

JOB THE PATIENT AND JOB THE IMPATIENT

BY

H. L. GINSBERG

New York

It is a matter of common knowledge that the prophet Ezekiel (Ezek. xiv 14, 20) names Noah, Daniel, and Job as classical types of piety, and that whereas what is told about a person by the name of Job in Job i-ii; xlii 7-17 is very much the sort of thing one would expect to read about a classical saint most of what is told about him in the rest of the Book of Job is not exactly what we should expect to read about a paragon of saintliness. The particular virtue of the hero of the framework of the Book of Job is unflinching loyalty to God under unimaginably severe trials or, in the phrase which the King James Version of the Epistle of James v 11 has made a household word wherever English is spoken, "the patience of Job". Building on this phrase we may say that there are two main strata in the Book of Job: the Book of Job the Patient, or JP; and the Book of Job the Impatient, or JIP.

JOB THE PATIENT (JP)

As regards JP, there is general agreement about its nature and import and disagreement only about its extent. In the case of JIP, on the other hand, there is even more disagreement on its interpretation than on its delimitation. In all these controversies, I find myself in opposition to the two full length commentaries on the Book of Job to which Bible scholarship gave birth in the middle sixties of the current century¹). But whereas I shall have relatively little to say that is original on the JP controversy, my position here being essentially the neglected view of a predecessor, in the case of JIP I shall—though again leaning heavily on a predecessor—exercise more selectivity and make what I trust will be judged rather important contributions of my own.

On the extent of JP, we may distinguish a minimalist, a medialis-

and a maximalist view. Thus SPIEGEL¹) limits it to i 1—ii 10; xlii 10-17; for he believes that the three special friends were invented by the author of JIP and that xlii 7-9 never meant anything other than what it is commonly understood to mean now, namely that Job's forthrightness is meritorious while the friends' orthodoxy is displeasing to God and requires expiation.

In the medialis view, which is that of the majority, all of i-ii and xlii 7b-17 pertains to JP (cf. the threefold 'abdi' 'iyyōb [plus an 'iyyōb 'abdi thrown in for good measure] in xlii 7b-8 with i 8; ii 3), and JP is assumed to have originally included utterances by the friends which were comparable to that of Job's wife in ii 9 as also a rejoinder or rejoinders by Job comparable to that which he addresses to his wife in ii 10. This view will impose itself on anybody who, though he can understand why a person who held the opinion which is now read into xlii 7b-9 would read it into xlii 7b-9 if the latter were already in existence, finds it most improbable that such a person would himself have composed xlii 7b-9. (After all, Eliphaz & Co. had, in JIP, only misguidedly defended God; they had not spoken of him in an offensive manner.) As a matter of fact, even the assumption that the author(s) of JIP harbored the said opinion is gratuitous; it is not at all the view of JIP that its hero spoke properly of God, or we should not have Job confessing at each of the two conclusions of JIP that he has spoken *improperly* of, or to, God. The passage xl 3-5, which is commonly believed to be the original conclusion, reads as follows:

- 3 Job answered YHWH and said:
- 4 Behold, I am worthless—
what can I say in reply?
I put my hand to my mouth.
- 5 I spoke once—I shall not a second time
twice—but I shall not again.

In the second conclusion, xlii 1-6, vss. 3a and 4 are the misplaced opening of YHWH's second speech, which has been ousted by xl 7, a fragment of YHWH's first speech (xxxviii 2-3). What remains of xlii 1-6 after 3a and 4 have been returned to their rightful place reads as follows:

- 1 Job answered YHWH and said:
- 2 I realize that you can do anything
and no purpose is beyond your power.

¹) G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Hiob (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Band XVI)*, 1963, pp. 568; M. H. POPE, *Job (The Anchor Bible)*, 1965, pp. LXXII/295.

¹) S. SPIEGEL, *Louis Ginsberg Jubilee Volume*, 1945, *English Section*, pp. 323-336.

- 3b Truly, I declared what I had not seen,
- c hidden things beyond my ken.
- 5 I had heard of you only by hearsay,
- only now has my own eye beheld you.
- 6 Therefore am I contrite and penitent,
- humble in the dust.

