appearance, but lays hold of the very principles. It does not attempt the explanation of the many apparent contradictions to retributive justice which outward events manifest, as agreeing with it; it does not solve the question by mere empiricism, but from the idea of the Godhead and its relation to the world, and by such inner necessity guarantees to the mysteries still remaining to human shortsightedness, their future solution.

JOB 35

Elihu's Third Speech

[Then began Elihu, and said:]

2 Dost thou consider this to be right,

Sayest thou: my righteousness exceedeth God's,

3 That thou sayest, what advantage is it to thee,

What doth it profit me more than my sin?

4 I will answer thee words,

And thy companions with thee.

Job 35:2–4. The neutral זֹאת, v. 2a, refers prospectively to כִּי־תֹאמַר, v. 3a: this that thou sayest. חָשַׁב with acc. of the obj. and לְ of the predicate, as Job 33:10, comp. 13:24, and freq. The second interrogative clause, v. 2b, is co-ordinate with the first, and the collective thought of this ponderous construction, vv. 2, 3, is this: Considerest thou this to be right, and thinkest thou on this account to be able to put thy righteousness above the divine, that, as thou maintainest, no righteousness on the side of God corresponds to this thy righteousness, because God makes no distinction between righteousness and the sin of man, and allows the former to go unrewarded? צִדְקִי (for which Olsh. wishes to read צַדַּקְתִּי, as Job 9:27 אמרתי for אָמְרִי) forms with מֵאֵל a substantival clause: justitia mea est prae Deo (prae divina); מִן comparative as Job 32:2, comp. on the matter 34:5, not equivalent to ἀπό as Job 4:17. כי־תאמר is first followed by the oratio obliqua: what it (viz., צדקך) advantageth thee, then by the or. directa (on this change vid., Ew. § 338, a): what profit have I (viz., בצדקי), prae peccato meo; this מִן is also comparative; the constantly ambiguous combination would be allowable from the fact that, according to the usage of the language, "to obtain profit from anything" is expressed by בְּ הוֹעִיל, not by מִן הועיל. Moreover, prae peccato meo is equivalent to plus quam inde quod pecco, comp. Ps. 18:24, מֵעֲוֹנִי, Hos. 4:8 אֶל־עֲוֹנָם. We have already on Job 34:9 observed that Job has not directly said (he cites it, Job 21:15, as the saying of the ungodly) what Elihu in v. 3 puts into his mouth, but as an inference it certainly is implied in such utterances as Job 9:22. Elihu's polemic against Job and his companions (רֵעֶיךָ are not the three, as LXX and Jer. translate, but the אָוֶן אַנְשֵׁי, to whom Job is likened by such words as Job 34:8, 36) is therefore not unauthorized; especially since he assails the conclusion together with its premises. In the second strophe the vindication of the conclusion is now refuted.

5 Look towards heaven and see,

And behold the ethereal heights: they are high above thee.

6 If thou sinnest, what dost thou effect with Him?

And if thy transgressions are many, what doest thou to Him?

7 If thou art righteous, what dost thou give Him,

Or what doth He take from thy hand?

8 To man like thee thy godlessness availeth,
And to thee, a son of man, thy righteousness.

Job 35:5–8. Towards heaven he is to direct his gaze, to obtain from the height of heaven a notion of the exaltation of God who dwells above the heavens. The combination וְרָאֵה הִבִּיט is like Ps. 80:15 and freq. שְׁחָקִים (שָׁחַק, Arab. sḥq, to rub in pieces, make thin, therefore the opposite of עָבִים) are the thin transparent strata of the atmosphere above the hanging clouds. מִן after גָּבַהּ denotes the height that is on the opposite side to the beholder. From the exaltation of God it is then further inferred that it is impossible to exercise any human influence upon Him, by which He might suffer. The pointing wavers here between תִּפְעַל (the common fut. form) and תִּפְעָל (as a contraction of תִּפְעֹל after the form אֶזְעָם, Num. 23:8). Human wrong or right doing neither diminishes nor increases His blessedness; injury or advantage is only on the side of man, from whom it proceeds. Others, whom his conduct affect, are not included in v. 8: righteous or ungodly doing, Elihu means to say, as such and with its consequences, belongs solely to the doer himself, the man "like thee" (לְאִישׁ with Munach, כָּמוֹךָ with Munach), the son of man, i.e., man, capable of evil as of good, and who always, after deciding in favour of the latter or the former, determines his fortune or misfortune, in distinction from God, who ever remains unchangeably the same in His perfect righteousness. What Elihu here says we have already heard from Eliphaz, Job 22:2f., and Job even expresses himself similarly in Job 7:20; but to Elihu's mind it all becomes for Job new and powerful motives to quiet submission, for what objection should Job raise in justification of his complaints concerning his affliction against such sentiments as these, that goodness bears its reward and evil its punishment in itself, and that God's reward of goodness is not a work of indebtedness, nor His punishment of evil a work of necessity? Before such truth he must really hold his peace.

9 By reason of the multitude of oppressions they raise a cry,
They call for help by reason of the arm of the great,
10 But none saith: Where is Eloah my Creator,
Who giveth songs of praise in the night,
11 Who teacheth us by the beasts of the earth,
And maketh us wise by the fowls of heaven?
12 Then they cry, yet He answereth not,
Because of the pride of evil men.
13 Vanity alone God heareth not,
And the Almighty observeth it not.

Job 35:9–13. In v. 9a the accentuation of מֵרֹב with Dechî, according to which Dachselt interprets: prae multitudine (oppressionum) oppressi clamabunt, is erroneous; it is to be written מֵרֹב, as everywhere else, and this (according to Codd. and the editions of Jablonski, Majus, Michaelis, and others) is to be accented with Munach, which is followed by עֲשׁוּקִים with a vicarious Munach: prae multitudine oppressionum (עֹשֶׁק like Eccl. 4:1a, and probably also Amos 3:9) edunt clamorem (Hiph. in the intensive Kal signification, as e.g., הִזְנָה, to commit fornication, Hos. 4:10, and freq., comp. p. 590, note). On זְרוֹעַ, v. 9b, vid., p. 479; רַבִּים are the great or lords (Arab. arbâb). The plur. with a general subj. is followed by the sing. in v. 10a: and no one says (exactly as in הֶאָמַר, Job 34:31). Elihu weakens the doubt expressed by Job in Job 24:12, that God allows injustice to prevail, and oppressed innocence remains without vindication. The failure of the latter arises from the fact of the sufferers complaining, but not seeking earnestly the only true helper, God their maker (עֹשַׂי, intensive plur., as Isa. 22:11, 54:5, Ps. 149:2), who gives (to which may be compared a passage of the Edda: "Wuodan gives songs to the Scalds") songs (זְמִרוֹת, from the onomatopoetic זמר) in the night, i.e., who in the night of sorrow puts songs of praise concerning the dawning light of help into the mouth of the sufferers. The singing of the glory of the nightly heavens (Stick., Hahn) is to be as little thought of as the music of the spheres; the night is, as Job 34:20, 25, the time of unexpectedly sudden change.

In v. 11 most expositors (last of all Schlottm.) take the two מִן as comparative. Elihu would then, since he feels the absence of the asking after this God on the part of the sufferers, mean the conscious relation in which He has placed us to Himself, and in accordance with which the sufferer should not merely instinctively complain, but humbly bow himself and earnestly offer up prayer. But according to Job 12:7 (comp. Prov. 6:6, וחכם), it is to be translated: who teaches (מַלְּפָנוּ = מְאַלְּפֵנוּ, comp. 2 Sam. 22:40, Psalter i. 160) us from the beasts of the earth (so that from them as a means of instruction teaching comes to us), and makes us wise from the birds of heaven. The fut. interchanging with the part. better accords with this translation, according to which v. 11 is a continuation of the assertion of a divine instruction, by means of the animal creation; the thought also suits the connection better, for of the many things that may be learned from the animal creation, prayer here comes under consideration,—the lions roar, Ps. 104:21; the thirsty cattle cry to God, Joel 1:20; the ravens call upon God, Ps. 147:9. It we now determine the collective thought of vv. 10f., that affliction does not drive most men to God the almighty Helper, who will be humbly entreated for help: it is more natural to take שָׁם (vid., on Job 23:7) in the sense of then (τότε), than, with reference to the scene of oppression, in the sense of there (LXX, Jer.: ibi). The division of the verse is correct, and H. B. Starcke has correctly interpreted: Tunc clamabunt (sed non respondebit) propter superbiam (insolentiam) malorum. מִפְּנֵי is not to be connected with יַעֲנֶה in the sense of non exaudiet et servabit, by which constr. praegnans one would expect מִן, Ps. 22:22, instead of מפני, nor in the sense of non exaudiet propter (Hirz., Schlottm.), for the arrogant רָעִים are not those who complain unheard: but, as the connection shows, those from whom the occasion of complaint proceeds. Therefore: not allowing themselves to be driven to God by oppression, they cry then, without, however, being heard of God, by reason of the arrogance of evil men which they have to endure. V. 13 gives the reason of their obtaining no answer: Only emptiness (i.e., mere motion of the lips without the true spirit of prayer) God heareth not, and the Almighty observeth it not. Hahn wrongly denies אַךְ the significations certo and verumtamen; but we prefer the restrictive signification (sheer emptiness or hollowness) which proceeds from the affirmative primary signification312 here, to the adversative (nevertheless emptiness), since the adversative thought, verumtamen non exaudit, has found its expression already in וְלֹא יְהַיֶּנָּה.

14 Although thou sayest, thou seest Him not:

The cause lieth before Him, and thou mayest wait for Him.

15 Now, then, if His wrath hath not yet punished,

Should He not be well acquainted with sullenness?

16 While Job openeth his mouth without reason,

Without knowledge multiplieth words.

Job 35:14–16. The address is not direct to Job exclusively, for it here treats first of the acts of injustice which prevail among men and remain apparently unpunished; but to Job, however, also, so far as he has, Job 23:8–10, comp. 19:7, 30:20, thus complained concerning his prayer being unanswered. כִּי אַף signifies elsewhere quanto minus, Job 4:19, or also quanto magis, Prov. 15:11, but nowhere quanto minus si (Hirz., Hlgst.) or quanto magis si (Hahn), also not Ezek. 15:5, where it signifies etiamne quum. As it can, however, naturally signify etiam quum, it can also signify etiamsi, etsi, as here and Neh. 9:18. This quamvis dicas (opineris) is followed by the oratio obliqua, as Job 35:3a. The relation of the matter—says the conclusion, v. 14b—is other than thou thinkest: the matter to be decided lies before Him, is therefore well known to Him, and thou mightest only wait for Him (חוֹלֶל instead of יְחֵל or הוֹחִיל only here, comp. Ps. 37:7, לו והתחולל); the decision, though it pass by, will not fail. In vv. 15f., v. 15 is taken by most modern commentators as antecedent to v. 16, in which

case, apart from the distortions introduced, two interpretations are possible: (1) However now, because His (God's) wrath does not visit … Job opens his mouth; (2) However now, because He (God) does not visit his (Job's) wrath (comp. on this reference of the אַפּוֹ to Job, Job 18:4, 36:13, 18) … Job opens, etc. That a clause with a confirmatory כי is made to precede its principal clause is not without example, Gen. 3:14, 17; but in connection with this arrangement the verb is accustomed always, in the principal clause or in the conclusion, to stand prominent (so that consequently we should expect ויפצה איוב), although in Arabic this position of the words, יפצה ואיוב, and in fact Arab. fâyûb instead of wâyûb (in connection with a difference of the subj. in the antecedent and in the conclusion, vid., De Sacy, Gramm. Arabe, § 1201, 2), is regular. Therefore for a long time I thought that v. 15 was to be taken interrogatively: And now (וְעַתָּה as logical inference and conclusion, which is here its most probable function, Ew. § 353, b) should His wrath not punish (פָּקַד as absolute as Job 31:14), and should He not take notice, etc., כִּי interrogative as 1 Sam. 24:20, 27:13, 1 Kings 11:22, as הֲכִי (is it so that, or: should it be so that), Job 6:22, and freq., in connection with which, what is said on Gen. 21:7 concerning the modal use of the praet. might be compared on the two praett. But by this rendering the connection of v. 16 with what precedes is awkward. Ewald has given the correct rendering (apart from the misunderstanding of פַּשׁ): Therefore, because His wrath has not yet punished, He does not know much about foolishness! V. 15b requires to be taken as the conclusion to v. 15a, yet not as an exclamation, but as an interrogative. The interrogative use of ולא is not unusual, 2 Sam. 19:44, Ezek. 16:43, 47, 56, 32:27; and just as here, this interrogative ולא is found after a hypothetical antecedent clause, 1 Sam. 20:9, Ex. 8:22.

In connection with this interrogative rendering of v. 15, it still remains questionable whether it refers to Job's sin, or sin which prevails among men. The theme of this third speech of Elihu requires the latter reference, although perhaps not without a side-glance at Job's won arrogant behaviour. The translation shows how suitably v. 16 is connected with what precedes: v. 16 is a circumstantial clause, or, if one is not willing to take it as a subordinate clause, but prefers to take it as standing on a level with v. 15, an adversative clause attached with Waw, as is frequently the case: but (nevertheless) Job …; פֶּה פָּצָה of opening the mouth in derision, as Lam. 2:16, 3:46; הֶבֶל is the acc. of closer definition to it (= בְּהֶבֶל), and the הַכְבִּיר, which occurs only here and Job 36:31, signifies without distinction magnificare and multiplicare: Job multiplies high emotional words. As this יַכְבִּיר is, so to speak, Hebraeo-Arabic (Arab. akbara), so is v. 15 full of Arabisims: (1) The combination אַיִן פָּקַד, which has not its like in the Hebrew language (whether it be originally intended as relative or not: non est quod visitaverit, Ew. § 321, b), corresponds to the popular Arabic use of lys for lâ, Ges. Thes. i. 82, b; probably אַיִן has the value of an intensive negation (Carey: not at all). (2) The combination בְּ יָדַע, to know about anything, to take knowledge of anything (differently Job 12:9, but comp. Job 24:12 on the idea), is like the Arab. construction of the verb 'alima with bi (concerning) or bianna (because that) of the obj.; מְאֹד (on this vid., on Ps. 31:12) belongs not to בפשׁ (which is indeed possible), but, according to Ps. 139:14, to ידע. (3) פַּשׁ is especially to be explained from the Arabic. The signification a multitude (Jewish expositors, after פּוּשׁ, Niph. se diffundere, Nah. 3:18) is not suitable; the signification evil (LXX, Jer., and others: פּשׁע = פּשׁ) presents a forcibly mutilated word, and moreover one devoid of significance in this connection; whereas the Arab. fšš (but not in its derivatives, fashsh, empty-headed; fâshûsh, empty-headedness, imbecility, with its metaphorical sense) indicates a development of signification which leads to the desired end, especially in the Syro-Arabic usage most natural here. The Arab. verb fšš (פּשׁשׁ, cogn. Arab. fšr, frš, to extend, expandere) is used originally of water (fashsh el-mâ): to overflow its dam, to overflow its banks, whence a valley by the lake of el-Hîgâne, into which the waters of the lake flow after the winter rains, is called el-mefeshsh; then of a

leathern bottle: to run out (tarf mefshûsh, an emptied bottle), of a tumour (waram): to disperse, disappear, and tropically of anger (el-chulq): to break forth, vent itself on anything, hence the phrase: dost thou make me a mefeshshe (an object for the venting) of thine anger? From this Arab. fšš (distinct from Arab. fâš med. Waw, to swim on the surface, trop. to be above, not to allow one's self to be kept down, and med. Je, comp. פּוּשׁ, Hab. 1:8, Jer. 50:11, Mal. 3:20, signifies to be proud) is פַּשׁ, formed after the forms בַּד, מַד, מַס, a synon. of זָדוֹן, or even of עֶבְרָה in the signification of excessive haughtiness, pride that bursts forth violently.313

Thus, even at the close of this third speech of Elihu, the Arabic, and in fact Syro-Arabic colouring, common to this section with the rest of the book, is confirmed; while, on the other hand, we miss the bold, original figures which up to Job 31 followed like waves one upon another, and we perceive a deficiency of skill, as now and then between Koheleth and Solomon. The chief thought of the speech we have also heard already from the three friends and Job himself. That the piety of the pious profits himself without involving God in any obligation to him, Eliphaz has already said, Job 22:2f.; and that prayer that is heard in time of need and the unanswered cry of the godly and the ungodly are distinct, Job said, Job 27:9f. Elihu, however, deprives these thoughts of their hitherto erroneous application. If piety gives nothing to God which He ought to reward, Job dare not regard his affliction, mysterious as it is to him, as unjust; and if the godly do not directly experience the avenging wrath of God on the haughtiness of their oppressors, the question, whether then their prayer for help is of the right kind, is more natural than the complain of a want of justice in God's government of the world. Job is silent also after this speech. It does not contain the right consolation; it contains, however, censure which he ought humbly to receive. It touches his heart. But whether it touches the heart of the idea of the book, is another question.

JOB 36

Elihu's Fourth Speech.—Ch. 36–37

[Then Elihu continued and said:]

2 Suffer me a little, and I will inform thee,
For there is something still to be said for Eloah.

3 I will fetch my knowledge from afar,
And to my Creator will I ascribe right.

4 For truly my words are not lies,
One perfect in knowledge stands before thee.

Job 36:2–4. Elihu's preceding three speeches were introduced by וַיֹּסֶף; this fourth, in honour of the number three, is introduced only as a continuation of the others. Job is to wait yet a little while, for he still has (= לִי עוֹד), or: there still are, words in favour of Eloah; i.e., what may be said in vindication of God against Job's complaints and accusations is not yet exhausted. This appears to be the only instance of the Aramaic כַּתַּר being taken up as Hebr.; whereas חָוָה, nunciare (Arab. wḥâ, I, IV), is a poetic Aramaism occurring even in Ps. 19:3 (comp. on the construction Job 32:6); and זְעֵיר (a diminutive form, after the manner of the Arab. zu'air) belongs in Isa. 28:10, 13 to the popular language (of Jerusalem), but is here used poetically. The verb נָשָׂא, v. 3a, is not to be understood according to מִשֹּׂל נשׂא, but according to 1 Kings 10:11; and לְמֵרָחוֹק signifies, as also Job 39:29, Isa. 37:26, e longinquo, viz., out of the wide realm of history and nature. The expression צֶדֶק נָתַן follows the analogy of (עז) נתן כבוד. דֵּעָה, v. 4b, interchanges with the דֵּעַ which belongs exclusively to Elihu, since Elihu styles himself דַּעוֹת תְּמִים, as Job 37:16 God דֵּעִים תְּמִים (comp. 1 Sam. 2:3, דַּעוֹת אֵל). תמים in this combination with דעות cannot be intended of purity of character; but as Elihu there attributes absolute perfection of knowledge in every direction to God, so here, in reference to the theodicy which he opposes to Job, he claims faultlessness and clearness of perception.

5 Behold, God is mighty, and yet doth not act scornfully,

Mighty in power of understanding.

6 He preserveth not the life of the ungodly,

And to the afflicted He giveth right.

7 He withdraweth not His eyes from the righteous,

But with kings on the throne

He establisheth them for ever, and they are exalted.

Job 36:5–7. The obj. that must be mentally supplied to יִמְאָס וְלֹא is, as in Job 42:6, to be derived from the connection. The idea of the verb is, as in Job 8:20: He is exalted, without however looking down disdainfully (non despicit) from His height, or more definitely: without setting Himself above the justice due to even the meanest of His creatures—great in power of heart (comp. Job 34:33 לבב אנשי, Arab. ûlû-l-elbâb), i.e., understanding (νοῦὸ πνεῦμα), to see through right and wrong everywhere and altogether. Vv. 6, 7 describe how His rule among men evinces this not merely outward but spiritual superiority coupled with condescension to the lowly. The notion of the object, לַכִּסֵּא ת־מְלָכִים וְאֶ (as Isa. 9:11 the subject), becomes the more distinctly prominent by virtue of the fut. consec. which follows like a conclusion, and takes it up again. Ewald thinks this explanation contrary to the accents and the structure of the sentence itself; but it is perfectly consistent with the former, and indisputably syntactic (Ges. § 129, 2, b, and Ew. himself, § 344, b). Ps. 9:5, comp. 132:12, Isa. 47:1, shows how לכסא is intended (He causes them to sit upon the throne). Ch. 5:11, 1 Sam. 2:8, Ps. 113:7f. are parallel passages.

8 And if they are bound with chains,

Holden in cords of affliction:

9 Then He declareth to them their doing

And their transgressions, that they have been vainglorious;

10 Then He openeth their ear to warning,

And commandeth them to turn from iniquity.

Job 36:8–10. The subj. is in no case the רשׁעים (Hahn), but the צדיקים, or those who are as susceptible to discipline as it is needful to them, just as in Ps. 107, which in general presents many instances for an extensive comparison with the speeches of Elihu. The chains, v. 8a, are meant literally, and the bands, v. 8b, figuratively; the Psalmist couples both in אסירי וברזל עֳנִי, 107:10. The conclusion begins with v. 9, and is repeated in another application, v. 10. עַלֹּפּ in the sense of maleficium, as Arab. fa'alat, recalls מעשׂה, facinus, Job 33:17. כִּי, v. 9b, as in v. 10b, an objective quod. It is not translated, however, quod invaluerint (Rosenm.), which is opposed to the most natural sense of the Hithpa., but according to Job 15:25: quod sese extulerint. מוּסָר, παιδεία, disciplina, interchanges here with the more rare מֹסָר used in Job 33:16; there we have already also met with the phrase אֹזֶן גָּלָה, to uncover the ear, i.e., to open. כִּי אָמַר corresponds to the Arab. amara an (bi-an), to command that. The fundamental thought of Elihu here once again comes unmistakeably to view: the sufferings of the righteous are well-meant chastisements, which are to wean them from the sins into which through carnal security they have fallen—a warning from God to penitence, designed to work their good.

11 If they hear and yield,

They pass their days in prosperity

And their years in pleasure.

12 And if they hear not,

They pass away by the bow

And expire in lack of knowledge.

Job 36:11, 12. Since a declaration of the divine will has preceded in v. 10b, it is more natural to take וְיַעֲבֹדוּ in the sense of obsequi, to do the will of another (as 1 Kings 12:7, comp. מַעֲבָד from עָבַד in the generalized sense of facere), than, with Umbr., in the sense of colere scil. Deum (as Isa. 19:23, Arab. 'âbid, one who reveres God, a godly person). Instead of יִבְלוּ, Isa. 65:22 (on which the Masora observes לית, i.e., "nowhere else") and Job 21:13 Chethîb, 'it is here without dispute יְכַלּוּ (Targ. יְשַׁלְּמוּן, peragent, as Ezek. 43:27). נָעִימִים is, as Ps. 16:6, a neutral masc.: amoena. On בשׁלח עבר, to precipitate one's self into the

weapon, i.e., to incur peremptory punishment, comp. Job 33:18. On דעת בבלי comp. 35:16, 4:21. Impenitence changes affliction, which is intended to be a means of rescue, into total destruction; yet there are some who will not be warned and affrighted by it.

13 Yet the hypocrites in heart cherish wrath,
They cry not when He hath chained them.
14 Thus their soul dieth in the vigour of youth,
And their life is like that of the unclean.
15 Yet He delivereth the sufferer by his affliction,
And openeth their ear by oppression.

Job 36:13–15. He who is angry with God in his affliction, and does not humbly pray to Him, shows thereby that he is a חָנֵף, one estranged from God (on the idea of the root, vid., i. 216), and not a צדיק. This connection renders it natural to understand not the divine wrath by אַף: θησαυρίζουσιν ὀργήν (Rosenm. after Rom. 2:5), or: they heap up wrath upon themselves (Wolfson, who supplies עֲלֵיהֶם), but the impatience, discontent, and murmuring of man himself: they cherish or harbour wrath, viz., בְּלִבָּם (comp. Job 22:22, where בלב שׂים signifies to take to heart, but at the same time to preserve in the heart). Used thus absolutely, שִׂים signifies elsewhere in the book, to give attention to, Job 4:20, 24:12, 34:23, or (as Arab. wḍ') to lay down a pledge; here it signifies reponunt s. recondunt (with an implied in ipsis), as also Arab. šâm, fut. i, to conceal with the idea of sinking into (immittentem), e.g., the sword in the sheath. With תָּמֹת, for וְתָמֹת (Isa. 50:2) or וַתָּמָת, the punishment which issues forth undistinguished from this frustration of the divine purpose of grace follows ἀσυνδέτως, as e.g., Hos. 7:16. חַיָּה interchanges with נפשׁ, as Job 33:22, 28; נעַר (likewise a favourite word with Elihu) is intended just as Job 33:25, and in the Ps. 88 v. 16, which resembles both the Elihu section and the rest of the book. The Beth of בַּקְּדֵשִׁים has the sense of aeque ac (Targ. הֵיךְ), as Job 34:36, comp. תַּחַת, Job 34:26. Jer. translates inter effeminatos; for קְדֵשִׁים (heathenish, equivalent to קְדוֹשִׁים, as כְּמָרִים, heathenish, equivalent to כֹּהֲנִים) are the consecrated men, who yielded themselves up, like the women in honour of the deity, to passive, prematurely-enervating incontinence (vid., Keil on Deut. 23:18), a heathenish abomination prevailing now and again even in Israel (1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:47), which was connected with the worship of Astarte and Baal that was transferred from Syria, and to which allusion is here made, in accordance with the scene of the book. For the sufferer, on the other hand, who suffers not merely of necessity, but willingly, this his suffering is a means of rescue and moral purification. Observe the play upon the words יְחַלֵּץ and בְּלַחַץ. The Beth in both instances is, in accordance with Elihu's fundamental thought, the Beth instrum.

16 And He even bringeth thee out of the jaws of distress
To a broad place, whose ground hath no straitness,
And the adorning of thy table shall be full of fatness.
17 Yet thou art become full of the judging of the evil-doer:
Judging and judgment lay hold on one another!
18 For let not anger indeed entice thee to scorning,
And let not the greatness of the ransom mislead thee.

Job 36:16–18. With v. 16a Elihu passes over to the application to Job of what he said in the preceding strophe. Since it is usual to place אַף (like גַּם and אַךְ) at the beginning of the sentence, although not belonging to the member of the sentence which immediately follows, הֲסִיתְךָ וְאַף for אוֹתְךָ אַף וְהֲסִית cannot be remarkable. The praet. הסיתך is not promissory, but Elihu says with what design God has decreed the present suffering for Job. מִן הֵסִית is like 2 Chron. 18:31: out of distress (צָר for צַר by Rebia magnum), which has him in its jaws, and threatens to swallow him, God brings him away to great prosperity; a thought which Elihu expresses in the imagery of the Psalms of a broad place and

a bountiful table (comp. e.g., Ps. 4:2, 23:5). רַחַב is locative, and תַּחְתֶּיהָ לֹא־מוּצַק is either a relative clause: whose beneath (ground) is not straitened, no-straitness (in which case מוּצַק would not be constr. from the n. hophal. מוּצָק, Isa. 8:23, but absol. after the form מַחֲנַק, Job 7:15, Ew. § 160, c, Anm. 4), Saad. Arab. lâ ḍîq fî mûḍ'hâ (cujus in loco non angustiae); or it is virtually an adj.: without (לֹא = בְּלֹא, as Job 34:24), comp. on Job 12:24) straitness of what is beneath them, eorum quae sub se habet (comp. on Job 28:5). רַחַב is fem., like רְחוֹב, Dan. 9:25. A special clause takes the place of the locative, v. 16c: and the settling or spreading, i.e., the provision (from נוּחַ, to come down gradually, to seat one's self) of thy table shall be full of fatness. מָלֵא (whether it be adj. or verb) is treated by attraction, according to the gender of the governed noun; and it is unnecessary, with Rosenm. and others, to derive נַחַת from נָחַת (Aram. for יָרַד).

In v. 17, דִּין is intended of Job's negative judgment concerning God and His dealings (comp. Ps. 76:9, where it signifies a judicial decision, and Prov. 22:10, where it signifies a wrangling refusal of a fair decision). V. 17a is not a conditional clause (Hahn), in which case the praet. hypothet. would have a prominent position, but an adversative predicative clause: but (nevertheless) thou art full of the judging of the evil-doer (evil judging); after which, just as ἀσυνδέτως as v. 14a, the sad issue in which this judging after the manner of evil-doers results is expressed: such judging and judgment border closely upon one another. Röd., Dietr., and Schlottm. have wrongly reproduced this idea, discerned by Ges., when they translate: judgment and sentence (guilt and punishment) shall seize thee. יִתְמְכוּ, prehendunt scil. se (Ebr.: put forth the hand), is used like the Aram. סְמַךְ, to draw nearer, fasten together (Rabb. סָמוּךְ, near at hand), Arab. tamâsaka (from Arab. msk = סמך, as e.g., hanash = נָחָשׁ). In v. 18 we leave the signification thick milk or cream (חֵמָה = חֶמְאָה, as Job 29:6) to those who persuade themselves that cream can be metaphorically equivalent to superfluity (Ew., Hirz., Vaih., Hlgst.). Renan's translation: N'espère pas détourner la colère de Dieu par une amende, we also leave as a simple puzzle to its discoverer, who, with this one exception, is destitute of thoughts proper to the book of Job. In general, the thought, "do not imagine by riches, by a great ransom, to be able to satisfy the claims of God," is altogether out of place here. Moreover, חֵמָה, which, as e.g., דְּאָגָה, Prov. 12:25 (Ew. § 174, g), is construed as masc., cannot be understood of God's wrath, since the poet by הֵסִית will not at one time have ascribed to God a well-meant incitation, at another an enticement in malam partem. That which allures is Job's own חֵמָה, and that not the excitement of his affliction (Hahn), but of his passion; comp. אַף, v. 13. שֶׁפֶק is, however, to be explained according to Job 34:37, comp. 27:23 (clapping of hands = derision); and כֹּפֶר signifies reconciliation or expiation, as Job 33:24. Elihu admonishes Job not to allow himself to be drawn by the heat of passion into derision, or to deride; nor to be allured from the right way by the ransom which is required of him as the price of restoration to happiness, viz., humble submission to the divine chastisement, as though this ransom were exceeding great. The connection is clear: an adverse verdict (דִּין) and condemnation (מִשְׁפָּט) are closely connected; for (כִּי) hastiness of temper, let it not (פֶּן) lead thee astray … thou wouldst not escape the judgment of God!

19 Shall thy crying place thee beyond distress,
And all the efforts of strength?
20 Long not for the night to come,
Which shall remove people from their place!
21 Take heed, incline not to evil;
For this thou hast desired more than affliction.

Job 36:19–21. Those expositors who found in v. 18b the warning, that Job should not imagine that he would be able to redeem himself from judgment by a large ransom, go on to explain: will He esteem thy riches? (Farisol, Rosenm., Umbr., Carey, Ebr., and others); or: will thy riches suffice? (Hirz., Schlottm.); or some other way (Ew.). But apart from the want of

connection of this insinuation, which is otherwise not mentioned in the book, and apart from the violence which must be done to הֲיַעַרְכֶךָּ to accommodate it to it, שׁוּעַ, although it might, as the abstract of שׁוֹעַ, Job 34:19, signify wealth (comp. Arab. sa'at, amplitudo), is, however, according to the usage of the language (vid., Job 30:24), so far as we can trace it, a secondary form of שָׁוְעָה (שַׁוְעָה), a cry for help; and Job 35:9f., v. 13, and other passages, also point to this signification. What follows is still less appropriate to this thought of ransom; Hirz. translates: Oh, not God and all the treasures of wealth! But בְּצָר is nowhere equivalent to בָּצָר, Job 22:24; but צָר, v. 16, signifies distress; and the expression לֹא בָצָר, in a condition devoid of distress, is like לֹא בחכמה, Job 4:21, and לֹא ביד, Job 34:20. Finally, כֹּחַ אַמִּיץ signifies mighty in physical strength, Job 9:4, 19, and מַאֲמַצֵּי־כֹחַ strong proofs of strength, not "treasures of wealth." Stick. correctly interprets: "Will thy wild raging cry, then, and all thine exertions, as a warrior puts them forth in the tumult of battle to work his way out, put thee where there is an open space?" but the figure of a warrior is, with Hahn, to be rejected; עָרַךְ is only a nice word for שִׂים שִׁית, to place, set up, Job 37:19.

Ver. 20. Elihu calls upon Job to consider the uselessness of his vehement contending with God, and then warns him against his dreadful provocation of divine judgment: ne anheles (Job 7:2) noctem illam (with the emphatic art.) sublaturam populos loco suo. לַעֲלוֹת is equivalent to futuram (הַהֹוָה or הָעֲתִידָה) ut tollat = sublaturam (vid., on Job 5:11, לָשׂוּם, collocaturus; 30:6, לִשְׁכֹּן, habitandum est), syncopated from לְהַעֲלוֹת, in the sense of Ps. 102:25; and תַּחְתָּם signifies, as Job 40:12 (comp. on Hab. 3:16), nothing but that just where they are, firmly fixed without the possibility of escape, they are deprived of being. If whole peoples are overtaken by such a fate, how much less shall the individual be able to escape it! And yet Job presses forward on to the tribunal of the terrible Judge, instead of humbling himself under His mighty hand. Oh that in time he would shrink back from this absolute wickedness (אָוֶן), for he has given it the preference before עָנִי, quiet, resigned endurance. עַל בָּחַר signifies, 2 Sam. 19:39, to choose to lay anything on any one; here as בחר בְּ, elsewhere to extend one's choice to something, to make something an object of choice; perhaps also under the influence of the phrase עַל הִתְעַבֵּר, and similar phrases. The construction is remarkable, since one would sooner have expected עִנְיְעַל־ בחרת זה, hanc elegisti prae toleratione.

22 Behold, God acteth loftily in His strength;
Who is a teacher like unto Him?
23 Who hath appointed Him His way,
And who dare say: Thou doest iniquity!?
24 Remember that thou magnify His doing,
Which men have sung.
25 All men delight in it,
Mortal man looketh upon it from afar.

