

## THE DATE OF THE PROSE-TALE OF JOB LINGUISTICALLY RECONSIDERED

AVI HURVITZ

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY/JERUSALEM

### I

On several occasions we have attempted to demonstrate the significance of a certain type of linguistic analysis, for discussing biblical texts whose date of composition is questionable. The main advantage of this analysis lies in the fact, that, being an autonomous and independent criterion, one may use it without subscribing to any particular theory prevailing in biblical Higher Criticism. Most of the complicated and unresolved problems of Higher Criticism — literary, historical and theological — simply have no bearing upon its procedures.

This analysis seeks to identify linguistic elements, the very existence and the unusual concentration of which may reveal the late origin of chronologically problematic texts. It is the distinct corpus of unquestionably late compositions written in post-exilic times — as manifested by the historical episodes and persons mentioned therein — which provides us with reliable data for determining just exactly what late Biblical Hebrew (= LBH) is. Examples are the book of Esther (which tells about “the days of Ahasuerus” [I 1], Chronicles (which mentions Zerubabel [I Ch. III 19]) or Ezra (the hero of which lived “in the reign of Artaxerxes King of Persia” [VII 1]). The late linguistic elements in such compositions are unmistakably discernible.<sup>1</sup> Most significant among these are the Persianisms, which constitute, so to speak, an “Archimedean point” for confirming the whole system. This is so, since the close contact between Hebrew and Persian — through the mediation of Imperial Aramaic — is not recognizable, in the literary sources at our disposal, prior to the Persian conquest in the sixth century B.C.E.

<sup>1</sup> Cf., for instance, S.R. DRIVER, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, New York 1956 [=Meridian Library], pp. 473-4; 505-6.

Furthermore, it has been already pointed out that the late features, characteristic of post-exilic writings, are by no means restricted to *prose works*. Non-classical expressions and idioms, which are best explained as imprints of post-classical Hebrew, may be found in the elevated style of the *late prophecy* as well.<sup>2</sup> The same holds true of compositions which fall under the category of *poetic literature*. Thus, both in Psalms included in the canonical Psalter<sup>3</sup> and in non-canonical Psalms discovered at Qumran,<sup>4</sup> distinct elements of "Late Hebrew" are clearly traceable.

Here we shall apply the above mentioned analysis to the language of the Prose Tale of Job (chapters I-II; XLII 7-17), which is said to preserve *epic elements*.<sup>5</sup> We believe that there is some exaggeration in the statement saying that "the prose tale in the prologue and epilogue is written in exquisite biblical Hebrew, on a par with the classic narratives in Genesis and Samuel"; or that "the author [of the Prose Tale — A.H.] uses perfect classical Hebrew with practically no trace of a later style".<sup>6</sup> It would appear that in spite of his efforts to write pure classical Hebrew and to mark his story with "Patriarchal colouring", the author of the Prose Tale could not avoid certain phrases which are unmistakably characteristic of post-exilic Hebrew, thus betraying his actual late date.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 505.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., for instance, A. HURVITZ, "When was the Hebrew Phrase *שְׁמוֹת עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל* coined?" *Leshonenu* XXVII-XXVIII, 1963-4, pp. 297-302 [in Hebrew].

<sup>4</sup> *Idem.*, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran", *RdQ* V, 1965, pp. 225-232.

<sup>5</sup> N.M. SARNA, "Epic Substratum in the Prose of Job", *JBL* LXXXVI, 1957, pp. 13-25. Cf. also U. CASSUTO, *Knesset VIII*, 1944, p. 142 [in Hebrew]. For the reasons why the method cannot decidedly be utilized for the poetic discourses of Job, see our remarks in *IEJ* XVIII, 1968, p. 236. An interesting parallel in another Wisdom composition, where a clear distinction between the language of the narrative framework and the gnomic portions must be drawn, is supplied by the Aramaic *Words of Ahiqar*: here as well the kind of language in which the proverbs are formulated is distinctively different from that used in the framework story (Cf. E.V. KUTSCHER, *JBL* LXXXVI, 1957, p. 338; J.C. GREENFIELD, *Leshonenu* XXXII, 1967-8, pp. 364-5 [in Hebrew]).

<sup>6</sup> R. GORDIS, *The Book of God and Man*, Chicago-London 1965 [1966], pp. 163; 164 (Gordis allows, however, for one exception — *לִקְבֹּל*; *ibid.*, p. 345, n. 32).

<sup>7</sup> Mention should be made here of K. KAUTZSCH's study *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob*, Leipzig 1900, pp. 22-39, where, while discussing the chronological problems of Job's Prose Narrative, he analyses its peculiar expressions. Unfortunately, however, some good observations were indiscriminately mixed up with dubious material and, as a result, completely neglected by subsequent scholars. It seems that

## II

Job I 6, 7, 8, 9, 12; II 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7: *שָׁטָן* (ה)<sup>8</sup>

The biblical concept of *Satanic figures*, which exist in the universe, goes back to ancient times. The word *שָׁטָן* itself is found already in Numbers (XXII 22,32), 1 Sam. (XXIX 4), 2 Sam. (XIX 23) and 1 Kings (V 18; XI 14,23,25). However, *שָׁטָן* — whatever its etymology — still carries in these passages the general meaning of "stumble". The clear emergence of a *definite image of "The Satan"*, as was pointed out by many scholars, is late. It is not until Zechariah (III 1,2) and 1 Chr. (XXI 1) that The Satan as such is first mentioned in the Bible (with or without the definite article).<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, the appearance of "The Satan" in Chronicles illustrates very clearly the decisive transition which took place in biblical thought — as well as in Biblical Hebrew (=BH) — in the post exilic period. For the early parallel of 1 Ch. XXI 1, in 2 Sam. XXIV 1, is quite unaware of "The Satan":<sup>10</sup>