Wherein the Job of JIP was, in the view of JIP, wrong, we shall endeavor to ascertain in connection with JIP; the point we are making here is simply that the enthusiasm for Job that we find in xlii 7b-9 is not JIP's but JP's. To be sure, it is claimed that the view of xlii 7b-9 which we oppose as "read into" it is implied by xiii 7-11, in which case it would be at least reasonable to assume that JIP meant us to read it into xlii 7b-9; but we shall see further on, in our interpretation of xiii 1 ff. (p. 98, especially n.ē.), that the sense of xiii 7-11 is not precisely what it is usually supposed to be, and that this passage consequently does *not* hint that the book is going to end with a rebuke by God to Eliphaz & Co. for partiality in God's behalf.

Surely all the foregoing considerations against the attribution of xlii 7-9 to JIP ¹⁾ outweigh the only serious objection to its attribution to JP, namely, that if anybody was rebuked for suggesting that Job owed no more loyalty to God such a rebuke was merited by Job's wife, who definitely made such a suggestion (ii 9), at least as much as by the friends, who are only assumed to have made it in a lost section of JP (for whose former existence, however, we shall presently cite impressive additional evidence). And this objection is not even as serious as it looks at first sight. After all, poor Mrs. Job was only one person, and a woman, and not even a sufficiently important one for her name to be recorded (contrast the three Junos of xlii 14-15). She timidly ventured only six Hebrew words (ii 9b-c), and Job did not feel constrained to reply with more than fourteen (ii 10b-d). Since she evidently knew her place, and did not repeat her idea after that either to Job or to others (she may have been convinced by him, and what weight would her words carry with the public, anyway?), intervention by YHWH would have been superfluous. Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, on the other hand, were Job's peers, and might in any case be safely assumed to have spoken (mainly through their leader Eliphaz [cf. xlii 7b]?) a total of many

times six words. (In a moment we shall see that Job the Patient's reply to them has been recovered in recent years, and its length and strength indirectly reflect those of the—for us, lost—pronouncements which he was refuting.) There can be no question, therefore, but the medialist position is stronger than the minimalist.

Strongest of all, however, is the maximalist position, which was first enunciated by FINE ¹⁾. Without being aware of it, FINE had a predecessor in BUHL ²⁾, who had sensed thirty years earlier that most (why not all?) of xxvii 1-6 can only be fragments of a reply by the Job of chs. i-ii to friends who shared the naive *do ut des* philosophy of piety that is expressed by Job's wife in ii 9 (and who probably maintained that piety seldom did pay, if ever). FINE did better than BUHL because he went further: quite rightly, he interpreted the whole of xxvii-xxviii as such a sermon by Job the Patient. Thus the passage in which Job, as YHWH testifies in xlii 7-9, "spoke properly of me" is still extant; only the passage, or passage, in which Eliphaz and his two companions "did not speak properly of me" is now wanting.

Here, first of all, is a complete interpretation of ch. xxvii.

Chapter xxvii

- 1 Job made this further pronouncement:
(Summary: I'd be a fool to follow your [plural!] advice and give up godliness.)
- 2 Witness God who denies me redress,
Shaddai who has made me wretched!
- 3 So long as my breath is in me,
the lifebreath from God in my nostrils,
- 4 My lips shall never speak godlessness,
my tongue never utter impiety.
- 5 Far be it from me to declare you [plural!] right!
I will not give up my integrity ³⁾ till I die.
- 6 I hold fast to ⁴⁾ my righteousness and will not let go;
even my heart ⁵⁾ shall never blaspheme all my days.
- 7 I wish my foe the fate of the scoundrel;
my enemy, that of the rogue!

¹⁾ H. A. FINE, *JBL* 74 (1955): 28-32.

²⁾ F. BUHL, *Festschrift Karl Marti*, 1925, pp. 52 ff.

³⁾ Heb. *tummā*, as in ii 3, 9.

⁴⁾ Heb. *beḥēzīq b-*, again as in ii 3, 9.

⁵⁾ Let alone my lips and tongue, vs. 4; cf. Job the Patient's concern lest his children might have admitted blasphemous thoughts into *their hearts* when their consciences were drugged with wine (i 4).

¹⁾ xlii 7a is evidently one of two things: (1) a link forged by the author of JIP or by an editor to join JIP to JP; (2) a reference by JP to a lost section of JP in which God, as in Gen. xx 15-18, praised to his face the saint who had stood the test of true, disinterested piety and promised him his due reward. See p. 94 top.