Job 36:22–25. Most modern expositors, after the LXX δυνάστης, give מוֹרֶה the signification lord, by comparing the Arab. mar-un (imru-un), Syr. mor (with the art. moro) or more (with the art. morjo), Chald. מָרֵא, Talmud. מַר (comp. Philo, ii. 522, ed. Mangey: οὕτως, viz., μάριὼ φασὶ τὸν κύριον ὀνομάζεσθαι παρὰ Σύροις), with it; but Rosenm., Arnh., Löwenthal, Wolfson, and Schlottm., after the Targ., Syr., and Jer., rightly abide by the signification: teacher. For (1) מוֹרֶה (from הוֹרָה, Ps. 25:8, 12, 32:8) has no etymological connection with מר (of מָרָא, Arab. maru'a, opimum, robustum esse); (2) it is, moreover, peculiar to Elihu to represent God as a teacher both by dreams and dispensations of affliction, Job 33:14ff., 34:32, and by His creatures, 35:11; and (3) the designation of God as an incomparable teacher is also not inappropriate here, after His rule is described in v. 22a as transcendently exalted, which on that very account commands to human research a reverence which esteems itself lightly. V. 23a is not to be translated: who overlooketh Him in His way? (פָּקַד with עַל of the personal and acc. of the neutral obj.), which is without support in the language; but: who has prescribed to Him (על פקד as Job 34:13) His way? i.e., as Rosenm. correctly interprets: quis

ei praescripsit quae agere deberet, He is no mandatory, is responsible to no one, and under obligation to no one, and who should dare to say (quis dixerit; on the perf. comp. on Job 35:15): Thou doest evil?—man shall be a docile learner, not a self-satisfied, conceited censurer of the absolute One, whose rule is not to be judged according to the laws of another, but according to His own laws. Thus, then, shall Job remember (memento = cura ut) to extol (תַּשְׁגִּיא, Job 12:23) God's doings, which have been sung (comp. e.g., Ps. 104:22) by אֲנָשִׁים, men of the right order (Job 37:24); Jer. de quo cecinerunt viri. שׁוּר nowhere has the signification intueri (Rosenm., Umbr.); on the other hand, Elihu is fond of direct (Job 33:27, 35:10) and indirect allusions to the Psalms. All men—he continues, with reference to God's פֹּעַל, working—behold it, viz., as בּוֹ implies, with pleasure and astonishment; mortals gaze upon it (reverentially) from afar,—the same thought as that which has already (Job 26:14) found the grandest expression in Job's mouth.

26 Behold, God is exalted—we know Him not entirely;

The number of His years, it is unsearchable.

27 For He draweth down the drops of water,

They distil as rain in connection with its mist,

28 Which the clouds do drop,

Distil upon the multitude of men.

29 Who can altogether understand the spreadings of the clouds,

The crash of His tabernacle?

Job 36:26–29. The Waw of the quasi-conclusion in v. 26b corresponds to the Waw of the train of thought in v. 26a (Ges. § 145, 2). שָׁנָיו מִסְפַּר is, as the subject-notion, conceived as a nominative (vid., on Job 4:6, p. 293, note 1), not as in similar quasi-antecedent clauses, e.g., Job 23:12, as an acc. of relation. שַׁגִּיא here and Job 37:23 occurs otherwise only in Old Testament Chaldee. In what follows Elihu describes the wondrous origin of rain. "If Job had only come," says a Midrash (Jalkut, § 518), "to explain to us the matter of the race of the deluge (vid., especially Job 22:15–18), it had been sufficient; and if Elihu had only come to explain to us the matter of the origin of rain (גשׁמים ירידת מעשׂה), it had been enough." In Gesenius' Handwörterbuch, v. 27 is translated: when He has drawn up the drops of water to Himself, then, etc. But it is יִגְרַע, not גִּרַע; and גָּרַע neither in Hebr. nor in Arab. signifies attrahere in sublime (Rosenm.), but only attrahere (root גר) and detrahere; the latter signification is the prevailing one in Hebr. (Job 15:8, 36:7). With כִּי the transcendent exaltation of the Being who survives all changes of creation is shown by an example: He draws away (draws off, as it were) the water-drops, viz., from the waters that are confined above on the circle of the sky, which pass over us as mist and cloud (vid., Genesis, S. 107); and these water-drops distil down (זָקַק, to ooze, distil, here not in a transitive but an intransitive signification, since the water-drops are the rain itself) as rain, לְאֵדוֹ, with its mist, i.e., since a mist produced by it (Gen. 2:6) fills the expanse (רָקִיעַ), the downfall of which is just this rain, which, as v. 28 says, the clouds (called שְׂחָקִים on account of its thin strata of air, in distinction from the next mist-circle) cause to flow gently down upon the multitude of men, i.e., far and wide over the mass of men who inhabit the district visited by the rain; both verbs are used transitively here, both נָזַל as Isa. 45:8, and רָעַף, as evidently Prov. 3:20. אִם אַף, v. 29a, commences an intensive question: moreover, could one understand = could one completely understand; which certainly, according to the sense, is equivalent to: how much less (כִּי אַף). אִם is, however, the interrogative an, and אִם אַף corresponds to הֲאַף in the first member of the double question, Job 34:17, 40:8f. מִפְרְשֵׂי are not the burstings, from פָּרַס = פָּרַשׂ, frangere, findere, but spreadings, as Ezek. 27:7 shows, from פָּרַשׂ, expandere, Ps. 105:39, comp. supra on Job 36:9. It is the growth of the storm-clouds, which collect often from a beginning "small as a man's hand" (1 Kings 18:44), that is intended; majestic omnipotence conceals itself behind these as in a סֵכָּה (Ps. 18:12) woven out of thick branches; and the rolling thunder is here called the crash

(תְּשֵׁאוֹת, as Job 39:7, is formed from שׁוֹא, to rumble, whence also שׁוֹאָה, if it is not after the form גּוֹלָה, migration, exile, from שׁאה, vid., on Job 30:3) of this pavilion of clouds in which the Thunderer works.

30 Behold, He spreadeth His light over Himself,
And the roots of the sea He covereth.
31 For thereby He judgeth peoples,
He giveth food in abundance.
32 Both hands He covereth over with light,
And directeth it as one who hitteth the mark.
33 His noise announceth Him,
The cattle even that He is approaching.

Job 36:30–33. A few expositors (Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm.) understand the celestial ocean, or the sea of the upper waters, by יָם, v. 30b; but it is more than questionable (vid., on Job 9:8) whether ים is used anywhere in this sense. Others as (Umbr., Ew.) the masses of water drawn up to the sky out of the depths of the sea, on which a Persian passage cited by Stick. (who, however, regards the Waw of וְשָׁרְשֵׁי as Waw adaequationis) from Schebisteri may be compared: "an exhalation rises up out of the sea, and comes down at God's command upon the deserts." In both cases כִּסָּה would be equivalent to עָלָיו כסה, obtegit se, which in and of itself is possible. But he who has once witnessed a storm in the neighbourhood of the sea, will decide in favour of one of the three following explanations: (1.) He covereth the uprooted ground of the sea (comp. Ps. 18:15f.) with the subsiding waves (Blumenf.); but then v. 30a would require to be understood of the light of the brightening sky following the darkness of the storm, which is improbable in respect of v. 32a. (2.) While the sky is brilliantly lighted up by the lightning, the abysses of the ocean are veiled in a so much deeper darkness; the observation is correct, but not less so another, that the lightning by a thunder-storm, especially when occurring at night, descends into the depths of the sea like snares that are cast down (פַּחִים, Ps. 11:6), and the water is momentarily changed as it were into a sea of flame; accordingly it may be explained, (3.) Behold, He spreadeth over Himself His light (viz., the light which incessantly illumines the world), and the roots of the sea, i.e., the sea down to its depths, He covers with it, since He makes it light through and through (Stuhlm. Wolfs.). Thus, as it appears, Jerome also interprets: Et (si voluerit) fulgurare lumine suo desuper, cardines quoque maris operiet. 314

This, that He makes the light of the lightning His manifestation (עָלָיו פָּרַשׂ), and that He covers the earth down to the roots of the sea beneath with this light, is established in v. 31 from the design, partly judicial, partly beneficial, which exists in connection with it. בָּם refers as neuter (like בָּהֶם, Job 22:21) to the phenomena of the storm; מַכְבִּיר (with the adverbial ל like לָרֹב, Job 26:3), what makes great = a making great, abundance (only here), is n. hiphil. after the form מַשְׁחִית, perdens = perditio. In v. 32 God is represented under a military figure as a slinger of lightnings: He covers light over both hands, i.e., arms both completely with light (comp. סְכָסֵךְ and Arab. škk, totum se operire armis), and directs it (עָלֶיהָ referring to אוֹר as fem. like Jer. 13:16, and sometimes in the Talmud). But what is the meaning of בְּמַפְגִּיעַ? Hahn takes יעמפג as n. hiphil. like מכביר: an object of attack; but what then becomes of the original Hiphil signification? It ought to be בְּמָפְגָּע (Job 7:20), as Olsh. wishes to read it. Ew., Hirz., and others, after the example of Theod. (LXX), Syr., Jer., translate: against the adversary; מפגיע signifies indeed the opposite in Isa. 49:16: intercessor (properly, one who assails with prayers); however, it would be possible for this word, just as פגע c. acc. (which signifies usually a hostile meeting, Ex. 5:3 and freq., but sometimes also a friendly, Isa. 47:3, 64:4), to be an ἐναντιόσημον. We prefer to abide by the usage of the language as we have it, according to which הפגיע signifies facere ut quid incurset s. petat, Isa. 53:6; מפגיע therefore is one who hits, in opposition to one who misses the mark. The Beth is the Beth essentiae (vid., on Job 23:13), used here like Ex. 6:3, Ps. 55:19, Isa. 40:10. With both hands He seizes the substance of the lightning, fills them with it so that they are completely covered by it, and

gives it the command (appoints it its goal), a sure aimer!

Ver. 33a. Targ., Syr., Symm., Theod. (from which v. 32f. is supplied in the LXX315), Jer., Luther, and others destroy the idea, since they translate רֵעֵהוּ = רֵעוֹ, "his friend (companion)." Among moderns, only Umbr. and Schlottm. adopt this signification; Böttch. and Welte, after the example of Cocceius, Tingstad, and others, attempt it with the signification "thought = determination;" but most expositors, from Ew. to Hahn, decide in favour of the rendering as simple as it is consistent with the usage of the language and the connection: His noise (רֵעוֹ as Ex. 32:17) gives tidings concerning Him (announces Him). In v. 33b Theod. (LXX), Syr., and Jer. point מקנה like our text, but translate possessio, with which we can do nothing. It seems that in the three attempts of the Targ. to translate v. 33, the translators had קִנְאָה and קִנְּא before their mind, according to which Hahn translates: the arousing of anger (announces) the comer, which assumes מקנֵה instead of מקנֶה; and Schlottm.: fierce wrath (goes forth) over evil (according to Symm. ζῆλον περὶ ἀδικίας), which assumes the reading עַוְלָה (עוֹלָה), ἀδικία, adopted also by Syr., Theod. (LXX). Schultens even renders similarly: rubedinem flammantem nasi contra elatum, and Tingstad: zelum irae in iniquitatem. But it is not probable that the language was acquainted with a subst. מִקְנֶה, exciting, although in Ezek. 8:3 הַמַּקְנֶה is equivalent to הַמַּקְנִיא, so that one might more readily be tempted (vid., Hitz. in loc.) to read אַף מַקְנֶה, "one who excites anger against evil," it one is not willing to decide with Berg, and recently Bleek, in favour of (מְקַנֵּא) בְּעַוְלָה אַף מְקַנֵּא, excandescens (zelans) irâ contra iniquitatem. But does the text as it stands really not give an appropriate idea? Aben-Ezra and Duran have understood it of the foreboding of an approaching thunder-storm which is manifested by cattle, מִקְנֶה. Accordingly Ew. translates: His thunder announces Him, the cattle even, that He is approaching; and peculiarly new (understanding יגיד not of a foreboding but of a thankful lowing) is Ebrard's rendering; also the cattle at fresh sprouting grass. But such a change of the position of אף is without precedent. Hirz. and Ges.: His rumble (rumble of thunder) announces Him to the herds, Him, and indeed as Him who rises up (approaches). But this new interpunction destroys the division of the verse and the syntax. Better Rosenm. like Duran: pecus non tantum pluviam proximam, sed et antequam nubes in sublime adscenderint adscensuras praesagit, according to Virgil, Georg. i. 374f.:

illum (imbrem) surgentem vallibus imis

Aeriae fugere grues.

But עָלָיו refers to God, and therefore עַל־עוֹלֶה also, viz., Him who leads forth the storm-clouds (Jer. 10:13, 51:16, Ps. 135:7), and Himself rising up in them; or, what עָלָה frequently signifies, coming on as to battle. It is to be interpreted: His thunder-clap announces Him (who is about to reveal Himself as a merciful judge), the cattle even (announce) Him at His first rising up, since at the approach of a storm they herd together affrighted and seek shelter. The speakers are Arabian, and the scene is laid in the country: Elihu also refers to the animal world in Job 35:11; this feature of the picture, therefore, cannot be surprising.

JOB 37

37:1 Yea, at this my heart trembleth
And tottereth from its place.

2 Hear, O hear the roar of His voice,
And the murmur that goeth out of His mouth.

3 He sendeth it forth under the whole heaven,
And His lightning unto the ends of the earth.

4 After it roareth the voice of the thunder,
He thundereth with the voice of His majesty,
And spareth not the lightnings, when His voice is heard.

5 God thundereth with His voice marvellously,
Doing great things, incomprehensible to us.

Job 37:1–5. Louis Bridel is perhaps right when he inserts after Job 36 the observation: L'éclair

brille, la tonnerre gronde. לְזֹאת does not refer to the phenomenon of the storm which is represented in the mind, but to that which is now to be perceived by the senses. The combination שָׁמוֹעַ שִׁמְעוּ can signify both hear constantly, Isa. 6:9, and hear attentively, Job 13:17; here it is the latter. רֹגֶז of thunder corresponds to the verbs Arab. rḥz and rjs, which can be similarly used. The repetition of קוֹל five times calls to mind the seven קולות (ἐπτὰ βρονταί) in Ps. 29. The parallel is הֶגֶה, v. 2b, a murmuring, as elsewhere of the roar of the lion and the cooing of the dove. The suff. of יְשָׁרֵהוּ refers to the thunder which rolls through the immeasurable breadth under heaven; it is not perf. Piel of יָשַׁר (Schlottm.), for "to give definite direction" (2 Chron. 32:30) is not appropriate to thunder, but fut. Kal of שָׁרָה, to free, to unbind (Ew., Hirz. and most others). What v. 3a says of thunder, v. 3b says of light, i.e., the lightning: God sends it forth to the edges, πτέρυγες, i.e., ends, of the earth. אַחֲרָיו, v. 4a, naturally refers to the lightning, which is followed by the roar of the thunder; and יְעַקְּבֵם to the flashes, which, when once its rumble is heard, God does not restrain (עִקֵּב = עִכֵּב of the Targ., and Arab. 'aqqaba, to leave behind, postpone), but causes to flash forth in quick succession. Ewald's translation: should He not find (prop. non investigaverit) them (the men that are to be punished), gives a thought that has no support in this connection. In v. 5a נִפְלָאוֹת, mirabilia, is equivalent to mirabiliter, as Dan. 8:24, comp. Ps. 65:6, 139:14. נֵדַע וְלֹא is intended to say that God's mighty acts, with respect to the connection between cause and effect and the employment of means, transcend our comprehension.

6 For He saith to the snow: Fall towards the earth,

And to the rain-shower

And the showers of His mighty rain.

7 He putteth a seal on the hand of every man,

That all men may come to a knowledge of His creative work.

8 The wild beast creepeth into a hiding-place,

And in its resting-place it remaineth.

9 Out of the remote part cometh the whirlwind,

And cold from the cloud-sweepers.

10 From the breath of God cometh ice,

And the breadth of the waters is straitened.

Job 37:6–10. Like אֲבִי, Job 34:36, and פִּשׁ, Job 35:15, הֱוֵא, v. 6a (is falsely translated "be earthwards" by LXX, Targ., and Syr.), also belongs to the most striking Arabisms of the Elihu section: it signifies delabere (Jer. ut descendat), a signification which the Arab. hawâ does not gain from the radical signification placed first in Gesenius-Dietrich's Handwörterbuch, to breathe, blow, but from the radical signification, to gape, yawn, by means of the development of the meaning which also decides in favour of the primary notion of the Hebr. הָוָה, according to which, what was said on Job 6:2, 30:13 is to be corrected.316

The ל of לַשֶּׁלֶג influences v. 6bc also. The Hebr. name for rain, גֶּשֶׁם (cogn. with Chald. גֹּשֶׁם, Arab. gism, a body), denotes the rain collectively. The expression v. 6b is exceeded in v. 6c, where מִטְרוֹת does not signify rain-drops (Ew.), but, like the Arab. amtâr, rain-showers. The wonders of nature during the rough season (חֹרֶף, סְתָיו, Cant. 2:11, comp. p. 555f.), between the autumnal and vernal equinoxes, are meant; the rains after the autumnal equinox (the early rain), which begin the season, and the rains before the vernal equinox (the late rain, Zech. 10:1), which close it, with the falls of snow between, which frequently produce great desolation, especially the proper winter with its frosty winds and heavy showers, when the business of the husbandmen as of the nomads is brought to a stand-still, and every one retreats to his house or seeks a sheltering corner (vid., p. 503, note).

This is the meaning of v. 7: He sealeth up (בְּ חָתַם as Job 33:16) the hand of all men that they cannot, viz., on account of the cold out of doors, be opened for work, that all people of His work (i.e., thanking Him for their origin as His handiwork, Job 34:19) may come to the

perception (of Him who doeth all things). The expression is remarkable, and by the insertion of a ם may be as easily cleared up as Job 33:17: מַעֲשֵׂהוּ כָל־אֱנָשִׁים לְדַעַת, in order that each and every one may acknowledge His work; after which even Jer. translates: ut noverint singuli opera sua. The conjecture עֹשֵׂהוּ אנשׁים (Schultens junior, Reiske, Hirz.) is inferior to the former (Olsh.) by its awkward synecdoche num. The fut. consec. in v. 8 continues the description of what happens in consequence of the cold rainy season; the expression calls to mind Ps. 104:22, as Job 34:14f. does Ps. 104:29. The winter is also the time of the stormy and raw winds. In v. 9a Elihu means the storms which come across from the great wide desert, Job 1:19, therefore the south (Isa. 21:1, Zech. 9:14), or rather (vid., p. 533, note) south-east winds (Hos. 13:15), increasing in violence to storms. הַחֶדֶר (properly the surrounded, enclosed space, never the storehouse,—so that Ps. 135:7 should be compared,—but adytum, penetrale, as Arab. chidr, e.g., in Vita Timuri ii. 904: after the removal of the superincumbent earth, they drew away sitr chidrihâ, the curtain of its innermost part, i.e., uncovered its lowest depth) is here the innermost part of the south (south-east),—comp. Job 9:9 תימן חדרי, and 23:9 ימין יעטף (so far as יעטף there signifies si operiat se),—especially of the great desert lying to the south (south-east), according to which חַדְרֵי אֶרֶץ, Zech. 9:1, is translated by the Targ. ומאדר ארעא. In opposition to the south-east wind, מְזָרִים, v. 9b, seems to mean the north winds; in and of itself, however, the word signifies the scattering or driving, as also in the Koran the winds are called the scatterers, dhârijât, Sur. li. 1.317 In מזרים, Reiske, without any ground for it, traces the Arab. mirzam (a name of two stars, from which north wind, rain, and cold are derived); the Targ. also has one of the constellations in view: מְזָרִים מַכַּוַּת (from the window, i.e., the window of the vault of heaven, of the mezarim); Aq., Theod. ἀπὸ μαζούρ (= מזרות, Job 38:32); LXX ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων, we know not wherefore. Concerning מְנַשְׁמַת־אֵל (with causal מִן) with reference to the wind, vid., on Job 4:15. יִתֵּן, it gives, i.e., comes to light, is used as in Gen. 38:28, Prov. 13:10. The idea of מוּצָק (not fusum from יָצַק, but coarctatum from צוּק) cannot be doubtful in connection with the antithesis of רֹחַב, comp. Job 36:16, the idea is like Job 38:30 (comp. Mutenebbi: "the flood is bound by bands of ice"); the בְּ of בְּמוּצָק is, as Job 36:32, the Beth essentiae, used far more extensively in Hebr. than in Arab. as an exponent of the predicate: the breadth of the water is (becomes) straitened (forcibly drawn together).

11 Also He loadeth the clouds with water,
He spreadeth far and wide the cloud of His light,

12 And these turn themselves round about,
Directed by Him, that they execute
All that He hath commanded them
Over the wide earth.

13 Whether for a scourge, or for the good of His earth,
Or for mercy, He causeth it to discharge itself.

Job 37:11–13. With אַף extending the description, Elihu, in the presence of the storm that is in the sky, continually returns to this one marvel of nature. The old versions connect בְּרִי partly with בַּר, electus (LXX, Syr., Theod.) or frumentum (Symm., Jer.), partly with בָּרָה = בָּרַר in the signification puritas, serenitas (Targ.); but בְּרִי is, as Schultens has already perceived, the Hebr.-Arabic רִי, Arab. rîyun, rîj-un (from רוה = riwj), abundant irrigation, with בְּ; and יַטָּרִיחַ does not signify, according to the Arab. atraha, "to hurl down," so that what is spoken of would be the bursting of the clouds (Stick.),318 but, according to טֹרַח, a burden (comp. Arab. taraha ala, to load), "to burden;" with fluidity (Ew., Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm.), better: fulness of water, He burdens the clouds (comp. rawij-un as a designation of cloud as the place of rain). עֲנַן אוֹרוֹ, His cloud of light, is that that is charged with lightning, and הֵפִיץ has here its Hebr.-Arab. radical signification effundere, diffundere, with a preponderance of the idea not of scattering, but of spreading out wide (Arab. faid, abundance). וְהוּא, v. 12a, refers to the cloud pregnant with lightning; this turns round about

(מְסִבּוֹת, adv. as מֵסַב, round about, 1 Kings 6:29) seeking a place, where it shall unburden itself by virtue of His (God's) direction or disposing (תַּחְבּוּלֹת, a word belonging to the book of Proverbs; LXX, Cod. Vat. and Alex., untranslated: εν θεεβουλαθωθ, Cod. Sinait. still more monstrous), in order that they (the clouds full of lightning) may accomplish everything that He commands them over the surface of the earth; אָרְצָה as Job 34:13, and the combination אָרְצָה תֵּבֵל as Prov. 8:31, comp. וְתֵבֵל אֶרֶץ, Ps. 90:2. The reference of the pronominal suff. to men is as inadmissible here as in v. 4c. In v. 13 two אִם have certainly, as Job 34:29, two וְ, the correlative signification sive … sive (Arab. in … wa-in), in a third, as appears, a conditional, but which? According to Ew., Hirz., Hahn, Schlottm., and others, the middle one: if it (the rod) belongs to His land, i.e., if it has deserved it. But even the possessive suff. of לְאַרְצוֹ shows that the לְ is to be taken as dat. commodi: be it for a rod, be it for the good of His land; which is then followed by a conditional verbal clause: in case He mercifully causes it (the storm) to come, i.e., causes this His land to be overtaken by it (הִמְצִיא here with the acc., the thing coming, whereas in Job 34:11 of the thing to be overtaken). The accentuation, indeed, appears to assume a threefold sive: [whether He causeth it to discharge itself upon] man for punishment, man for mercy, or His earth for good with reference to man. Then Elihu would think of the uninhabited steppe in connection with לְאַרְצוֹ אִם. Since a conditional אִם by the side of two correlatives is hazardous, we decide finally with the LXX, Targ., and all the old versions, in favour of the same rendering of the threefold אִם, especially since it corresponds to the circumstances of the case.

14 Hearken unto this, O Job;
Stand still and consider the wonderful works of God!
15 Dost thou know when God designeth
To cause the light of His clouds to shine?
16 Dost thou understand the balancings of the clouds,
The wondrous things of Him who is perfect in knowledge?

Job 37:14–16. Job is to stand still, instead of dictating to God, in order to draw from His wondrous acts in nature a conclusion with reference to his mystery of suffering. In v. 15a בְּ יָדַע does not, as Job 35:15 (Ew. § 217, S. 557), belong together, but בְּ is the temporal Beth. שׂוּם is equivalent to לִבּוֹ שִׂים (vid., on Job 34:23); עֲלֵיהֶם does not refer to נִפְלְאוֹת (Hirz.) or the phenomena of the storm (Ew.), but is intended as neuter (as בָּם Job 36:31, בָּהֶם 22:21), and finds in v. 15b its distinctive development: "the light of His clouds" is their effulgent splendour. Without further support, עַל יָדַע is to have knowledge concerning anything, v. 16a; מִפְלְשֵׂי is also ἁπ. γεγρ. It is unnecessary to consider it as wrongly written from מִפְרְשֵׂי, Job 36:29, or as from it by change of letter (as אַלְמָנוֹת = אַרְמָנוֹת, Isa. 13:22). The verb פָּלַס signifies to make level, prepare (viz., a way, also weakened: to take a certain way, Prov. 5:6), once: to weigh, Ps. 58:3, as denom. from פֶּלֶס, a balance (and indeed a steelyard, statera), which is thus mentioned as the means of adjustment. מִפְלְשֵׂי accordingly signifies either, as synon. of מִשְׁקְלֵי (thus the Midrash, vid., Jalkut, § 522), weights (the relations of weight), or even equipoised balancings (Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, and others), Lat. quomodo librentur nubes in aëre. 319 מִפְלְאוֹת is also a word that does not occur elsewhere; in like manner דֵּעַ belongs exclusively to Elihu. God is called דֵּעִים תְּמִים (comp. Job 36:4) as the Omniscient One, whose knowledge is absolute as to its depth as well as its circumference.

17 Thou whose garments became hot,
When the land is sultry from the south:
18 Dost thou with Him spread out the sky,
The strong, as it were molten, mirror?
19 Let us know what we shall say to Him!—
We can arrange nothing by reason of darkness.
20 Shall it be told Him that I speak,
Or shall one wish to be destroyed?

Job 37:17–20. Most expositors connect v. 17a with v. 16: (Dost thou know) how it comes to

pass that …; but אֲשֶׁר after ידע signifies quod, Ex. 11:7, not quomodo, as it sometimes occurs in a comparing antecedent clause, instead of כאשׁר, Ex. 14:13, Jer. 33:22. We therefore translate: thou whose …,—connecting this, however, not with v. 16 (vid., e.g., Carey), but as Bolduc. and Ew., with v. 18 (where הֲ before תַּרְקִיעַ is then the less missed): thou who, when the land (the part of the earth where thou art) keeps rest, i.e., in sultriness, when oppressive heat comes (on this Hiph. vid., Ges. § 53, 2) from the south (i.e., by means of the currents of air which come thence, without דָּרוֹם signifying directly the south wind),—thou who, when this happens, canst endure so little, that on the contrary the heat from without becomes perceptible to thee through thy clothes: dost thou now and then with Him keep the sky spread out, which for firmness is like a molten mirror? Elsewhere the hemispheric firmament, which spans the earth with its sub-celestial waters, is likened to a clear sapphire Ex. 24:10, a covering Ps. 104:2, a gauze Isa. 40:22; the comparison with a metallic mirror (מוּצָק here not from צוּק, v. 10, Job 36:16, but from יָצַק) is therefore to be understood according to Petavius: Coelum aëreum στερέωμα dicitur non a naturae propria conditione, sed ab effectu, quod perinde aquas separet, ac si murus esset solidissimus. Also in תרקיע lies the notion both of firmness and thinness; the primary notion (root רק) is to beat, make thick, stipare (Arab. rq', to stop up in the sense of resarcire, e.g., to mend stockings), to make thick by pressure. The ל joined with תרקיע is nota acc.; we must not comp. Job 8:8, 21:22, as well as Job 5:2, 19:3.

Therefore: As God is the only Creator (Job 9:8), so He is the all-provident Preserver of the world—make us know (הוֹדִיעֵנוּ, according to the text of the Babylonians, Keri of הוֹדִיעֵנִי) what we shall say to Him, viz., in order to show that we can cope with Him! We cannot arrange, viz., anything whatever (to be explained according to מִלִּין עָרַךְ, Job 32:14, comp. "to place," Job 36:19), by reason of darkness, viz., the darkness of our understanding, σκότος τῆς διανοίας; מִפְּנֵי is much the same as Job 23:17, but different from Job 17:12, and חֹשֶׁךְ different from both passages, viz., as it is often used in the New Testament, of intellectual darkness (comp. Eccl. 2:14, Isa. 60:2). The meaning of v. 20 cannot now be mistaken, if, with Hirz., Hahn, and Schlottm., we call to mind Job 36:10 in connection with כִּי אָמַר: can I, a short-sighted man, enshrouded in darkness, wish that what I have arrogantly said concerning and against Him may be told to God, or should one earnestly desire (אָמַר, a modal perf., as Job 35:15b) that (an jusserit s. dixerit quis ut) he may be swallowed up, i.e., destroyed (comp. לבלעו, Job 2:3)? He would, by challenging a recognition of his unbecoming arguing about God, desire a tribunal that would be destructive to himself.

21 Although one seeth now the sunlight
That is bright in the ethereal heights:
A wind passeth by and cleareth them up.
22 Gold is brought from the north,—
Above Eloah is terrible majesty.
23 The Almighty, whom we cannot find out,
The excellent in strength,
And right and justice He perverteth not.
24 Therefore men regard Him with reverence,
He hath no regard for all the wise of heart.

Job 37:21–24. He who censures God's actions, and murmurs against God, injures himself—how, on the contrary, would a patiently submissive waiting on Him be rewarded! This is the connection of thought, by which this final strophe is attached to what precedes. If we have drawn the correct conclusion from Job 37:1, that Elihu's description of a storm is accompanied by a storm which was coming over the sky, וְעַתָּה, with which the speech, as Job 35:15, draws towards the close, is not to be understood as purely conclusive, but temporal: And at present one does not see the light (ורא of the sun, as Job 31:26) which is bright in the ethereal heights (בָּהִיר again a Hebr.-Arab. word, comp. bâhir, outshining, surpassing, especially of the moon, when it dazzles with its brightness); yet it only requires a breath of wind to pass over it, and to clear it, i.e., brings

the ethereal sky with the sunlight to view. Elihu hereby means to say that the God who his hidden only for a time, respecting whom one runs the risk of being in perplexity, can suddenly unveil Himself, to our surprise and confusion, and that therefore it becomes us to bow humbly and quietly to His present mysterious visitation. With respect to the removal of the clouds from the beclouded sun, to which v. 21 refers, זָהָב, v. 22a, seems to signify the gold of the sun; esh-shemsu bi-tibrin, the sun is gold, says Abulola. Oriental and Classic literature furnishes a large number of instances in support of this calling the sunshine gold; and it should not perplex us here, where we have an Arabizing Hebrew poet before us, that not a single passage can be brought forward from the Old Testament literature. But מִצָּפוֹן is against this figurative rendering of the זהב (LXX νέφη χρυσαυγοῦντα). In Ezek. 1:4 there is good reason for the storm-clouds, which unfold from their midst the glory of the heavenly Judge, who rideth upon the cherubim, coming from the north; but wherefore should Elihu represent the sun's golden light as breaking through from the north? On the other hand, in the conception of the ancients, the north is the proper region for gold: there griffins (γρυπές) guard the gold-pits of the Arimaspian mountains (Herod. iii. 116); there, from the narrow pass of the Caucasus along the Gordyaean mountains, gold is dug by barbarous races (Pliny, h. n. vi. 11), and among the Scythians it is brought to light by the ants (ib. xxxiii. 4). Egypt could indeed provide itself with gold from Ethiopia, and the Phoenicians brought the gold of Ophir, already mentioned in the book of Job, from India; but the north was regarded as the fabulously most productive chief mine of gold; to speak more definitely: Northern Asia, with the Altai mountains.320 Thus therefore Job 28:1, 6 is to be compared here.

What Job describes so grandly and minutely in Job 28, viz., that man lays bare the hidden treasures of the earth's interior, but that the wisdom of God still transcends him, is here expressed no less grandly and compendiously: From the north cometh gold, which man wrests from the darkness of the gloomy unknown region of the north (צָפוֹן, ζόφος, from צפן, cogn. טמן, טמר,321 vid., p. 520, note, comp. p. 497, note); upon Eloah, on the contrary is terrible majesty (not genitival: terror of majesty, Ew. § 293, c), i.e., it covers Him like a garment (Ps. 104:1), making Him inaccessible (הוֹד, glory as resounding praise, vid., on Job 39:20, like כבוד as imposing dignity). The beclouded sun, v. 21 said, has lost none of the intensity of its light, although man has to wait for the removing of the clouds to behold it again. So, when God's doings are mysterious to us, we have to wait, without murmuring, for His solution of the mystery. While from the north comes gold—v. 22 continues—which is obtained by laying bare the interior of the northern mountains, God, on the other hand, is surrounded by inaccessibly terrible glory: the Almighty—thus v. 23 completes the thought towards which v. 22 tends—we cannot reach, the Great in power, i.e., the nature of the Absolute One remains beyond us, the counsel of the Almighty impenetrable; still we can at all times be certain of this, that what He does is right and good: "Right and the fulness of justice (וְרֹב־ according to the Masora, not וְרַב־) He perverteth not." The expression is remarkable: מְשָׁפָט עִנָּה is, like the Talmudic דִּין עִנָּה, equivalent elsewhere to הִטָּה פִּטמֹשׁ; and that He does not pervert רֹב־צְדָקָה, affirms that justice in its whole compass is not perverted by Him; His acts are therefore perfectly and in every way consistent with it: רֹב־צְדָקָה is the abstract. to כביר צדיק, Job 34:17, therefore summa justitia. One may feel tempted to draw ומשׁפט to כח שׂגיא, and to read וְרַב according to Prov. 14:29 instead of וְרֹב, but the expression gained by so doing is still more difficult than the combination ומשׁפט ... יְעַנֶּה לא; not merely difficult, however, but putting a false point in place of a correct one, is the reading יַעֲנֶה לא (LXX, Syr., Jer.), according to which Hirz. translates: He answers, not, i.e., gives no account to man. The accentuation rightly divides v. 23 into two halves, the second of which begins with ומשׁפט—a significant Waw, on which J. H. Michaelis observes: Placide

invicem in Deo conspirant infinita ejus potentia et justitia quae in hominibus saepe disjuncta sunt.

Elihu closes with the practical inference: Therefore men, viz., of the right sort, of sound heart, uncorrupted and unaffected, fear Him (יִרְאוּהוּ verentur eum, not יִרְאוּהוּ veremini eum); He does not see (regard) the wise of heart, i.e., those who imagine themselves such and are proud of their לֵב, their understanding. The qui sibi videntur (Jer.) does not lie in לב (comp. Isa. 5:21), but in the antithesis. Stick. and others render falsely: Whom the aggregate of the over-wise beholds not, which would be יִרְאֻנּוּ. God is the subj. as in Job 28:24, 34:21, comp. 41:26. The assonance of יראוהו and יראה, which also occurs frequently elsewhere (e.g., Job 6:21), we have sought to reproduce in the translation.

In this last speech also Elihu's chief aim (Job 36:2–4) is to defend God against Job's charge of injustice. He shows how omnipotence, love, and justice are all found in God. When judging of God's omnipotence, we are to beware of censuring Him who is absolutely exalted above us and our comprehension; when judging of God's love, we are to beware of interpreting His afflictive dispensations, which are designed for our well-being, as the persecution of an enemy; when judging of His justice, we are to beware of maintaining our own righteousness at the cost of the Divine, and of thus avoiding the penitent humbling of one's self under His well-meant chastisement. The twofold peculiarity of Elihu's speeches comes out in this fourth as prominently as in the first: (1) They demand of Job penitential submission, not by accusing him of coarse common sins as the three have done, but because even the best of men suffer for hidden moral defects, which must be perceived by them in order not to perish on account of them. Elihu here does for Job just what in Bunyan (Pilgrim's Progress) the man in the Interpreter's house does, when he sweeps the room, so that Christian had been almost choked with the dust that flew about. Then (2) they teach that God makes use of just such sufferings, as Job's now are, in order to bring man to a knowledge of his hidden defects, and to bless him the more abundantly if he will be saved from them; that thus the sufferings of those who fear God are a wholesome medicine, disciplinary chastenings, and saving warnings; and that therefore true, not merely feigned, piety must be proved in the school of affliction by earnest self-examination, remorseful self-accusation, and humble submission.