2 Sam. XXIV 1 — וַיִּסַּף אֶף ה' לַחֲרוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּסַּף אֶת דָּוִד

1 Ch. XXI 1 — וַיַּעֲמֵד שָׁטָן עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּסַּף אֶת דָּוִיד

That the phenomenon under discussion is indeed late, is particularly obvious in the light of the post-biblical sources. Both Rabbinic and Apocryphal literature, when referring to various biblical episodes, tend — like Chronicles — to insert "The Satan" into the context. Yet, in the biblical models The Satan is missing

Kautzsch's failure is due mainly to his lack of disciplined standards in determining what "late" linguistic elements actually are. Nevertheless, our criticism of the Old School *methods* — in this case as well as in others — hardly justifies a complete discarding of the *issues* they dealt with. In the light of the new data available — and the refined methods developed — we are at present in a much better position to examine thoroughly the whole issue of LBH. Cf. A. HURVITZ, *Bein Lashon Lelashon* (the Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew: a Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and its Implications for the Dating of Psalms), Jerusalem 1972.

<sup>8</sup> In order not to enter into detailed reconstructions, which inevitably involve non-linguistic considerations, the following discussion is limited to a presentation of the essential semantic development of *שָׁטָן* in its general outline only.

<sup>9</sup> Cf., for instance, S.R. DRIVER — G.B. GRAY, *The Book of Job* (=ICC), 1921, pp. 10-11. Ps. CIX 6 is of no help for a chronological study, since its date is unknown.

<sup>10</sup> Cf., for instance, DRIVER, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n.1), p. 434.

altogether.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, even in such a passage as 1 Kings XXII 21, where the heavenly court is gathered and a seducer is called upon for stumbling Ahab, that seducer is still named רֹחַ. The term שָׂטָן (ה) obviously has not been coined yet in BH.

It is also significant to note, in this context, that the occurrence of Angels with proper names in the Bible (מִיכָאֵל, גַּבְרִיאֵל) is exclusively limited to the late book of Daniel. Though much is said about Angels in early biblical literature, those heavenly beings do not have yet proper names and definite jobs which are so characteristic of the angelological phraseology in the later times.<sup>12</sup>

In sum: the discussion of heavenly affairs and assemblies of celestial beings is by no means restricted to the late literature.<sup>13</sup> However, the emergence of the figure of The Satan in the Bible — which is linguistically associated with a semantic development שָׂטָן = "Stumble" > שָׂטָן = "The Satan" — is an exclusive feature of post-exilic literature. It would thus appear, that the שָׂטָן of Job's Prose Tale — whatever its exact position in this development — is a part of LBH.<sup>14</sup>

Job II 10:    ל    ק    ז    ל  
                  —    —    —    —

לִקְבֹּל = "to receive, take" is widely used in post-exilic Hebrew, in Tannaitic and Talmudic literature alike.<sup>15</sup> It is also very common in the Aramaic sources: earlier and later, western and eastern.<sup>16</sup> In BH, however, the usage of לִקְבֹּל is clearly char-

<sup>11</sup> Cf. C. BRANDWEIN, "The Legend of Job According to its Various Stages", *Tarbiz* XXXV, 1965-6, p. 9 [in Hebrew]. Cf. also 11Q Ps<sup>a</sup> Plea, line 15: אֵל הַשֵּׁטָן אל השלשט בי שטן as against Ps. CXIX 133 וְאֵל תִּשְׁלַט בִּי כָל אֹיֵן (R. POLZIN, HThR LX, 1967, pp. 470-471).

<sup>12</sup> Cf., for instance, M. TESTUZ, *Les Idées Religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*, Genève-Paris 1960, p. 87. In Yer. *Rosh Heshana* I 2 it is explicitly stated, that the names of the angels — as well as the names of the months — were introduced by those who returned from Babylonia: שְׁמוֹת הַמַּלְאָכִים עָלוּ בִּידֵן מִבָּבֶל.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., for instance, SARNA, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 5), p. 22.

<sup>14</sup> In non-linguistic terms: The Satan in Job is far from being an immediate "reflex of early Near Eastern mythology" (*ibid.*; italics are mine — A.H.). Its late character within Hebrew suggests that rather we ought to consider it a reflex of post-exilic angelology.

<sup>15</sup> See the rich variety of examples quoted in E. BEN-IEHUDA's *Thesaurus* ... XI, s.v.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the etymological references in KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER's *Lexicon*, p. 1117 s.v.

acteristic of the post exilic writings: out of 9 occurrences outside Job, 8 are found in Esther, Ezra and Chronicles — all of which are known to have been written in the Persian period at the earliest. Once (XIX 20) לִקְבֹּל also appears in the chronologically disputable book of Proverbs — which, therefore, cannot bear upon our discussion — but never does it occur in any of the biblical compositions which were without doubt written in pre-exilic times.