- 8 For what can the godless one hope to attain
when he longingly turns to God? ¹⁾
9 Will God heed his cry
when distress befalls him?
10 Can he bespeak Shaddai's favor,
call unto God at all times?
11 I will set forth to you [plural!] what God has in store,
will not conceal what Shaddai has ready.—
12 Come, all of you have seen it yourselves,
so why do you prate such nonsense?—
13 This, then, is from God the rogue's portion,
the lot that the villain shall get from Shaddai:
14 If his children wax many, 'tis but for the sword;
his offspring shall not have their fill of bread.
15 His survivors shall be buried in pestilence, ²⁾
and their widows shall not bewail them.
16 Should he pile up silver like dust
and store up raiment like dirt—
17 what he stores up a good man shall wear,
to a pure man's lot fall his silver.
18 He has built his house like the spider's, ³⁾
like the hut that a watchman makes.
19 He shall go to bed rich, and be so no more ⁴⁾;
when he opens his eyes, it ⁵⁾ shall have vanished.
20 Destruction overtakes it by day, ⁶⁾
by night the whirlwind makes off with it;
21 a gale tears it loose
and drives it away from its site.
22 It abandons its owner ⁷⁾ without compassion,
it slips away from his hand.
23 His whole town hisses at him,
strikes its hands together at him. ⁸⁾

As for ch. xxviii, its verses are to be rearranged, after TUR-SINAI ⁹⁾,

¹⁾ For *yāl 'lwb* rd. *yā' 'l 'lwb*.

²⁾ I.e. shall not be buried; see Ir. xvi 4.

³⁾ Rd. *'akkēbī?*

⁴⁾ Rd. *yōsīp*.

⁵⁾ Refers to 'his house', vs. 18, which also means 'his property'.

⁶⁾ Rd. *yōmōm*.

⁷⁾ Rd. *b'ēlqū*.

⁸⁾ The two gestures are apotropaic. One executes them at the sight of ruin in order to ward off "infection" by it; see Lam. ii 15.

⁹⁾ N. H. TUR-SINAI (H. TORCZYNER), *The Book of Job, A New Commentary*, Jerusalem 1957, pp. 395 ff. TUR-SINAI attributes the chapter to Job, but to Job the Impatient. For he believes that ch. xxvii is also by Job the Impatient, who protests that God afflicted him although he *was* pious and *used to give* orthodox instruction—xxvii 7-xxviii 28—to his fellow men!

in the order 1-2, 5-6, 12-24, 7-8, 3-4, 9-11, 25-28 and interpreted in the main according to him, though sundry improvements could be suggested. The drift of the whole will then appear more clearly than ever to be: Wisdom is God's, and he has taught man that it is wise to be godly. In the climactic final verse אֲדֹנָי 'my Lord' is a strange way for God to refer to himself in, and is surely to be corrected to אֱלֹהִים, the appellation by which the speaker is introduced in v. 23. It is then hard to escape the conclusion that vs. 28 (look at it well!) intentionally alludes to the description of Job the Patient in i 1, 8; ii 3 and clearly hints that the smartest thing that a man can do is emulate Job the Patient!

I submit that the above detailed interpretation of ch. xxvii and the above summary interpretation of ch. xxviii are the only possible ones, and that they leave no doubt but xxviii is the continuation of xxvii and the two constitute between them the speech in which Job (the Patient) "spoke properly" about God (xlii 7b, 8b) in opposition to Eliphaz and his companions—the Eliphaz and companions of JP—who did not (*ibid.*). The author of JP is not as profound—or sophisticated, which is the same thing—as the author of JIP. The former believes that things never go so badly with the good man but they would go even worse with him if were bad, and he definitely leaves open the possibility, perhaps even the probability, that they will eventually go very well with him if he remains steadfast in his goodness. The author of JIP, on the other hand, recognizes that goodness may go completely unrewarded and badness completely unpunished, and that goodness must not expect either reward or explanation. As we shall see.

To recapitulate, then, the Book of Job the Patient (JP) is made up as follows:

(a) i 1-ii 8. Job's disinterested piety. Put to much crueler tests than Abraham (Gen. xxii), Job proves that he, like Abraham, *yōrē 'ēlōhīm hīnnōm* (see Jb i 9; cf. Gen. xxii 12), is pious unconditionally.