Elihu therefore in this agrees with the rest of the book, that he frees Job's affliction from the view which accounts it the evil-doer's punishment (vid., Job 32:3). On the other hand, however, he nevertheless takes up a position apart from the rest of the book, by making Job's sin the cause of his affliction; while in the idea of the rest of the book Job's affliction has nothing whatever to do with Job's sin, except in so far as he allows himself to be drawn into sinful language concerning God by the conflict of temptation into which the affliction plunges him. For after Jehovah has brought Job over this his sin, He acknowledges His servant (Job 42:7) to be in the right, against the three friends: his affliction is really not a merited affliction, it is not a result of retributive justice; it also had not chastisement as its design, it was an enigma, under which Job should have bowed humbly without striking against it—a decree, into the purpose of which the prologue permits us an insight, which however remains unexplained to Job, or is only explained to him so far as the issue teaches him that it should be to him the way to a so much the more glorious testimony on the part of God Himself.

With that criticism of Job, which the speeches of Jehovah consummate, the criticism which lies before us in the speeches of Elihu is irreconcilable. The older poet, in contrast with the false doctrine of retribution, entirely separates sin and punishment or chastisement in the affliction of Job, and teaches that there is an affliction of the righteous, which is solely designed to prove and test them. His thema, not Elihu's (as Simson322 with Hengstenberg thinks), is the mystery of the Cross. For the Cross according to its proper notion is suffering

ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης (or what in New Testament language is the same, ἕνεκεν Χριστοῦ). Elihu, however, leaves sin and suffering together as inseparable, and opposes the false doctrine of retribution by the distinction between disciplinary chastisement and judicial retribution. The Elihu section, as I have shown elsewhere,323 has sprung from the endeavour to moderate the bewildering boldness with which the older poet puts forth his idea. The writer has felt in connection with the book of Job what every Christian must feel. Such a maintaining of his own righteousness in the face of friendly exhortations to penitence, as we perceive it in Job's speeches, is certainly not possible where "the dust of the room has flown about." The friends have only failed in this, that they made Job more and more an evil-doer deservedly undergoing punishment. Elihu points him to vainglorying, to carnal security, and in the main to those defects from which the most godly cannot and dare not claim exemption. It is not contrary to the spirit of the drama that Job holds his peace at these exhortations to penitence. The similarly expressed admonition to penitence with which Eliphaz, Job 4f., begins, has not effected it. In the meanwhile, however, Job is become more softened and composed, and in remembrance of his unbecoming language concerning God, he must feel that he has forfeited the right of defending himself. Nevertheless this silent Job is not altogether the same as the Job who, in Job 40 and 42, forces himself to keep silence, whose former testimony concerning himself, and whose former refusal of a theodicy which links sin and calamity together, Jehovah finally sets His seal to.

On the other hand, however, it must be acknowledged, that what the introduction to Elihu's speeches, Job 32:1–5, sets before us, is consistent with the idea of the whole, and that such a section as the introduction leads one to expect, may be easily understood really as a member of the whole, which carries forward the dramatic development of this idea; for this very reason one feels urged to constantly new endeavours, if possible, to understand these speeches as a part of the original form. But they are without result, and, moreover, many other considerations stand in our way to the desired goal; especially, that Elihu is not mentioned in the epilogue, and that his speeches are far behind the artistic perfection of the rest of the book. It is true the writer of these speeches has, in common with the rest of the book, a like Hebraeo-Arabic, and indeed Hauranitish style, and like mutual relations to earlier and later writings; but this is explained from the consideration that he has completely blended the older book with himself (as the points of contact of the fourth speech with Job 28 and the speeches of Jehovah, show), and that to all appearance he is a fellow-countryman of the older poet. There are neither linguistic nor any other valid reasons in favour of assigning it to a much later period. He is the second issuer of the book, possibly the first, who brought to light the hitherto hidden treasure, enriched by his own insertion, which is inestimable in its relation to the history of the perception of the plan of redemption.

We now call to mind that in the last (according to our view) strophe of Job's last speech. Job 31:35–37, Job desires, yea challenges, the divine decision between himself and his opponents. His opponents have explained his affliction as the punishment of the just God; he, however, is himself so certain of his innocence, and of his victory over divine and human accusation, that he will bind the indictment of his opponents as a crown upon his brow, and to God, whose hand of punishment supposedly rests upon him, will he render an account of all his steps, and go forth as a prince to meet Him. That he considers himself a צדיק is in itself not censurable, for he is such: but that he is מצדק מאלהים נפשׁו, i.e., considers himself to be righteous in opposition to God, who is no angry with him and punishes him; that he maintains his own righteousness to the prejudice of the Divine; and that by maintaining his own right, places the Divine in the shade,—all this is explainable as the result of the false idea which he entertains of his affliction, and in which he is strengthened by the friends; but there is need

of censure and penitence. For since by His nature God can never do wrong, all human wrangling before God is a sinful advance against the mystery of divine guidance, under which he should rather humbly bow. But we have seen that Job's false idea of God as his enemy, whose conduct he cannot acknowledge as just, does not fill his whole soul. The night of temptation in which he is enshrouded, is broken in upon by gleams of faith, in connection with which God appears to him as his Vindicator and Redeemer. Flesh and spirit, nature and grace, delusion and faith, are at war within him. These two elements are constantly more definitely separated in the course of the controversy; but it is not yet come to the victory of faith over delusion, the two lines of conception go unreconciled side by side in Job's soul. The last monologues issue on the one side in the humble confession that God's wisdom is unsearchable, and the fear of God is the share of wisdom appointed to man; on the other side, in the defiant demand that God may answer for his defence of himself, and the vaunting offer to give Him an account of all his steps, and also then to enter His presence with the high feeling of a prince. If now the issue of the drama is to be this, that God really reveals Himself as Job's Vindicator and Redeemer, Job's defiance and boldness must be previously punished in order that lowliness and submission may attain the victory over them. God cannot acknowledge job as His servant before he penitently acknowledges as such the sinful weakness under which he has proved himself to be God's servant, and so exhibits himself anew in his true character which cherishes no known sin. This takes place when Jehovah appears, and in language not of wrath but of loving condescension, and yet earnest reproof, He makes the Titan quite puny in his own eyes, in order then to exalt him who is outwardly and inwardly humbled.

JOB 38

The Unravelment in the Consciousness.—Ch. 38–42:6

The First Speech of Jehovah, and Job's Answer.—Ch. 38–40:5

[Then Jehovah answered Job out of the storm, and said:]

2 Who then darkeneth counsel
With words without knowledge?
3 Gird up now thy loins as a man:
I will question thee, and inform thou me!

Job 38:2, 3. "May the Almighty answer me!" Job has said, Job 31:35; He now really answers, and indeed out of the storm (Chethib, according to a mode of writing occurring only here and Job 40:6, מנהסערה, arranged in two words by the Keri), which is generally the forerunner of His self-manifestation in the world, of that at least by which He reveals Himself in His absolute awe-inspiring greatness and judicial grandeur. The art. is to be understood generically, but, with respect to Elihu's speeches, refers to the storm which has risen up in the meanwhile. It is not to be translated: Who is he who …, which ought to be המחשיך, but: Who then is darkening; זֶה makes the interrogative מִי more vivid and demonstrative, Ges. § 122, 2; the part. מַחֲשִׁיךְ (instead of which it might also be יַחֲשִׁיךְ) favours the assumption that Job has uttered such words immediately before, and is interrupted by Jehovah, without an intervening speaker having come forward. It is intentionally עֲצָה for עֲצָתִי (comp. עם for עמי, Isa. 26:11), to describe that which is spoken of according to its quality: it is nothing less than a decree or plan full of purpose and connection which Job darkness, i.e., distorts by judging it falsely, or, as we say: places in a false light, and in fact by meaningless words.324

When now Jehovah condescends to negotiate with Job by question and answer, He does not do exactly what Job wished (Job 13:22), but something different, of which Job never thought. He surprises him with questions which are intended to bring him indirectly to the consciousness of the wrong and absurdity of his

challenge—questions among which "there are many which the natural philosophy of the present day can frame more scientifically, but cannot satisfactorily solve."325 Instead of גֻּבְרֵךְ (the received reading of Ben-Ascher), Ben-Naphtali's text offered כְּגִ (as Ezek. 17:10), in order not to allow two so similar, aspirated mutae to come together.

4 Where wast thou when I established the earth?

Say, if thou art capable of judging!

5 Who hath determined its measure, if thou knowest it,

Or who hath stretched the measuring line over it?

6 Upon what are the bases of its pillars sunk in,

Or who hath laid its corner-stone,

7 When the morning stars sang together

And all the sons of God shouted for joy?

Job 38:4–7. The examination begins similarly to Job 15:7f. In opposition to the censurer of God as such the friends were right, although only negatively, since their conduct was based on self-delusion, as though they were in possession of the key to the mystery of the divine government of the world. בִּינָה יָדַע signifies to understand how to judge, to possess a competent understanding, 1 Chron. 12:32, 2 Chron. 2:12, or (ידע taken not in the sense of novisse, but cognoscere) to appropriate to one's self, Prov. 4:1, Isa. 29:24. כִּי, v. 5a, interchanges with אִם (comp. v. 18b), for כִּי תֵדַע signifies: suppose that thou knowest it, and this si forte scias is almost equivalent to an forte scis, Prov. 30:4. The founding of the earth is likened altogether to that of a building constructed by man. The question: upon what are the bases of its pillars or foundations sunk (טבע, Arab. ṭb', according to its radical signification, to press with something flat upon something, comp. Arab. ṭbq, to lay two flat things on one another, then both to form or stamp by pressure, vid., p. 449, note, and to press into soft pliant stuff, or let down into, immergere, or to sink into, immergi), points to the fact of the earth hanging free in space, Job 26:7. Then no human being was present, for man was not yet created; the angels, however, beheld with rejoicing the founding of the place of the future human family, and the mighty acts of God in accordance with the decree of His love (as at the building of the temple, the laying of the foundation, Ezra 3:10, and the setting of the head-stone, Zech. 4:7, were celebrated), for the angels were created before the visible world (Psychol. S. 63; Genesis, S. 105), as is indeed not taught here, but still (vid., on the other hand, Hofmann, Schriftbew. i. 400) is assumed. For בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים are, as in Job 1–2, the angels, who proceeded from God by a mode of creation which is likened to begetting, and who with Him form one πατριά (Genesis, S. 121). The "morning stars," however, are mentioned in connection with them, because between the stars and the angels, which are both comprehended in השׂמים צבא (Genesis, S. 128), a mysterious connection exists, which is manifoldly attested in Holy Scripture (vid., on the other hand, Hofm. ib. S. 318). בֹּקֶר כּוֹכַב is the morning star which in Isa. 14:12 is called הֵילֵל (as extra-bibl. נֹגַהּ) from its dazzling light, which exceeds all other stars in brightness, and בֶּן־שַׁחַר, son of the dawn, because it swims in the dawn as though it were born from it. It was just the dawn of the world coming into being, which is the subject spoken of, that gave rise to the mention of the morning star; the plur., however, does not mean the stars which came into being on that morning of the world collectively (Hofm., Schlottm.), but Lucifer with the stars his peers, as כְּסִילִים, Isa. 13:10, Orion and the stars his peers. Arab. suhayl (Canopus) is used similarly as a generic name for stars of remarkable brilliancy, and in general suhêl is to the nomads and the Hauranites the symbol of what is brilliant, glorious, and beautiful;326 so that even the beings of light of the first rank among the celestial spirits might be understood by בקר כוכבי. But if this ought to be the meaning, v. 7a and 7b would be in an inverted order. They are actual stars, whether it is intended of the sphere belonging to the earth or to the higher sphere comprehended in השׂמים, Gen. 1:1.

Joy and light are reciprocal notions, and the scale of the tones of joy is likened to the scale of light and colours; therefore the fulness of light, in which the morning stars shone forth all together at the founding of the earth, may symbolize one grandly harmonious song of joy.

8 And [who] shut up the sea with doors,
When it broke through, issued from the womb,
9 When I put clouds round it as a garment,
And thick mist as its swaddling clothes,
10 And I broke for it my bound,
And set bars and doors,
11 And said: Hitherto come, and no further,
And here be thy proud waves stayed!?

Job 38:8–11. The state of ובהו תהו was the first half, and the state of תהום the second half of the primeval condition of the forming earth. The question does not, however, refer to the תהום, in which the waters of the sky and the waters of the earth were as yet not separated, but, passing over this intermediate condition of the forming earth, to the sea, the waters of which God shut up as by means of a door and bolt, when, first enshrouded in thick mist (which has remained from that time one of its natural peculiarities), and again and again manifesting its individuality, it broke forth (גִּיחַ of the foetus, as Ps. 22:10) from the bowels of the, as yet, chaotic earth. That the sea, in spite of the flatness of its banks, does not flow over the land, is a work of omnipotence which broke over it, i.e., restraining it, a fixed bound (חֹק as Job 26:10, Prov. 8:29, Jer. 5:22, = גְּבוּל, Ps. 104:9), viz., the steep and rugged walls of the basin of the sea, and which thereby established a firm barrier behind which it should be kept. Instead of ופֹּה, Josh. 18:8, v. 11b has the Chethib וּפֹא. חֹק is to be understood with יָשִׁית, and "one set" is equivalent to the passive (Ges. § 137*): let a bound be set (comp. שָׁת, Hos. 6:11, which is used directly so) against the proud rising of thy waves.

12 Hast thou in thy life commanded a morning,
Caused the dawn to know its place,
13 That it may take hold of the ends of the earth,
So that the evil-doers are shaken under it?
14 That it changeth like the clay of a signet-ring,
And everything fashioneth itself as a garment.
15 Their light is removed from the evil-doers,
And the out-stretched arm is broken.

Job 38:12–15. The dawn of the morning, spreading out from one point, takes hold of the carpet of the earth as it were by the edges, and shakes off from it the evil-doers, who had laid themselves to rest upon it the night before. נָעַר, combining in itself the significations to thrust and to shake, has the latter here, as in the Arab. nâ'ûra, a water-wheel, which fills its compartments below in the river, to empty them out above. Instead of שַׁחַר יְדַעְתָּה with He otians, the Keri substitutes הַשַּׁחַר יְדַעְתָּ. The earth is the subj. to v. 14a: the dawn is like the signet-ring, which stamps a definite impress on the earth as the clay, the forms which floated in the darkness of the night become visible and distinguishable. The subj. to v. 14b are not morning and dawn (Schult.), still less the ends of the earth (Ew. with the conjecture: יתיבצו, "they become dazzlingly white"), but the single objects on the earth: the light of morning gives to everything its peculiar garb of light, so that, hitherto overlaid by a uniform darkness, they now come forth independently, they gradually appear in their variegated diversity of form and hue. In לְבוּשׁ כָּמוֹ, לבוּשׁ is conceived as accusative (Arab. kemâ libâsan, or thauban), while in כלבוּשׁ (Ps. 104:6, instar vestis) it would be genitive. To the end of the strophe everything is under the logical government of the ל of purpose in v. 13a. The light of the evil-doers is, according to Job 24:17, the darkness of the night, which is for them in connection with their works what the light of day is for other men. The sunrise deprives them, the enemies of light in the true sense (Job 24:13), of this light per antiphrasin, and the carrying out of their evil work, already prepared for, is frustrated. The ע of רשׁעים, vv. 13

and 15, is תלויה ועי [Ayin suspensum], which is explained according to the Midrash thus: the רשׁעים, now עשׁירים (rich), become at a future time רשׁים (poor); or: God deprives them of the עין (light of the eye), by abandoning them to the darkness which they loved.

16 Hast thou reached the fountains of the sea,
And hast thou gone into the foundation of the deep?
17 Were the gates of death unveiled to thee,
And didst thou see the gates of the realm of shades?
18 Hast thou comprehended the breadth of the earth?
Speak, in so far as thou knowest all this!
19 Which is the way to where the light dwelleth,
And darkness, where is its place,
20 That thou mightest bring it to its bound,
And that thou mightest know the paths of its house?
21 Thou knowest it, for then wast thou born,
And the number of thy days is great!—

Job 38:16–21. The root נב has the primary notion of obtruding itself upon the senses (vid., Genesis, S. 635), whence נבך in Arabic of a rising country that pleases the eye (nabaka, a hill, a hillside), and here (cognate in root and meaning נבע, Syr. Talmud. נְבַג, Arab. nbg, nbṭ, scatuirire) of gushing and bubbling water. Hitzig's conjecture, approved by Olsh., נבלי, sets aside a word that is perfectly clear so far as the language is concerned. On חֵקֶר vid., on Job 11:7. The question put to Job in v. 17, he must, according to his own confession, Job 26:6, answer in the negative. In order to avoid the collision of two aspirates, the interrogative הֲ is wanting before הִתְבֹּנַנְתָּ, Ew. § 324, b; עַד התבנן signifies, according to Job 32:12, to observe anything carefully; the meaning of the question therefore is, whether Job has given special attention to the breadth of the earth, and whether he consequently has a comprehensive and thorough knowledge of it. כֻּלָּהּ refers not to the earth (Hahn, Olsh., and others), but, as neuter, to the preceding points of interrogation. The questions, v. 19, refer to the principles of light and darkness, i.e., their final causes, whence they come forth as cosmical phenomena. כָּן־אוֹרִיךְ is a relative clause, Ges. § 123, 3, c; the noun that governs (the Regens) this virtual genitive, which ought in Arabic to be without the art. as being determined by the regens, is, according to the Hebrew syntax, which is freer in this respect, הַדֶּרֶךְ (comp. Ges. § 110, 2). That which is said of the bound of darkness, i.e., the furthest point at which darkness passes away, and the paths to its house, applies also to the light, which the poet perhaps has even prominently (comp. Job 24:13) before his mind: light and darkness have a first cause which is inaccessible to man, and beyond his power of searching out. The admission in v. 21 is ironical: Verily! thou art as old as the beginning of creation, when light and darkness, as powers of nature which are distinguished and bounded the one by the other (vid., Job 26:10), were introduced into the rising world; thou art as old as the world, so that thou hast an exact knowledge of its and thine own contemporaneous origin (vid., Job 15:7). On the fut. joined with אָז regularly in the signification of the aorist, vid., Ew. § 134, b. The attraction in connection with מִסְפַּר is like Job 15:20, 21:21.

22 Hast thou reached the treasures of the snow,
And didst thou see the treasures of the hail,
23 Which I have reserved for a time of trouble,
For the day of battle and war?
24 Which is the way where the light is divided,
Where the east wind is scattered over the earth?
25 Who divideth a course for the rain-flood
And the way of the lightning of thunder,
26 That it raineth on the land where no one dwelleth,
On the tenantless steppe,
27 To satisfy the desolate and the waste,

And to cause the tender shoot of the grass to spring forth?

Job 38:22–27. The idea in v. 22 is not that—as for instance the peasants of Menîn, four hours' journey from Damascus, garner up the winter snow in a cleft of the rock, in order to convey it to Damascus and the towns of the coast in the hot months—God treasures up the snow and hail above to cause it to descend according to opportunity. אִצְרוֹת (comp. Ps. 135:7) are the final causes of these phenomena which God has created—the form of the question, the design of which (which must not be forgotten) is ethical, not scientific, is regulated according to the infancy of the perception of natural phenomena among the ancients; but at the same time in accordance with the poet's task, and even, as here, in the choice of the agents of destruction, not merely hail, but also snow, according to the scene of the incident. Wetzstein has in his possession a writing of Muhammed el-Chatîb el-Bosrâwi, in which he describes a fearful fall of snow in Hauran, by which, in February 1860, innumerable herds of sheep, goats, and camels, and also many human beings perished.327 עֶת־צָר might, according to Job 24:1, 19:11, signify a time of judgment for the oppressor, i.e., adversary; but it is better to be understood according to Job 36:16, 21:30, a time of distress: heavy falls of snow and tempestuous hail-storms bring hard times for men and cattle, and sometimes decide a war as by a divine decree (Josh. 10:11, comp. Isa. 28:17, 30:30, Ezek. 13:13).

In v. 24a it is not, as in v. 19a, the place whence light issues, but the mode of the distribution of light over the earth, that is intended; as in v. 24b, the laws according to which the east wind flows forth, i.e., spreads over the earth. אוֹר is not lightning (Schlottm.), but light in general: light and wind (instead of which the east wind is particularized, vid., p. 533) stand together as being alike untraceable in their courses. הֻפִּיץ, se diffundere, as Ex. 5:12, 1 Sam. 13:8, Ges. § 53, 2. In v. 25a the descent of torrents of rain inundating certain regions of the earth is intended—this earthward direction assigned to the water-spouts is likened to an aqueduct coming downwards from the sky—and it is only in v. 25b, as in Job 28:26, that the words have reference to the lightning, which to man is untraceable, flashing now here, now there. This guiding of the rain to chosen parts of the earth extends also to the tenantless steppe. לֹא־אִישׁ (for בְּלֹא) is virtually an adj. (vid., on Job 12:24). The superlative combination וּמְשֹׁאָה שֹׁאָה (from שׁוֹא = שָׁאָה, to be desolate, and to give forth a heavy dull sound, i.e., to sound desolate, vid., on Job 37:6), as Job 30:3 (which see). Not merely for the purposes of His rule among men does God direct the changes of the weather contrary to human foresight; His care extends also to regions where no human habitations are found.

28 Hath the rain a father,
Or who begetteth the drops of dew?
29 Out of whose womb cometh the ice forth,
And who bringeth forth the hoar-frost of heaven?
30 The waters become hard like stone,
And the face of the deep is rolled together.

Job 38:28–30. Rain and dew have no created father, ice and hoar-frost no created mother. The parallelism in both instances shows that מִי הוֹלִיד asks after the one who begets, and מִי יְלָדוֹ the one who bears (vid., Hupfeld on Ps. 2:7). בֶּטֶן is uterus, and meton. (at least in Arabic) progenies uteri; ex utero cujus is מִי מבטן, in distinction from בטן מֵאֵי־זֶה, ex quo utero. אֲגֻלֵי־טָל is excellently translated by the LXX, Codd. Vat. and Sin., βώλους (with Omega) δρόσου; Ges. and Schlottm. correct to βόλους, but βῶλος signifies not merely a clod, but also a lump and a ball. It is the particles of the dew holding together (LXX, Cod. Alex.: συνοχὰς καὶ βω. δρ.) in a globular form, from אָגַל, which does not belong to גָּלַל, but to Arab. 'jil, retinere, II colligere (whence agîl, standing water, ma''gal, a pool, pond); אֲגֻלֵי is constr., like עֲגֻלֵי from עֲגֻל. The waters "hide themselves," by vanishing as fluid, therefore: freeze. The surface of the deep (LXX ἀσεβοῦς, for which Zwingli has in marg. ἀβύσσου) "takes hold of itself," or presses together (comp. Arab. lekda, crowding, synon.

hugûm, a striking against) by forming itself into a firm solid mass (continuum, Job 41:9, comp. 37:10). Moreover, the questions all refer not merely to the analysis of the visible origin of the phenomena, but to their final causes.

31 Canst thou join the twistings of the Pleiades,

Or loose the bands of Orion?

32 Canst thou bring forth the signs of the Zodiac at the right time,

And canst thou guide the Bear with its children?

33 Knowest thou the laws of heaven,

Or dost thou define its influence on the earth?

Job 38:31–33. That מַעֲדַנּוֹת here signifies bindings or twistings (from עָדַן = עָנַד, Job 31:36) is placed beyond question by the unanimous translations of the LXX (δεσμόν) and the Targ. (שֵׁירֵי = σειράς), the testimony of the Masora, according to which the word here has a different signification from 1 Sam. 15:32, and the language of the Talmud, in which מעדנין, Kêlim, c. 20, signifies the knots at the end of a mat, by loosing which it comes to pieces, and Succa, 13b, the bands (formed of rushes) with which willow-branches are fastened together above in order to form a booth (succa); but מדאני, Sabbat, 33a, signifies a bunch of myrtle (to smell on the Sabbath). כִּימָה מעדנות is therefore explained according to the Persian comparison of the Pleiades with a bouquet of jewels, mentioned on Job 9:9, and according to the comparison with a necklace ('ipd-eth-thurajja), e.g., in Sadi in his Gulistan, p. 8 of Graf's translation: "as though the tops of the trees were encircled by the necklace of the Pleiades." The Arabic name thurajja (diminutive feminine of tharwân) probably signifies the richly-adorned, clustered constellation. But כִּימָה signifies without doubt the clustered group,328 and Beigel (in Ideler, Sternnamen, S. 147) does not translate badly: "Canst thou not arrange together the rosette of diamonds (chain would be better) of the Pleiades?"

As to כְּסִיל, we firmly hold that it denotes Orion (according to which the Greek versions translate Ὠρίων, the Syriac gaboro, the Targ. נְפִילָא or נְפִילָא, the Giant). Orion and the Pleiades are visible in the Syrian sky longer in the year than with us, and there they come about 17° higher above the horizon than with us. Nevertheless the figure of a giant chained to the heavens cannot be rightly shown to be Semitic, and it is questionable whether כסיל is not rather, with Saad., Gecat., Abulwalid, and others, to be regarded as the Suhêl, i.e., Canopus, especially as this is placed as a sluggish helper (כסיל, Hebr. a fool, Arab. the slothful one, ignavus) in mythical relation to the constellation of the Bear, which here is called עַיִשׁ, as Job 9:9 עָשׁ, and is regarded as a bier, נַעַשׁ (even in the present day this is the name in the towns and villages of Syria), which the sons and daughters forming the attendants upon the corpse of their father, slain by Gedî, the Pole-star. Understood of Orion, מֹשְׁכוֹת (with which Arab. msk, tenere, detinere, is certainly to be compared) are the chains (Arab. masakat, compes), with which he is chained to the sky; understood of Suhêl, the restraints which prevent his breaking away too soon and reaching the goal.329 מַזָּרוֹת is not distinct from מַזָּלוֹת, 2 Kings 23:5 (comp. מַזָּרֵךְ, "Thy star of fortune," on Cilician coins), and denotes not the twenty-eight menâzil (from Arab. nzl, to descend, turn in, lodge) of the moon,330 but the twelve signs of the Zodiac, which were likewise imagined as menâzil, i.e., lodging-houses or burûg, strongholds, in which one after another the sun lodges as it describes the circle of the year.331 The usage of the language transferred lzm also to the planets, which, because they lie in the equatorial plane of the sun, as the sun (although more irregularly), run through the constellations of the Zodiac. The question in v. 32a therefore means: canst thou bring forth the appointed zodiacal sign for each month, so that (of course with the variation which is limited to about two moon's diameters by the daily progress of the sun through the Zodiac) it becomes visible after sunset and is visible before sunset? On v. 33 vid., on Gen. 1:14–19. מִשְׁטָר is construed after the analogy of בְּ רָדָה, עָצַר, מָשַׁל; and שָׁמַיִם, as sing. (Ew. § 318, b).

34 Dost thou raise thy voice to the clouds
That an overflow of waters may cover thee?
35 Dost thou send forth lightnings, and they go,
And say to thee: Here we are?
36 Who hath put wisdom in the reins,
Or who hath given understanding to the cock?
37 Who numbereth the strata of the clouds with wisdom
And the bottles of heaven, who emptieth them,
38 When the dust flows together into a mass,
And the clods cleave together?

Job 38:34–38. As v. 25b was worded like Job 28:26, so v. 34b is worded like Job 22:11; the ך of תכסך is dageshed in both passages, as Job 36:2, 18, Hab. 2:17. What Jehovah here denies to the natural power of man is possible to the power which man has by faith, as the history of Elijah shows: this, however, does not come under consideration here. In proof of divine omnipotence and human feebleness, Elihu constantly recurs to the rain and the thunder-storm with the lightning, which is at the bidding of God. Most moderns since Schultens therefore endeavour, with great violence, to make טֻחוֹת and שֶׂכְוִי mean meteors and celestial phenomena. Eichh. (Hirz., Hahn) compares the Arabic name for the clouds, tachâ (tachwa), Ew. Arab. ḍiḥḥ, sunshine, with the former; the latter, whose root is שָׂכָה (סָכָה), spectare, is meant to be something that is remarkable in the heavens: an atmospheric phenomenon, a meteor (Hirz.), or a phenomenon caused by light (Ew., Hahn), so that e.g., Umbr. translates: "Who hath put wisdom in the dark clouds, and given understanding to the meteor?" But the meaning which is thus extorted from the words in favour of the connection borders closely upon absurdity. Why, then, shall טחות, from טוּחַ, Arab. ṭîych, oblinere, adipe obducere, not signify here, as in Ps. 51:8, the reins (embedded in a cushion of fat), and in fact as the seat of the predictive faculty, like כְּלָיוֹת, Job 19:27, as the seat of the innermost longing for the future; and particularly since here, after the constellations and the influences of the stars have just been spoken of, the mention of the gift of divination is not devoid of connection; and, moreover, as a glance at the next strophe shows, the connection which has been hitherto firmly kept to is already in process of being resolved?

If טחות signifies the reins, it is natural to interpret שֶׂכְוִי also psychologically, and to translate the intellect (Targ. I, Syr., Arab.), or similarly (Saad., Gecat.), as Ges., Carey, Renan, Schlottm. But there is another rendering handed down which is worthy of attention, although not once mentioned by Rosenm., Hirz., Schlottm., or Hahn, according to which שכוי signifies a cock, gallum. We read in b. Rosch ha-Schana, 26a: "When I came to Techûm-Kên-Nishraja, R. Simeon b. Lakish relates, the bride was there called נינפי and the cock שכוי, according to which Job 38:36 is to be interpreted: שכוי = תרנגול." The Midrash interprets in the same way, Jalkut, § 905, beginning: "R. Levi says: In Arabic the cock is called סַכְוָא." We compare with this, Wajikra rabba, c. 1: "סוכו is Arabic; in Arabia a prophet is called סַכְיָא;" whence it is to be inferred that שכוי, as is assumed, describes the cock as a seer, as a prophet.

As to the formation of the word, it would certainly be without parallel (Ew., Olsh.) if the word had the tone on the penult., but Codd. and the best old editions have the Munach by the final syllable; Norzi, who has overlooked this, at least notes שֶׂכְוִי with the accent on the ult. as a various reading. It is a secondary noun, Ges. § 86, 5, a so-called relative noun (De Sacy, Gramm. Arabe, § 768): שָׂכְוִי, speculator, from שָׂכָו (שָׂכָה, שֵׂכוּ), speculatio, as פִּלְאִי, Judg. 13:18 (comp. Ps. 139:6), miraculosus, from פֶּלֶא, a cognate form to the Chald. סַכְוָי (סַכְוָאָה), of similar meaning. In connection with this primary signification, speculator, it is intelligible how סכוי in Samaritan (vid., Lagarde on Proverbs, S. 62) can signify the eye; here, however, in a Hebrew poet, the cock, of which e.g., Gregory says: Speculator semper in altitudine stat, ut quidquid venturum sit longe prospiciat. That

this signification speculator = gallus 332 was generally accepted at least in the Talmudic age, the Beracha prescribed to him who hears the cock crow: "Blessed be He who giveth the cock (שֵׂכוי) knowledge to distinguish between day and night!" shows. In accordance with this, Targ. II translates: who has given understanding לְתַרְנְגוֹל בָּרָא, gallo sylvestri (whereas Targ. I לְלִבָּא, cordi, scil. hominis), to praise his Lord? and Jer.: (quis posuit in visceribus hominis sapientiam) et quis dedit gallo intelligentiam. This traditional rendering, condemned as talmudicum commentum (Ges.), we follow rather than the "phenomenon" of the moderns who guess at a meaning. What is questioned in Cicero, de divin. ii. 26: Quid in mentem venit Callistheni dicere, Deos gallis signum dedisse cantandi, quum id vel natura vel casus efficere potuisset, Jehovah here claims for Himself. The weather-prophet κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν among animals appropriately appears in this astrologico-meteorological connection by the side of the reins as, according to the Semitic view, a medium of augury (Psychol. S. 268f.). The Koran also makes the cock the watchman who wakes up the heavenly hosts to their duty; and Masius, in his Studies of Nature, has shown how high the cock is placed as being prophetically (for divination) gifted, Moreover, the worship of cocks in the idolatry of the Semites was a service rendered to the stars: the Sabians offered cocks, probably (vid., Chwolsohn, ii. 87) as the white cock of Jezides, regarded by them as a symbol of the sun (Deutsch. Morgenländ. Zeitschr. 1862, S. 365f.).

In v. 37b Jerome translates: et concentum coelorum quis dormire faciet; נִבְלֵי, however, does not here signify harps, but bottles; and הִשְׁכִּיב is not: to lay to rest, but to lay down = to empty, pour out, which the Kal also, like the Arab. sakaba, directly signifies. בְּצָקֶת might be taken actively: when it pours, but according to 1 Kings 22:35 the intransitive rendering is also possible: when the dust pours forth, i.e., flows together, לְמוּצָק, to what is poured out, i.e., not: to the fluid, but in contrast: to a molten mass, i.e., as cast metal (to be explained not according to Job 22:16, but according to Job 37:18), for the dry, sandy, dusty earth is made firm by the downfall of the rain (Arab. ruṣidat, firmata est terra imbre, comp. Arab. lbbd, pluviam emisit donec arena cohaereret). רִגְבִים, glebae, as Job 21:33, from רָגַב, Arab. rjb, in the primary signification, which as it seems must be supposed: to bring together, from which the significations branch off, to thicken, become firm (muraggab, supported), and to be seized with terror.

39 Dost thou hunt for the prey of the lioness
And still the desire of the young lions,
40 When they couch in the dens,
Sit in the thicket lying in wait for prey?
41 Who provideth for the raven its food,
When its young ones cry to God,
They wander about without food?

Job 38:39–41. On the wealth of the Old Testament language in names for the lion, vid., on Job 4:10f. לָבִיא can be used of the lioness; the more exact name of the lioness is לָבִיא, for לָבִיא is = לְבִי, whence לְבָאִים, lions, and לְבָאוֹת, lionesses. The lioness is mentioned first, because she has to provide for her young ones (גּוּרִים); then the lions that are still young, but yet are left to themselves, כְּפִירִים. The phrase חַיָּה מִלֵּא (comp. חַיָּה of life that needs nourishment, Job 33:20) is equivalent to נָפֶשׁ מִלֵּא, Prov. 6:30 (Psychol. S. 204 ad fin.). The book of Psalms here furnishes parallels to every word: comp. on v. 39b, Ps. 104:21; on יָשְׁחוּ, Ps. 10:10; 333 on מְעוֹנוֹת, lustra, Ps. 104:22 (compared on Job 37:8 already); on סֻכָּה, סֹךְ, which is used just in the same way, Ps. 10:9, Jer. 25:38. The picture of the crying ravens has its parallel in Ps. 147:9. כִּי, quum, is followed by the fut. in the signif. of the praes., as Ps. 11:3. As here, in the Sermon on the Mount in Luke 12:24 the ravens, which by their hoarse croaking make themselves most observed everywhere among birds that seek their food, are mentioned instead of the fowls of heaven.