Furthermore, in not a few cases it is possible to illustrate how other roots, which clearly belong to the stock of classical BH, are functioning in pre-exilic literature — before the penetration of the late לִקְבֹּל — in the same meaning. This is explicit particularly when we come to confront certain BH idioms with those of MH or Targ. Aram.<sup>17</sup> Cf., for instance,

Deut. XVI 19 —	וְלֹא תִקַּח שָׂחָד	Ex. XXIV 7 —	נִעְשָׂה וְנִשְׁמַע
Onkelos —	וְלֹא תִקְבִּיל שׁוּחָדָא	Onk. —	נִעְבִּיד וְנִקְבִּיל
B.Ket. 105a —	מִקְבִּילֵי שׁוּחָד		

Gen. XXIII 13 —	מִמֶּנִּי קָח הַשָּׂדֶה	נָתַתִּי כֶסֶף
M. Sheq. V 4 —	וּמִקְבֵּל מִמֶּנּוּ הוֹתֵם	וְנוֹתַן לוֹ מַעוֹת

Lev. XIV 15 —		
	וְלִקַּח ... מֶלֶךְ הַשֶּׁמֶן וַיִּצֶק עַל	כַּף הַכֹּהֵן הַשְּׂמֵאלִית

Tos. Zeb. I 11 —	
	לֹג שֶׁמֶן שֶׁל מִצּוּרֵי מִקְבֵּל בִּימֵינוּ וְנוֹתַן בְּשִׂמְאָלוֹ

Ps. VI 10 —	ה' תִּפְלִיתִי יִקַּח
Targ. —	ה' צְלוֹתִי יִקְבֵּל
Jewish liturgy —	וְקַבֵּל בְּרַחֲמִים ... אֶת תְּפִלָּתֵנוּ

Within BH see:

Esr. VIII 30 —	
	וְקַבְּלוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים ... מִשְׁקַל הַכֶּסֶף וְהַזָּהָב ... לְהַבִּיא לִירוּשָׁלַם וּלְבֵית אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Num. XXXI 54 —	וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה וְאַלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת הַזָּהָב ... וַיַּבְאוּ אֹתוֹ אֶל אֱהֱל מוֹעֵד
----------------	--

II Ch. XXIX 22 —	
	וַיִּקְבְּלוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת הַדָּם וַיִּזְרְקוּ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

Ex. XXIV 6 —	
	וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה חֲצִי הַדָּם ... וְחֲצִי הַדָּם זָרַק עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

<sup>17</sup> Cf. E.Y. KUTSCHER, *Leshonenu* XXX, 1965-6, pp. 21-23 [in Hebrew]; A. BENDAVID, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, Tel Aviv 1967, index [in Hebrew].

<sup>18</sup> לִקְבֹּל is a common expression in MH. Cf., for instance, M. Yoma III 4;

Est. IV 4 —

ותשלח בגדים להלביש את מרדכי... ולא קבל

Gen. XXXIII 10-11 —

אם נא מצאתי הן... ולקחת מנחתי... ויקח

[But Ork. —

].אם כען אשנחית רחמין... ותקביל תיקרובתי... וקביל

Compare also לקבל ברכה in 11Q Ps<sup>a</sup> Zion,<sup>19</sup> whereas classical BH employs instead לקחת/לשאה ברכה:

11Q Ps<sup>a</sup> Zion. 13 —

צדק עולמים... וברכות נכבדים תקבלי

Ps XXIV 5 —

ישא ברכה

[ But the Targ. —

! יקבל ברכתא ]

Gen. XXVII 35 —

בא אחיך במרמה ויקח ברכתך

Onk. —

על אחוך בחוכמא וקביל ברכתך

Num. XXIII 20 —

הנה ברך לקחתי

Onk. —

הא בירכן קבילית<sup>20</sup>

It seems, therefore, that the usage of לקבל in BH<sup>21</sup> is indeed

Me'ila I 1; Zeb. III 1. It is being discussed, among other technical idioms, in "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code (a Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology)", RB LXXXI, 1974, pp. 52-83.

<sup>19</sup> R. POLZIN, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 11), p. 474.

<sup>20</sup> Many instances for the equations קבל = שמע, קבל = נשא, קבל = לקח may be found in CH. J. KASOWSKI, *Thesaurus Aquilae Versionis* I, Jerusalem 1940, s.v. קבל. It should be emphasized that only after קבל found its way into literary/written Hebrew, a clear differentiation in use was developed between קבל on the one hand, and קח, נשא, שמע on the other. This was not the case with classical/pre-exilic Hebrew; since in that period various connotations of the yet-not-known קבל are being expressed, as mentioned above, by קח, נשא, שמע. For a parallel development compare נכנס/בא in MH, which employs both roots, there is a clear distinction between בא (meaning "come, arrive") and נכנס (meaning "enter"). However, in BH — which is unaware yet of the post-biblical נכנס — the meaning "enter" may be conveyed by בא (Jos. VI 1; Cf. E. Y. KUTSCHER, *Words and their History*, Jerusalem 1961, p. 76 [in Hebrew]).

<sup>21</sup> "Though W.F. ALBRIGHT believes he has discovered the root in a *Canaanite* Gloss in the Tel-el-Amarna Letters... the exclusively late usage of the verb makes it a late word in *Hebrew*" — GORDIS, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 6), p. 345, n. 32 (italics are mine — A.H.). Against the uncritical identification — prevailing in certain circles — of Hebrew = Ugaritic = Amarna Glosses = Phoenician, see A.F. RAINY's most important remarks in *Leshonenu* XXX, 1965-66, p. 253 [in Hebrew]. This point was emphasized, as a matter of fact, by ALBRIGHT as well. Cf. his "A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter", JCS II, 1948, p. 240, footnote: "research on each dialect must take constant stock of pertinent phenomena in all the other dialects, without reading interpretations valid for one dialect into another unless these interpretations fit the facts of the case in question". [due weight is not given to

late.<sup>22</sup> Consequently its employment in Job II 10 should be considered late.