(b) ix 9-10. Job defends, against his wife, the view that men must remain devoted to God under all circumstances.

(c) ii 11-13. Arrival of Job's friends.

(d) *Now missing*: the urging of the friends that Job repudiate the God who has let him down so shabbily.

(e) Chs. xxvii-xxviii. Job's indignant reply to this blasphemous suggestion.

(f) *A second missing passage*, in which YHWH assured Job that

he would reward his steadfastness; cf. Gen. xxii 16. It is far more likely that Job xlii 7a is an integral part of JP and refers to such a revelation of approval and promise than that it was written either by an editor or—still less—by the author of JIP for the purpose of connecting JIP with xlii 7b ff. To a student with a taste for reading meanings out of texts rather than into them, the gist of xxxviii 1-xlii 6 is that YHWH considers Job's manner of talking about him highly *improper* and that Job himself ends by conceding that it was.

(g) xlii 7b-17. YHWH's rebuke to the friends for their aberration and his reward to Job for his constancy ¹⁾.

JOB THE IMPATIENT (JIP)

Whereas the exegesis of JP is relatively easy even in its most evolved form, that of JIP is exceedingly difficult. It is, or ought to be, obvious that here a great man has taken advantage of a chink in the armor of the orthodox doctrine of retribution in order to drive a wedge into it. Tradition itself admits that Job, for a time, suffered though blameless. It therefore occurred to our poet to make Job, at the nadir of his fortunes, a mouthpiece for a protest against the doctrine. To this end, he has switched the roles of Job and his friends: It is Job, the paragon of godliness, who now questions the doctrine of retribution, whereas his friends play the part of apologists for orthodoxy. But just what proposition does each side defend, and how does the argument proceed? To be convinced, in these matters, by the exegesis of the most recent commentaries requires a tremendous will to believe. Let me say it once that progress on these heads is impossible for anyone who bypasses Harry TORCZYNER-N. H. TUR-SINAI ²⁾—unless, indeed, he has the good fortune to make that scholar's basic observations independently. I would also observe that on many a passage the latter's first publication, the German one of 1920, is more brilliant and helpful than his final Hebrew commentary of 1952 and its English counterpart of 1957. If the proffered grain is mixed with chaff and straw chips, it must

¹⁾ The full story of which the foregoing is a summary exhibits certain inconcinnities which show that it is the end product of an evolution. Since, however, this study is primarily concerned with JIP, which was grafted onto the final form of JP, the prehistory of JP does not concern us. The interested reader is referred to A. ALT, *ZAW* 55 (1937): 265-8. S. SPIEGEL, op. cit. (above p. 89, n. 1).

²⁾ H. TORCZYNER, *Das Buch Hiob*, 1920 (= T-1); *ג. ה. טורקשינר ספר איוב*, 1941 (= T-2); *ספר איוב עם פירוש חדש*, Tel Aviv 1954 (= T-3); op. cit. above p. 92, n. 9 (= T-4).

nevertheless not be rejected out of hand but accepted and winnowed.

From these prolegomena we proceed to the observation that the thesis of the friends is easier to determine than that of Job. First of all, it is not difficult to determine the authority, or source of knowledge, on which the friends rely, and it can be shown that Job ridicules that authority. After that, we shall discover what authority Job invokes, and we shall show that it in turn is ridiculed by his opponents. The way will then have been cleared for noting what Job asserts in the name of his authority and the friends for their part deny, and what the friends assert in the name of their authority and Job on his part denies. All this will contribute to bringing the discussion into sharp focus.

A. The Friends' Source of Knowledge and Job's Rejection of It

The authority invoked by the friends may be defined as "hokmatic (sapiential) tradition", that which hakamim (sages) teach as the lesson of the past and which, in the case of old hakamim like Eliphaz, they are able to confirm from their own experience. Thus, in Eliphaz's first speech (iv-v), we find him appealing to both his own experience ("as I have seen", iv 8; "myself have seen", v 3) and traditional lore (v 27: "This we have probed—and it's so; we have heard it—and you, note well"). Very significantly, one of the things Eliphaz proves from his own observation is the dire consequences of un-

Translation

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| v | 2 | For a fool is slain by grief,
a simpleton killed by chagrin. ^a |
| | 4 | Never succored are his children,
oppressed in judgment, defenseless. |
| | 3 | Myself have seen fools' progeny,
observed the brood of simpletons: ^b |
| | 5 | Hunger devours what they reap, ^c
sterility seizes their riches. ^d
Their wealth is swallowed by thirst. ^e |

^a I.e., it is a fool who fails to master his grief and lets it drive him into doing what can only have the worst possible consequences for himself—which Eliphaz is earnestly trying to dissuade Job from doing.