JOB 39

39:1 Dost thou know the bearing time of the wild goats of the rock?
Observest thou the circles of the hinds?

2 Dost thou number the months which they fulfil,

And knowest thou the time of their bringing forth?

3 They bow down, they let their young break through,

They cast off their pains.

4 Their young ones gain strength, grow up in the desert,

They run away and do not return.

Job 39:1–4. The strophe treats of the female chamois or steinbocks, ibices (perhaps including the certainly different kinds of chamois), and stags. The former are called יְעֵלִים, from יָעַל, Arab. w'l (a secondary formation from עלה, Arab. 'lâ), to mount, therefore: rock-climbers. חוֹלֵל is inf. Pil.: τὸ ὠδίνειν, comp. the Pul. Job 15:7. שָׁמַר, to observe, exactly as Eccl. 11:4, 1 Sam. 1:12, Zech. 11:11. In v. 2 the question as to the expiration of the time of bearing is connected with that as to the time of bringing forth. תִּסְפּוֹר, plene, as Job 14:16; לִדְתָּנָה (littâna, like עֵת = עִדְּת, vid., p. 500, note) with an euphonic termination for לִדְתָּן, as Gen. 42:36, 21:29, and also out of pause, Ruth 1:19, Ges. § 91, 1, rem. 2. Instead of תְּפַלַּחְנָה Olsh. wishes to read תְּפַלַּטְנָה, but this (synon. תמלטנה) would be: they let slip away; the former (synon. תבקענה): they cause to divide, i.e., to break through (comp. Arab. felâh, the act of breaking through, freedom, prosperity). On כָּרַע, to kneel down as the posture of one in travail, vid., 1 Sam. 4:19. "They cast off their pains" is not meant of an easy working off of the after-pains (Hirz., Schlottm.), but חֶבֶל signifies in this phrase, as Schultens has first shown, meton. directly the foetus, as Arab. ḥabal, plur. ahbâl, and ὠδίν, even of a child already grown up, as being the fruit of earlier travail, e.g., in Aeschylus, Agam. 1417f.; even the like phrase, ῥίψαι ὠδῖνα = edere foetum, is found in Euripides, Ion 45. Thus born with ease, the young animals grow rapidly to maturity (חָלַם, pinguescere, pubescere, whence חֲלוֹם, a dream as the result of puberty, vid., Psychol. S. 282), grow in the desert (בָּגַר, Targ. = בַּחוּץ, vid., i. 329, note), seek the plain, and return not again לָמוֹ, sibi h. e. sui juris esse volentes (Schult.), although it might also signify ad eas, for the Hebr. is rather confused on the question of the distinction of gender, and even in חבליהם and בניהם the masc. is used ἐπικοίνως. We, however, prefer to interpret according to Job 6:19, 24:16. Moreover, Bochart is right: Non hic agitur de otiosa et mere speculativa cognitione, sed de ea cognitione, quae Deo propria est, qua res omnes non solum novit, sed et dirigit atque gubernat.

5 Who hath sent forth the wild ass free,

And who loosed the bands of the wild ass,

6 Whose house I made the steppe,

And his dwelling the salt country?

7 He scorneth the tumult of the city,

He heareth not the noise of the driver.

8 That which is seen upon the mountains is his pasture,

And he sniffeth after every green thing.

Job 39:5–8. On the wild ass (not: ass of the forest), vid., p. 501, note.334 In Hebr. and Arab. it is פֶּרֶא (ferâ or himâr el-wahsh, i.e., asinus ferus), and Aram. עָרוֹד; the former describes it as a swift-footed animal, the latter as an animal shy and difficult to be tamed by the hand of man; "Kulan" is its Eastern Asiatic name. LXX correctly translates: τίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἀφεὶς ὄνον ἄγριον ἐλεύθερον. חָפְשִׁי is the acc. of the predicate (comp. Gen. 33:2, Jer. 22:30). Parallel with עֲרָבָה (according to its etymon perhaps, land of darkness, terra incognita) is מְלֵחָה, salt [adj.] or (sc. ארץ) a salt land, i.e., therefore unfruitful and incapable of culture, as the country round the Salt Sea of Palestine: that the wild ass even gladly licks the salt or natron of the desert, is a matter of fact, and may be assumed, since all wild animals that feed on plants have a partiality, which is based on chemical laws of life, for licking slat. On v. 8a Ew. observes, to render יְתוּר as "what is espied" is insecure, "on account of the structure of the verse" (Gramm. S. 419, Anm.). This reason is unintelligible; and in general there is no reason for rendering יְתוּר, after LXX, Targ., Jer., and others, as an Aramaic 3 fut. with a mere half

vowel instead of Kametz before the tone = יָתוּר, which is without example in Old Testament Hebrew (for יְהוּא, Eccl. 11:3, follows the analogy of יְהִי), but יְתוּר signifies either abundantia (after the form לְחוּם, יְבוּל Job 20:23, from יתר, Arab. wtr, p. 571) or investigabile, what can be searched out (after the form יְקוּם, that which exists, from תּוּר, Arab. târ, to go about, look about), which, with Olsh. § 212, and most expositors, we prefer.

9 Will the oryx be willing to serve thee,

Or will he lodge in thy crib?

10 Canst thou bind the oryx in the furrow with a leading rein,

Or will he harrow the valleys, following thee?

11 Wilt thou trust him because his strength is great,

And leave thy labour to him?

12 Wilt thou confide in him to bring in thy sowing,

And to garner thy threshing-floor?

Job 39:9–12. In correct texts רֵים has a Dagesh in the Resh, and הֲיֹאבֶה the accent on the penult., as Prov. 11:21 רַע מְאוּמָה, and Jer. 39:12 רָע מְאוּמָה. The tone retreats according to the rule, Ges. § 29, 3, b; and the Dagesh is, as also when the second word begins with an aspirate,335 Dag. forte conj., which the Resh also takes, Prov. 15:1 מַעֲנֶה־רַךְ, exceptionally, according to the rule, Ges. § 20, 2, a. In all, it occurs thirteen times with Dagesh in the Old Testament—a relic of a mode of pointing which treated the ר (as in Arabic) as a letter capable of being doubled (Ges. § 22, 5), that has been supplanted in the system of pointing that gained the ascendency. רֵים (Ps. 22:22, רֵם) is contracted from רְאֵם (Ps. 92:11, plene, רְאֵים), which (= רְאֻם) is of like form with Arab. ri'm (Olsh. § 154, a).336 Such, in the present day in Syria, is the name of the gazelle that is for the most part white with a yellow back and yellow stripes in the face (Antilope leucoryx, in distinction from Arab. 'ifrî, the earth-coloured, dirty-yellow Antilope oryx, and Arab. ḥmrî, himrî, the deer-coloured Antilope dorcas); the Talmud also (b. Zebachim, 113b; Bathra, 74b) combines ראימא and אורזילא or ארזילא, a gazelle (Arab. gazâl), and therefore reckons the reêm to the antelope genus, of which the gazelle is a species; and the question, v. 10b, shows that an animal whose home is on the mountains is intended, viz., as Bochart, and recently Schlottm. (making use of an academic treatise of Lichtenstein on the antelopes, 1824), has proved, the oryx, which the LXX also probably understands when it translates μονοκέρως; for the Talmud. קרש, mutilated from it, is, according to Chullin, 59b, a one-horned animal, and is more closely defined as עילאי דבי טביא, "gazelle (antelope) of Be (Beth)-Illâi" (comp. Lewysohn, Zoologie des Talmuds, 1858, § 146).

The oryx also appears on Egyptian monuments sometimes with two horns, but mostly with one variously curled; and both Aristotle337 and Pliny describe it as a one-horned cloven-hoof; so that one must assent to the supposition of a one-horned variety of the oryx (although as a fact of natural history it is not yet fully established), as then there is really tolerably certain information of a one-horned antelope both in Upper Asia and in Central Africa;338 and therefore there is sufficient ground for seeking the origin of the tradition of the unicorn in an antelope,—perhaps rather like a horse,—with one horn rising out of the two points of ossification over the frontal suture. The proper buffalo, Bos bubalus, cannot therefore be intended, because it only came from India to Western Asia and Europe at a more recent date, but also not any other species whatever of this animal (Carey and others), which is recognisable by its flat horns, which are also near together, and its forbidding, staring, bloodshot eyes; for it is tameable, and is (even in modern Syria) used as a domestic animal. On the other hand there are antelopes which somewhat resemble the horse, others the ox (whence βούβαλοὸ βούβαλις, is a name for the antelope), others the deer and the ass. Schultens erroneously considers ראם to be the buffalo, being misled by a passage in the Divan of the Hudheilites, which gives the ri'm the by-name of dhu chadam, i.e., oxen-like white-

footed, which exactly applies to the A. oryx or even the A. leucoryx; for the former has white feet and legs striped lengthwise with black stripes, the latter white feet and legs. Just as little reason is there for imagining the rhinoceros after Aquila (and in part Jerome); ῥινοκέρως is nothing but an unhappy rendering of the μονοκέρως of the LXX. The question in v. 10b, as already observed, requires an animal that inhabits the mountains.

On אָבָה, to be willing = to take up, receive, vid., p. 559, note. The "furrow (תֶּלֶם, sulcus, not porca, the ridge between the furrows, vid., p. 597) of his cord" is that which it is said to break up by means of the ploughshare, being led by a rein. אַחֲרִיךְ refers to the leader, who goes just before or at the side; according to Hahn, to one who has finished the sowing which precedes the harrowing; but it is more natural to imagine the leader of the animal that is harrowing, which is certainly not left to itself. On כִּי, v. 12a, as an exponent of the obj. vid., Ew. § 336, b. The Chethib here uses the Kal שׁוּב transitively: to bring back (viz., that which was sown as harvested), which is possible (vid., Job 42:10). גָּרְנֶךָ, v. 12b, is either a locative (into thy threshing-floor) or acc. of the obj. per synecd. continentis pro contento, as Ruth 3:2, Matt. 3:12. The position of the question from beginning to end assumes an animal outwardly resembling the yoke-ox, as the ראם is also elsewhere put with the ox, Deut. 33:17, Ps. 29:6, Isa. 34:7. But the conclusion at length arrived at by Hahn and in Gesenius' Handwörterbuch, that on this very account the buffalo is to be understood, is a mistake: A. oryx and leucoryx are both (for this very reason not distinguished by the ancients) entirely similar to the ox; they are not only ruminants, like the ox, with a like form of the hoof, but also of a plump form, which makes them appear to be of the ox tribe.

13 The wing of the ostrich vibrates joyously,
Is she pious, wing and feather?
14 No, she leaveth her eggs in the earth
And broodeth over the dust,
15 Forgetting that a foot may crush them,
And the beast of the field trample them.
16 She treateth her young ones harshly as if they were not hers;
In vain is her labour, without her being distressed.
17 For Eloah hath caused her to forget wisdom,
And gave her no share of understanding.
18 At the time when she lasheth herself aloft,
She derideth the horse and horseman.

Job 39:13–18. As the wild ass and the ox-like oryx cannot be tamed by man, and employed in his service like the domestic ass and ox, so the ostrich, although resembling the stork in its stilt-like structure, the colour of its feathers, and its gregarious life, still has characteristics totally different from those one ought to look for according to this similarity. רְנָנִים, a wail, prop. a tremulous shrill sound (vid., v. 23), is a name of the female ostrich, whose peculiar cry (vid., p. 583) is called in Arabic zimâr (זְמָר). נֶעֱלַס (from עָלַס, which in comparison with עָלַז, עָלַץ, rarely occurs) signifies to make gestures of joy. אִם, v. 13b, is an interrogative an; חֲסִידָה, pia, is a play upon the name of the stork, which is so called: pia instar ciconiae (on this figure of speech, comp. Mehren's Rehtorik der Araber, S. 178). כִּי, v. 14a, establishes the negation implied in the question, as e.g., Isa. 28:28. The idea is not that the hen-ostrich abandons the hatching of her eggs to the earth (לְ עָזַב as Ps. 16:10), and makes them "glow over the dust" (Schlottm.), for the maturing energy compensating for the sitting of the parent bird proceeds from the sun's heat, which ought to have been mentioned; one would also expect a Hiph. instead of the Piel תְּחַמֵּם, which can be understood only of hatching by her own warmth. The hen-ostrich also really broods herself, although from time to time she abandons the חַמָּם to the sun.339 That which contrasts with the φιλοστοργία of the stork, which is here made prominent, is that she lays here eggs in a hole in the ground, and partly, when the nest is full, above round about it, while ביתה ברושׁים חסידה, Ps. 104:17. רננים is construed in accordance with its meaning as

fem. sing., Ew. § 318, a. Since she acts thus, what next happens consistently therewith is told by the not aoristic but only consecutive וַתִּשְׁכַּח: and so she forgets that the foot may crush (זוּר, to press together, break by pressure, as הַזּוּרָה, Isa. 59:5 = הַזּוּרָה, that which is crushed, comp. לָנָה = לָנָה, Zech. 5:4) them (i.e., the eggs, Ges. § 146, 3), and the beast of the field may trample them down, crush them (דּוּשׁ as Arab. dâs, to crush by treading upon anything, to tread out).

Ver. 16. The difficulty of הִקְשִׁיחַ (from קָשַׁח, Arab. qsḥ, hardened from קָשָׁה, Arab. qsâ) being used of the hen-ostrich in the masc., may be removed by the pointing הַקְשִׁיחַ (Ew.); but this alteration is unnecessary, since the Hebr. also uses the masc. for the fem. where it might be regarded as impossible (vid., v. 3b, and comp. e.g., Isa. 32:11f.). Jer. translates correctly according to the sense: quasi non sint sui, but לְ is not directly equivalent to דְּ (vid., pp. 421, 460, note); what is meant is, that by the harshness of her conduct she treats her young as not belonging to her, so that they become strange to her, Ew. § 217, d. In v. 16b the accentuation varies: in vain (לְרִיק with Rebia mugrasch) is her labour that is devoid of anxiety; or: in vain is her labour (לריק with Tarcha, יְגִיעָהּ with Munach vicarium) without anxiety (on her part); or: in vain is her labour (לריק with Mercha, יגיעה with Rebia mugrasch), yet she is without anxiety. The middle of these renderings (לְרִיק in all of them, like Isa. 49:4 = לָרִיק, Isa. 65:23 and freq.) seems to us the most pleasing: the labour of birth and of the brooding undertaken in places where the eggs are put beyond the danger of being crushed, is without result, without the want of success distressing her, since she does not anticipate it, and therefore also takes no measures to prevent it. The eggs that are only just covered with earth, or that lie round about the nest, actually become a prey to the jackals, wild-cats, and other animals; and men can get them for themselves one by one, if they only take care to prevent their footprints being recognised; for if the ostrich observes that its nest is discovered, it tramples upon its own eggs, and makes its nest elsewhere (Schlottm., according to Lichtenstein's Südafrik. Reise). That it thus abandons its eggs to the danger of being crushed and to plunder, arises, according to v. 17, from the fact that God has caused it to forget wisdom, i.e., as v. 17b explains, has extinguished in it, deprived it of, the share thereof (ב as Isa. 53:12a, LXX ἐν, as Acts 8:21) which it might have had. It is only one of the stupidities of the ostrich that is made prominent here; the proverbial ahmaq min en-na'âme, "more foolish than the ostrich," has its origin in more such characteristics. But if the care with which other animals guard their young ones is denied to it, it has in its stead another remarkable characteristic: at the time when (כָּעֵת here followed by an elliptical relative clause, which is clearly possible, just as with בָּעֵת, Job 6:17) it stretches (itself) on high, i.e., it starts up with alacrity from its ease (on the radical signification of הִמְרִיא = הִמָּרָה, vid., p. 492, note), and hurries forth with a powerful flapping of its wings, half running half flying, it derides the horse and its rider—they do not overtake it, it is the swiftest of all animals; wherefore Arab. ' 'dâ mn 'l-ḍlîm (zalîm, equivalent to delîm according to a less exact pronunciation, supra, p. 582, note) and Arab. 'nfr mn 'l-n'âmt, fleeter than the ostrich, is just as proverbial as the above Arab. 'ḥmq mn 'l-wa'nat; and "on ostrich's wings" is equivalent to driving along with incomparable swiftness. Moreover, on תַּמְרִיא and תְּשָׂחֵק, which refer to the female, it is to be observed that she is very anxious, and deserts everything in her fright, while the male ostrich does not forsake his young, and flees no danger.340

19 Dost thou give to the horse strength?
Dost thou clothe his neck with flowing hair?
20 Dost thou cause him to leap about like the grasshopper?
The noise of his snorting is a terror!
21 He paweth the ground in the plain, and boundeth about with strength.
He advanceth to meet an armed host.
22 He laugheth at fear, and is not affrighted,
And turneth not back from the sword.

23 The quiver rattleth over him,

The glittering lance and spear.

24 With fierceness and rage he swalloweth the ground,

And standeth not still, when the trumpet soundeth.

25 He saith at every blast of the trumpet: Ha, ha!

And from afar he scenteth the battle,

The thundering of the captains and the shout of war.

Job 39:19–25. After the ostrich, which, as the Arabs say, is composed of the nature of a bird and a camel, comes the horse in its heroic beauty, and impetuous lust for the battle, which is likewise an evidence of the wisdom of the Ruler of the world—a wisdom which demands the admiration of men. This passage of the book of Job, says K. Löffler, in his Gesch. des Pferdes (1863), is the oldest and most beautiful description of the horse. It may be compared to the praise of the horse in Hammer-Purgstall's Duftkörner; it deserves more than this latter the praise of majestic simplicity, which is the first feature of classic superiority. Jer. falsely renders v. 19b: aut circumdabis collo ejus hinnitum; as Schlottm., who also wishes to be so understood: Dost thou adorn his neck with the voice of thunder? The neck (צַוָּאר, prop. the twister, as Persic gerdân, gerdan, from צוּר, Arab. ṣâr, to twist by pressure, to turn, bend, as Pers. from gerdîden, to turn one's self, twist) has nothing to do with the voice of neighing. But רַעְמָה also does not signify dignity (Ew. 113, d), but the mane, and is not from רָעַם = רָאַם = רָם, the hair of the mane, as being above, like λοφιά, but from רָעַם, tremere, the mane as quivering, trembling (Eliz. Smith: the shaking mane); like φόβη, according to Kuhn, cogn. with σόβη, the tail, from φοβεῖν (σοβεῖν), to wag, shake, scare, comp. άίσσεσθαι of the mane, Il. vi. 510.

Ver. 20a. The motion of the horse, which is intended by תַּרְעִישֶׁנּוּ (רָעַשׁ, Arab. r's, r'š, tremere, trepidare), is determined according to the comparison with the grasshopper: what is intended is a curved motion forwards in leaps, now to the right, now to the left, which is called the caracol, a word used in horsemanship, borrowed from the Arab. hargala-l-farasu (comp. חַרְגֹּל), by means of the Moorish Spanish; moreover, Arab. r's is used of the run of the ostrich and the flight of the dove in such "successive lateral and oblique motions" (Carey). נַחַר, v. 20b, is not the neighing of the horse, but its snorting through the nostrils (comp. Arab. nachîr, snoring, a rattling in the throat), Greek φρύαγμα, Lat. fremitus (comp. Aeschylus, Septem c. Th. 374, according to the text of Hermann: ἵππος χαλινῶν δ᾽ ὡς κατασθμαίνων βρέμει); הוֹד, however, might signify pomp (his pompous snorting), but perhaps has its radical signification, according to which it corresponds to the Arab. hawîd, and signifies a loud strong sound, as the peal of thunder (hawîd er-ra'd),' the howling of the stormy wind (hawîd er-rijâh), and the like.341 The substantival clause is intended to affirm that its dull-toned snort causes or spreads terror. In v. 21a the plur. alternates with the sing., since, as it appears, the representation of the many pawing hoofs is blended with that of the pawing horse, according to the well-known line,

Quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum

(Virgil, Aen. viii. 596);

or, since this is said of the galloping horse, according to the likewise Virgilian line,

Cavatque

Tellurem, et solido graviter sonat ungula cornu

(Georg. iii. 87 f).

חָפַר is, as the Arab. hâfir, hoof, shows, the proper word for the horse's impatient pawing of the ground (whence it then, as in v. 29, signifies rimari, scrutari). עֵמֶק is the plain as the place of contest; for the description, as now becomes still more evident, refers to the war-horse. The verb שִׂישׂ (שׂוּשׂ) has its radical signification exsultare (comp. Arab. šâṣ, σκιρτᾶν, of the foetus) here; and since בְּכֹחַ, not בְּגֹאַי, is added to it, it is not to be translated: it rejoices in its strength, but: it prances or is

joyous with strength, LXX γαυριᾷ ἐν ἰσχύϊ. The difference between the two renderings is, however, scarcely perceptible. נֶשֶׁק, armament, v. 21b, is meton. the armed host of the enemy; אַשְׁפָּה, "the quiver," is, however, not used metonymically for the arrows of the enemy whizzing about the horse (Schult.), but v. 23 is the concluding description of the horse that rushes on fearlessly, proudly, and impetuously in pursuit, under the rattle and glare of the equipment of its rider (Schlottm. and others). רָנָה (cogn. of רָנַן), of the rattling of the quiver, as Arab. ranna, ranima, of the whirring of the bow when the arrow is despatched; to point it תְּרֹנָה (Prov. 1:20, 8:3), instead of תְּרֻעָה, would be to deprive the language of a word supported by the dialects (vid., Ges. Thes.). On v. 24a we may compare the Arab. iltahama-l-farasu-l-arda, the horse swallows up the ground, whence lahimm, lahîm, a swallower = swift-runner; so here: with boisterous fierceness and angry impatience (רֹגֶז בְּרַעַשׁ) it swallows up the ground, i.e., passes so swiftly over it that long pieces vanish so rapidly before it, as though it greedily sucked them up (גִּמֵּא intensive of גָּמָא, whence גֹּמֶא, the water-sucking papyrus); a somewhat differently applied figure is nahab-el-arda, i.e., according to Silius' expression, rapuit campum. The meaning of v. 24b is, as in Virgil, Georg. iii. 83f.:

Tum si qua sonum procul arma dedere,

Stare loco nescit;

and in Aeschylus, Septem, 375: ὅστις βοὴν σάλπιγγος ὀρμαίνει (Hermann, ὀργαίνει) μένων (impatiently awaiting the call of the trumpet). הֶאֱמִין signifies here to show stability (vid., Genesis, S. 367f.) in the first physical sense (Bochart, Rosenm., and others): it does not stand still, i.e., will not be held, when (כִּי, quum) the sound of the war-trumpet, i.e., when it sounds. שׁוֹפָר is the signal-trumpet when the army was called together, e.g., Judg. 3:27; to gather the army that is in pursuit of the enemy, 2 Sam. 2:28; when the people rebelled, 2 Sam. 20:1; when the army was dismissed at the end of the war, 2 Sam. 20:22; when forming for defence and for assault, e.g., Amos 3:6; and in general the signal of war, Jer. 4:19. As often as this is heard (בְּדֵי, in sufficiency, i.e., happening at any time = quotiescunque), it makes known its lust of war by a joyous neigh, even from afar, before the collision has taken place; it scents (praesagit according to Pliny's expression) the approaching conflict, (scents even in anticipation) the thundering command of the chiefs that may soon be heard, and the cry of battle giving loose to the assault. "Although," says Layard (New Discoveries, p. 330), "docile as a lamb, and requiring no other guide than the halter, when the Arab mare hears the war-cry of the tribe, and sees the quivering spear of her rider, her eyes glitter with fire, her blood-red nostrils open wide, her neck is nobly arched, and her tail and mane are raised and spread out to the wind. The Bedouin proverb says, that a high-bred mare when at full speed should hide her rider between her neck and her tail."

26 Doth the hawk fly by thy wisdom,
Doth it spread its wings towards the south?
27 Or is it at thy command that the eagle soareth aloft,
And buildeth its nest on high?
28 It inhabiteth the rock, and buildeth its nest
Upon the crag of the rock and fastness.
29 From thence it seeketh food,
Its eyes see afar off.
30 And its young ones suck up blood;
And where the slain are, there is it.

Job 39:26–30. The ancient versions are unanimous in testifying that, according to the signification of the root, נֵץ signifies the hawk (which is significant in the Hieroglyphics): the soaring one, the high-flyer (comp. Arab. nṣṣ, to rise, struggle forwards, and Arab. nḍḍ, to raise the wings for flight). The Hiph. יַאֲבֶר (jussive form in the question, as Job 13:27) might signify: to get feathers, plumescere (Targ., Jer.), but that gives a tame question; wherefore Gregory understands the plumescit of the Vulgate of moulting, for which purpose the hawk seeks the sunny side. But הֶאֱבִיר alone, by itself, cannot signify "to get new feathers;"

moreover, an annual moulting is common to all birds, and prominence is alone given to the new feathering of the eagle in the Old Testament, Ps. 103:5, Mic. 1:16, comp. Isa. 40:31 (LXX πτεροφυήσουσιν ὡς ἀετοί).342 Thus, then, the point of the question will lie in לְתֵימָן: the hawk is a bird of passage, God has endowed it with instinct to migrate to the south as the winter season is approaching.

In vv. 27ff. the circle of the native figures taken from animal life, which began with the lion, the king of quadrupeds, is now closed with the eagle, the king of birds. It is called נֶשֶׁר, from נָשַׁר, Arab. nsr, vellere; as also vultur (by virtue of a strong power of assimilation = vultor) is derived from vellere,—a common name of the golden eagle, the lamb's vulture, the carrion-kite (Cathartes percnopterus), and indeed also of other kinds of kites and falcons. There is nothing to prevent our understanding the eagle κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, viz., the golden eagle (Aquila chrysaëtos), in the present passage; for even to this, corpses, though not already putrified, are a welcome prey. In v. 27b we must translate either: and is it at thy command that … ? or: is it so that (as in הֲכִי) at thy command … ? The former is more natural here. מְצוּדָה, v. 28b, signifies prop. specula (from צוּד, to spy); then, however, as Arab. masâd (referred by the original lexicons to masada), the high hill, and the mountain-top. The rare form יְעַלְעוּ, for which Ges., Olsh., and others wish to read לַעֲלְעוּ or יְלַעֲלְעוּ (from לוּעַ, deglutire), is to be derived from עָלַע, a likewise secondary form out of עָלַל (from עוּל, to suck, to give suck343), like שָׂרַשׁ out of שָׁרַשׁ (from שָׂרַר, Arab. srr, to make firm), Ew. § 118, a, comp. Fürst, Handwörterbuch, sub עוּל, since instances are wanting in favour of עלע being formed out of לעלע (Jesurun, p. 164). Schult. not inappropriately compares even גלג = גלגל in גָּלְגָּתָא, Γολγοθᾶ = לְתָאגָּלְגָּ. The concluding words, v. 30b, are perhaps echoed in Matt. 24:28. High up on a mountain-peak the eagle builds its eyrie, and God has given it a remarkably sharp vision, to see far into the depth below the food that is there for it and its young ones. Not merely from the valley in the neighbourhood of its eyrie, but often from distant plains, which lie deep below on the other side of the mountain range, it seizes its prey, and rises with it even to the clouds, and bears it home to its nest.344 Thus does God work exceeding strangely, but wonderously, apparently by contradictions, but in truth most harmoniously and wisely, in the natural world.

JOB 40

[Then Jehovah answered Job, and said:]

40:2,3 Will now the censurer contend with the Almighty?

Let the instructor of Eloah answer it!

Job 40:2,3. With v. 1, Job 38:1 is again taken up, because the speech of Jehovah has now in some measure attained the end which was assigned to it as an answer to Job's outburst of censure. רִב is inf. abs., as Judg. 11:25; it is left to the hearer to give to the simple verbal notion its syntactic relation in accordance with the connection; here it stands in the sense of the fut. (comp. 2 Kings 4:43): num litigabit, Ges. § 131, 4, b. The inf. abs. is followed by יִסּוֹר as subj., which (after the form שִׂכּוֹר) signifies a censurer and fault-finder, μωμητής. The question means, will Job persist in this contending with God? He who sets God right, as though he knew everything better than He, shall answer the questions put before him.

[Then Job answered Jehovah, and said:]

4 Behold, I am too mean: what shall I answer Thee?

I lay my hand upon my mouth.

5 Once have I spoken, and will not begin again;

And twice—I will do it no more.

Job 40:4, 5. He is small, i.e., not equal to the task imposed, therefore he keeps his mouth firmly closed (comp. Job 21:5, 29:9), for whatever he might say would still not be to the point. Once he has dared to criticise God's doings; a second time (שְׁתַּיִם = שֵׁנִית, Ges. § 120, 5) he ventures it no more, for God's wondrous wisdom and all-careful love dazzle him, and he gladly bows.

But how? Is not the divine speech altogether different from what one ought to expect? One expects to hear from the mouth of Jehovah something unheard of in the previous course of the drama, and in this expectation we find ourselves disappointed at the outset. For one need only look back and read Job 9:4–10, where Job acknowledges and describes God as a wise and mighty Lord over the natural world, especially as an irresistible Ruler over everything great in it; Job 12:7–10, where he refers to the creatures of the sky and deep as proofs of God's creative power; Job 12:11–25, where he sketches the grandest picture of God's terrible doings in nature and among men; Job 26:5–14, where he praises God as the Creator and Lord of all things, and describes what he says concerning Him as only a faint echo of the thunder of His might; Job 28:23ff., where he ascribes absolute wisdom to Him as the Creator of and Ruler of the world. If one ponders these passages of Job's speeches, he will not be able to say that the speech of Jehovah, in the exhibition of the creative power and wisdom of God, which is its theme, would make Job conscious of anything which was previously unknown to him; and it is accordingly asked, What, then, is there that is new in the speech of Jehovah by which the great effect is brought about, that Job humbles himself in penitence, and becomes ready for the act of redemption which follows?

It has indeed never occurred to Job to desire to enter into a controversy with God concerning the works of creation; he is far from the delusion of being able to stand such a test; he knows in general, that if God were willing to contend with him, he would not be able to answer God one in a thousand, Job 9:3. And yet God closely questioned him, and thereby Job comes to the perception of his sin—how comes it to pass? Has the plot of the drama perhaps failed in this point? Has the poet made use of means unsuited to the connection of the whole, to bring about the needful effect, viz., the repentance of Job,—because, perhaps, the store of his thoughts was exhausted? But this poet is not so poor, and we shall therefore be obliged to try and understand the disposition of the speech of Jehovah before we censure it.

When one of Job's last words before the appearing of Jehovah was the word יענני שׁדי, Job thereby desired God's decision concerning the testimony of his innocence. This wish is in itself not sinful; yea, it is even a fruit of his hidden faith, when he casts the look of hope away from his affliction and the accusation of the friends, into the future to God as his Vindicator and Redeemer. But that wish becomes sinful when he looks upon his affliction as a de facto accusation on the part of God, because he cannot think of suffering and sin as separable, and because he is conscious of his innocence, looks upon it as a decree of God, his opponent and his enemy, which is irreconcilable with the divine justice. This Job's condition of conflict and temptation is the prevailing one; his faith is beclouded, and breaks through the night which hangs over him only in single rays. The result of this condition of conflict is the sinful character which that wish assumes: it becomes a challenge to God, since Job directs against God Himself the accusation which the friends have directed against him, and asserts his ability to carry through his good cause even if God would enter with him into a judicial contention; he becomes a יסור and אלוה מוכיח, and raises himself above God, because he thinks he has Him for an enemy who is his best friend. This defiance is, however, not common godlessness; on the contrary, Job is really the innocent servant of God, and his defiant tone is only the result of a false conception which the tempted one indulges respecting the Author of his affliction. So, then, this defiance has not taken full possession of Job's mind; on the contrary, the faith which lays firm hold on confidence in the God whom he does not comprehend, is in conflict against it; and this conflict tends in the course of the drama, the nearer it comes to the catastrophe, still nearer to the victory, which only awaits a decisive stroke in order to be complete. Therefore Jehovah yields to Job's longing יענני שׁדי, in as far as He really answers Job; and even that this takes place, and that, although out of the storm, it nevertheless takes

place, not in a way to crush and destroy, but to instruct and convince, and displaying a loving condescension, is an indirect manifestation that Job is not regarded by God as an evil-doer mature for judgment. But that folly and temerity by which the servant of God is become unlike himself must notwithstanding be destroyed; and before Job can realize God as his Witness and Redeemer, in which character his faith in the brighter moments has foreseen Him, his sinful censuring and blaming of God must be blotted out by penitence; and with it at the same time his foolish imagination, by which his faith has been almost overwhelmed, must be destroyed, viz., the imagination that his affliction is a hostile dispensation of God.

And by what means is Job brought to the penitent recognition of his gloomy judgment concerning the divine decree, and of his contending with God? Is it, perhaps, by God's admitting to him what really is the case: that he does not suffer as a sinner the punishment of his sin, but showing at the same time that the decree of suffering is not an unjust one, because its design is not hostile? No, indeed, for Job is not worthy that his cause should be acknowledged on the part of God before he has come to a penitent recognition of the wrong by which he has sinned against God. God would be encouraging self-righteousness if He should give Job the testimony of his innocence, before the sin of vainglory, into which Job has fallen in the consciousness of his innocence, is changed to humility, by which all uprightness that is acceptable with God is tested. Therefore, contrary to expectation, God begins to speak with Job about totally different matters from His justice or injustice in reference to his affliction. Therein already lies a deep humiliation for Job. But a still deeper one in God's turning, as it were, to the abecedarium naturae, and putting the censurer of His doings to the blush. That God is the almighty and all-wise Creator and Ruler of the world, that the natural world is exalted above human knowledge and power, and is full of marvellous divine creations and arrangements, full of things mysterious and incomprehensible to ignorant and feeble man, Job knows even before God speaks, and yet he must now hear it, because he does not know it rightly; for the nature with which he is acquainted as the herald of the creative and governing power of God, is also the preacher of humility; and exalted as God the Creator and Ruler of the natural world is above Job's censure, so is He also as the Author of his affliction. That which is new, therefore, in the speech of Jehovah, is not the proof of God's exaltation in itself, but the relation to the mystery of his affliction, and to his conduct towards God in this his affliction, in which Job is necessitated to place perceptions not in themselves strange to him. He who cannot answer a single one of those questions taken from the natural kingdom, but, on the contrary, must everywhere admire and adore the power and wisdom of God—he must appear as an insignificant fool, if he applies them to his limited judgment concerning the Author of his affliction.