Job XLII 8:

להתפלל על

In standard BH the meaning of "to intercede, to pray for [the sake of] somebody" is expressed by means of התפלל בעד (about fifteen times). Cf., for instance, Gen. XX 7 (השב אשת האיש כי... קבצו את כל ישראל... or 1 Sam VII 5 (נביא הוא ויתפלל בעדך) (ואתפלל בעדכם אל ה'). Once this meaning is conveyed through התפלל על (1 Sam. II 25), but never does one find, in the earlier sections of the Bible, the combination התפלל על with the meaning "intercede".<sup>23</sup> התפלל על = "intercede" occurs in the Bible — outside Job — only in Nehemiah and Chronicles:

Neh. I 6 —

אנכי מתפלל לפניך היום... על בני ישראל

2 Ch XXX 18 —

כי התפלל יחזקיהו עליהם

התפלל על is, further, used for "intercede" in post-biblical literature. Cf.

M. Ber. V 5

אמרו עליו... שהיה מתפלל על החולין

Mech. Bo' (Ex. XII 32)

<sup>24</sup> התפללו עלי כדי שתכלה ממני הפורענות

It seems, therefore, that the appearance of התפלל על "intercede" in Job XLII 8 reflects late Hebrew phrasaeology.<sup>25</sup>

this linguistic point in K.A. KITCHEN, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, London 1966, p. 145. However, as far as the *book* of Proverbs is concerned, K. is undoubtedly right in insisting, that the occurrence there of קבל cannot be taken as evidence for the lateness of the book. Cf. our remarks in IEJ 18, 1968, p. 236].

<sup>22</sup> BDB, p. 867 s.v.

<sup>23</sup> Sam. I 10 (ה' על ה' להתפלל על ה' means, of course, "to pray to God" (and not "to intercede for God"). Ps. XXXII 6; 2 Ch. XXXII 20 להתפלל על זאת again do not belong here, since they involve "something" and not "somebody".

<sup>24</sup> Note that the preposition על is also used in the Aramaic equivalent על עלי which renders, in the Targumim, the Biblical בעד בעד. Cf., for instance,

Gen XX 7

השב אשת האיש... ויתפלל בעדך

Targ. Onk.

אתיב איתת גבר... ויגדלי עלך

Syr.

אהפך אנתת גברא... וינלא עליך

(Gen. Apocr. XX 23

ווישלח אנתתה מנה... וינלא עליה

התפלל על may be considered, consequently, as a further illustration of late Aramaic "calque" in Hebrew. Cf. E.Y. KUTSCHER, "Aramaic Calque in Hebrew", Tarbiz XXXIII, 1963-64, pp. 118-130 [in Hebrew].

<sup>25</sup> The fact that in XLII 10 use is made of the normal התפלל בעד seems to indicate that the author — unwilling to repeat himself — deliberately modified his wording.

Classical BH makes intense use of the expressions ויהי אחרי כן, (1) אחרי (י) כן, ויהי אחרי (י) הדברים האלה, אחר הדברים האלה. This is true of Genesis as well, a book whose language constitutes our only means for determining what biblical "Patriarchal colouring" should look like. In connection with summing up of years of primeval generations, another formula — אחרי הולך — is repeatedly employed. Job's Epilogue, however, does not adopt any of these:

Job XLII 16 —

מאה וארבעים שנה  
as against

Gen V 7 —

ויהי שם אחרי הולדו את אנוש שבע... ושמנה מאות שנה

Josh. X 26 —

ויכם יהושע אחרי כן וימיתם

Gen. XXIII 19 —

Gen. XV 1 — ויבא אחרי הדברים האלה היה דבר ה' אל אברהם etc.

A glance at the concordance reveals, that the peculiar זאת אחרי — as well as אחר זה and אחרי כל זאת — is entirely missing not only from the book of Genesis, but from classical Biblical prose as a whole.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, זאת, אחר (כל) and אחרי דנה and באחר דנה — which are duplicated in Dan. II 29,45; VII 6,7 — appear in BH solely in Ezra (IX 10) and 2 Chr. (XXI 18; XXXII 9; XXXV 20). See, for instance,

2 Ch. XXXII 9 —

שלח סנהריב... ירושלימה  
as against

Gen. XV 1 —

Gen. XL 1 — ויהי אחר הדברים האלה חמאו משקה מלך מצרים...

The relevant point for discussion is that such interchanging, between על התפלל and התפלל בער, could not arise before the idiom על התפלל was coined. It is only in the late period — when the התפלל על — that a biblical writer was able to play with the two synonymous idioms (for a parallel phenomenon cf. Eccl. III 1, where עת and זמן are used synonymously. This interchangeability however, is inconceivable in pre-exilic Hebrew, before the penetration of the late, obviously Persian, into BH.).

<sup>28</sup> In Job III 1 this idiom was indeed employed: ואחרי כן פתח איוב את פיהו. Cf. *Supra*, n. 25.

<sup>27</sup> 1 Kings XIII 33 אחר הדבר היה being close, but not identical, to them.

We have, therefore, to define זאת אחרי (כל) and אחר זה as "late",<sup>28</sup> and to regard the occurrence of זאת אחרי in Job XLII 16 as an imprint of LBH.<sup>29</sup>

Job I 6; II 1:

להתיצב על

להתיצב = "present oneself before", "take one's stand on the side of" is accompanied in Ex. VIII 16; IX 13 by לפני. This is also the preposition used in Josh. XXIV 1, 1 Sam. X 19 (and Prov. XXII 29), where an "implication of readiness for service" is involved.<sup>30</sup> Outside Job it is only in 2 Chr. XI and Zech. VI that התיצב, carrying the above mentioned meanings, is being followed by על. Compare

2 Ch. XI 13 —

והכהנים... אשר בכל ישראל התיצבו עליו מכל גבולם  
against

Josh. XXIV 1 —

ויואסף יהושע את כל... ישראל... ויתיצבו לפני האלהים

Zech. VI 5 —

רחות השמים יוצאות מהתיצב על ארון כל הארץ  
against1 Sam. X 19 — ועתה התיצבו לפני ה' לשבטיכם.<sup>31</sup>

The only instances attested, in early biblical literature, for על following the root יצב/יצב, are in the Niph'al — not the Hithpa'el — conjugation. יצב על, meaning "Stand by (lit. *over*...) esp. of persons standing *about* a superior, as servants or courtiers... of persons surrounding a judge... of ה' heavenly ministers",<sup>32</sup> is indeed characteristic of classical BH, as manifested in the book of Genesis and other pre-exilic compositions.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>28</sup> BDB, pp. 29; 30; 260.