^b Reading *ראיתי שרש אוילים ואביט בני פתאים*; cf. Ugaritic *bn||šrš*.

^c Reading *rāq'qb* and *qāqrū*.

^d Reading tentatively *šqnm* and *'ūlqm*.

^e Reading *qāqrū*.

- iv 21 Thus is their tent-pin ^r pulled up:
they perish for want of wisdom.
v 6 For misery sprouts not from the ground,
nor does woe spring up from the soil;
7 no, woe is spawned by ^g man,
as birds of high flight are by eagles. ^h

^r Reading *yēdōm*.

^g Reading *yēlēd*.

^h Lit. "it is children of eagles that fly high." *Vulture* or *eagle* is what *rēšēp* must mean from the context (cf. LXX); otherwise, simply read *nēšer* for *rēšēp*.

And again in his second speech (ch. xv), Eliphaz, after excoriating Job for his thesis, announces that he is going to state the truth of the matter (1) as he himself has seen it and (2) as it is vouched for by the sages of all generations, and he again makes it clear that theirs is the only road that leads to happiness. Says he:

Translation

- xv 17 Listen and let me tell you,
relate that which I have seen,
18 that which the wise declare
and have taught to our forefathers. ^a —
19 To them alone has earth been given, ^b
no outsiders have shared it with them.

Notes

^a Read *וְלֹא כָחַד מֵאֲבוֹתֵינוּ*; lit. "have not withheld from our forefathers."

^b I.e. only to the wise (*hakamim*, v. 18). Of course not to the wicked (as Job has asserted in ix 24), but not to foolish saints either (who, like Job, refuse to accept the teachings of traditional *ḥokmah*).

Since Eliphaz always speaks before the other two friends, and they always adopt the same tone as he, he is evidently the oldest of the three. xii 11-12 and xv 10 (both to be translated in due course) seem to imply that all three are older than Job, but evidently Bildad and Zophar do not feel that they are old enough to rely on their own experience. Consequently they invoke tradition alone. Thus Bildad says right in his first speech (ch. viii):

- viii 8 Ask even the earliest age,
inquire back to our ^a most distant ^b forebears—
9 since we are but of yesterday and lack knowledge,
since our time on earth is (like) that of a (fading) shadow—

^a In MT miswritten, as frequently, 'their' (ligatured *ו* mistaken for *ם*).

^b Lit. 'aim (or, reading *ב* for *ב*, 'peer') at the limit of our'.

- 10 and even they will instruct you, inform you,
will bring forth these words from their throats: ^c

^c On *lēb* 'throat, as the organ of speech,' see *Hebräische Wortforschung, Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner*, Leiden 1967, p. 80.

Zophar, finally, has no occasion to refer to his source of knowledge in his first speech, but when he does refer to it in his second speech it is, again, *ḥokmatic* lore:

- xx 4 Surely this you (emend to 'we?') know from of yore,
since man was placed upon the earth.

And what does Job think of the qualifications his friends are so proud of? Let him speak for himself (xii 1-6, 11-12 ¹); ch. xiii):

- xii 1 Job spoke up and said:
2 Are you really the whole people, ^a
and will wisdom die with you? ^b
3 I too have understanding, just like you;
I am no worse than you.
Who doesn't know ^c things like these?:
4 "He laughs ^d at mischance and disaster, ^e
just calls ^d to God and is answered—
the blameless good man laughs.
5 He scorns ^d misfortune, is tranquil in time of calamity, ^f
firm in time of foot-slippings.
6 Tents are unharmed despite marauders,
there is security despite those who provoke God,
for him whom God shelters ^g with his hand." ^h
11 But surely an ear can test words,
just as a palate tastes food.

^a Taking *ki* as an interrogative particle implying a negative; cf. 2 Ki xviii 34//Isa xxxvi 19.