The fundamental tone of the divine speech is the thought, that the divine working in nature is infinitely exalted above human knowledge and power, and that consequently man must renounce all claim to better knowledge and right of contention in the presence of the divine dispensations. But at the same time, within the range of this general thought, it is also in particular shown how nature reflects the goodness of God as well as His wisdom (He has restrained the destructive power of the waters, He also sendeth rain upon the steppe, though untenanted by man); how that which accomplishes the purposes for which it was in itself designed, serves higher purposes in the moral order of the world (the dawn of day puts an end to the works of darkness, snow and hail serve as instruments of divine judgments); how divine providence extends to all creatures, and always according to their need (He provides the lion its prey, He satisfies the ravens that cry to Him); and how He has distributed His manifold gifts in a way often paradoxical to man, but in truth worthy of admiration (to the steinbock ease in bringing forth and growth without toil, to the wild ass freedom, to the antelope

untameable fleetness, to the ostrich freedom from anxiety about its young and swiftness, to the horse heroic and proud lust for the battle, to the hawk the instinct of migration, to the eagle a lofty nest and a piercing sight). Everywhere the wonders of God's power and wisdom, and in fact of His goodness abounding in power, and His providence abounding in wisdom, infinitely transcend Job's knowledge and capacity. Job cannot answer one of all these questions, but yet he feels to what end they are put to him. The God who sets bounds to the sea, who refreshes the desert, who feeds the ravens, who cares for the gazelle in the wilderness and the eagle in its eyrie, is the same God who now causes him seemingly thus unjustly to suffer. But if the former is worthy of adoration, the latter will also be so. Therefore Job confesses that he will henceforth keep silence, and solemnly promises that he will now no longer contend with Him. From the marvellous in nature he divines that which is marvellous in his affliction. His humiliation under the mysteries of nature is at the same time humiliation under the mystery of his affliction; and only now, when he penitently reveres the mystery he has hitherto censured, is it time that its inner glory should be unveiled to him. The bud is mature, and can now burst forth, in order to disclose the blended colours of its matured beauty.

The Second Speech of Jehovah, and Job's Second Penitent Answer.—Ch. 40:6–42:6

Schema: 6. 10. 9. 12. 10. 9 | 4. 6. 6. 8. 8. 8. 10. | 6. 6.

[Then Jehovah answered Job out of the storm, and said:]

This second time also Jehovah speaks to Job out of the storm; not, however, in wrath, but in the profound condescension of His majesty, in order to deliver His servant from dark imaginings, and to bring him to free and joyous knowledge. He does not demand blind subjection, but free submission; He does not extort an acknowledgement of His greatness, but it is effected by persuasion. It becomes manifest that God is much more forbearing and compassionate than men. Observe the friends, the defenders of the divine honour, these sticklers for their own orthodoxy, how they rave against Job! How much better is it to fall into the hands of the living God, than into the hands of man! For God is truth and love; but men have at one time love without truth, at another truth without love, since they either connive at one or anathematize him. When a man who, moreover, like Job, is a servant of God, fails in one point, or sins, men at once condemn him altogether, and admit nothing good in him; God, however, discerns between good and evil, and makes the good a means of freeing the man from the evil. He also does not go rashly to work, but waits, like an instructor, until the time of action arrives. How long He listens to Job's bold challenging, and keeps silence! And then, when He does begin to speak, He does not cast Job to the ground by His authoritative utterances, but deals with him as a child; He examines him from the catechism of nature, and allows him to say for himself that he fails in this examination. In this second speech He acts with him as in the well-known poem of Hans Sachs with St. Peter: He offers him to take the government of the world for once instead of Himself. Here also He produces conviction; here also His mode of action is a deep lowering of Himself. It is Jehovah, the God, who at length begets Himself in humanity, in order to convince men of His love.

7 Gird up thy loins manfully:

I will question thee, and do thou answer me!

8 Wilt thou altogether annul my right,

Condemn me, that thou mayest be righteous?

9 And hast thou then an arm like God,

And canst thou with the voice thunder like Him?

Job 40:7–9. The question with וְגַם stands to Job 40:2 in the relation of a climax: Job contended not alone with God, which is in itself wrong, let it be whatsoever it may; he went so far as to lose sight of the divine justice in the

government of the world, and in order not to be obliged to give up his own righteousness, so far as to doubt the divine. וְאִם, v. 9a, is also interrogative, as Job 8:3, 21:4, 34:17, comp. 39:13, not expressive of a wish, as Job 34:16. In the government of the world, God shows His arm, He raises His voice of thunder: canst thou perhaps—asks Jehovah—do the like, thou who seemest to imagine thou couldst govern the world more justly, if thou hadst to govern it? כָּמֹהוּ וּבְקוֹל are to be combined: of like voice to Him; the translation follows the accents (ובקול with Rebia mugrasch).

10 Deck thyself then with pomp and dignity,
And in glory and majesty clothe thyself!
11 Let the overflowings of thy wrath pour forth,
And behold all pride, and abase it!
12 Behold all pride, bring it low,
And cast down the evil-doers in their place;
13 Hide them in the dust together,
Bind their faces in secret:
14 Then I also will praise thee,
That thy right hand obtaineth thee help.

Job 40:10–14. He is for once to put on the robes of the King of kings (עֲדֵה, comp. עָטָה, to wrap round, Ps. 104:2), and send forth his wrath over pride and evil-doing, for their complete removal. הֲפִיץ, effundere, diffundere, as Arab. afâda, vid., Job 37:11. ותעְבְרֹ, or rather, according to the reading of Ben-Ascher, עַבְרוֹת, in its prop. signif. oversteppings, i.e., overflowings. In connection with vv. 11–13, one is directly reminded of the judgment on everything that is high and exalted in Isa. 2, where בָּעָפָר טָמֻנִם also has its parallel (Isa. 2:10). Not less, however, does v. 14b recall Isa. 59:16, 63:5 (comp. Ps. 98:1); Isaiah I and II have similar descriptions to the book of Job. The ἅπ. λεγ. הָדַד is Hebraeo-Arab.; hadaka signifies, like hadama, to tear, pull to the ground. In connection with טָמוּן (from טָמַן; Aram., Arab., טמר), the lower world, including the grave, is thought of (comp. Arab. mat-murât, subterranean places); חָבַשׁ signifies, like Arab. ḥbs IV, to chain and to imprison. Try it only for once—this is the collective thought—to act like Me in the execution of penal justice, I would praise thee. That he cannot do it, and yet venture with his short-sightedness and feebleness to charge God's rule with injustice, the following pictures of foreign animals are now further intended to make evident to him:—

15 Behold now the behêmôth,
Which I have made with thee:
He eateth grass like an ox.
16 Behold now, his strength is in his loins,
And his force in the sinews of his belly.
17 He bendeth his tail like a cedar branch,
The sinews of his legs are firmly interwoven.
18 His bones are like tubes of brass,
His bones like bars of iron.

Job 40:15–18. בְּהֵמוֹת (after the manner of the intensive plur. תְּהוֹמוֹת, חָכְמוֹת, which play the part of the abstract termination), which sounds like a plur., but without the numerical plural signification, considered as Hebrew, denotes the beast κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, or the giant of beasts, is however Hebraized from the Egyptian p-ehe-mau, (muau), i.e., the (p) ox (ehe) of the water (mau as in the Hebraized proper name מֹשֶׁה). It is, as Bochart has first of all shown, the so-called river or Nile horse, Hippopotamus amphibius (in Isa. 30:6, נֶגֶב בַּהֲמוֹת, as emblem of Egypt, which extends its power, and still is active in the interest of others), found in the rivers of Africa, but no longer found in the Nile, which is not inappropriately called a horse; the Arab. water-hog is better, Italian bomarino, Eng. sea-cow [?], like the Egyptian p-ehe-mau. The change of p and b in the exchange of Egyptian and Semitic words occurs also elsewhere, e.g., pug' and בּוּץ, harpu and חֶרֶב (ἅρπη), Apriu and עִבְרִים (according to Lauth). Nevertheless p-ehe-mau (not mau-t, for what should the post-positive fem. art. do here?) is first of all only the בהמות translated back again into the Egyptian by Jablonsky; an instance in favour of this is still wanting. In Hieroglyph the Nile-horse is called apet; it was honoured as

divine. Brugsch dwelt in Thebes in the temple of the Apet. 345 In v. 15b עִמָּךְ signifies nothing but "with thee," so that thou hast it before thee. This water-ox eats חָצִיר, green grass, like an ox. That it prefers to plunder the produce of the fields—in Arab. chadîr signifies, in particular, green barley—is accordingly self-evident. Nevertheless, it has gigantic strength, viz., in its plump loins and in the sinews (שְׁרִירֵי, properly the firm constituent parts,346 therefore: ligaments and muscles) of its clumsy belly. The brush of a tail, short in comparison with the monster itself, is compared to a cedar (a branch of it), ratione glabritiei, rotunditatis, spissitudinis et firmitatis (Bochart); since the beast is in general almost without hair, it looks like a stiff, naked bone, and yet it can bend it like an elastic cedar branch; חָפַץ is Hebraeo-Arab., ḥfḍ 347 is a word used directly of the bending of wood (el-'ûd).

Since this description, like the whole book of Job, is so strongly Arabized, פחד, v. 17b, will also be one word with the Arab. fachidh, the thigh; as the Arabic version also translates: 'urûku afchâdhihi (the veins or strings of its thigh). The Targ., retaining the word of the text here,348 has פַּחֲדִין in Lev. 21:20 for אָשֶׁךְ, a testicle, prop. inguina, the groins; we interpret: the sinews of its thighs or legs349 are intertwined after the manner of intertwined vine branches, שׂריגים.350 But why is פַּחֲדָיו pointed thus, and not פְּחָדָיו (as e.g., שְׁעָרָיו)? It is either an Aramaizing (with אַשָׁרָיו it has another relationship) pointing of the plur., or rather, as Köhler has perceived, a regularly-pointed dual (like רַגְלָיו), from פַּחֲדַיִם (like פַּעֲמַיִם), which is equally suitable in connection with the signification femora as testiculi. מָטִיל, v. 18b, is also Hebraeo-Arab.; for Arab. mṭl signifies to forge, or properly to extend by forging (hammering), and to lengthen, undoubtedly a secondary formation of טוּל, tâla, to be long, as makuna of kâna, madana of dâna, massara (to found a fortified city) of sâra, chiefly (if not always) by the intervention of such nouns as makân, medîne, misr (= מָצוֹר), therefore in the present instance by the intervention of this metîl (= memtûl 351), whence probably μέταλλον (metal), properly iron in bars or rods, therefore metal in a wrought state, although not yet finished.352 Its bones are like tubes of brass, its bones (גִּרְמָיו, the more Aram. word) like forged rods of iron—what an appropriate description of the comparatively thin but firm as iron skeleton by which the plump mass of flesh of the gigantic boar-like grass-eater is carried!

19 He is the firstling of the ways of God;
He, his Maker, reached to him his sword.
20 For the mountains bring forth food for him,
And all the beasts of the field play beside him.
21 Under the lote-trees he lieth down,
In covert of reeds and marsh.
22 Lote-trees cover him as shade,
The willows of the brook encompass him.
23 Behold, if the stream is strong, he doth not quake;
He remaineth cheerful, if a Jordan breaketh forth upon his mouth.
24 Just catch him while he is looking,
With snares let one pierce his nose!

Job 40:19–24. God's ways is the name given to God's operations as the Creator of the world in v. 19a (comp. Job 25:14, where His acts as the Ruler of the world are included); and the firstling of these ways is called the Behêmôth, not as one of the first in point of time, but one of the hugest creatures, un chef-d'oeuvre de Dieu (Bochart); רֵאשִׁית not as Prov. 8:22, Num. 24:20, of the priority of time, but as Amos 6:1, 6, of rank. The art. in הָעֹשׂוֹ is, without the pronominal suff. being meant as an accusative (Ew. § 290, d), equal to a demonstrative pronoun (comp. Ges. § 109, init): this its Creator (but so that "this" does not refer back so much as forwards). It is not meant that He reached His sword to behêmoth, but (on which account לוֹ is intentionally wanting) that He brought forth, i.e., created, its (behêmoth's) peculiar sword, viz., the gigantic incisors ranged opposite one another, with which it grazes upon the meadow as with a sickle:

ἁρούρῃσιν κακὴν ἐπιβάλλεται ἄρπην (Nicander, Theriac. 566), ἄρπη is exactly the sickle-shaped Egyptian sword (harpu = חֶרֶב). Vegetable food (to which its teeth are adapted) is appointed to the behêmoth: "for the mountains produce food for him;" it is the herbage of the hills (which is scanty in the lower and more abundant in the upper valley of the Nile) that is intended, after which this uncouth animal climbs (vid., Schlottm.). בּוּל is neither a contraction of יְבוּל (Ges.), nor a corruption of it (Ew.), but Hebraeo-Arab. = baul, produce, from bâla, to beget, comp. aballa, to bear fruit (prop. seed, bulal), root בל, to soak, wet, mix.353 V. 20b describes how harmless, and if unmolested, inoffensive, the animal is; שָׁם there, viz., while it is grazing.

In v. 21a Saadia correctly translates: Arab. tḥt 'l-ḍâl; and v. 22a, Abulwalid: Arab. ygṭîh 'l-ḍl mḍlllâ lh, tegit eum lotus obumbrans eum, by interpreting Arab. 'l-ḍl, more correctly Arab. 'l-ḍâl, with es-sidr el-berrî, i.e., Rhamnus silvestris (Rhamnus Lotus, Linn.), in connection with which Schultens' observation is to be noticed: Cave intelligas lotum Aegyptiam s. plantam Niloticam quam Arabes Arab. nûfr. The fact that the wild animals of the steppe seek the shade of the lote-tree, Schultens has supported by passages from the poets. The lotus is found not only in Syria, but also in Egypt, and the whole of Africa.354 The plur. is formed from the primary form צַאֲל, as שִׁקְמִים from שִׁקֶם, Olsh. § 148, b; the single tree was perhaps called צַאֲלָה (= Arab. ḍâlt), as שִׁקְמָה (Ew. § 189, h). Ammianus Marc. xxii. 15 coincides with v. 21b: Inter arundines celsas et squalentes nimia densitate haec bellua cubilia ponit. צִלְלוֹ, v. 22a (resolved from צִלּוֹ, as גִּלְלוֹ, Job 20:7, from גִּלּוֹ355), is in apposition with the subj.: Lote-trees cover it as its shade (shading it). The double play of words in v. 22 is [not] reproduced in the [English] translation.

הֵן, v. 23a, pointing to something possible, obtains almost the signification of a conditional particle, as Job 12:14, 23:8, Isa. 54:15. The Arabic version appropriately translates Arab. 'n ṭgâ 'l-nhr, for Arab. ṭgâ denotes exactly like עָשַׁק, excessive, insolent behaviour, and is then, as also Arab. ḍlm, 'tâ, and other verbs given by Schultens, transferred from the sphere of ethics to the overflow of a river beyond its banks, to the rush of raging waters, to the rising and bursting forth of swollen streams. It does not, however, terrify the behêmoth, which can live as well in the water as on the land; יַחְפֹּז לֹא, properly, it does not spring up before it, is not disturbed by it. Instead of the Jordan, v. 23b, especially in connection with גִּיחוֹן, the 'Gaihûn (the Oxus) or the 'Gaihân (the Pyramus) might have been mentioned, which have their names from the growing force with which they burst forth from their sources (גִּיחַ, גּוּחַ, comp. 'gâcha, to wash away). But in order to express the notion of a powerful and at times deep-swelling stream, the poet prefers the יַרְדֵּן of his fatherland, which moreover, does not lie so very far from the scene, according to the conception at least, since all the wadis in its neighbourhood flow directly or indirectly (as Wâdi el-Meddân, the boundary river between the district of Suwêt and the Nukra plain) into the Jordan. For יַרְדֵּן (perhaps fromיָרַד356) does not here signify a stream (rising in the mountain) in general; the name is not deprived of its geographical definiteness, but is a particularizing expression of the notion given above.

The description closes in v. 24 with the ironical challenge: in its sight (בְּעֵינָיו as Prov. 1:17) let one (for once) catch it; let one lay a snare which, when it goes into it, shall spring together and pierce it in the nose; i.e., neither the open force nor the stratagem, which one employs with effect with other animals, is sufficient to overpower this monster. מוֹקְשִׁים is generally rendered as equal to חַחִים, Isa. 37:29, Ezek. 19:4, or at least to the cords drawn through them, but contrary to the uniform usage of the language. The description of the hippopotamus357 is not followed by that of the crocodile, which also elsewhere form a pair, e.g., in Achilles Tatius, iv. 2, 19. Behemoth and leviathan, says Herder, are the pillars of Hercules at the end of the book, the non plus ultra of another world [distant from the scene]. What the same writer says of the poet, that he

does not "mean to furnish any contributions to Pennant's Zoologie or to Linnaeus' Animal Kingdom," the expositor also must assent to.

25 Dost thou draw the crocodile by a hoop-net,
And dost thou sink his tongue into the line?!
26 Canst thou put a rush-ring into his nose,
And pierce his cheeks with a hook?
27 Will he make many supplications to thee,
Or speak flatteries to thee?
28 Will he make a covenant with thee,
To take him as a perpetual slave?
29 Wilt thou play with him as a little bird,
And bind him for thy maidens?

Job 40:25–29. In Job 3:8, לִוְיָתָן signified the celestial dragon, that causes the eclipses of the sun (according to the Indian mythology, râhu the black serpent, and ketu the red serpent); in Ps. 104:26 it does not denote some great sea-saurian after the kind of the hydrarchus of the primeval world,358 but directly the whale, as in the Talmud (Lewysohn, Zoologie des Talm. § 178f.). Elsewhere, however, the crocodile is thus named, and in fact as תַּנִּין also, another appellation of this natural wonder of Egypt, as an emblem of the mightiness of Pharaoh (vid., on Ps. 74:13f.), as once again the crocodile itself is called in Arab. el-fir'annu. The Old Testament language possesses no proper name for the crocodile; even the Talmudic makes use of קרוקתא = κροκόδειλος (Lewysohn, § 271). לויתן is the generic name of twisted, and תנין long-extended monsters. Since the Egyptian name of the crocodile has not been Hebraized, the poet contents himself in תִּמְשֹׁךְ with making a play upon its Egyptian, and in Arab. tmsâḥ, timsâh, 359 Arabized name (Ew. § 324, a). To wit, it is called in Coptic temsah, Hierogl. (without the art.) msuh (emsuh), as an animal that creeps "out of the egg (suh)." 360 In v. 25b, Ges. and others falsely translate: Canst thou press its tongue down with a cord; הִשְׁקִיעַ does not signify demergere = deprimere, but immergere: canst thou sink its tongue into the line, i.e., make it bite into the hook on the line, and canst thou thus draw it up? V. 25b then refers to what must happen in order that the מָשׁךְ of the msuh may take place. Herodotus (and after him Aristotle) says, indeed, ii. 68, the crocodile has no tongue; but it has one, only it cannot stretch it out, because the protruding part has grown to the bottom of the mouth, while otherwise the saurians have a long tongue, that can be stretched out to some length. In v. 26 the order of thought is the same: for first the Nile fishermen put a ring through the gills or nose of valuable fish; then they draw a cord made of rushes (σχοῖνον) through it, in order to put them thus bound into the river. "As a perpetual slave," v. 28b is intended to say: like one of the domestic animals. By צִפּוֹר, v. 29a, can hardly be meant הַכְּרָמִים צִפֹּרֶת, the little bird of the vineyard, i.e., according to a Talmud. usage of the language, the golden beetle (Jesurun, p. 222), or a pretty eatable grasshopper (Lewysohn, § 374), but, according to the words of Catullus, Passer deliciae meae puellae, the sparrow, Arab. 'asfûr—an example of a harmless living plaything (בְּ שְׂחַק, to play with anything, different from Ps. 104:26, where it is not, with Ew., to be translated: to play with it, but: therein).

30 Do fishermen trade with him,
Do they divide him among the Canaanites?
31 Canst thou fill his skin with darts,
And his head with fish-spears?
32 Only lay thy hand upon him—Remember the battle, thou wilt not do it again!

41:1 Behold, every hope becometh disappointment:

Is not one cast down even at the sight of him?

JOB 41

Job 40:20–41:1. The fishermen form a guild (Arab. ṣunf, sunf), the associated members of which are called חַבָּרִים (distinct from חֲבֵרִים). On עַל כֵּן, vid., on Job 6:27. "When I came to the towns of the coast," says R. Akiba, b. Rosch ha-Schana, 26b, "they called selling, which we call מכירה, כירה, there," according to which, then, Gen. 50:5 is understood, as by the Syriac; the word is

Sanscrito-Semitic, Sanscr. kri, Persic chirîden (Jesurun, p. 178). LXX ἐνσιτοῦνται, according to 2 Kings 6:23, to which, however, עָלָיו is not suitable. כְּנַעֲנִים are Phoenicians; and then, because they were the merchant race of the ancient world, directly traders or merchants. The meaning of the question is, whether one sells the crocodile among them, perhaps halved, or in general divided up (vid., i. 409). Further, v. 31: whether one can kill it בְּשֻׂכּוֹת, with pointed missiles (Arab. shauke, a thorn, sting, dart), or with fish-spears (צִלְצַל, so called from its whizzing, צלל, salla). In v. 32 the accentuation is the right indication: only seize upon him—remember the battle, i.e., thou wilt be obliged to remember it, and thou wilt have no wish to repeat it. זְכֹר is a so-called imperat. consec.: if thou doest it, thou wilt …, Ges. § 130, 2. תּוֹסַף is the pausal form of תּוֹסֶף (once tôsp, Prov. 30:6), of which it is the original form.

Job 41:1. The suff. of תִּוֹחַלְתּוֹ refers to the assailant, not objectively to the beast (the hope which he indulges concerning it). נִכְזָבָה, Job 41:1, is 3 praet., like נֶאֱלָמָה, Isa. 53:7 (where also the participial accenting as Milra, occurs in Codd.); Fürst's Concord. treats it as part., but the participial form נִקְטָלָה, to be assumed in connection with it, along with נִקְטָלָה and נִקְטָלֶת, does not exist. הֲגַם, v. 1b, is, according to the sense, equivalent to גַּם הֲלֹא, vid., on Job 20:4. מַרְאָיו (according to Ges., Ew., and Olsh., sing., with the plural suff., without a plur. meaning, which is natural in connection with the primary form מַרְאֵי; or what is more probable, from the plur. מַרְאִים with a sing. meaning, as פָּנִים) refers to the crocodile, and יֻטָּל (according to a more accredited reading, יֻטָּל = יוּטָל) to the hunter to whom it is visible.

What is said in v. 30 is perfectly true; although the crocodile was held sacred in some parts of Egypt, in Elephantine and Apollonopolis, on the contrary, it was salted and eaten as food. Moreover, that there is a small species of crocodile, with which children can play, does not militate against v. 29. Everywhere here it is the creature in its primitive strength and vigour that is spoken of. But if they also knew how to catch it in very early times, by fastening a bait, perhaps a duck, on a barb with a line attached, and drew the animal to land, where they put an end to its life with a lance-thrust in the neck (Uhlemann, Thoth, S. 241): this was angling on the largest scale, as is not meant in v. 25. If, on the other hand, in very early times they harpooned the crocodile, this would certainly be more difficult of reconcilement with v. 31, than that mode of catching it by means of a fishing-hook of the greatest calibre with v. 25. But harpooning is generally only of use when the animal can be hit between the neck and head, or in the flank; and it is very questionable whether, in the ancient times, when the race was without doubt of an unmanageable size, that has now died out, the crocodile hunt (Job 7:12) was effected with harpoons. On the whole subject we have too little information for distinguishing between the different periods. So far as the questions of Jehovah have reference to man's relation to the two monsters, they concern the men of the present, and are shaped according to the measure of power which they have attained over nature. The strophe which follows shows what Jehovah intends by these questions.

2 None is so foolhardy that he dare excite him!

And who is it who could stand before Me?

3 Who hath given Me anything first of all, that I must requite it?

Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is Mine.

Job 41:2, 3. One sees from these concluding inferences, thus applied, what is the design, in the connection of this second speech of Jehovah, of the reference to behêmoth and leviathan, which somewhat abruptly began in Job 40:15. If even the strength of one of God's creatures admits no thought of being able to attack it, how much more should the greatness of the Creator deter man from all resistance! For no one has any claim on God, so that he should have the right of appearing before Him with a rude challenge. Every creature under heaven is God's; man, therefore, possesses

nothing that was not God's property and gift, and he must humbly yield, whether God gives or takes away. לֹא, v. 2a, is not directly equivalent to אֵין, but the clause is exclamatory. יעורנו Chethîb, יעירנו Kerî, is the Palestine reading, the reverse the Babylonian; the authorized text (chiefly without a Kerî) is יְעוֹרֲנוּ from עור in a transitive signification (ἐγείρειν), as שׁוּב, Job 39:12, comp. 42:10. The meaning of הִקְדִּימַנִי is determined according to וַאֲשַׁלֵּם: to anticipate, viz., by gifts presented as a person is approaching the giver (Arab. aqdama). הוּא, v. 3b, is neutral, as Job 13:16, 15:9, 31:11, 28. תַּחַת is virtually a subj.: that which is under … After these apparently epiphonematic verses (2 and 3), one might now look for Job's answer. But the description of the leviathan is again taken up, and in fact hitherto it was only the invincibility of the animal that was spoken of; and yet it is not so described that this picture might form the exact pendent of the preceding.

4 I will not keep silence about his members,
The proportion of his power and the comeliness of his structure.

5 Who could raise the front of his coat of mail?
Into his double teeth—who cometh therein?

6 The doors of his face—who openeth them?
Round about his teeth is terror.

Job 41:4–6. The Kerî לוֹ authorized by the Masora assumes an interrogative rendering: as to it, should I be silent about its members (לוֹ at the head of the clause, as Lev. 7:7–9, Isa. 9:2),—what perhaps might appear more poetic to many. הֶחֱרִישׁ (once, Job 11:3, to cause to keep silence) here, as usually: to be silent. בַּדָּיו, as Job 18:13, p. 420. דְּבַר signifies the relation of the matter, a matter of fact, as דִּבְרֵי, facts, Ps. 65:4, 105:27, 145:5. חִין (compared by Ew. with הִין, a measure) signifies grace, χάρις (as synon. חֶסֶד), here delicate regularity, and is made easy of pronunciation from חֵנֶן, just as the more usual חֵן; the language has avoided the form חֶנֶן, as observed above. לְבוּשׁ clothing, we have translated "coat of mail," which the Arab. libâs usually signifies; לְבוּשׁוֹ פָּנָיו is not its face's covering (Schlottm.), which ought to be לְבוּשׁ פָּנָיו; but פְּנֵי is the upper or front side turned to the observer (comp. Isa. 25:7), as Arab. wjh, (wag'h), si rem desuper spectes, summa ejus pars, si ex adverso, prima (Fleischer, Glossae, i. 57). That which is the "doubled of its mouth" (רֶסֶן, prop. a bit in the mouth, then the mouth itself) is its upper and lower jaws armed with powerful teeth. The "doors of the face" are the jaws; the jaws are divided back to the ears, the teeth are not covered by lips; the impression of the teeth is therefore the more terrible, which the substantival clause, v. 6b (comp. Job 39:20), affirms. שִׁנָּיו gen. subjecti: the circle, ἔρκος, which is formed by its teeth (Hahn).

7 A pride are the furrows of the shields,
Shut by a rigid seal.

8 One joineth on to the other,
And no air entereth between them.

9 One upon another they are arranged,
They hold fast together, inseparably.

Job 41:7–9. Since the writer uses אָפִיק both in the signif. robustus, Job 12:12, and canalis, Job 40:18, it is doubtful whether it must be explained robusta (robora) scutorum (as e.g., Ges.), or canales scutorum (Hirz., Schlottm., and others). We now prefer the latter, but so that "furrows of the shields" signifies the square shields themselves bounded by these channels; for only thus is the סָגוּר, which refers to these shields, considered, each one for itself, suitably attached to what precedes. צַר חוֹתָם is an acc. of closer definition belonging to it: closed is (each single one) by a firmly attached, and therefore firmly closed, seal. LXX remarkably ὥσπερ σμυρίτης λίθος, i.e., (emery (vid., Krause's Pyrogeteles, 1859, S. 228). Six rows of knotty scales and four scales of the neck cover the upper part of the animal's body, in themselves firm, and attached to one another in almost impenetrable layers, as is described in vv. 7f. in constantly-varying forms of expression (where יִגַּשׁוּ with Pathach beside Athnach is the correct reading),—a גַּאֲוָה, i.e., an equipment of which the animal may be proud. Umbr. takes גאוה, with

Bochart, = גַּוָּה, the back; but although in the language much is possible, yet not everything.

10 His sneezing sendeth forth light,
And his eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn;
11 Out of his mouth proceed flames,
Sparks of fire escape from him;
12 Out of his nostrils goeth forth smoke
Like a seething pot and caldron;
13 His breath kindleth coals,
And flames go forth out of his mouth.

Job 41:10–13. That the crocodile delights to sun itself on the land, and then turns its open jaws to the sunny side, most Nile travellers since Herodotus have had an opportunity of observing;361 and in connection therewith the reflex action of sneezing may occur, since the light of the sun produces an irritation on the retina, and thence on the vagus; and since the sun shines upon the fine particles of watery slime cast forth in the act of sneezing, a meteoric appearance may be produced. This delicate observation of nature is here compressed into three words; in this concentration of whole, grand thoughts and pictures, we recognise the older poet. עָטַשׁ is the usual Semitic word for "sneezing" (Synon. זֵרַר 2 Kings 4:35). תָּהֵל shortened from תַּהֵל, Job 31:26, Hiph. of הָלַל (comp. p. 516). The comparison of the crocodile's eyes with עַפְעַפֵּי־שָׁחַר (as Job 3:9, from עִפְעֵף, to move with quick vibrations, to wink, i.e., tremble), or the rendering of the same as εἶδος ἐωσφόρου (LXX), is the more remarkable, as, according to Horus, i. 68, two crocodile's eyes are the hieroglyph362 for dawn, ἀνατολή: ἐπειδήπερ (probably to be read ἐπειδὴ πρὸ) παντὸς σώματος ζώου οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ ἀναφαίνονται. There it is the peculiar brilliancy of the eyes of certain animals that is intended, which is occasioned either by the iris being furnished with a so-called lustrous substance, or there being in the pupil of the eye (as e.g., in the ostrich) that spot which, shining like metal, is called tapetum lucidum. For ἀναφαίνεσθαι of the eyes ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ, is the lustre of the pupil in the depth of the eye. The eyes of the crocodile, which are near together, and slanting, glimmer through the water, when it is only a few feet under water, with a red glow.

Nevertheless the comparison in v. 10b might also be intended differently. The inner (third) eyelid363 of the crocodile is itself a rose red; and therefore, considered in themselves, its eyes may also be compared with the "eyelids of the dawn." What is then said, vv. 11–13, of the crocodile, Achilles Tatius, iv. 2, says of the hippopotamus: μυκτὴρ ἐπὶ μέγα κεχῃνὼς καὶ πνέων πυρώδη καπνὸν ὡς ἀπὸ πηγῆς πυρός. Bartram has observed on the alligator, that as it comes on the land a thick smoke issues from its distended nostrils with a thundering sound. This thick, hot steam, according to the credible description which is presented here, produces the impression of a fire existing beneath, and bursting forth. The subjective truth of this impression is faithfully but poetically reproduced by the poet. On כִּידוֹד (root כד, escudere), vid., p. 466. הִתְמַלֵּט signifies no more than to disentangle one's self, here therefore: to fly out in small particles. אַגְמוֹן, v. 11b, is rendered by Saad., Gecat., and others, by qumqum (קומקום), a caldron; the modern expositors derive it from אגם = agama, to glow, and understand it of a "heated caldron." But the word signifies either heat or caldron; the latter signification, however, cannot be linguistically established; one would look for אַגָּן (Arab. iggâne, a copper [Germ. Waschkessel]). The noun אַגְמוֹן signifies, Job 40:26, the reed σχοῖνος, and in the Jerusalem Talmud, Sota ix. 12, some menial service (comp. Arab. ugum); Ew. rightly retains the former signification, like a pot blown upon, i.e., fired, heated, and beside it (in combination with it) reeds as fuel, which in themselves, and especially together with the steaming water, produce a thick smoke. The Waw is to be compared to the Arabic Waw concomitantiae (which governs the acc.).

14 Great strength resteth upon his neck,
And despair danceth hence before him.
15 The flanks of his flesh are thickly set,
Fitting tightly to him, immoveable.

16 His heart is firm like stone,
And firm like the nether millstone.
17 The mighty are afraid of his rising up;
From alarm they miss their aim.

Job 41:14–17. Overpowering strength lodges on its neck, i.e., has its abiding place there, and before it despair, prop. melting away, dissolution (דְּאָבָה from דָּאַב, Arab. d'b = דּוּב Hiph., Arab. ḍ'b II, to bring into a loose condition, synon. הֻמַּס), dances hence, i.e., spring up and away (יָדוּץ, Arab. jadisu, to run away), i.e., it spreads before it a despondency which produces terror, and deprives of strength. Even the pendulous fleshy parts (מַפְּלֵי), especially of its belly, hang close together, דָּבְקוּ, i.e., they are not flabby, but fit to it, like a metal casting, without moving, for the skin is very thick and covered with thick scales; and because the digestive apparatus of the animal occupies but little space, and the scales of the back are continued towards the belly, the tender parts appear smaller, narrower, and closer together than in other animals. יָצוּק here is not, as Job 27:2, 29:6, the fut. of צוּק, but the part. of יָצַק, as also v. 16ab: its heart is firm and obdurate, as though it were of cast brass, hard as stone, and in fact as the nether millstone (פֶּלַח from פלח, falacha, to split, crush in pieces), which, because it has to bear the weight and friction of the upper, must be particularly hard. It is not intended of actual stone-like hardness, but only of its indomitable spirit and great tenacity of life: the activity of its heart is not so easily disturbed, and even fatal wounds do not so quickly bring it to a stand. מִשֹּׁתֹו from שֵׁת = שֵׁאת = שְׁאֵת), primary form שַׁאְתּ, is better understood in the active sense: afraid of its rising, than the passive: of its exaltedness. יִמְאֵיל (according to another reading אֵלִים) is not, with Ew., to be derived from אַיִל (Arab. îjal), a ram; but אֵילִים Ex. 15:15, Ezek. 17:13 (comp. גִּירִים 2 Chron. 2:16, נֵירֵי 2 Sam. 22:29), אֵלִים Ezek. 31:11, 32:21, and אוּלִים Cheth. 2 Kings 24:15, are only alternating forms and modes of writing of the participial adject., derived from אוּל (אִיל) first of all in the primary form awil (as גֵּר = gawir). The signif. assigned to the verb אוּל: to be thick = fleshy, which is said then to go over into the signif. to be stupid and strong (Ges. Handwörterb.), rests upon a misconception: âla is said of fluids "to become thick," because they are condensed, since they go back, i.e., sink in or settle (Ges. correctly in Thes.: notio crassitiei a retrocendendo). The verb âla, ja'ûlu, unites in itself the significations to go backward, to be forward, and to rule; the last two: anteriorem and superiorem esse, probably belong together, and אֵל signifies, therefore, a possessor of power, who is before and over others. תְּחַטֵּאהוּ, v. 17b, has the signif., which does not otherwise occur, to miss the mark (from חטא, Arab. chaṭiya, to miss, opp. Arab. ṣâb, to hit the mark), viz., (which is most natural where אילים is the subject spoken of) since they had designed the slaughter and capture of the monster. שְׁבָרִים is intended subjectively, as תְּבִירָא = פַּחַד Ex. 15:16, Targ. II, and also as the Arab. thubûr, employed more in reference to the mind, can be used of pain.