<sup>29</sup> Most recently N.H. SNAITH has drawn attention to this fact (*The book of Job, its Origin and Purpose*, London 1968, p. 5, n. 6).

<sup>30</sup> The definitions are taken from BDB, s.v. יצב, p. 426.

<sup>31</sup> Numbers XXIII 3 (15) על עילת (זה) התיצב; Hab II 1 מצור על מוצר; Ps. XXXVI 5 יצב על דרך לא טוב are all cases of "loc. על" — not "pers. על" — and therefore are irrelevant to our discussion.

<sup>32</sup> BDB, s.v. על 6c, p. 756.

<sup>33</sup> Cf., for instance Gen. XVIII 2 אנשים נצבים עליו; Gen. XLV 1 שלשה אנשים נצבים על עמד על. ולא יכר יוסף להתאפק לכל הנצבים עליו (BDB., *op. cit.*). Cf., for instance, Gen. XVIII 8 עליו; Jud. III 19 ויהוא עמד עליהם; 13-14 ויצאו... כל העבדים עליו. Both roots are found in parallelism in Ex. XVIII 13-14

<sup>39</sup> Cf., for instance, H. GRAETZ, "Verwechselung der Partikeln ך with ך... und

- (2) its existence in MH and Neh., and its total absence from standard BH, where classical עוֹד is used instead, further indicates the lateness of the phenomenon under investigation. Consequently the penetration of the non-classical עַד + pres. part. into the Prose Tale of Job is to be considered an imprint of post-classical Hebrew.

Job I 1:

אִישׁ הָיָה ... (ו) שְׁמוֹ

The opening formula וַיְהִי אִישׁ ... וְשְׁמוֹ — either commencing a new book or a new scene — serves in pre-exilic narratives as a classical introduction for presenting the person (אִישׁ) around whom the story is going to be centered. Cf.

Jud. XIII 2 —	וְשְׁמוֹ מְנוּחָה	וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד מִצְרַעָה ...
Jud. XVII 1 —	וְשְׁמוֹ מִכְיָהוּ	מֵהָר אֶפְרַיִם
1 Sam I 1 —	וְשְׁמוֹ אֶלְקָנָה	וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד מִן הָרִמְתִּיִּים ...
1 Sam IX 1 —	וְשְׁמוֹ קִישׁ	מִבְנֵימִן

In contradistinction to the above, a quite different formula is employed in Esther II 5, where (a) the order of the words is reversed; (b) the Waw consecutive form is discarded and replaced by the regular past form הָיָה:

Est. II 5 — אִישׁ יְהוּדִי הָיָה בְּשׁוֹשֵׁן הַבֵּיטָה וְשְׁמוֹ מְרְדֳּכָי.

It was correctly noted, that the preference for this new expression in Esther is but one of a whole series of linguistic neologisms, "indicating the forthcoming Mishnaic Hebrew".<sup>40</sup> As is well known, the complicated system of the consecutive tenses has been completely discarded in MH.<sup>41</sup> This revolutionary development affected the whole grammatical and syntactical structure of the Hebrew language, and its traces are to be found in LBH and Qumran Hebrew as well.<sup>42</sup> Thus, the emergence of the new open-

<sup>40</sup> mit עוֹד "MGWJ XXX, 1881, pp. 233-5. GRAETZ, failing to take into consideration Aram. and MH, concluded that עַד = "While", 'ist grundfalsch' and, as a result, "corrected" the pertinent biblical examples of עַד into עוֹד.

<sup>41</sup> A. BENDAVID, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 17), pp. 61-62.

<sup>42</sup> M.H. SEGAL, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, Oxford 1927 [1958], § 104, p. 54.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. A. KROPAT, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, Giessen 1909 [= BZAW XVI], p. 22; E.Y. KUTSCHER, *The Language ... of the Isaiah Scroll*, Jerusalem 1959, p. 269 [in Hebrew].

ing אִישׁ הָיָה in Est II 5, which approaches the prevalent opening ... חַד בְּאַנֶשׁ קָם/אֹזֵל/הוּהָ מֵהָלֶךְ etc. recorded in the Palestinian Talmud, is a by-product of that comprehensive process.<sup>43</sup> The lack of mastery of LBH writers in the use of the out-dated וַיְהִי is further manifested by a great many of temporal sentences, which in post-exilic literature significantly omit the prefixed וַיְהִי prevalent in classical BH. Thus, for instance,

2 Kings XXII 3 —

וַיְהִי בְּשִׁמְנֵה עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לְמֶלֶךְ ... שְׁלֹחַ

against

2 Ch. XXXIV 8 —

וּבְשִׁנַּת שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה לְמַלְכוֹ ... שְׁלֹחַ

1 Kings VIII 54 —

וַיְהִי כְּכֹלֹת שְׁלֹמֹה לְהִתְפַּלֵּל ...

against

2 Ch. VII 1 —

וּכְכֹלֹת שְׁלֹמֹה לְהִתְפַּלֵּל ...