^b Or, vocalizing *tammūt* with TUR-SINAI, 'and is the totality of wisdom with you?'

^c An idiom like that in xv 9, 11.

^d Read verbs in the perfect.

^e Reading with TUR-SINAI *lrq'q ul'ahyq*.

^f Reading *l'eṭ šēṭ* (cf. Lam. iii 47).

^g Reading *hebbi*.

^h Despite uncertainties in detail, vss. 4-6 are surely a parody on the banalities of orthodox "wisdom", particularly on v 19-24, designed to demonstrate to the friends that he is as familiar with their lore as they are (vs. 3c).

¹) Most of ch. xii belongs in ch. xi; we shall revert to this.

- 12 Wisdom is not ¹ in the aged;
length of days is not understanding.
- xii 1 Bear in mind, my eye has seen all,
and my ear has heard and noted.
2 I know as much as you do, I am no worse than you.
3 Now, I would address Shaddai,
what I want is to arraign God.
4 As for you, you are daubers of quack unguents,
worthless physicians all of you.
5 If only you would be silent,
that would count as wisdom for you!
6 Listen, rather, to my arraignment,
attend to my indictment!
7 Will you tell lies to *God*,
speak falsehoods to *him*?
8 Will you show bias in *his* favor,
play the advocate for *God*?
9 Will it be pleasant when he takes you to task?
Can you mock him as you mock mortals?
10 And accuse you he surely will
if you show partiality in the dispute. ¹
11 Surely, his majesty must frighten you
and the fear of him must fall on you!
12 Your armor ^k is comparable to dust,
your plating to plating of clay.
13 Keep silent before him ¹, and *I* will speak,
Come upon me what may.

¹ Transfer *lō* from the end of vs. 11 to the beginning of vs. 12, and interpret it as the negative particle.

¹ Obviously open partiality is no less heinous than secret, and anyway it would be no "secret" if they did it in the presence of Job. Cf., rather, postbibl. *str.* 'to contradict'; perhaps also at Ps lxxxi 8.

^k Reading, tentatively, *siryōnēkēm*; cf. Ir. li 3.

¹ MT 'me', but the gist of 3-12 is that they will be guilty of lying to *God* if they repeat their untruths while *Job* is pleading with *God*.

B. *Job's Source of Knowledge and the Friends' Rejection of It*

So much for the "bible" that the friends invoke and Job's opinion of it. What, now, is the authority that Job relies on and his friends sneer at? Here is where recent writers on Job have sinned grievously. They have been shown a light and they have refused to follow it. All of forty-eight years have elapsed since TUR-SINAI (then TORCZYNER) first made the following three observations in the (mark you) *unemended* text of Job:

(1) What Job says in vi 10c is, "for (or, that) I have not withheld the words of a holy being". 'To conceal, suppress, withhold' is admittedly what *kihēd* means in all the other passages in which it occurs. To assume that here it means 'to deny' would only be justified if the assumption yielded better sense. Instead, "for I have not denied the words of the Holy One" is so pointless in the context (and it is hard to imagine a context in which it would make very much sense) that the clause is regarded as doubtful by many, whereas according to the assured sense of *kihēd* Job claims here the very thing that Eliphaz in two other passages accuses him, once by implication and once directly, of having claimed.

(2) Thus, the non-pilpulic import of v 1, 8 is this: "Job, forget about 'holy beings'. You obviously need help, and only God can and does help those who turn to him". Here is a translation of the two verses:

- 1 Just call—see if anyone answers you!
To whom of the "holy beings" can you turn?
- 8 I, on the other hand, resort to God,
to God do I address my plea.

(3) An unshakable rock of evidence is ch. xv. In it Eliphaz first alludes in the most sarcastic tone imaginable to Job's claim to an information leak from on high: it must be said, courteously but firmly, that the translations and interpretations that fail to get this meaning out of vss. 4-11 get precious little meaning altogether, and that false. He then goes on to say, in effect, "The nerve of you, opposing our wisdom with such unheard-of tommyrot as...", and then quotes or paraphrases that tommyrot: again, with all due respect, the sooner any other "interpretation" of vss. 12-16 ceases to be offered in scholarly circles, the better. And after, with one can imagine what distaste, quoting or paraphrasing what to him is unmitigated balderdash, Eliphaz continues, "Listen, rather, to what I can vouch for the truth of from my own experience, namely, the teaching which the sages have received from their predecessors—for the soundness of which there could be no better proof than the impressive success of its exponents." If readers do not find the following treatment of Job xv 1-19 strikingly superior to those in recent commentaries, the outlook for Bible scholarship is dismal.