18 If one reacheth him with the sword—it doth not hold;
Neither spear, nor dart, nor harpoon.
19 He esteemeth iron as straw,
Brass as rotten wood.
20 The son of the bow doth not cause him to flee,
Sling stones are turned to stubble with him.
21 Clubs are counted as stubble,
And he laugheth at the shaking of the spear.

Job 41:18–21. מַשִּׂיגֵהוּ, which stands first as nom. abs., "one reaching him," is equivalent to, if one or whoever reaches him, Ew. § 357, c, to which תָּקוּם בְּלִי, it does not hold fast (בְּלִי with v. fin., as Hos. 8:7, 9:16, Chethîb), is the conclusion. חֶרֶב is instrumental, as Ps. 17:13. מַסָּע, from נָסַע, Arab. nz', to move on, hasten on, signifies a missile, as Arab. minz'a, an arrow, manz'a, a sling. The Targ. supports this latter signification here (funda quae projicit lapidem); but since קֶלַע, the handling, is mentioned separately, the word appears to men missiles in general, or the catapult. In this combination of weapons of attack it is very questionable

whether שִׁרְיָה is a cognate form of שִׁרְיוֹן (שִׁרְיָן), a coat of mail; probably it is equivalent to Arab. sirwe (surwe), an arrow with a long broad edge (comp. serîje, a short, round, as it seems, pear-shaped arrow-head), therefore either a harpoon or a peculiarly formed dart.364 "The son of the bow" (and of the אַשְׁפָּה, pharetra) is the arrow. That the ἁπ. γεγρ. תּוֹתָח signifies a club (war-club), is supported by the Arab. watacha, to beat. כִּידוֹן (vid., p. 466), in distinction from חֲנִית (a long lance), is a short spear, or rather, since רַעַשׁ implies a whistling motion, a javelin. Iron the crocodile esteems as תֶּבֶן, tibn, chopped straw; sling stones are turned with him into קַשׁ. Such is the name here at least, not for stumps of cut stubble that remain standing, but the straw itself, threshed and easily driven before the wind (Job 13:25), which is cut up for provender (Ex. 5:12), generally dried (and for that reason light) stalks (e.g., of grass), or even any remains of plants (e.g., splinters of wood).365 The plur. נֶחְשְׁבוּ, v. 21a, does not seem to be occasioned by תותח being conceived collectively, but by the fact that, instead of saying וכידון תותח, the poet has formed וכידון into a separate clause. Parchon's (and Kimchi's) reading תּוֹחָח is founded upon an error.

22 His under parts are the sharpest shards,
He spreadeth a threshing sledge upon the mire.
23 He maketh the deep foam like a caldron,
He maketh the sea like a pot of ointment.
24 He lighteth up the path behind him,
One taketh the water-flood for hoary hair.
25 Upon earth there is not his equal,
That is created without fear.
26 He looketh upon everything high,
He is the king over every proud beast.

Job 41:22–26. Under it, or, תַּחְתָּיו taken like תַּחַת, Job 41:3, as a virtual subject (vid., Job 28:5, p. 544): its under parts are the most pointed or sharpest shards, i.e., it is furnished with exceedingly pointed scales. חַדּוּד is the intensive form of חַד (Arab. hadîd, sharpened = iron, p. 542, note), as חַלּוּק, 1 Sam. 17:40, of חָלָק (smooth),366 and the combination שׁוֹחֵר חַדּוּדֵי (equal the combination הַחֲרַשִּׁים חדודי, comp. Job 30:6) is moreover superlative: in the domain of shards standing prominent as sharp ones, as Arab. chairu ummatin, the best people, prop. bon en fait de peuple (Ew. § 313, c. Gramm. Arab. § 532). LXX ἡ στρωμνὴ αὐτοῦ ὀβελίσκοι ὀξεῖς, by drawing יִרְפַּד to v. 22a, and so translating as though it were רִפִּידָתוֹ (Arab. rifâde, stratum). The verb רָפַד (rafada), cogn. רָבַד, signifies sternere (Job 17:13), and then also culcire; what is predicated cannot be referred to the belly of the crocodile, the scales of which are smooth, but to the tail with its scales, which more or less strongly protrude, are edged round by a shallow cavity, and therefore are easily and sharply separated when pressed; and the meaning is, that when it presses its under side in the morass, it appears as though a threshing-sledge with its iron teeth had been driven across it.

The pictures in v. 23 are true to nature; Bartram, who saw two alligators fighting, says that their rapid passage was marked by the surface of the water as it were boiling. With מְצוּלָה, a whirlpool, abyss, depth (from צוּל = צָלַל, to hiss, clash; to whirl, surge), יָם alternates; the Nile even in the present day is called bahr (sea) by the Beduins, and also compared, when it overflows its banks, to a sea. The observation that the animal diffuses a strong odour of musk, has perhaps its share in the figure of the pot of ointment (LXX ὥσπερ ἐξάλειπτρον, which Zwingli falsely translates spongia); a double gland in the tail furnishes the Egyptians and Americans their (pseudo) musk. In v. 24a the bright white trail that the crocodile leaves behind it on the surface of the water is intended; in v. 24b the figure is expressed which underlies the descriptions of the foaming sea with πολιός, canus, in the classic poets. שֵׂיבָה, hoary hair, was to the ancients the most beautiful, most awe-inspiring whiteness. מָשְׁלוֹ, v. 25a, understood by the Targ., Syr., Arab. version, and most moderns (e.g., Hahn: there is not on earth any mastery over it), according to Zech. 9:10, is certainly, with LXX, Jer., and

Umbr., not to be understood differently from the Arab. mithlahu (its equal); whether it be an inflexion of מֹשֶׁל, or what is more probable, of מָשָׁל (comp. Job 17:6, where this nomen actionis signifies a proverb = word of derision, and הִתְמַשֵּׁל, to compare one's self, be equal, Job 30:19). עַל־עָפָר is also Hebr.-Arab.; the Arabic uses turbe, formed from turâb (vid., on Job 19:25), of the surface of the earth, and et-tarbâ-u as the name of the earth itself. הֶעָשׂוּי (for הֶעָשׂוּי, as צָפוּ, Job 15:22, Cheth. = צָפוּי, resolved from עָשׂוּוי, 'asûw, 1 Sam. 25:18, Cheth.) is the confirmatory predicate of the logical subj. described in v. 25a as incomparable; and לִבְלִי־חָת (from חַת, the ă of which becomes ĭ in inflexion), absque terrore (comp. Job 38:4), is virtually a nom. of the predicate: the created one (becomes) a terrorless one (a being that is terrified by nothing). Everything high, as the י־חתלבל, v. 25a, is more exactly explained, it looketh upon, i.e., remains standing before it, without turning away affrighted; in short, it (the leviathan) is king over all the sons of pride, i.e., every beast of prey that proudly roams about (vid., on Job 28:8).

JOB 42

[Then Job answered Jehovah, and said:]

42:2 Now I know that Thou canst do all things,

And no plan is impracticable to Thee.

3 "Who then hideth counsel—

Without knowledge?"

Thus have I judged without understanding,

What was too wonderful for me, without knowing.

Job 42:2, 3. He indeed knew previously what he acknowledges in v. 2, but now this knowledge has risen upon him in a new divinely-worked clearness, such as he has not hitherto experienced. Those strange but wondrous monsters are a proof to him that God is able to put everything into operation, and that the plans according to which He acts are beyond the reach of human comprehension. If even that which is apparently most contradictory, rightly perceived, is so glorious, his affliction is also no such monstrous injustice as he thinks; on the contrary, it is a profoundly elaborated מְזִמָּה, a well-digested, wise עֵצָה of God. In v. 3 he repeats to himself the chastening word of Jehovah, Job 38:2, while he chastens himself with it; for he now perceives that his judgment was wrong, and that he consequently has merited the reproof. With לָכֵן he draws a conclusion from this confession which the chastening word of Jehovah has presented to him: he has rashly pronounced an opinion upon things that lie beyond his power of comprehension, without possessing the necessary capacity of judging and perception. On the mode of writing יָדַעְתִּי, Cheth., which recalls the Syriac form med'et (with the pronominal suff. cast off), vid., Ges. § 44, rem. 4; on the expression v. 2b, comp. Gen. 11:6. The repetition of Job 38:2 in v. 3 is not without some variations according to the custom of authors noticed in Psalter, i. 330. הֻגַּדְתִּי, "I have affirmed," i.e., judged, is, v. 3v, so that the notion of judging goes over into that of pronouncing a judgment. The clauses with וְלֹא are circumstantial clauses, Ew. § 341, a.

4 O hear now, and I will speak:

I will ask Thee, and instruct Thou me.

5 I had heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear,

And now mine eye hath seen Thee.

6 Therefore I am sorry, and I repent

In dust and ashes.

Job 42:4–6. The words employed after the manner of entreaty, in v. 4, Job also takes from the mouth of Jehovah, Job 38:3, 40:7. Hitherto Jehovah has interrogated him, in order to bring him to a knowledge of his ignorance and weakness. Now, however, after he has thoroughly perceived this, he is anxious to put questions to Jehovah, in order to penetrate deeper and deeper into the knowledge of the divine power and wisdom. Now for the first time with him, the true, living perception of God has its beginning, being no longer effected by tradition (לְ of the external cause: in

consequence of the tidings which came to my ears, comp. Ps. 18:45, comp. Isa. 23:5), but by direct communication with God. In this new light he can no longer deceive himself concerning God and concerning himself; the delusion of the conflict now yields to the vision of the truth, and only penitential sorrow for his sin towards God remains to him. The object to אֶמְאַס is his previous conduct. נִחַם is the exact expression for μετανοεῖν, the godly sorrow of repentance not to be repented of. He repents (sitting) on dust and ashes after the manner of those in deep grief.

If the second speech of Jehovah no longer has to do with the exaltation and power of God in general, but is intended to answer Job's doubt concerning the justice of the divine government of the world, the long passage about the hippopotamus and the crocodile, Job 40:15–41:26, in this second speech seems to be devoid of purpose and connection. Even Eichhorn and Bertholdt on this account suppose that the separate portions of the two speeches of Jehovah have fallen into disorder. Stuhlmann, Bernstein, and De Wette, on the other hand, explained the second half of the description of the leviathan, Job 41:4–26, as a later interpolation; for this part is thought to be inflated, and to destroy the connection between Jehovah's concluding words, Job 41:2, 3, and Job's answer, Job 42:2–6. Ewald forcibly rejected the whole section, Job 40:15–41:26, by ascribing it to the writer of Elihu's speeches,—an opinion which he has again more recently abandoned. In fact, this section ought to have had a third poet as its writer. But he would be the double (Doppelgänger) of the first; for, deducting the somewhat tame בדיו אחרישׁ לא, Job 41:4, —which, however, is introduced by the interrupted description being resumed, in order now to begin in real earnest,—this section stands upon an equally exalted height with the rest of the book as a poetic production and lofty description; and since it has not only, as also Elihu's speeches, an Arabizing tinge, but also the poetic genius, the rich fountain of thought, the perfection of technical detail, in common with the rest of the book; and since the writer of the book of Job also betrays elsewhere an acquaintance with Egypt, and an especial interest in things Egyptian, the authenticity of the section is by no means doubted by us, but we freely adopt the originality of its present position.

But before one doubts the originality of its position, he ought, first of all, to make an earnest attempt to comprehend the portion in its present connection, into which it at any rate has not fallen from pure thoughtlessness. The first speech of Jehovah, moreover, was surprisingly different from what was to have been expected, and yet we recognised in it a deep consistency with the plan; perhaps the same thing is also the case in connection with the second.

After Job has answered the first speech of Jehovah by a confession of penitence, the second can have no other purpose but that of strengthening the conviction, which urges to this confession, and of deepening the healthful tone from which it proceeds. The object of censure here is no longer Job's contending with Jehovah in general, but Job's contending with Jehovah on account of the prosperity of the evil-doer, which is irreconcilable with divine justice; that contending by which the sufferer, in spite of the shadow which affliction casts upon him, supported the assertion of his own righteousness. Here also, as a result, the refutation follows in the only way consistent with the dignity of Jehovah, and so that Job must believe in order to perceive, and does not perceive in order not to be obliged to believe. Without arguing the matter with Job, as to why many things in the government of the world are thus and not rather otherwise, Jehovah challenges Job to take the government of the world into his own hand, and to give free course to his wrath, to cast down everything that is exalted, and to render the evil-doer for ever harmless. By thus thinking of himself as the ruler of the world, Job is obliged to recognise the cutting contrast of his feebleness and the divine rule, with which he has ventured to find fault; at the same time, however, he is

taught, that—what he would never be able to do—God really punishes the ungodly, and must have wise purposes when, which He indeed might do, He does not allow the floods of His wrath to be poured forth immediately.

Thus far also Simson is agreed; but what is the design of the description of the two Egyptian monsters, which are regarded by him as by Ewald as out of place here? To show Job how little capable he is of governing the world, and how little he would be in a position to execute judgment on the evil-doer, two creatures are described to him, two unslain monsters of gigantic structure and invincible strength, which defy all human attack. These two descriptions are, we think, designed to teach Job how little capable of passing sentence upon the evil-doer he is, who cannot even draw a cord through the nose of the behêmoth, and who, if he once attempted to attack the leviathan, would have reason to remember it so long as he lived, and would henceforth let it alone. It is perhaps an emblem that is not without connection with the book of Job, that these בהמות and לויתן (תנין), in the language of the Prophets and the Psalms, are the symbols of a worldly power at enmity with the God of redemption and His people. And wherefore should Job's confession, Job 42:2, not be suitably attached to the completed description of the leviathan, especially as the description is divided into two parts by the utterances of Jehovah, Job 41:2, 3, which retrospectively and prospectively set it in the right light for Job?

The Unravelment in Outward Reality.—Ch. 42:7ff.

Job's confession and tone of penitence are now perfected. He acknowledges the divine omnipotence which acts according to a wisely-devised scheme, in opposition to his total ignorance and feebleness. A world of divine wisdom, of wondrous thoughts of God, now lies before him, concerning which he knows nothing of himself, but would gladly learn a vast amount by the medium of divine instruction. To these mysteries his affliction also belongs. He perceives it now to be a wise decree of God, beneath which he adoringly bows, but it is nevertheless a mystery to him. Sitting in dust and ashes, he feels a deep contrition for the violence with which he has roughly handled and shaken the mystery,—now will it continue, that he bows beneath the enshrouded mystery? No, the final teaching of the book is not that God's rule demands faith before everything else; the final teaching is, that sufferings are for the righteous man the way to glory, and that his faith is the way to sight. The most craving desire, for the attainment of which Job hopes where his faith breaks forth from under the ashes, is this, that he will once more behold God, even if he should succumb to his affliction. This desire is granted him ere he yields. For he who hitherto has only heard of Jehovah, can now say: עתה ראתך עיני; his perception of God has entered upon an entirely new stage. But first of all God has only borne witness of Himself to him, to call him to repentance. Now, however, since the rust of pollution is purged away from Job's pure soul, He can also appear as his Vindicator and Redeemer. After all that was sinful in his speeches is blotted out by repentance, there remains only the truth of his innocence, which God Himself testifies to him, and the truth of his holding fast to God in the hot battle of temptation, by which, without his knowing it, he has frustrated the design of Satan.

V. 7. And it came to pass, after Jehovah had spoken these words to Job, that Jehovah said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee and thy two friends: for ye have not spoken what is correct in reference to Me, as My servant Job.

Job 42:7,8. In order that they may only maintain the justice of God, they have condemned Job against their better knowledge and conscience; therefore they have abandoned truth in favour of the justice of God,—a defence which, as Job has told the friends, God abhors. Nevertheless He is willing to be gracious.

V. 8. And now take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to My servant Job, and offer an offering for yourselves, and Job My servant

shall pray for you; only his person will I accept, that I recompense not unto you your folly: for ye have not spoken what is correct in reference to Me, as My servant Job.

Job 42:8. Schlottm., like Ew., translates נְכוֹנָה what is sincere, and understands it of Job's inward truthfulness, in opposition to the words of the friends contrary to their better knowledge and conscience. But נכון has not this signification anywhere: it signifies either directum = rectum or erectum = stabile, but not sincerum. However, objective truth and subjective truthfulness are here certainly blended in the notion "correct." The "correct" in Job's speeches consists of his having denied that affliction is always a punishment of sin, and in his holding fast the consciousness of his innocence, without suffering himself to be persuaded of the opposite. That denial was correct; and this truthfulness was more precious to God than the untruthfulness of the friends, who were zealous for the honour of God.

After Job has penitently acknowledged his error, God decides between him and the friends according to his previous supplicatory wish, Job 16:21. The heavenly Witness makes Himself heard on earth, and calls Job by the sweet name of עַבְדִּי. And the servant of Jehovah is not only favoured himself, but he also becomes the instrument of grace to sinners. As where his faith shone forth he became the prophet of his own and the friends' future, so now he is the priestly mediator between the friends and God. The friends against whom God is angry, but yet not as against רשׁעים, but only as against those who have erred, must bring an offering as their atonement, in connection with which Job shall enter in with a priestly intercession for them, and only him (אִם כִּי, non alium sed = non nisi), whom they regarded as one punished of God, will God accept (comp. Gen. 19:21)—under what deep shame must it have opened their eyes!

Here also, as in the introduction of the book, it is the עוֹלָה which effects the atonement. It is the oldest and, according to its meaning, the most comprehensive of all the blood-offerings. Bullocks and rams are also the animals for the whole burnt- offerings of the Mosaic ritual; the proper animal for the sin-offering, however, is the he-goat together with the she-goat, which do not occur here, because the age and scene are strange to the Israelitish branching off of the חטאת from the עולה. The double seven gives the mark of the profoundest solemnity to the offering that was to be offered. The three also obey the divine direction; for although they have erred, God's will is above everything in their estimation, and they cheerfully subordinate themselves as friends to the friend.367

V. 9. The Eliphaz of Teman, and Bildad of Shuach, [and] Zophar of Naamah, went forth and did as Jehovah had said to them; and Jehovah accepted the person of Job.

Job 42:9. Jehovah has now risen up as a witness for Job, the spiritual redemption is already accomplished; and all that is wanting is, that He who has acknowledged and testified to Job as His servant should also act outwardly and visibly, and in mercy show Himself the righteous One.

V. 10. And Jehovah turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends; and Jehovah increased everything that Job had possessed to the double.

Job 42:10. רֵעֵהוּ is to be understood generally, as Job 16:21, and the בְּ signifies not "because," but "when." The moment in which Job prayed for his friends became, as the climax of a life that is well-pleasing with God, the turning-point of glory to him. The Talmud has borrowed from here the true proverb: נענה חברו בעד כל־המתפלל תחלה, i.e., he who prays for his fellow-men always finds acceptance for himself first of all. The phrase שְׁבוּת שׁוּב (שְׁבִית) signifies properly to turn captivity, then in general to make an end of misery; also in German, elend, old High Germ. elilenti, originally signified another, foreign country (vid., Psalter, ii. 192), since an involuntary removal from one's native land is regarded as the emblem of a lamentable condition. This phrase does not exactly stamp

Job as the Mashal of the Israel of the Exile, but it favoured this interpretation. Now when Job was recovered, and doubly blessed by God, as is also promised to the Israel of the Exile, Isa. 61:7 and freq., sympathizing friends also appeared in abundance.

V. 11. Then came to him all his brothers, and all his sisters, and all his former acquaintances, and ate bread with him in his house, and expressed sympathy with him, and comforted him concerning all the evil which Jehovah had brought upon him; and each one gave him a Kesitâ, and each a golden ring.

Job 42:11. Prosperity now brought those together again whom calamity had frightened away; for the love of men is scarcely anything but a number of coarse or delicate shades of selfishness. Now they all come and rejoice at Job's prosperity, viz., in order to bask therein. He, however, does not thrust them back; for the judge concerning the final motives of human love is God, and love which is shown to us is certainly more worthy of thanks than hatred. They are his guests again, and he leaves them to their own shame. And now their tongues, that were halting thus far, are all at once become eloquent: they mingle congratulations and comfort with their expressions of sorrow at his past misfortune. It is now an easy matter, that no longer demands their faith. They even bring him each one a present. In everything it is manifest that Jehovah has restored His servant to honour. Everything is now subordinated to him, who was accounted as one forsaken of God. קְשִׂיטָה is a piece of metal weighed out, of greater value than the shekel, moreover indefinite, since it is nowhere placed in the order of the Old Testament system of weights and measures, adapted to the patriarchal age, Gen. 33:19, in which Job's history falls.368 נְזָמִים are rings for the nose and ear; according to Ex. 32:3, an ornament of the women and men.

The author now describes the manner of Job's being blessed.

V. 12 And Jehovah blessed Job's end more than his beginning; and he had fourteen thousand sheep and six thousand camels, and a thousand yoke of oxen and a thousand she-asses.

Job 42:12. The numbers of the stock of cattle, Job 1:3, 369 now appear doubled, but it is different with the children.

V. 13. And he had seven sons and three daughters.

Job 42:13. Therefore, instead of the seven sons and three daughters which he had, he receives just the same again, which is also so far a doubling, as deceased children also, according to the Old Testament view, are not absolutely lost, 2 Sam. 12:23. The author of this book, in everything to the most minute thing consistent, here gives us to understand that with men who die and depart from us the relation is different from that with things which we have lost. The pausal שִׁבְעָנָה (instead of שִׁבְעָה), with paragogic âna, which otherwise is a fem. suff. (Ges. § 91, rem. 2), here, however, standing in a prominent position, is an embellishment somewhat violently brought over from the style of the primeval histories (Gen. 21:29; Ruth 1:19): a septiad of sons. The names of the sons are passed over in silence, but those of the daughters are designedly given.

V. 14. And the one was called Jemîma, and the second Kezia, and the third Keren ha-pûch.

Job 42:14. The subject of וַיִּקְרָא is each and every one, as Isa. 9:5 (comp. supra, Job 41:25, existimaverit quis). The one was called יְמִימָה (Arab. jemâme, a dove) on account of her dove's eyes; the other קְצִיעָה, cassia, because she seemed to be woven out of the odour of cinnamon; and the third קֶרֶן הַפּוּךְ, a horn of paint (LXX Hellenizing: κέρας ἀμαλθείας), which is not exactly beautiful in itself, but is the principal cosmetic of female beauty (vid., Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, transl.): the third was altogether the most beautiful, possessing a beauty heightened by artificial means. They were therefore like three graces. The writer here keeps to the outward appearance, not disowning his Old Testament standpoint. That they were what their names implied, he says in

V. 15. And in all the land there were not found women so fair as the daughters of Job: and their father gave them inheritance among their brothers.

Job 42:15. On נִמְצָא, followed by the acc., vid., Ges. § 143, 1, b. לָהֶם, etc., referring to the daughters, is explained from the deficiency in Hebrew in the distinction of the genders. V. 15b sounds more Arabian than Israelitish, for the Thora only recognises a daughter as heiress where there are no sons, Num. 27:8ff. The writer is conscious that he is writing an extra-Israelitish pre-Mosaic history. The equal distribution of the property again places before our eyes the pleasing picture of family concord in the commencement of the history; at the same time it implies that Job will not have been wanting in son-in-law for his fair, richly-dowried daughters,—a fact which v. 16 establishes:

And Job lived after this a hundred and forty years, and saw his children and his children's children to four generations.

Job 42:16. In place of וַיַּרְא, the Keri gives the unusual Aorist form וַיִּרְאֶה, which, however, does also occur elsewhere (e.g., 1 Sam. 17:42). The style of the primeval histories, which we here everywhere recognise, Gen. 50:23 (comp. Isa. 53:10), is retained to the last words.

V. 17. And Job died, old, and weary of life.

Job 42:17. In the very same manner Genesis, 25:8, 35:29, records the end of the patriarchs. They died satiated of life; for long life is a gift of God, but neither His greatest nor His final gift.

A New Testament poet would have closed the book of Job differently. He would have shown us how, becoming free from his inward conflict of temptation, and being divinely comforted, Job succumbs to his disease, but waves his palm of victory before the throne of God among the innumerable hosts of those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. The Old Testament poet, however, could begin his book with a celestial scene, but not end it with the same. True, in some passages, which are like New Testament luminous points in the Old Testament poem, Job dares to believe and to hope that God will indeed acknowledge him after death. But this is a purely individual aspiration of faith—the extreme of hope, which comes forth against the extreme of fear. The unravelment does not correspond to this aspiration. The view of heaven which a Christian poet would have been able to give at the close of the book is only rendered possible by the resurrection and ascension of Christ. So far, what Oehler in his essay on the Old Testament Wisdom (1854, S. 28) says, in opposition to those who think the book of Job is directed against the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, is true: that, on the contrary, the issue of the book sanctions the present life phase of this doctrine anew. But the comfort which this theologically and artistically incomparable book presents to us is substantially none other than that of the New Testament. For the final consolation of every sufferer is not dependent upon the working of good genii in the heavens, but has its seat in God's love, without which even heaven would become a very hell. Therefore the book of Job is also a book of consolation for the New Testament church. From it we learn that we have not only to fight with flesh and blood, but with the prince of this world, and to accomplish our part in the conquest of evil, to which, from Gen. 3:15 onwards, the history of the world tends; that faith and avenging justice are absolutely distinct opposites; that the right kind of faith clings to divine love in the midst of the feeling of wrath; that the incomprehensible ways of God always lead to a glorious issue; and that the suffering of the present time is far outweighed by the future glory—a glory not always revealed in this life and visibly future, but the final glory above. The nature of faith, the mystery of the cross, the right practice of the care of souls,—this, and much besides, the church learns from this book, the whole teaching of which can never be thoroughly learned and completely exhausted.

APPENDIX

THE MONASTERY OF JOB IN HAURAN, AND THE TRADITION OF JOB

BY J. G. WETZSTEIN

The oral tradition of a people is in general only of very subordinate value from a scientific point of view when it has reference to an extremely remote past; but that of the Arabs especially, which is always combined with traditions and legends, renders the simplest facts perplexing, and wantonly clothes the images of prominent persons in the most wonderful garbs, and, in general, so rapidly disfigures every object, that after a few generations it is no longer recognisable. So far as it has reference to the personality of Job, whose historical existence is called in question or denied by some expositors, it may be considered as altogether worthless, but one can recognise when it speaks of Job's native country. By the עוּץ אֶרֶץ the writer of the book of Job meant a definite district, which was well known to the people for whom he wrote; but the name has perished, like many others, and all the efforts of archaeologist to assign to the land its place in the map of Palestine have been fruitless. Under these circumstances the matter is still open to discussion, and the tradition respecting Job has some things to authorize it. True, it cannot of itself make up for the want of an historical testimony, but it attains a certain value if it is old, i.e., if it can be traced back about to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, when reliable information was still obtainable respecting that district, although its name was no longer in use.

In all the larger works of travel on Palestine and Syria, we find it recorded that Haurân is there called Job's fatherland. In Hauran itself the traveller hears this constantly; if any one speaks of the fruitfulness of the whole district, or of the fields around a village, he is always answered: Is it not the land of Job (bildâd Eɛjûb)? Does it not belong to the villages of Job (diâ' Eɛjûb)? Thus to Seetzen370 Bosrâ was pointed out as a city of Job; and to Eli Smith371 even the country lying to the east of the mountains was called the land of Job. In Kanawat, a very spacious building, belonging to the Roman or Byzantine period, situated in the upper town, was pointed out to me as the summer palace of Job (the inscription 8799 in Corp. Inscr. Graec. is taken from it). The shepherds of Dâ'il, with whom I passed a night on the Wâdi el-Lebwe, called the place of their encampment Job's pasture-ground. In like manner, the English traveller Buckingham, when he wandered through the Nukra, was shown in the distance the village of Gherbi (i.e., Chirbet el-ghazale, which from its size is called el-chirbe κατ' ἐξοχήν) as the birthplace and residence of Job,372 and it seems altogether as though Hauran and the Land of Job are synonymous. But if one inquires particularly for that part of the country in which Job himself dwelt, he is directed to the central point of Hauran, the plain of Hauran (sahl Haurân),373 and still more exactly to the district between the towns of Nawâ and Edre'ât, which is accounted the most fertile portion of the country, covered with the ruins of villages, monasteries, and single courts, and is even now comparatively well cultivated. Among the nomads as well as among the native agricultural population, this district is called from its formation Nukra or Nukrat esh-Shâm, 374 a name by which this highly-favoured plain is known and celebrated by the poets in the whole Syrian desert, as far as 'Irâk and Higâz.

But even the national writers are acquainted with and frequently make mention of the Hauranitish tradition of Job; yet they do not call Job's home Nukra,—for this word, which belongs only to the idiom of the steppe, is unknown to the literature of the language,—but Bethenîje (Betanaea). It is so called in a detailed statement of the legends of Job:375 After the death of his father, Job journeyed into Egypt376 to marry Rahme (רַחְמָה) the daughter of Ephraim, who had inherited from her grandfather Joseph the robe of beauty; and after he had brought her to his own country, he received from God a mission as prophet to his countrymen, viz., to the inhabitants of Haurân and Batanaea (Arab. b'th 'llh t' rsûlâ 'lâ qûmh

whm ‘hl ḥûrân w-’l-btnît). The historian of Jerusalem, Mugîr ed-dîn el-Hambeli, in the chapter on the legend of the prophets, says: “Job came from el-’Eεs, and the Damascene province of Batanaea was his property.” In like manner, in the Geography of Jâkût el-Hamawi,377 under the art. Bethenîje, it is said: “and in this land lived Job (wakân Eεjûb minhâ).”

Modern exegetes, as is known, do not take the plain of Hauran, but the mountain range of Hauran with its eastern slope, as the Provincia Batanaea. I have sought elsewhere378 to show the error of this view, and may the more readily confine myself to merely referring to it, as one will be convinced of the correctness of my position in the course of this article. One thing, however, is to be observed here, that the supposition that Basan is so called as being the land of basalt rocks, is an untenable support of this error. The word basalt may be derived from βασάντις, or a secondary formation, βασάλτις, because Basan is exclusively volcanic;379 but we have no more right to reverse the question, than to say that Damascus may have received its name from the manufacture of damask.380

The home of Job is more definitely described in the following passages. Muhammed el-Makdeshi381 says, p. 81 of his geography: “And in Haurân and Batanaea lie the villages of Job and his home (diâ’ Eεjûb wa-diâruh). The chief place (of the district) is Nawâ, rich in wheat and other cereals.” The town of Nawâ is still more definitely connected with Job by Jâkût el-Hamawi under the article Nawâ: “Between Nawa and Damascus in two days’ journey; it belongs to the district of Hauran,382 and is, according to some, the chief town of the same. Nawâ was the residence (menzil) of Job;” and Ibn er-Râbi says, p. 62 of his essay on the excellences of Damascus:383 “To the prophets buried in the region of Damascus belongs also Job, and his tomb is near Nawâ, in the district of Hauran.” Such passages prove at the same time the identity of the Nukra with Batanaea; for if the latter is said to be recognisable from the fact of Job’s home being found in it, and we find this sign in connection with the Nukra in which Nawâ with its surrounding country is situated, both names must denote one and the same district.

That, according to the last citation, Job’s tomb is also shown in the Nukra, has been already observed in my Reisebericht, S. 121. Jâkût, under Dêr Eεjûb, thus expresses himself: “The Monastery of Job is a locality in Hauran, a Damascene province, in which Job dwelt and was tried of God. There also is the fountain which he made to flow with his foot, and the block of rock on which he leant. There also is his tomb.” What Kazwîni ways in his Wonders of Creation (’agâib el-machlûkât), under Dêr Eεjûb, accords with it: “The Monastery of Job lies in one of the Damascene provinces, and was the place of Job’s residence, in which God tried him. There also is the fountain which sprang forth at the stamping of his foot, when at the end of his trial God commanded him, and said: Strike with thy foot—(thus a fountain will spring forth, and) this shall be to thee a cool bath and a draught (Korân, xxxviii. 41ff.). There is also the rock on which he sat, and his tomb.” Recurring to the passage of the Koran cited, we shall see that the stone of Job, the fountain and the tomb, are not situated in the Monastery itself, but at some little distance from it.

I came with my cortége out of Gôlân, to see the remarkable pilgrim fair of Muzêrîb, just when the Mekka caravan was expected; and since the Monastery of Job, never visited by any one now-a-days, could not lie far out of the way, I determined to seek it out, because I deluded myself with the hope of finding an inscription of its founder, ‘Amr I, and in fact one with a date, which would have been of the greatest importance in reference to the history of the Ghassanides,—a hope which has remained unfulfilled. In the evening of the 8th of May we came to Tesîl. Here the Monastery was for the first time pointed out to us. It was lighted up by the rays of the setting sun,—a stately ruin, which lay in the distance a good hour towards the east. The following morning we left Tesîl.