The אִישׁ הָיָה ... (ו) שְׁמוֹ formula is found in the Bible, beside Esther, only at the beginning of Job:

Job I 1 אִישׁ הָיָה בְּאֶרֶץ עֵיזָן אִיּוֹב שְׁמוֹ

Here the lack of וַיְהִי has often been interpreted as being due to the tendency of וַיְהִי to denote continuity of happenings (cf. Josh I 1; Jud I 1; 1 Sam I 1; 2 Sam I 1) rather than completely new events. Since Job is not linked in contents to any of the preceding compositions, it was claimed that this is the reason why the author avoided וַיְהִי. The commentators further maintained that the Nathan Story in 2 Sam. XII 1 אַחַת בְּעֵינֵי אֶחָד proves the sequence of Job אִישׁ הָיָה to be classical.<sup>45</sup> However, these explanations miss the basic points of the issue: (I) it is not an isolated וַיְהִי/הָיָה and its position in the sentence that needs clarification, but rather a certain fixed and stereotyped formula which consists of three elements: אִישׁ + הָיָה

<sup>43</sup> The disuse of biblical וַיְהִי also underlies the other types of opening, current in the Tosephta and Bab. Talmud (BENDAVID, *op. cit.* [*Supra*, n. 17], pp. 210-211): (וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד ... מַעֲשֵׂה בְּאָדָם אֶחָד שׁ ... מַעֲשֵׂה בְּאָדָם שׁ ...)

<sup>44</sup> Cf. S.R. DRIVER, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 1), pp. 538 (n. 37), 506 (n. 12); *idem*, *Notes on ... the Books of Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1913[1960], p. 148. Cf. also KROPAT, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 42), pp. 22-23.

<sup>45</sup> Cf., for instance, DRIVER-GRAY, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 9), Part II, p. 1.

+ אִישׁ; <sup>46</sup> (II) The classical pattern of this formulaic introduction, as manifested in pre-exilic literature, is וַיְהִי אִישׁ . . . וַשְּׁמוֹ; (III) The non-classical construction אִישׁ הָיָה . . . (ו) שְׁמוֹ — which is in accord with linguistic developments characteristic of post-exilic Hebrew — is found, outside Job, only in the late book of Esther. It would thus appear, that Est. II 5 and Job I 1 — both avoiding the formalized opening וַיְהִי in their peculiar formulation of the classical model וַיְהִי אִישׁ . . . וַשְּׁמוֹ — reflect the same linguistic background; that of LBH.

### III

The story of Job may well have been known among the Israelites long before the sixth century B.C.E., as suggested particularly in the light of the ancient Near Eastern records: <sup>47</sup> the "Babylonian Job" (*Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*) provides us with a parallel to the *story* of Job, while other sources attest to the antiquity of the *name* of Job among the West Semites throughout the second Millennium B.C.E. — from the Egyptian Execration Texts ('ybm), via the Alalakh Letters (A-ia-bu/i) to the Amarna Tablets (A-ia-ab).<sup>48</sup> That the figure of Job was indeed considered by the Israelites as belonging to primeval times is clear from biblical sources as well. In Ez. XIV 14 Job is mentioned in one breath with נֹחַ and דָּנִיֵּאל,<sup>49</sup> two non-Israelite heroes, the far off adventures of whom are well-known to us from the Mesopotamian literature (*Ut Napishtim* the hero of the flood story) and the Ugaritic epos (*Dan'il* the righteous judge). Needless to say, such an exegesis

<sup>46</sup> Besides, as far as וַיְהִי itself is concerned, it had lost its contextual connotation already in biblical times. The optional choice of וַיְהִי by a LBH writer is particularly instructive in the case of Esther: on the one hand, the book opens in I 1 with וַיְהִי, although Esther has nothing to do in contents with any of the books it follows; on the other hand, the book of Esther avoids וַיְהִי in II 5 though we are right in the middle of the plot. The conclusion seems inevitable: the use or disuse of the introductory וַיְהִי is not necessarily indicative of the text's narrative relationship with the surrounding compositions.

<sup>47</sup> Cf., for instance, M. POPE, *Job* [= Anchor Bible], 1965, p. XXXV.

<sup>48</sup> W.F. ALBRIGHT, *JAOS* LXXIV, 1954, pp. 225-226; B. MAISLER, *Tarbiz* XIII, 1941-2, p. 72. Probably *Hayabum* of the Mari Letters reflect the same name; Cf., ALBRIGHT, *op. cit.* and H.B. HUFFMON, *Amorite Personal Names* . . . , Baltimore 1965, pp. 103; 161.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. S. SPIEGEL, "Noah, Danel and Job", *L. Ginzberg Jubilee Volume*, English section, New York 1945, pp. 305-355.

finds support in the "Patriarchal colouring" which characterizes the prose framework of Job. This is noticeable, *inter alia*, in idioms and phrasaeology encountered elsewhere, in biblical literature, only in connection with personalities mentioned in the Pentateuch.<sup>50</sup> Sarna's conclusion, that an "epic substratum" is preserved in the Prose Tale of Job, also relies on the occurrence of idioms which are ascribed to a language of remote antiquity.<sup>51</sup>

However, all this does not imply that the prose narrative, in its extant version, is necessarily old.<sup>52</sup> As was emphasised long ago, "it is a mistake to infer the age of the *writer* from the circumstances of the *hero* of the book." We have to consider the possibility, that it may be only the writer who "intends us to think of Job as living" in the Patriarchal age.<sup>53</sup> That is to say, we may actually be dealing not with an archaic but rather with an archaizing language. Another possible explanation of the existence of old linguistic elements could be, of course, that (some of) the material in the Prose Tale is indeed old, its final form being shaped, however, in a late period.<sup>54</sup> Be that as it may, we ought not to be misled by these seeming archaisms. This is true