Our way led through luxuriant corn-fields and fields lying fallow, but decked with a rich variety of flowers in gayest blossom, to an isolated volcanic mound, Tell el-Gumû', 384 from which we intended to reconnoitre the surrounding country. From this point, as far as the eye could reach, it swept over fields of wheat belonging to the communities of Sahm, Tell Shihâb, Tesîl, Nawâ, and Sa'dîje, which covered a region which tradition calls the home of Job. True, the volcanic chaos (el-wa'r) extended in the west to the distance of some three miles up the hill on which we stood, and on the north the plain was bounded partly by Tell el-Gâbĭa and the "tooth of Nawâ" (sinn Nawâ), a low ridge with a few craters; but towards the E. and S. and S.W. the plain was almost unbounded, for isolated eminences, as Tell 'Ashtarâ, T. Ash'arî, T. Shihâb, T. el-Chammân, and others, rose above the level of the plain only like mole-hills; and the deep gorges of the Meddân, Jarmûk, Hît, and Muchêbi, were sudden and almost perpendicular ravines, either not seen at all, or appeared as dark marks. The plain slopes gently and scarcely perceptibly towards Kufr el-mâ, Kufr es-sâmir, Zêzûn, and Bendek; and the Naher el'Owêrid, a rover abounding in water in its level bed, resembles a glistening thread of silver. If this district had trees, as it once had,—for among the ruins one often discovers traces of vineyards and garden walls, which it can have no longer, since the insecurity and injustice of the country do not admit of men remaining long in one and the same village, therefore not to take hold upon the soil and establish one's self, and become at home anywhere,—it would be an earthly paradise, by reason of its healthy climate and the fertility of its soil. That even the Romans were acquainted with the glorious climate of Hauran, is proved by the name Palaestina salutaris, which they gave to the district.385 The inhabitants of Damascus say there is no disease whatever in Haurân; and as often as the plague or any other infectious disease shows itself in their city, thousands flee to Hauran, and to the lava-plateau of the Legâ. This healthy condition may arise from the volcanic formation of the country, and from the sea-breeze, which it always has in connection with its position, which is open towards the west. Even during the hottest days, when e.g., in the Ghûta a perfect calm prevails, so that no breeze is felt, this cool and moist sea-breeze blows refreshingly and regularly over the plain; and hence the Hauranitish poet never speaks of his native country without calling it the "cool-blowing Nukra" (en-nukra el-'adîje). But as to the fertility of the district, there is indeed much good arable land in the country east of the Jordan, as in Irbid and Suwêt, of the same kind as between Salt and 'Ammân, but nowhere is the farming, in connection with a small amount of labour (since no manure is used), more productive than in Hauran, or more profitable; for the transparent "Batanaean wheat" (hinta bethenîje) is always at least 25 per cent. higher in price than other kinds. Hence the agriculture of that region also, in times of peace and security (during the first six centuries after Christ), produced that fondness for building, some of the magnificent memorials of which are our astonishment in the present day; and, in fact, not unfrequently the inscriptions testify that the buildings themselves owe their origin to the produce of the field. Thus, in the locality of Nâhite in the Nukra, I found the following fragment of an inscription: … Μασαλέμου Ράββου κτίσμα ἐξ ἰδίων κόπων γεωργικῶν ἐν ἔτι στ, Masalemos son of Rabbos set up (this memorial) out of the produce of his farming in the year 280. Of a like kind is the following remains of two distichs in Marduk: … δρός τε σαόφρων| … μεγαρόν| … ις ἀνάπαυμα μέγιστον| … γεωπονίης. In Shakkâ the longer inscription of a mausoleum in a state of good preservation begins:

Βάσσος ἐῆς πάτρης μεγακύδεος ἀγλαὸν ὅμμα

Ἑκ σφετέρου καμάτοιο γεωπονίης τέ μ' ἔδειμεν.

Bassos, beaming eye of the honourable city of his birth,

Has built me out of the produce of his own tillage.

Similar testimonies are to be found in the inscriptions of Burckhardt.

After a long sojourn on the hill, which was occasioned by the investigation of some interesting plants in the crater of the mound, we set out for Sa'dîje, which is built on the slope of a hill. After a good hour's journey we arrived at the Makâm Eɛjûb, "the favoured tomb of Job," situated at the southern base of the hill, and rendered conspicuous by two white domes, and there we dismounted. The six attendants and alumni of the Makâm, or, as the Arabs thoughtfully call them, "the servants of our master Job" (châdimîn sêjidna Eɛjûb), received us, with some other pilgrims, at the door of the courtyard, and led us to the basin of the fountain of Job, by the side of which they spread out their mantles for us to rest upon under the shade of walnut tree and a willow. While the rest were negated in the duties of hospitality, the superior of the Makâm, the Sheikh Sa'îd el-Darfûri (from Darfûr) did not leave us, and made himself in every way obliging. Like him, all the rest of the inhabitants of the place were black, and all unmarried; their celibacy, however, I imagine, was only caused by the want of opportunity of marrying, and the limited accommodation of the place. Sheikh Sa'îd believed himself to be fifty years of age; he left his home twenty years before to go on pilgrimage to Mekka, where he "studied" four years; the same length of time he sojourned in Medîna, and had held his present office ten years. Besides his mother tongue, he spoke Arabic and a little Turkish, having been in Constantinople a few years before. His judgment of the inhabitants of that city is rather harsh: he charges them with immorality, drunkenness, and avarice. In one year, said he, I could hardly save enough to travel by the steamer to Chôdscha Bêk (Odessa). How different was my experience to the inhabitants of this city! I was there three months, during which time I had nothing to provide for, and left with ninety Mânôt (imperials), which just sufficed to set up these dilapidated relics again. A Russian ship brought me to Smyrna, whence I travelled by the Nemsâwi (Austrian Lloyd steamer) to Syria.

According to the account given by the inhabitants of Sa'dîje, the Makâm has been from ancient times a negro hospice. These Africans, commonly called 'Abîd in Damascus, and in the country Tekârine, come chiefly from Tekrûr in Sûdân; they first visit Mekka and Medîna, then Damascus, and finally the Makâm of Job. Here they sojourn from twenty to thirty days, during which time they wash themselves daily in Job's fountain, and pray upon Job's stone; and the rest of the day they either read or assist the dwellers in the Makâm in their tillage of the soil. When they are about to leave, they received a testimonial, and often return home on foot across the Isthmus of Suez, often by water, chiefly from Jâfâ, by the Austrian Lloyd ship to Egypt, and thence to their native country. These pilgrims, so far as the requirements of their own country are concerned, are literati; and it appears as though by this journey they obtained their highest degree. I have frequently met them in my travels. They are known by their clean white turban, and the white broad-sleeved shirt, which reaches to the ankles, their only garment. They carry a small bundle over the shoulder upon a strong staff, which may serve as a weapon of defence in case of need. In this bundle they carry a few books and other effects, and above this their cloak. They are modest, taciturn men, who go nimbly onward on their way, and to whom one always gladly gives a supper and a night's lodging.

We visited the holy places in the company of the Sheikh Sa'îd. The Makâm, and the reservoir, which lies fifty paces to the front of it, are surrounded by a wall. This reservoir is filled by a strong, rapid, and cold stream of water, which comes from the fountain of Job, about 400 paces distant. The fountain itself springs up by the basalt hill on which the village and the Job's stone are situated; and it is covered in as far as the reservoir (called birke), in order to keep the water fresh, and to guard against pollution. Between the fountain and the Makâm stand a

half-dozen acacias and a pomegranate, which were just then in full bloom. The Makâm itself, on which the wretched habitations for the attendants and pilgrims adjoin, is a one-storey stone building, of old material and moderate circumference. The first thing shown us was the stone trough, called gurn, in which Job bathed at the end of his trial. The small space in which this relic stands, and over which, so far as I remember, one of the two domes is raised, is called wadjet sêjidnâ Eɛjûb, "the lavatory of our lord Job." Adjoining this is the part with the tomb, the oblong mound of which is covered with an old torn green cloth. The tomb of Sa'd was more carefully tended. Our Damascene travelling companions were divided in their opinions as to the person whose tomb was near that of Job, as in Syria it is hardly possible to find and distinguish the makâms of the many men of God (rigâl Allâh) or favoured ones of God (auliâ) who bear the same names; but a small white flag standing upon the grave informed us, for it bore the inscription: "This is the military emblem (râje) of our lord Sa'd abû Merzûka."

Perhaps the preservation of the Makâm of Job is due to the tomb of Sa'd, as its endowments have long since disappeared, while the tomb of Sa'd still has its revenues. From 'Aglûn it receives tribute of oil and olives yearly. And several large vegetable gardens, which lie round about the Makâm, and are cultivated by its attendants, must also contribute something considerable towards its maintenance. In these gardens they grow dura (maize), tobacco, turnips, onions, and other things, for their own use and for sale. The plants, which can be freely watered from the fountain of Job, are highly esteemed. The government levies no taxes on the Makâm, and the Arabs no tribute; and since, according to the popular belief, that Beduin horse that is watered from the birke dies, the Beduins do not even claim the rights of hospitality,—a fortunate circumstance, the removal of which would speedily cause the ruin of the hospice. From nightly thieves, who not unfrequently break through the walls of the stables in the villages of the plain, and carry off the smaller cattle, both the Makâm and the village are secure; for if the night thieves come, they see, as every one in Hauran testifies, a surging sea around the place, which prevents their approach.

From the Makâm we ascended the hill of the village, on the highest part of which is the stone of Job (Sachrat Eɛjûb). It is inside a small Mussulman hall of prayer, which in its present form is of more modern origin, but is undoubtedly built from the material of a Christian chapel, which stood here in the pre-Muhammedan age. It is an unartistic structure, in the usual Hauranitish style, with six or eight arches and a small dome, which is just above the stone of Job. My Mussulman attendants, and a Hauranite Christina from the village of Shemiskîn, who had joined us as we were visiting the Sachra, trod the sacred spot with bare feet, and kissed the rock, the basaltic formation of which is unmistakeable. Against this rock, our guide told us, Job leaned "when he was afflicted by his Lord" (hîn ibtelâ min rabbuh).386 While these people were offering up their 'Asr (afternoon) prayer in this place, Sa'îd brought me a handful of small long round stones and slag, which the tradition declares to be the worms that fell to the ground out of Job's sores, petrified. "Take them with thee," said he, "as a memento of this place; let them teach thee not to forget God in prosperity, and in misfortune not to contend with Him." The frequent use of these words in the mouth of the man might have weakened them to a set phrase: they were, however, appropriate to the occasion, and were not without their effect. After my attendants had provided themselves with Job's worms, we left the Sachra. These worms form a substantial part of the Hauranitish tradition of Job, and they are known and revered generally in the country. Our Christian attendant from Shemiskîn bound them carefully in the broad sleeve of his shirt, and recited to us a few verses from a kasîde, in which they are mentioned. The poem, which a member of our company, the dervish Regeb, wrote down, is by a Hauranite Christian, who in it describes his unhappy love in colours as

strong as the bad taste it displays. The lines that are appropriate here are as follows:—

Min ‘azma nârî nâra jôm el-qijâma,

Tûfâna Nûha ‘dmû’ a ‘ênî ‘anuh zôd.

Ja’ qûba min hoznî hizânuh qisâma

Min belwetî Ejûba jerta’ bihe ‘d-dûd. 387

The fire of hell at the last day will kindle itself from the glow of my pain,

And stronger than the flood of Noah are the tear-streams of mine eyes.

The grief of Jacob for his son was but a small part of my grief;

And, visited with my misery, Job was once the prey of worms.388

The village, which the peasants call Shêch Sa’d, and the nomads Sa’dîje, is, as the name implies, of later origin, and perhaps was founded by people who fled hither when oppressed elsewhere, for the sake of being able to live more peacefully under the protection of the two tombs. That the place is not called Eɛjûbîje, is perhaps in order to distinguish it from the Monastery of Job.

In less than a quarter of an hour we rode up to the Dêr Eɛjûb, a square building, standing entirely alone, and not surrounded by ruins. When the Arabian geographers call it a village, they reckon to it the neighbouring Sa’dîje with the Makâm. It is very extensive, and built of fine square blocks of dolerite. While my fellow-traveller, M. Dörgens, was engaged in making a ground-plan of the shattered building, which seemed to us on the whole to have had a very simple construction, I took some measurements of its sides and angles, and then searched for inscriptions. Although the ground-floor is now in part hidden in a mezbele, 389 which has been heaped up directly against the walls, on the east side, upon the architrave, not of the chief doorway, which is on the south, but of a door of the church, is found a large Greek inscription in a remarkable state of preservation. The architrave consists of a single carefully-worked block of dolerite, and at present rests almost upon the ground, since the rubbish has filled the whole doorway. The writing and sculpture are hollowed out.

In the center is a circle, and the characters inscribed at each side of this circle are still undeciphered; the rest of the inscription is easy to be read: αὕτη ἡ πύλη κ(υρίο)υ δίκαιοι εἰσελεύσοντε ἐν αὐτῇ• τοῦτο τὸ ὑπέρθυρον ἐτέθη ἐν χρόνοισ’Ηλίου εὐλαβεστ(άτου) ἡγουμ(ένου) μ(ηνί)’Ιουλίῳ κε ἰνδ(ι)κ(τίωνος) ιε τοῦ ἔτους πηντακοσιοστοῦ τρικοστοῦ ἕκτου κ(υρί)ου’Ι(ης)οῦ Χ(ριστ)οῦ Βασιλεύοντος. The passage of Scripture, Ps. 118:20, with which this inscription beings, is frequently found in these districts in the inscriptions on church portals.

This inscription was an interesting discovery; for, so far as I know, it is the oldest that we possess which reckons according to the Christian era, and in the Roman indiction (indictio)390 we have an important authority for determining its date. Now, since there might be a difference of opinion as to the beginning of the “kingdom of Christ,” I was anxious to have the judgment of an authority in chronology on the point; and I referred to Prof. Piper of Berlin, who kindly furnished me with the following communication:—“… The inscription therefore furnishes the following data: July 25, indict. xv., year 536, κυρίου Ιοῦ Χοῦ βασιλεύοντος. To begin with the last, the Dionysian era, which was only just introduced into the West, is certainly not to be assumed here. But it is also by no means the birth of Christ that is intended. Everything turns upon the expression βασιλεύοντος. The same expression occurs once in an inscription from Syria, Corp. Inscr. Graec. 8651: βασιλεύοντος Ιουστινιανοῦ τῷ ια ἔτει. The following expression, however, occurs later concerning Christ on Byzantine coins: Rex regnantium and βασιλεὺς βασιλέων (after Apoc. 17:14, 19:16), the latter under John Zimiszes (died 975), in De Saulcy, Pl. xxii. 4. But if the βασιλεία of Christ is employed as the era, we manifestly cannot refer to the epoch of the birth of Christ, but must take the epoch of His ascension as our basis: for with this His βασιλεία first began; just as in the West we

sometimes find the calculation begins a passione. Now the fathers of the Western Church indeed place the death (and therefore also the ascension) of Christ in the consulate of the two Gemini, 29 A.D. Not so with the Greek fathers. Eusebius takes the year of His death, according to one supposition, to be the 18th year of Tiberius, i.e., 785 A.U.C. = 32 A.D. Supposing we take this as the first year regnante Jesu Christo, then the year 536, of the inscription of the Monastery of Job, is reduced to our era, after the birth of Christ, by adding 31. Thus we have the number of the year 567, to which the accompanying xv. indictio corresponds, for 567 + 3 = 570; and 570/15 has no remainder. XV is therefore the indiction of the year 567, which more accurately belongs to the year from 1st Sept. 566 to 31st Aug. 567. And since the day of the month is mentioned in the inscription, it is the 25th July 567 that is indicated. For it appears to me undoubted that the indictions, according to the usual mode of computation among the Greeks, begin with the 1st Sept. 312. Thus a Sidonian inscription of dec. 642 A.D. has the I indiction (Corp. Inscr. Gr. 9153) …"

Thus far Prof. Piper's communication. According to this satisfactory explanation of its date, this inscription is perhaps not unqualified to furnish a contribution worth notice, even for the chronology of the life of Jesus, since the Ghassinides, under whom not only the inscription, but the Monastery itself 300 years earlier, had its origin, dwelt in Palestine, the land of Christ; and their kings were perhaps the first who professed Christianity.

The "festival of the Monastery of Job," which, according to Kazwînî's Syrian Calendar,391 the Christians of the country celebrated annually on the 23rd April, favours the pre-Muhammedan importance of the Monastery. This festival in Kazwînî's time, appearing only by name inf the calendar, had undoubtedly ceased with the early decline of Christianity in the plain of Hauran, for the historically remarkable exodus of a large portion of the Ghassinides out of the cities of Hauran to the north of Georgia had taken place even under the chalifate of Omar. The Syrian Christians of the present day celebrate the festival of Mâr Gorgius (St. George), who slew the dragon (tennîn) near Beirût, on the 23rd April. A week later (the 1st May, oriental era) the Jews of Damascus have the sôm Eɛjûb (the fast of Job), which lasts twenty-four hours. In Kazwînî's calendar it is erroneously set down to the 3rd May.

Moreover, with reference to the Monastery, it must be mentioned that, according to the history of Ibn Kethîr, 392 the great Greco-Ghassinide army, which, under the leadership of Theodoric, a brother of the Emperor Heraclius, was to have repulsed the attack of the Mussulmans on Syria, revolted in its neighbourhood in the 13th year of the Hegira (Higra), while the enemy was encamped on the south bank of the Meddân, and was drawn up near Edre'ât. After several months had passed came the battle known as the "battle of the Jarmûk," the issue of which cost the Byzantines Syria. The volcanic hollows of the ground, which for miles form a complex network of gorges, for the most part inaccessible, offer great advantages in defensive warfare; and here the battle near Edre'î, in which 'Og king of Bashan lost his kingdom, was probably fought.

According to the present division of the country, the Monastery of Job and the Makâm are in the southern part of Gêdûr, an administrative district, which is bounded on the north by the Wâdî Bêrût, on the east by the W. el-Horêr and the high road, on the south by the Jarmûk, and on the west by the W. Hit and by a range of volcanic mounds, which stretch to the south-east corner of the Snow-mountain (el-Hermôn); this district, however, has only a nominal existence, for it has no administration of its own. Either it is added to Haurân, or its revenues, together with those of Gôlân, are let out to the highest bidder for a number of years. Gêdûr is the natural north-western continuation of the plain of Haurân; and the flat bed of the Horêr, which does not form a gorge until it comes to the bridge of Sîra, forms no

boundary proper. Moreover, the word is not found in ancient geography; and the Arabian geographers, even the later ones, who recognised the idea of Gêdûr, always so define the position of a locality situated in Gêdûr, that they say it is situated in the Haurân. Thus Jâkût describes the town of el-Gâbĭa, situated in western Gêdûr, and in like manner, as we have seen above, Nawâ and the Monastery of Job, etc.393 There is no doubt that, as the Gêdûr of the present day is reckoned in the Nukra, so this country also in ancient days, at least as far as its northern watershed, has belonged to the tetrarchy of Batanaea.

The Monastery of Job is at present inhabited. A certain sheikh, Ahmed el-Kâdirî, has settled down here since the autumn of 1859, as partner of the senior of the Damascene 'Omarîje (the successors of the Chalif 'Omar), to whose family endowments (waqf) the Monastery belongs, and with his family he inhabits a number of rooms in the inner court, which have escaped destruction. He showed us the decree of his partner appointing him to his position, in which he is styled Sheikh of the Dêr Eɛjûb, Dêr el-Lebwe, and 'Ashtarâ. Dêr el-Lebwe, "the monastery of the lion,"394 was built by the Gefnide Eihem ibn el-Hârith; and we shall have occasion to refer to 'Ashtarâ, in which Newbold,395 in the year 1846, believed he had found the ancient capital of Basan, 'Ashtarôt, further on. But the possessor of all these grand things was a very unhappy man. While we were drinking coffee with him, he related to us how the inhabitants of Nawâ had left him only two yoke (feddân) of arable land from the territory assigned to him, and taken all the rest to themselves. The harvest of that year, after the deduction of the bedhâr (the new seed-corn), would hardly suffice to meet the demands of his family, and of hospitality; and for his partner, how had advanced money to him, there would be nothing left. In Damascus he found no redress; and the Sheikh of Nawâ, Dhiâb el-Medhjeb, had answered his last representation with the words, "He who desires Job's inheritance must look for trials." Here also, as in Arabia generally, I found that intelligence and energy was on the side of the wife. During our conversation, his wife, with one of her children, had drawn near; and while the child kissed my hand, according to custom, she said: "To-morrow thou wilt arrive at Muzêrîb; Dhiâb will also be going thither with contributions for the pilgrims. We put our cause in thy hands, arrange it as seems thee best; this old man will accompany thee." And as we were riding, the Sheikh Ahmed was also obliged to mount, and his knowledge of the places did us good service on Tell Ashtarâ and Tell el-Ash'arî. In Muzêrîb, where the pilgrim fair and the arriving caravans for Mekka occupied our attention for five days, we met Dhiâb and the Ichtiârîje (elders of the community) of Nawâ; and, after some opposition, the sheikh of the Monastery of Job obtained four feddân of land under letter and seal, and returned home satisfied.

The case of this man is no standard of the state of the Hauranites, for there are so many desolated villages that there is no lack of land; only round about Nawâ it is insufficient, since this place is obliged to take possession of far outlying fields, by reason of its exceedingly numerous agricultural population.396 The more desolate a land exposed to plunder becomes, the more populous must its separate towns become, since the inhabitants of the smaller defenceless villages crowd into them. Thus the inhabitants of the large town of Kenâkir at the present time till the fields of twelve neighbouring deserted villages; and Salt, the only inhabited place in the Belkâ, has its corn-fields even at a distance of fifteen miles away. The poet may also have conceived of Job's domain similarly, for there were five hundred ploughmen employed on it; so that it could not come under the category of ordinary villages, which in Syria rarely have above, mostly under, fifty yoke of oxen. According to the tradition, which speaks of "Job's villages" (diâ' Eɛjûb), these ploughmen would be distributed over several districts; but the poet, who makes them to be overwhelmed by one ghazwe, therefore as ploughing in one district, will have conceived of them only as dwelling in one locality.

It might not be out of place here to give some illustration of the picture which the poet draws of Job's circumstances and position as a wealthy husbandman. Haurân, the scene of the drama (as we here assume), must at that period, as at present, have been without protection from the government of the country, and therefore exposed to the marauding attacks of the tribes of the desert. In such a country there is no private possession; but each person is at liberty to take up his abode in it, and to cultivate the land and rear cattle at his own risk, where and to what extent he may choose. Whoever intends doing so much first of all have a family, or as the Arabs say, "men" (rigâl), i.e., grown-up sons, cousins, nephews, sons-in-law; for one who stands alone, "the cut off one" (maktû'), as he is called, can attain no position of eminence among the Semites, nor undertake any important enterprise.397 Then he has to make treaties with all the nomad tribes from which he has reason to fear any attack, i.e., to pledge himself to pay a yearly tribute, which is given in native produce (in corn and garments). Thus the community of el-Hîgâne, ten years since, had compacts with 101 tribes; and that Job also did this, seems evident from the fact that the poet represents him as surprised not by neighbouring, but by far distant tribes (Chaldaeans and Sabaeans), with whom he could have no compact.398 Next he proceeds to erect a chirbe, i.e., a village that has been forsaken (for a longer or shorter period), in connection with which, excepting the relations, slaves, and servants of the master, all those whom interest, their calling, and confidence in the good fortune of the master, have drawn thither, set about the work. Perhaps Job 15:28 has reference to Job's settlement.399

With reference to the relation of the lord of a village (ustâd beled, or sâhib dê'a) to his work-people, there are among the dependants two classes. The one is called zurrâ', "sowers," also fellâhin kism, "participating husbandmen," because they share the produce of the harvest with the ustâd thus: he receives a fourth while they retain three-fourths, from which they live, take the seed for the following season, give their quota towards the demands of the Arabs, the village shepherds, the field watchmen, and the scribe of the community (chatîb); they have also to provide the farming implements and the yoke-oxen. On the other hand, the ustâd has to provide for the dwellings of the people, to pay the land-tax to the government, and, in the event of a failure of the crops, murrain, etc., to make the necessary advances, either in money or in kind at the market price, and without any compensation. This relation, which guarantees the maintenance of the family, and is according to the practice of a patriarchal equity, is greatly esteemed in the country; and one might unhesitatingly consider it therefore to be that which existed between Job and his ploughmen, because it may with ease exist between a single ustâd and hundreds, indeed thousands, of country people, if Job 1:3 did not necessitate our thinking of another class of country people, viz., the murâbi'în, the "quarterers." They take their name from their receiving a fourth part of the harvest for their labour, while they have to give up the other three-fourths to the ustâd, who must provide for their shelter and board, and in like manner everything that is required in agriculture. As Job, according to Job 1:3 (comp. on Job 42:12), provided the yoke-oxen and means of transport (asses and camels), so he also provided the farming implements, and the seed for sowing. We must not here think of the paid day-labourer of the Syrian towns, or the servants of our landed proprietors; they are unknown on the borders of the desert. The hand that toils has there a direct share in the gain; the workers belong to the aulâd, "children of the house," and are so called; in the hour of danger they will risk their life for their lord.

This rustic labour is always undertaken simultaneously by all the murâbi'în (it is so also in the villages of the zurrâ') for the sake of order, since the ustâd, or in his absence the village sheikh, has the general work of the following day announced from the roof of his house every evening. Thus it is explained how the 500 ploughmen could be together in one and the same district, and be slain all together.

The ustâd is the sole judge, or, by deputy, the sheikh. An appeal to the government of the country would be useless, because it has no influence in Hauran; but the servant who has been treated unjustly by his master, very frequently turns as dachîl fi 'l-haqq (a suppliant concerning his right) to his powerful neighbour, who is bound, according to the customs of the country, to obtain redress for him (comp. Job 29:12–17). If he does not obtain this by persuasion, he cries for force, and such a demand lies at the root of many a bloody feud.

Powerful and respected also as the position, described in Job 29, of such a man is, it must, according to the nature of its basis, fall in under strokes of misfortune, like those mentioned in Job 1:14–19, and change to the very opposite, as the poet describes it in Job 30.

After these observations concerning the agricultural relations of Hauran, we return to the tradition of Job. As we pursue the track of this tradition further, we first find it again in some of the Christina writers of the middle ages, viz., in Eugesippus (De distanc. loc. terr. sanct.), in William of Tyre (Histor. rerum a Francis gest.), and in Marino Sanuto (De secretis fid. cruc.). The passages that bear upon the point are brought together in Reland (Palest. pp. 265f.); and we would simply refer to them, if it were possible for the reader to find his way among the fabulous confusion of the localities in Eugesippus and Sanuto.

The oldest of these citations is from Eugesippus, and is as follows: One part of the country is the land of Hus, out of which Job was; it is also called Sueta, after which Bildad the Suhite was named. Sanuto tells us where this locality is to be sought. "Sueta is the home of Baldad the Suite, Below this city (civitas), in the direction of the Kedar-tribes, the Saracens are accustomed to assemble out of Aram, Mesopotamia, Ammon, Moab, and the whole Orient, around the fountain of Fiale; and, on account of the charms of the place, to hold a fair there during the whole summer, and to pitch their coloured tents." In another place he says: fontem Fialen Medan, i.e., aquas Dan, a Saracenis nuncupari.

Now, since according to an erroneous, but previously prevalent etymology, "the water of Dan" (דָּן יָאֹר = דָּן מַי) denoted the Jordan, and since we further know from Josephus (Bell. iii. 10, 7) that the Phiala is the small lake of Râm, whose subterranean outflow the tetrarch Philip is said to have shown to be the spring of the Jordan, which comes to light deeper below, we should have thought the country round about the lake of Râm, at the south foot of Hermôn, to be the home of Job and Bildad. This discovery would be confirmed by the following statement of Eugesippus (in Reland, loc. cit.): "The river Dan flows under ground from its spring as far as the plain of Meldan, where it comes to light. This plain is named after the fair, which is held there, for the Saracens call such an one Meldan. At the beginning of the summer a large number of men, with wares to sell, congregate there, and several Parthian and Arabian soldiers also, in order to guard the people and their herds, which have a rich pasture there in the summer. The word Meldan is composed of mel and dan." It is indeed readily seen that the writer has ignorantly jumbled several words together in the expression meldan, as mê Dan, "water of Dan," and Mêdân or mîdân, "market-place;" perhaps even also leddân, the name of the great fountain of the Jordan in the crater of the Tell el-Kâdi. In like manner, the statement that the neighbourhood of Phiala, or that of the large fountain of the Jordan, might formerly have been a fair of the tribes, is false, for the former is broken up into innumerable craters, and the latter is poisoned by the swamp-fevers of the Hûle; but as to the rest, both Eugesippus and Sanuto seem really to speak of a tradition which places Job's or Bildad's home in that region. And yet it is not so: their tradition is no other than the Hauranitish; but ignorance of the language and geography of the country, and some accidental circumstances, so confused their representations, that it is difficult to find out what is right. The first clue is given us by the history of William of Tyre, in which (l. xxii. c. 21) it is said that the crusaders, on their

return from a marauding expedition in the Nukra, wished to reconquer a strong position, the Cavea Roob, which they had lost a short time before. "This place," says the historian, "lies in the province of Suite, a district distinguished by its pleasantness, etc.; and that Baldad, Job's friend, who is on that account called the Suite, is said to have come from it." This passage removes us at once into the neighbourhood of Muzêrîb and the Monastery of Job, for the province of Suete is nothing but the district of Suwêt (Arab. ṣwît),400 the north-western boundary of which is formed by the gorge of the Wâdî Rahûb. The Cavea Roob, which was first of all again found out by me on my journey in 1862, lies in the middle of the steep bank of that wadi, and is at present called maghâret Rahûb, "the cave of R.," or more commonly mu'allakat Rahûb, "the swinging cave of R.," and at the time of the Crusades commanded the dangerous pass which the traveller, on ascending from the south end of the Lake of Galilee to Edre'ât by the nearest way, has to climb on hands and feet. In another passage (xvi. 9), where the unhealthy march to Bosrâ is spoken of, Will. of Tyre says: "After we had come through the gorge of Roob, we reached the plain which is called Medan, and where every year the Arabs and other oriental tribes are accustomed to hold a large fair." This plain is in the vicinity of Muzêrîb, in which the great pilgrim-fair is held annually. We find something similar in xiii. 18: "After having passed Decapolis401 we came to the pass of Roob, and further on into the plain of Medan, which stretches far and wide in every direction, and is intersected by the river Dan, which falls into the Jordan between (Tiberias and Scythopolis (Bîsân)." This river, the same as that which Sanuto means by his aquae Dan (Mê Dân), is none other than the Wâdi el-Meddân, called "the overflowing one," because in the month of March it overflows its banks eastward of the Gezzâr -bridge. It is extremely strange that the name of this river appears corrupted not only in all three writers mentioned above, but also in Burckhardt; for, deceived by the ear, he calls it Wâdî Om el-Dhan. 402 The Meddân is the boundary river between the Suwêt and Nukra plains; it loses its name where it runs into the Makran; and where it falls into the valley of the Jordan, below the lake of Tiberias, it is called el-Muchêbî.

We have little to add to what has been already said. The Fiale of Sanuto is not the Lake Râm, but the round begge, the lake of springs of Muzêrîb, the rapid outflow of which, over a depth of sixty to eighty feet, forms a magnificent waterfall, the only one in Syria, as it falls into the Meddân near the village of Tell Shihâb.

The unfortunate confusion of the localities was occasioned by two accidental circumstances: first, that both the springs of the Jordan below Bâniâs and the lake of Muzêrîb, have a village called Rahûb (רחוב) in their vicinity, of which one is mentioned in Judg. 18:28f., and the other, about a mile below the Cavea Roob, is situated by a fountain of the same name, from which village, cavern, and wadi derive their names; secondly, that there, as here, there is a village Abil (אָבֵל): that near Dan is situated in the "meadow-district of 'Ijôn" (Merg. 'Ijûn); and that in the Suwêt lies between Rahûb and the Makran, and was visited by Seetzen as well as by myself. Perhaps the circumstance that, just as the environs of Muzêrîb have their Mîdân, 403 so the environs of Bâniâs have their Ard el-Mejâdîn, "region of battle-fields," may also have contributed to the confusion; thus, for example, the country sloping to the west from the Phiala towards the Hûle, between Gubbâtâ ez-zêt and Za'ûra, is called, perhaps on account of the murderous encounters which took place there, both in the time of the Crusades and also in more ancient times. It is certainly the ground on which the battle narrated in the book of Joshua, Josh. 11, took place, and also the battle in which Antiochus the Great slew the Egyptian army about 200 B.C.

What we have gained for our special purpose from this information (by which not a few statements of Ritter, K. v. Raumer, and others, are substantiated), is not merely the fact that the tradition which places Job's home in the

region of Muzêrîb existed even in the middle ages (which the quotation given above from Makdeshî, who lived before the time of the Crusades, also confirms), and even came to the ears of the foreigners who settled in the country as they then passed through the land, but also the certainty that this tradition was then, as now, common to the Christians and the Mussulmans, for the three writers previously mentioned would hardly have recorded it on the testimony of the latter only.404

There can be no doubt as to which of these two religions must be regarded as the original mother of this tradition. The Hauranite Christians, who, from their costume, manners, language, and traditions, undoubtedly inherited the country from the pre-Muhammedan age, venerate the Makâm perhaps even more than the Muhammedans; which would be altogether impossible in connection with the hostile position of the two religious sects towards one another, and in connection with the zealous scorn with which the Syrian Christians regard the religion of Islam, if the Hauranitish tradition of Job and the Makâm were of later, Muhammedan origin. It is also possible that, on a closer examination of the Makâm and the buildings about the Sachra, one might find, besides crosses, Greek inscriptions (since they are nowhere wanting in the Nukra), which could only have their origin in the time before the occupation of Islam (635 A.D.); for after this the Hauranite Christians, who only prolong their existence by wandering from chirbe to chirbe, have not even built a single dwelling-house, much less a building for religious worship, which was forbidden under pain of death in the treaty of Omar. But in connection with the pre-Islam Monastery of Job, which owed its origin only to the sacred tradition that held its ground in that place, are monumental witnesses that this tradition is pre-Islamic, and has been transferred from the Christians to the Mussulmans, required? We may go even further, and assert that Muhammed, in the Sur. xxxviii. 41ff. of the Korân, had the Hauranitish tradition of Job and the localities near Sa'dîje definitely before his mind.

We must regard the merchandise caravans which the inhabitants of Tehâma sent continuously into the "north country," esh-shâm, 405 and the return freight of which consisted chiefly of Hauranitish corn, as proof of a regular intercourse between the east Jordanic country and the west of the Arabian peninsula in the period between Christ and Muhammed. Hundreds of men from Mekka and Medina came every year to Bosrâ; indeed, when it has happened that the wandering tribes of Syria, which were, then also as now, bound for Hauran with the kêl, i.e., their want of corn, got before them, and had emptied the granaries of Bosrâ, or when the harvests of the south of Hauran had been destroyed by the locusts, which is not unfrequently the case, they will have come into the Nukra 406 as far as Nawâ, sometimes even as far as Damascus, in order to obtain their full cargo.

If commerce often has the difficult task of bringing together the most heterogeneous peoples, and of effecting a reciprocal interchange of ideas, it here had the easy work of sustaining the intercourse among tribes that were originally one people, spoke one idiom, and regarded themselves as all related; for the second great Sabaean migration, under 'Amr and his son Ta'labe, had taken possession of Mekka, and left one of their number, Rabî'a ibn Hâritha, with his attendants (the Chuzâ'ites), behind as lord of the city. In the same manner they had become possessed of Jathrib (el-Medîna), and left this city to their tribes Aus and Chazreg: the remainder of the people passed on to Peraea and took possession of the country, at that time devastated, as far as Damascus, according to Ibn Sa'îd, even including this city. By the reception of Christianity, the Syrian Sabaeans appear to have become but slightly or not at all estranged from their relatives in the Higâz, for Christianity spread even here, so that the Caesars once ventured to appoint a Christian governor even to the city of Mekka. This was during the lifetime of the Gefnite king 'Amr ibn Gebele. At the time of Muhammed there were many Christians in Mekka, who will for the

most part have brought their Christianity with the Syrian caravans, so that at the commencement of Islâm the Hauranitish tradition of Job might have been very well known in Mekka, since many men from Mekka may have even visited the Makâm and the Sachra, and there have heard many a legend of Job like that intimated in the Korân xxxviii. 43. Yea, whoever will give himself the trouble to investigate minute commentaries on the Koran, especially such as interpret the Koran from the tradition (hadîth), e.g., the Kitâb ed-durr el-muchtâr, may easily find that not merely Kazwînî, Ibn el-Wardî, and Jâkût, whose observations concerning the Monastery of Job have been given above, but also much older authorities, identify the Koranish fountain of Job with the Hauranitish.

A statement of Eusebius, of value in connection with this investigation, brings us at one stride about three hundred years further on. It is in the Onomastikon, under Καρναείμ, and is as follows: "Astaroth Karnaim is at present (about 310 A.D.) a very large village (κώμη μεγίστη) beyond the Jordan, in the province of Arabia, which is also called Batanaea. Here, according to tradition (ἑκ παραδόσεως), they fix the dwelling (οἶκος) of Job." On the small map which accompanies these pages, the reader will find in the vicinity of the Makâm the low and somewhat precipitous mound, not above forty feet in height, of Tell 'Ashtarâ, the plateau of which forms an almost round surface, which is 425 paces in diameter, and shows the unartistic foundations of buildings, and traces of a ring-wall. Here we have to imagine that 'Astarot Karnaim. Euseb. here makes no mention whatever of the city of Astaroth, the ancient capital of Basan, for this he does under Ἀσταρὼθ; the hypothesis of its being the residence of king 'Og, which Newbold407 set up here, consequently falls to the ground. The κώμη μεγίστη of Eusebius must, in connection with the limited character of the ground, certainly be somewhat contracted; but the identity of the localities is not to be doubted in connection with the great nearness of the οἶκος (the Makâm).408 Let us compare another statement that belongs here; it stands under Ἀσταρὼθ Καρναείμ, and is as follows: "There are at the present time two villages of this name in Batanaea, which lie nine miles distant from one another, μεταξὺ ΑΔΑΡΩΝ καὶ ΑΒΙΛΗC." Jerome has duo castella instead of two villages, by which at least the κώμη μεγίστη is somewhat reduced; for that it is one of these two castles409 can be the less doubtful, since they also regulate the determining of the respective localities. If the reading ΑΒΙΛΗC is correct, only Abil (אָבֵל) in the north of Suwêt can (since, without doubt, the Arabian names of the places in Hauran existed in Eusebius' day) be intended; and ΑΔΑΡΩΝ ought then to be changed into ΑΛΑΡΩΝ, in order to denote the large village of El-hârâ, on the lofty peak of the same name in the plain of Gêdûr. El-hârâ lies to the north, and Abil to the south of 'Ashtarâ. If, however, as is most highly probable, instead of ΑΒΙΛΗC (which form Euseb. does not use elsewhere, for he calls the town of Abil Ἀβέλ, and the inscription in Turra has the form πόλεωσ Ἄβέλις), ΑΒΙΔΗC is to be read, which corresponds to the Ἀβιδᾶ of Ptolemy (ed. Wilberg, p. 369) and the modern /Abidîn near Bêtirrâ, thus the name of the other village is to be changed from ΑΔΑΡΩΝ to ΑΡΑΡΩΝ (for which the Cod. Vat. erroneously has ΔΡΑΡΩΝ), the modern 'Arâr.410 'Abîdîn, however, lies nine miles west, and 'Arâr nine miles east of 'Ashtarâ.

Now, as to the second village, and its respective castle, which is mentioned in the second citation from the Onomastikon, I believe that both Euseb. and Jerome intend to say there are two villages, of which the one has the byname of the other; consequently the one is called Astarôt (Karnaim), and the other Karnaim (Astarôt). Twelve miles west of 'Ashtarâ lies the Golanite village of Kornîje (קַרְנַיִם), which in old Kanêtra I have taken up in my trigonometrical measurements.

We find also a third passage in the Onomast. which belongs here; it is under Ἰαβώκ in Cod. Vat., under Ἰδουμαία in Cod. Leid. and Vellarsi, and runs: "According to the view of a certain

one (κατά τινος), this region is the land of Asitis (Ausitis), the home of Job, while according to others it is Arabia (ἠΆραβία); and again, according to others, it is the Land of Sîhôn." Whether genuine or not, this passage possesses a certain value. If it is genuine, Jerome would have left it accordingly untranslated, because he would not be responsible for its whole contents, for he not unfrequently passes over or alters statements of Eusebius where he believes himself to be better informed; but, taken exactly, he could only have rejected the views of those who seek Job's native country on the Jabbok (if the passage belongs to the art.Ἰαβώκ) or in Edom (if it belongs toΊδουμαία), or in the Belkâ, the land of Sîhôn; but not the view of those who make Arabia (Batanaea) to be Ausitis, for the statement of Eusebius with reference to this point under Καρναείμ he translates faithfully. If the passage is not genuine, it at any rate gives the very early testimony of an authority distinct from Eusebius and Jerome in favour of the age of the Hauranitish tradition concerning Job, while it has only a single (κατά τινος) authority for the view of those who make Edom to be Ausitis, and even this only when the passage belongs toΊδουμαία.

By means of these quotations from the Onomastikon, that passage of Chrysostom (Homil. V. de Stud. § 1, tom. ii. p. 59), in which it is said that many pilgrims from the end of the earth come to Arabia, in order to seek for the dunghill on which Job lay, and with rapture to kiss the ground where he suffered (——ἀπὸ περάτων τῆς γῆς είς τὴνΆραβίαν τρέχοντεὸ ἵνα τὴν κοπρίαν ἴδωσὶ καὶ θεασάμενοι καταφιλήσωσι τὴν γῆν), appears also to obtain its right local reference. This Arabia is certainly none other than that which Eusebius explains by ἢ καὶ Βαταναία, and that κοπρία or mezbele to be sought nowhere except near the Makâm Εεjûb. And should there by any doubts upon the subject, ought they not to be removed by the consideration that the proud structure of the Monastery of Job, with its spring festivals mentioned above, standing like a Pharos casting its light far and wide in that age, did not allow either the Syrian Christians or the pilgrims from foreign parts to mistake the place, which tradition had rendered sacred, as the place of Job's sufferings?

There is no monastery whose origin, according to an unimpeachable testimony, belongs to such an early date as that of the Monastery of Job. According to the chronicles of the peoples (ta'rîch el-umem), or the annals of Hamze el-Isfahâni (died about 360 of the Hegira), it was built by 'Amr I, the second Gefnide. Now, since the first Ghassanitish king (Gefne I) reigned forty-five years and three months, and 'Amr five years, the Monastery would have been in existence about 200 A.D., if we place the beginning of the Gefnide dynasty in the time 150 A.D. Objections are raised against such an early date, because one is accustomed on good authority to assign the origin of monasteries to about the year 300 A.D. In the face of more certain historical dates, these objections must remain unheeded, for hermit and monastery life (rahbanîja) existed in the country east of Jordan among the Essenes and other societies and forms of worship, even before Christianity; so that the latter, on its appearance in that part, which took place long before 200 A.D., received the monasteries as an inheritance: but certainly the chronology of the Gefnide dynasty is not reliable. Hamze fixes the duration of the dynasty at 616 years; Ibn Sa'îd, 411 in his history of the pre-Islamic Arabs, at 601 years; and to the same period extends the statement of Mejânishi, 412 who, in his topography of the Ka'be, says that between the conquest of Mekka by Ta'lebe and the rule of the Kosî in this city was 500 years. On the contrary, however, Ibn Jusef 413 informs us that this dynasty began "earlier" than 400 years before Islamism. With this statement accord all those numerous accounts, according to which the "rupture of the dyke" (sêl el-'arim), the supposed cause of the Jemanic emigration, took place rather more than 400 years before Islamism. If therefore, to content ourselves with an approximate calculation, we make Islamism to begin about 615 (the year of the "Mission" was 612 A.D.), and the Gefnide dynasty, with the addition of

the "earlier," 415 years previous, then the commencement of the reign of Gefne I would have been 200 A.D., and the erection of the Monastery shortly before 250.

When the tribe whose king later on built the Monastery migrated from Jemen into Syria, the Trachonitis was in the hands of a powerful race of the Kudâ'ides, which had settled there in the first century of our era, having likewise come out of Jemen, and become tributary to the Romans. This race had embraced Christianity from the natives; and some historians maintain that it permitted the Gefnides to settle and share in the possession of the country, only on the condition that they likewise should embrace Christianity. In those early times, these tribes, of course, with the new religion received the tradition of Job also from the first hand, from the Jews and the Jewish Christians, who, since the battle of the Jewish people with the Romans, will have found refuge and safety to a large extent in Petraea, and especially in the hardly accessible Trachonitis. The Nukra also, as the most favoured region of Syria and Palestina, will have had its native population, among which, in spite of the frequent massacres of Syrians and Jews, there will have been many Jews. Perhaps, moreover, the protection of the new Jemanic population of Hauran again attracted Jewish settlers thither: Nawâ414 at least is a place well known in the Talmud and Midrash, which is mentioned, as a city inhabited by the Jews among those who are not Jews, and as the birth-place of several eminent teachers.415 Moreover, in Syria the veneration of a spot consecrated by religious tradition is independent of its being at the time inhabited or desolate. The supposed tombs of Aaron near Petra, of Hud near Gerash, of Jethro (Su'êb) in the valley of Nimrîn, of Ezekiel in Melîhat Hiskîn, of Elisha on the el-Jesha' mountains, and many other mezâre (tombs of the holy, to which pilgrims resort), are frequently one or more days' journey distant from inhabited places, and yet they are carefully tended. They are preserved from decay and neglect by vows, by the spring processions, and especially by the piety of the Beduins, who frequently deposit articles of value near the mezâre, as property entrusted to the care of the saint. The Makâm of Job may also have been such a consecrated spot many centuries before the erection of the Monastery, and perhaps not merely to the Jews, but also to the Aramaean and Arab population. The superstitious veneration of such places is not confined among the Semites to a particular religious sect, but is the common heritage of the whole race; and the tradition of Job in particular was, originally, certainly not Israelitish, but Aramaean.

Job is not mentioned in the writings of Josephus, but we do find there a remarkable passage concerning Job's native country, the land of the Usites, viz., Ant. i. 6: "Aram, from whom come the Aramaeans, called by the Greeks Syrians, had four sons, of whom the first was named Οὔσης, and possessed Trachonitis and Damascus." The first of these two, Trachonitis, has usually been overlooked here, and attention has been fixed only on Damascus. The word el-Ghûta (Arab. 'l-gûṭt), the proper name of the garden and orchard district around Damascus, has been thought to be connected in sound with 'Us, and they have been treated as identical: this is, however, impossible even in philological grounds. Ghûta would certainly be written עוּטָה in Hebrew, because this language has no sign for the sound Gh (Arab. g); but Josephus, who wrote in Greek, ought then to have said Γούσης, not Οὔσης, just as he, and the LXX before him and Eusebius after him, render the city עזה by Γάζα, the mountain עיבל by Γαιβάλ, the village עי by Γαί, etc. In the same manner the LXX ought to have spoken of a Γαυσῖτις, not Αὐσῖτις, if this were the case. Proper names, also, always receive too definite and lasting an impress for their consonants, as ץ and ט, to be easily interchanged, although this is possible with the roots of verbs. Moreover, if the word עוץ had had the consonant ץ (Arab. ḍ), Josephus must have reproduced it with τ or θ, not with ς, in accordance with the pronunciation (especially if he had intended to identify עוץ and Ghûta). And we see from Ptolemy and Strabo, and likewise from the

Greek mode of transcribing the Semitic proper names in the Haurânite inscriptions of the Roman period, e.g., Μάθιος and Νάταρος for Arab. mâḍâ and nḍr, that in the time of Josephus the sound of ץ had already been divided into Arab. ṣ and ḍ; comp. Abhandl. der Berlin. Acad. d. Wissenschaft, 1863, S. 356f. Hence it is that Josephus manifestly speaks only of one progenitor Οὔσης, therefore of one tribe; while the word Ghûta, often as a synonym of buq'a (בֶּקָעָה), denotes a low well-watered country enclosed by mountains, and in this appellative signification occurs as the proper name of several localities in the most widely separated parts of Arabia (comp. Jâkût, sub voce), which could not be the case if it had been = עוץ ארץ.416 The word Ausitis used by the LXX also has no formation corresponding to the word Ghûta, but shows its connection with אֶרֶץ עוּץ by the termination; while the word Ghûta rendered in Greek is Γουθατά (in Theophanes Byzant. Γουθαθά), in analogy e.g., with the form῾Ρεβλαθά for Ribla (Jos. Ant. x. 11).417

But why are we obliged to think only of Damascus, since Josephus makes Trachonitis also to belong to the land of the Usites? If we take this word in its most limited signification, it is (apart from the eastern Trachon) that lava plateau, about forty miles long and about twenty-eight broad, which is called the Legâ in the present day. This is so certain, that one is not obliged first of all to recall the well-known inscription of the temple of Mismĭa, which calls this city situated in the Legâ, Μητροκώμη τοῦ Τράχωνος. From the western border of this Trachon, however, the Monastery of Job is not ten miles distant, therefore by no means outside the radius that was at all times tributary to the Trachonites (Arab el-wa'r), a people unassailable in their habitations in the clefts of the rocks.418 According to this, the statement of Josephus would at least not stand in open contradiction to the Hauranitish tradition of Job. But we go further and maintain that the Monastery of Job lies exactly in the centre of Trachonitis. This word has, viz., in Josephus and others, a double signification—a more limited and a wider one. It has the more limited where, together with Auranitis, Batanaea, Gamalitica, and Gaulonitis, it denotes the separate provinces of the ancient kingdom of Basan. Then it signifies the Trachonitis κατ' ἐξοχήν, i.e., the wildest portion of the volcanic district, viz., the Legâ, the Haurân mountain range, the Safâ and Harra of the Râgil. On the other hand, it has the wider signification when it stands alone; then it embraces the whole volcanic region of Middle Syria, therefore with the more limited Trachonitis the remaining provinces of Basan, but with the exception, as it seems, of the no longer volcanic Galadine (North Gilead). In this sense, therefore, as a geographical notion, Trachonitis is almost synonymous with Basan.

Since it is to the interest of this investigation to make the assertion advanced sure against every objection, we will not withhold the passages in support of it. Josephus says, Ant. xv. 10, 3, the district of Hûle (Οὐλαθά) lies between Galilee and Trachonitis. He might have said more accurately, "between Galilee and Gaulonitis," but he wished to express that the great basaltic region begins on the eastern boundary of the Hûle. The word Trachonitis has therefore the wider signification. In like manner, in Bell. iii. 10 it is said the lake of Phiala lies 120 stadia east of Paneion (Bâniâs) on the way to the Trachonitis. True, the Phiala is a crater, and therefore itself belongs to Trachonitis, but between it and Bâniâs the lava alternates with the chalk formation of the Hermôn, whereas to the south and east of the Phiala it is everywhere exclusively volcanic; Trachonitis has therefore here also the wider signification. Ant. xvii. 2, it is said Herod had the castle of Βαθύρα built in Batanaea (here, as often in Josephus, in the signification of Basan), in order to protect the Jews who travel from Babylon (viâ Damascus) to Jerusalem against the Trachonite robbers. Now, since this castle and village (the Bêtirrâ mentioned already), which is situated in the district of Gamalitica on an important ford of the Muchêbi gorge between 'Abidin and Sebbûte, could not be any protection against the robbers of Trachonitis in the more limited sense, but only against those of Golan, it is

manifest that by the Trachonites are meant the robbers of Trachonitis in the wider sense. Aurelius Victor (De Hist. Caes. xxvii.) calls the Emperor M. Julius Philippus, born in Bosrâ, the metropolis of Auranitis, quite correctly Arabs Trachonites; because the plain of Hauran, in which Bosra is situated, is also of a basaltic formation, and therefore is a part of the Trachonitis.

The passage of Luke's Gospel, 3:1, where it says Herod tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and Trachonitis, also belongs here. That Philip possessed not perhaps merely the Trachonitis (similar to a province assigned to a man as banishment rather than for administration, producing little or no revenue) in the more limited sense, but the whole Basanitis, is shown by Josephus, who informs us, Ant. xvii. 11, 4 and freq., that he possessed Batanaea (in the more restricted sense, therefore the fruitful, densely populated, profitable Nukra), with Auranitis, Trachonitis, etc. We must therefore suppose that in the words τῆσ῾Ιτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας in Luke, one district is meant, which by῾Ιτουραίας is mentioned according to the marauding portion of its population, and by Τραχωνίτιδος more generally, according to its trachonitic formation.419 Ioannes Malalas (Chronogr. ed. Dindorf, p. 236), who, as a Syrian born, ought to be well acquainted with the native usage of the language, hence calls Antipas, as a perfectly adequate term, only toparch of Trachonitis; and if, according to his statement (p. 237), the official title of this Herod was the following: Σεβαστὸσ῾Ηρώδης τοπάρχης καὶ θεσμοδότησ῾Ιουδαίων τε καὶ῾Ελλήνωὶ Βασιλεὺς τῆς Τραχωνίτιδος, it is self-evident that "king of Trachonitis" here is synonymous with king of Basan. In perfect harmony with this, Pliny says (H. N. v. 18) that the ten cities of Decapolis lay within the extensive tetrarchies of Trachonitis, which are divided into separate kingdoms. Undoubtedly Pliny adds to these tetrarchies of Trachonitis in the wider sense, which are already known to us, Galadine also, which indeed belonged also the pre-Mosaic Basan, but at the time of Josephus is mostly reckoned to Peraea (in the more limited sense).

On the ground of this evidence, therefore, the land of the Usites of Josephus, with the exception of the Damascene portion, was Trachonitis in the wider sense; and since the Makâm Eɛjûb is in the central point of this country, this statement accords most exactly with the Syrian tradition. It is clear that the latter remains untouched by the extension of the geographical notion in Josephus, for without knowing anything more of a "land of the Usites," it describes only a portion of the same as the "native country of Job;" and again, Josephus had no occasion to speak of Job in his commentary on the genealogies, therefore also none to speak of his special home within the land of the Usites. Eusebius, on the other hand, in his De Originibus (ix. 2, 4), refers to this home, and says, therefore limiting Josephus' definition: Hus, Traconitidis conditor, inter Palaestinam et Coelesyriam tenuit imperium; unde fuit Iob.

With this evidence of agreement between two totally independent witnesses, viz., the Syrian tradition and Josephus, the testimony of the latter in particular has an enhanced value; for, although connected with the Bible, it nevertheless avails as extra-biblical testimony concerning the Usites, it comes from an age when one might still have the historical fact from the seat of the race, and from an authority of the highest order. True, Josephus is not free from disfigurements, where he has the opportunity of magnifying his people, himself, or his Roman patrons, and of depreciating an enemy; but here he had to do with nothing more than the statement of the residence of a people; and since the word Οὔσης also has no similarity in sound with the words Damascus and Trachonitis, that might make a combination with them plausible, we may surely have before us a reliable historical notice here, or at least a tradition which was then general (and therefore also for us important), while we may doubt this in connection with other parts of the genealogies, where Josephus seems only to

catch at that which is similar in sound as furnishing an explanation.

But that which might injure the authority of Josephus is the contradiction in which it seems to stand to a far older statement concerning Ausitis, viz., the recognised postscript of the LXX to the book of Job, which makes Job to be the Edomitish king Jobab. The identification, it may be said, can however only have been possible because Ausitis was in or near Edom. But the necessity of this inference must be disputed. It is indeed unmistakeable that that postscript is nothing more than a combination of the Jews beyond Palestine (probably Egytpio-Hellenistic), formed, perhaps, long before the LXX,—such a vagary as many similar ones in the Talmud and Midrash. From the similarity in sound of Ἰωβάβ with Ἰώβ, and the similarity in name of Ζαρά, the father of Jobab, with a son of Re'ûÐl and grandson of Esau (Gen. 36:13), Job's descent from Esau has been inferred. That Esau's first-born was called Elîphaz and his son Temân, seemed to confirm this combination, since (in accordance with the custom420 of naming the grandson as a rule after his grandfather) Elîphaz the Temanite might be regarded as grandson of that Elîphaz, therefore like Job as great-grandson of Esau and πέμπτος ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ. The apparent and certainly designed advantages of this combination were: that Job, who had no pedigree, and therefore was to be thought of as a non-Israelite, was brought into the nearest possible blood-relationship to the people of God, and that, by laying the scene in the time of the patriarchs, all questions which the want of a Mosaic colouring to the book of Job might excite would be met. Now, even if the abode of Job were transferred from the land of 'Us to Edom, it would be only the consequence of his combination with Jobab, and, just as worthless as this latter itself, might lead no one astray. But it does not seem to have gone so far; it is even worthy of observation, that מבצרה (from Bosra, the Edomite city421), being attached to the misunderstood υἱὸς Ζαρά ἐκ Βοσόῤῥας, Gen. 36:33, is reproduced in the LXX by μητρὸς Βοσόῤῥας, as also that Job's wife is not called an Edomitess, but a γυνὴ Ἀράβισσα. And it appears still far more important, that Ausitis lies ἐν τοῖς ὀρίοις τῆσ Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας, so far as the central point of Ἰδουμαία is removed by the addition καὶ τῆσ Ἀραβίας, and Job's abode is certainly removed from the heart of Idumaea. The Cod. Alex. exchanges that statement of the place, even in a special additional clause, for ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων τοῦ Εὐφράτου, therefore transfers Ausitis to the vicinity of the Euphrates, and calls the father of Jobab (= Job) Ζαρὲθ ἐξ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου (קדם מבני). Nevertheless we attach no importance to this variation of the text, but rather offer the suggestion that the postscript gives prominence to the observation: οὗτος (viz., Ἰώβ) ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου.422

If we compare the postscript of the LXX with the legend of Islam, we find in both the Esauitish genealogy of Job; the genealogy of the legend is: Eejûb ibn Zârih (זֶרַח) ibn Reû'îl ibn el-'Ais ibn Ishâk ibn Ibrâhîm; and we may suppose that it is borrowed directly from the LXX, and that it reached Arabia and Mekka even in the pre-Islamic times by means of the (Arabian) Christians east of Jordan, who had the Old Testament only in the Greek translation. Even the Arabic orthography of the biblical proper names, which can be explained only on the supposition of their transfer from the Greek, is in favour of this mode of the transmission of the Christian religion and its legends to the people of the Higaz. Certainly there can be no doubt as to an historical connection between the postscript and the legend, and therefore it would be strange if they did not accord respecting the home of Job. The progenitor el-'Ais (עַיִץ), in the genealogy of the legend, is also a remarkable counterpart to the Ausitis ἐν τοῖς ὀρίοις τῆσ Ἰδουμ. καὶ Ἀρ., for it is a blending of עֵשָׂו and עוּץ, and it has to solve the difficult problem, as to how Job can be at the same time an Usite and an Esauite; for that Job as an Aisite no longer belongs to Idumaea, but to the district of the more northern Aramaeans, is shown e.g., from the following passage in Mugîr ed-dîn's History of Jerusalem: "Job belonged to the people of the Romans (i.e., the Aisites 423),

for he sprang from el-'Ais, and the Damascene province of Batanaea was his property."

The κοπρία of the LXX, at Job 2:8, leads to the same result; that it is also found again as mezbele in the later legend, is a further proof how thoroughly this accords with the LXX, and how it has understood its statement of the position of Ausitis. It may also be maintained here, that it was only possible to translate the words בתוך־האפר by ἐπὶ τῆς κοπρίας ἔξω τῆς πόλεως when "heap of ashes" and "dunghill" were synonymous notions. This, however, is the case only in Hauran, where the dung, as being useless for agricultural purposes, is burnt from time to time in an appointed place before the town (vid., p. 573424), while in every other part of Syria it is as valuable and as much stored up as among us. If the LXX accordingly placed the κοπρία of Job in Hauran, it could hardly represent Ausitis as Edom.

But how has the Ausitis of the LXX been transferred hither? Certainly not as the "land of 'Us" (in the sense of the land of Basan, land of Haurân), for without wasting a word about it, there has never been such an one in the country east of the Jordan: but as "the land of the Usites" in the sense of the Arabic diâr 'Us (dwelling-place of the Usites) or ard benî 'Us. A land receives designations of this kind with the settlement of a people in it; they run parallel with the proper name of the country, and in the rule vanish again with that people. These designations belong, indeed, to the geography of the whole earth, but nowhere have they preserved their natural character of transitoriness more faithfully than in the lands where the Semitic tongue is spoken. It is this that makes the geographical knowledge of these countries so extremely difficult to us, because we frequently take them to be the names of the countries, which they are not, and which—so far as they always involve a geological definition of the regions named—can never be displaced and competently substituted by them. In this sense the land of the Usites might, at the time of the decay of both Israelitish kingdoms, when the דמשׂק ארם possessed the whole of Peraea, very easily extend from the borders of Edom to the gates of Damascus, and even further northwards, if the Aramaean race of 'Us numbered many or populous tribes (as it appears to be indicated in העוץ ארץ מלכי כל, Jer. 25:20), in perfect analogy with the tribe of Ghassân, which during five hundred years occupied the country from the Aelanitic Gulf to the region of Tedmor, at one time settling down, at another leading a nomadic life, and Hauran was the centre of its power. By such a rendering the Ἀραβία of the postscript would not be different from the later provincia Arabiae, of which the capital was the Trachonitish Bostra, while is was bounded on the south end of the Dead Sea by Edom (Palaestine tertia).

But should any one feel a difficulty in freeing himself from the idea that Ausitis is to be sought only in the Ard el-Hâlât east of Ma'ân, he must consider that the author of the book of Job could not, like that legend which places the miraculous city of Iram in the country of quicksands, transfer the cornfields of his hero to the desert; for there, with the exception of smaller patches of land capable of culture, which we may not bring into account, there is by no means to be found that husbandman's Eldorado, where a single husbandman might find tillage for five hundred (Job 1:3), yea, for a thousand (Job 42:12) yoke of oxen. Such numbers as these are not to be depreciated; for in connection with the primitive agriculture in Syria and Palestine,—which renders a four years' alternation of crops necessary, so that the fields must be divided into so many portions (called in Hauran wâgihât, and around Damascus auguh, Arab. 'wjh), from which only one portion is used annually, and the rest left fallow (bûr),—Job required several square miles of tillage for the employment of his oxen. It is all the same in this respect whether the book of Job is a history or poem: in no case could the Ausitis be a country, the notorious sterility of which would make the statement of the poet ridiculous.

Our limited space does not admit of our proving the worth which we must acknowledge to the tradition, by illustrating those passages of the Old Testament scriptures which have reference to עוץ and ארץ עוץ. But to any one, who, following the hints they give, wishes again to pursue the investigations, elsewhere useless, concerning the position of the land of the Usites, we might indicate: (1) that עוץ the first-born of Aram (Gen. 10:23) is the tribe sought, while two others of this name—a Nahorite, Job 22:21, and a Horite, Job 36:28—may be left out of consideration; the former because the twelve sons of Nahor need not be progenitors of tribes, and the latter because he belongs to a tribe exterminated by the Edomites in accordance with Deut. 2:12, 22: (2) that העוץ ארץ, Jer. 25:20, is expressly distinguished from אדום in the 21st verse, and—if one compares the round of the cup of punishment, Jer. Job 25, with the detailed prophecies which follow in Job 46–51, to which it is a prooemium that has been removed from its place—corresponds to דמשׂק (with Hamât and Arpad), Job 49:23: (3) that therefore Lam. 4:21, where עוץ בארץ ושׂבתי would be devoid of purpose if it described the proper habitable land of Edom, must describe a district extending over that, in which the Edomites had established themselves in consequence of Assyria having led away captive the Israelitish and Aramaean population of the East Jordanic country and Coele-Syria. In connection with Jer. 25:20 one must not avoid the question whether עוץ is the name of the דמשׂק ארם that has been missed. Here the migration of the Damascene Aramaeans from Kîr (Am. 9:7) ought to be considered, the value of the Armenian accounts concerning the original abode of the Usites tested, what is erroneous in the combination of קִיר with the river Kur shown and well considered, and in what relations both as to time and events that migration might have stood to the overrunning of Middle Syria by the Aramaean Sôbaean tribes (from Mesopotamia) under Hadad-ezer, and to the seizure and possession of the city of Damascus by Rezon the Sôbaean? Finally, one more tradition might be compared, to which some value may perhaps be attached, because it is favoured by the stone monuments, whose testimony we are not accustomed otherwise to despise in Palestine and Syria. The eastern portal of the mosque of Benî Umêja in Damascus, probably of the very temple, the altar of which king Ahaz caused to be copied (2 Kings 16:10), is called Gêrûn or the Gerun gate: the portal in its present form belongs to the Byzantine or Roman period. And before this gate is the Gêrûnîje, a spacious, vaulted structure, mostly very old, which has been used since the Mussulman occupation of the city as a mêda'a, i.e., a place for religious ablutions. The topographical writings on Damascus trace these two names back to a Gêrûn ibn Sa'd ibn 'Ad ibn 'Aus (עוץ) ibn Iram (ארם) ibn Sâm (שׁם) ibn Nûh (נוח), who settled in Damascus in the time of Solomon (one version of the tradition identifies him with Hadad, Jos. Ant. viii. 7), and built in the middle of the city a castle named after him, in which a temple to the planet (kôkeb) Mushteri, the guardian-god of the city, has been erected. That this temple, which, as is well known, under Theodosius, at the same time with the temple of the sun at Ba'lbek, passed over to the Christians, was actually surrounded with a strong, fortified wall, is capable of proof even in the present day. In this tradition, which has assumed various forms, a more genuine counterpart of the biblical עוץ appears than that 'Ais which we have characterized above as an invention of the schools, viz., an 'Aus (Arab. 'wṣ), father of the Adite-tribe which is said to have settled in the Damascene district under that Gêrûn, and also ancestor of the prophet Hûd, lost to the tradition, whose makâm on the mountains of Suêt rises far above Gerash a city of pillars, this true Iram dhât el-'imâd, the valley of the Jabbok and the Sawâd of Gilead.

It is with good reason that we have hitherto omitted to mention the Αἰσῖται of Ptolemy v. 18 (19). The Codd have both Αἰσεῖται and Αἰσῖται; different Semitic forms (e.g., the name of the Arab. bny ḥays, which, according to Jâkût, once dwelt in the Harra of the Ragil) may lie at the basis of this name, only not the form עוץ, which ought to be Οὐσῖται, or at least Αὐσῖται (which

no Cod. reads). As to the abodes of the Αἰσῖται, Ptolemy distributes them under nine greater races or groups of races, which in his time inhabited the Syrian steppe. Three of these had their settlements in the eastern half of the Syrian steppe towards the Euphrates of on its western banks: the Καυχαβηνοί in the north, the Αἰσῖται in the middle, and the Ὀρχηνοί in the south. According to this the Αἰσῖται would have been about between Hît and Kûfa, or in that district which is called by the natives Ard el-Wudjan, and in which just that race of the Chaldaeans might have dwelt that plundered Job's camels. There we are certainly not to seek the scene of the drama of Job; and if the Edomites were dispersed there (Lam. 4:21), they were not to be envied on account of their fortune. But if the Αἰσῖται are to be sought there, we may not connect the Καυχαβηνοί with the village of Cochabe (Arab. kawkabâ) on the Hermon (Epiphan. Haer. x. 18), in order then to remove the Αἰσῖται, dwelling "below them," to Batanaea.

And now, in concluding here, I have still to explain, that in writing these pages I was not actuated by an invincible desire of increasing the dull literature respecting the עוץ ארץ by another tractate, but exclusively by the wish of my honoured friend that I should furnish him with a contribution on my visit to the Makâm Eɛjûb, and concerning the tradition that prevails there, for his commentary on the book of Job.

As to the accompanying map, it is intended to represent the hitherto unknown position of the Makâm, the Monastery, and the country immediately around the, by comparing it with two localities marked on most maps, Nawâ and the castle of Muzêrîb. The latter, the position of which we determined in 1860 as 32 44' north lat. and 35 51' 45" east long. (from Greenwich), lies three hours' journey on horseback south of the Monastery. The Wâdi Jarmûk and Wâdi Hît have the gorge formation in common with all other wadis that unite in the neighbourhood of Zêzûn and from the Makran, which is remarkable from a geological point of view: a phenomenon which is connected with the extreme depression of the valley of the Jordan. For the majority of the geographical names mentioned in this essay I refer the reader to Carl Ritter's Geographic von Syrien und Palästina; 425 others will be explained in my Itinerarien, which will be published shortly.

THE MODE OF TRANSCRIBING THE ARABIC WORDS426

t = ת, Arab. t; th = ת, Arab. t; 'g [soft, the ' over the g has been generally omitted, as liable to be mistaken for an accent in connection with vowels], or, in accordance with the predominant pronunciation, g = Arab. j; he or hh = Arab. ḥ; ch = Arab. ch; dh = Arab. d; z = ז, Arab. z; sh or sch = Arab. š; s or ss = ץ, Arab. ṣ; d or dd = Arab. ḍ; t or tt = ט, Arab. ṭ; z = Arab. ḍ; '= ע, Arab. ', e.g., 'Ain = עין, Gumû' = גמוש; gh = Arab. g; k (k) or q = ק, Arab. q; k (c) = Arab. k.

The exact transcription is sometimes omitted where the word occurs more frequently, e.g., Haurân, Makâm. Instead of ijj and uww are written îj and ûw. The vowels a and e correspond to the Fath (פתח), and u and o to the Damm; nevertheless the use of o is limited to the emphatic and guttural consonants, including r, while a, according to rule, is subject to this limitation only in nominal forms,—in verbal forms it is also combined with the rest of the consonants; â, ê (ei, ai), and ô (au) are = Fath followed by Elif, Jod, or Waw, û = Damm followed by Waw. The sign for Hamza is ', e.g., mala'a = Arab. ml' (מלא). The Tenwîn (Nunation) is only expressed exceptionally, e.g., 'gelle = גֶּלָה as it is generally pronounced, especially when the word stands out of its connection as the root form, not 'gellat-un (the nunized nominative). Perfect consistency has not been attainable in a book, the printing of which, together with the working in of constantly accumulating material, has occupied nearly two years.

[The consonantal notation is given above according to the variation that has been rendered necessary by the want of casts for printing according to the system adopted by Dr. Delitzsch. We were obliged to have recourse to

the old notation, which is clumsy and confusing, e.g., hh = Arab. ḥ, tt = ט, Arab. ṭ, and in one or two instances a· has been used in the tt thus, t.t, to represent Arab. ṭṭ (with Teshdîd). This applies to the first volume; but in the second I have adopted a change, which occurred to me later, viz., to use Roman letters among the Italics to represent the stronger consonants, or vice versâ, Italics among Roman letters. The advantage of this will be seen more especially in the exact reproduction of geographical names, as by means of it the spelling is not affected, and at the same time the Arabic letters are fairly distinguished. Suffice it to remind the student that the j is to be pronounced as Engl. y, being = Arab. y.

ABBREVIATIONS

Have been rarely used in the translation, and those used are mostly familiar and self-evident. The names of critics are given in full in the earlier part, and though abbreviated, as constantly recurring, need no explanation here. "The Arabic Version referred to is that of the London Polyglot; the Syriac, the Ancient Syrian version. b. and j. in connection with Talmud citations signify respectively the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds; b. with the names of persons, ben (bar), son." The Biblical references are according to the Hebrew divisions, e.g., Ps. 92:11 (10), as also the division of Job 40–41.