<sup>50</sup> זָקֵן וְשֹׁכֵן יָמִים, עַבְדָּה רַבָּה, קְשִׁיטָה (See the commentaries)

<sup>51</sup> SARNA, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 5). The interpretation which links Job with the background of the Pentateuch was already adopted — and further developed — in Rabbinic Literature, in the early Bible Translations and in the Apocryphal Literature: in Bab. Baba Bathra 14<sup>b</sup> we find the view that "Moses wrote his own book and the portion of Balaam [Num. XXII-XXIV] and Job" (though other Rabbis assume that "Job was among those who returned from the [Babylonian] Exile" or "in the time of Ahasuerus [*ibid.*, 15'; 15<sup>b</sup>1]); In a certain tradition of the Peshitta the book of Job immediately follows the Pentateuch; the addition appended to the Septuagint of Job identifies אִיּוֹב with יֹבָב King of Edom, mentioned in Gen. XXXVI 33, and so does the apocryphal composition "The Testament of Job". This composition even claims that Job was married to Dina, Jacob's daughter (as do the Aramaic Targum to Job II 9 and other Rabbinic sources).

<sup>52</sup> This is also SARNA's own view (orally).

<sup>53</sup> S.R. DRIVER — G.R. GRAY, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 9) p. LXVI. See also GORDIS, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 6), p. 164.

<sup>54</sup> Note that for our discussion it is irrelevant to decide whether the author "ein schriftlich niedergelegtes Volksbuch vorgefunden hat" or "er eine mündlich überlieferte, obwohl schon in ziemlich feste Form gebrachte Volkserzählung übernahm oder verwertete"; Whether "er die Erzählung umgearbeitet, redigiert oder frei gestaltet hat" or "sie ihm nur als äusserer Anknüpfungspunkt für sein Gedicht gedient oder ihn dazu inspiriert hat"; whether or not "die Rahmenerzählung nicht vom Dichter selbst mit seinem eigenen Werk verbunden, sondern erst später zu diesem hinzugefügt worden sein" (these being the alternative explanations usually suggested while analysing the book of Job: G. FOHRER, "Zur Vorgeschichte und Komposition des Buches Hiob", *VT* VI, 1956, pp. 250-1; Cf. also H.H. ROWLEY, "The Book of Job and its Meaning", *BJRL* XLI, 1958-9, p. 177).



particularly at present, when the current tendency to push back the date of biblical compositions is rather exaggerated, resulting occasionally in uncritical consequences.

The conclusion seems therefore inevitable, that we are unable to infer from *old* idioms and phrases, embodied in a given text, definite conclusions as to the date of its author.<sup>55</sup> However, the situation is different when we treat *late* linguistic elements. Such elements do betray their actual background; and if they are not few or sporadic — in which case their occurrence may be regarded as purely incidental — they effectively date a given text.<sup>56</sup> It is, therefore, the existence of possible late elements which has to be considered in the first place, while discussing the age of the prose narrative of *the biblical book of Job as we have it*.

Above, it has been our purpose to show that the examples discussed are not merely deviations from the accepted standards of classical BH. Neither are they problematic Aramaisms, whose date is often undetermined. These deviations from standard BH are duplicated in late Hebrew phrasaeology, both in biblical and non-biblical sources. Their wide usage in the late sources — as well as their complete absence, in similar contexts, from early biblical writings — is undeniable. Owing to the existence of a considerable number of such elements in the Prose Tale, there seems to be no justification either for ignoring them altogether<sup>57</sup> or for claiming that their concentration in Job I–II; XLII 7–17 is a mere matter of chance. As far as can be judged from the linguistic data at our disposal, these *non*-classical idioms ought to be explained as *post*-classical — namely, as imprints of late He-

<sup>55</sup> Cf., for instance, S. MOWINCKEL, "Zur Sprache der biblischen Psalmen", *ThL* LXXXI, 1956, p. 201: "das Vorhandensein von an sich alten . . . Vorstellungen und Wendungen in einem Gedicht nichts über die chronologische Ansetzung desselben beweist".

<sup>56</sup> Cf. A. HURVITZ, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 4), p. 231. Some of the linguistic peculiarities discussed above involve the substitution of prepositions, and not of words or roots. It must be emphasized that it is often the selection of prepositions which indicates mastery of a language and, therefore, deviations from classical usage in this regard should be given due consideration.

<sup>57</sup> "Apart from the reference to the Satan, there is scant ground for dating the Prologue-Epilogue in the Post-exilic period" — M. POPE, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 47), p. XXXV.

brew — thus making the final shaping of the extant Prose Tale incompatible with a date prior to the Exile.

This suggestion is, of course, not new. In fact, the book of Job as a whole "is by most held to be post-exilic".<sup>58</sup> However, as far as Job's Prose Tale is concerned, it is not *in spite of*,<sup>59</sup> but rather *because of*, its language that we consider it to be an exilic/post-exilic product.

## APPENDIX

Some other peculiar expressions employed in the Prose Tale, though being definitely non-classical, were not included in the main discussion above since they do not seem to exist in post-exilic Hebrew. Two of these will be mentioned here:

I. A common mourning practice in antiquity was the placing of dust (עפר) upon the head. This practice is described in detail in Josh VII 6, Ez. XXVII 30, Lam. II 10 and Job II 12. However, it is only in Job that the root זרק = "throw" is employed in such a context: "the rite of putting dust on the head is nowhere else expressed by this vb.; the usual phrase is . . . העלה" (DRIVER-GRAY, *op. cit.* [*supra*, n. 9], Part II, p. 15. In 2 Sam XIII 19 (אפר) לקח is employed. Cf. also Ugaritic (עפר . . . לכדקדה) — יצק — Text 67VI, 14–16 [C.H. GORDON, *UT*, p. 180]). To this excellent observation it may be added, that in the Aramaic translations the parallel Aramaic (and Syriac) expression is ארמי עפרא (Aram. רמה = Heb. זרק). Cf. the Syriac to Josh. VII 6, Ez. XXVII 30 and Lam. II 10 mentioned above as well as to Neh. IX 1 (though, curiously enough, not in the case of Job II 12). Compare also the Hebrew text of 2 Sam XV 32 ונדמה על ראשו, where the verb "put" is only implied, with the syriac and Targ. Jon., where it is explicitly expressed by means of רמה: (י)ה ונפרא רמא/י בר(י)ש (Cf. also Targ. Jon. to 1 Sam IV 12, 2 Sam I 2 and Syriac to 2 Sam XIII 19). We suggest, therefore, to regard the non-classical עפר זרק as a further "calque" (Cf. *Supra*, n. 24), resulting from the Aram. expression ארמי עפרא. Whether or not the writer of Job's Prose Tale was influenced by Ex. IX 8; 10 — which supplies the only biblical parallel for השמימה . . . זרק used in Job II 12 (DRIVER-GRAY, *ibid.*) — the basic argument is not affected. In creating the unique expression עפר זרק, the author of the

<sup>58</sup> H.H. ROWLEY, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 54), p. 197.

<sup>59</sup> R. GORDIS, *op. cit.* (*Supra*, n. 6), p. 163.

Prose Tale did two things: (1) he sharply deviated from the phraseology prevalent in BH (with which, allegedly, he was thoroughly familiar and which, certainly, he was eager to follow); (2) he strikingly approached the phrasaeology prevalent in Aramaic.

II. In Job XLII 8 the punishment imposed by God on Job's friends is strangely referred to in terms of עֲשָׂה נְבִלָה — an idiom common in classical BH, but invariably with a strong negative connotation ("do a thing disgraceful according to Israel's standard" — BDB, p. 615. This is, probably, why the Septuagint takes עֲשָׂה נְבִלָה in Job as (עֲשָׂה בִלָּה). The best explanation to reckon with the anomalous meaning implied by Job XLII 8 seems to be supplied by Aram. קלנא: קלנא — which indeed renders in the Aram. Targumim BH נְבִלָה — means both "disgrace" (= BH נְבִלָה) and "shame" (= BH קלון). Thus Job XLII 8 ... עֲשָׂה נְבִלָה עִם, being influenced by Aram. קלנא (Cf. *Supra*, n. 24), means "to do shame to" (Cf. Gen. XXVI 29 ... עֲשָׂה רָעָה עִם = ... עֲשָׂה רָעָה ל' = "to do hurt to").

If we are right in our interpretation of עֲשָׂה נְבִלָה and זֶרֶק עֵפֶר, then the author of the Prose Tale may be denounced for his loss of "Sprachgefühl" for genuine classical BH — which is rather surprising for a pre-exilic writer. However, in order to advance the argumentation that these two Aramaisms are in fact *post*-classical — not just *non*-classical — elements in BH, it would be desirable to follow one of two procedures:

1) To adduce parallels for the Aramaisms under investigation from late Hebrew sources (which we were unable to reveal);

2) To evaluate these Aramaisms only after the lateness of the Prose Tale has been established on grounds other than זֶרֶק עֵפֶר and עֲשָׂה נְבִלָה (for instance, relying on the analysis carried out above, on pages 19-30). Only after it has been agreed that the Prose Tale is written in LBH, may, perhaps, these two Aramaisms be regarded as late. ("The Chronological Significance of 'Aramaisms' in Biblical Hebrew," IEJ 18, 1968, pp. 234-403).

## CONFLICTING VERSIONS OF VALENTINIAN ESCHATOLOGY: IRENÆUS' TREATISE VS. THE EXCERPTS FROM THEODOTUS \*

ELAINE H. PAGELS

BARNARD COLLEGE  
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10027

For more than a hundred years the *Excerpts from Theodotus* (especially 42-65) and Irenæus' *Treatise* have served as primary sources of Valentinian eschatology.<sup>1</sup> Since Dibelius' article appeared in 1908, discussion of Valentinian eschatology has followed his premise that these two sources contain essentially the same teaching, and may be derived from a common source.<sup>2</sup> Dibelius makes this claim on the basis of observable parallels of terminology and structure between the two passages.

Yet Dibelius (and those who have accepted his premise) has failed to observe that in his major description of Valentinian eschatology — AH 1.7.1 — Irenæus not only selectively *omits* essential points of Valentinian doctrine that are included in Theodotus' account (and even in other passages of his own treatise) but he also *revises* crucial terms and concepts so that — in effect — he changes the whole theological conception. Critical examination of AH 1.7.1 in comparison with both the *Excerpts* and other passages of Irenæus' account (including those directly preceding and following 1.7.1) indicate that Irenæus offers in this passage a highly polemical version of Valentinian eschatology. Specifically, comparative analysis with other sources indicates that in 1.7.1:

1. Irenæus describes the relation of the elect to the rest of mankind

\* The writer gratefully acknowledges conversations with Dean Cyril Richardson of Union Theological Seminary.

<sup>1</sup> G. HENRICI, *Die Valentiniansche Gnosis und die heilige Schrift* (Berlin, 1871), 92; C. BARTH, *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis* (TU 37.3, 1911), 11f.; R. P. CASEY, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria* (London, 1934), 22-28; F. SAGNARD, *La Gnose Valentinienne et le Témoignage de Saint Irénée* (Paris, 1947), 526-37.

<sup>2</sup> O. DIBELIUS, *Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianer: Die Excerpta ex Theodoto und Irenäus* (ZNW, 1908), 230.