xv 1 Then Eliphaz spoke up and said:

- 2 Is it a wise man ^a who argues with words ^b of wind,
 who talks like a bag of hot air,
 3 pleading with useless prating,
 with speech devoid of worth?
 4 Or ^c do you, of all people, ^d offend against piety
 and eavesdrop on God's deliberations? ^e
 5 For your own mouth proclaims your iniquity;
 you adopt the tone of the shrewd. ^{e'}
 6 Your own mouth condemns you, not I;
 your own lips bear witness against you. ^f
 7 Were you born the first of men,
 brought into the world before the hills? ^{f'}
 8 Have you listened in God's assembly,
 and has wisdom reached ^g you in that way?
 9 What do you know that we do not,
 perceive that is beyond our ken?
 10 Among us are graybeard and ancient
 whose days exceed even your father's. ^h
 11 Do these men's ⁱ comfortings ^j fail to satisfy you

^a Such as Job has claimed to be (and has implied that his opponents are not exactly) in xii 1-6, 11-12; xiii 1-5—passages which were expounded a few pages back.

^b For *dā'at* 'speech', cf. Ps. xix 3(2); Jb xxxvi 4; further, *dē'ī* 'speech', Jb xxxii 6, 10, 17; xxxvi 3. The root of these words, unlike that of the ordinary *dā'at* meaning 'knowledge', is *d'w*, which means 'to call' in Arabic.

^c Probably read *'im*, though there seems to be another example of *'ap* for *ha'ap* in xix 3.

^d To a verb which itself indicates the person by inflection, the Hebrew does not add a personal pronoun except for a purpose, and that purpose is nearly always emphasis. (In the first person it may be only solemnity, formality, or impressiveness.) The point of the emphasis in our case is that Job is proverbially pious, a point which the speaker, Eliphaz, has also made in his first speech (iv 6).

^e Lit. 'and (did you) abstract conversation (from) before God?'

^{e'} Characters like the shrewd serpent of Eden, who guessed (or pretended to know) what was in God's mind (Gen. iii 1).

^f It's you who claim to have such information, thereby implying that you stole it. I don't accuse you of having stolen it, because I don't for a moment admit that you have it.

^{f'} In that case you might have had enough time to acquire the prodigious amount of knowledge you claim to have, or possibly even to consort with the celestials and participate in God's assembly; cf. Ezek. xxviii 11-14.

^g Read *wattagga'* (contamination by vs. iv).

^h Lit. 'greater than your father in respect of days'; cf. xi 9 'longer than the earth as regards extent (omitting the mappiq).'

ⁱ *'El* is a by-form of *'ellē*, as in Gen. xix 25; xxvi 3; etc.

^j The friends' arguments are meant to comfort and encourage Job.

- because you know some word that reached you by stealth? ^k
 12 What sinful haughtiness!
 what monstrous pride! ^l
 13 to blow ^m your wind at these men ⁱ
 and to belch forth ⁿ such words:
 14 "How can a mortal be judged righteous,
 a spawn of woman accounted just?
 15 If he ^o disapproves of his sacred abode, ^p
 if the very skies ^q are not pure in his sight,
 16 how much less a thing loathed and detested,
 man, who drinks godlessness like water!" ^r

We shall see that Job recognizes this, and that he doesn't question their sincerity, only their soundness.

^k For the idiom "there is with you" for "you know", cf. above vs. 9, also xii 3c. The graph *l'ṭ* is vocalized by the Masorah as a verb, and is rendered accordingly in the text. It is no doubt related to the verb *hṭf* 'to cover or hide', 1 Sam. xxi 10; 2 Sam. xix 5; 1 Ki. xix 13; Is. xxv 7. The fact that the noun *lōt* (otherwise occurring only in the phrase *ballōt* 'stealthily') is spelled once *l'ṭ* suggests that possibly *dbar lōt* 'secret word' is to be read here. Either way, the idea expressed is the same one that is expressed by iv 12a. Note the fact now, its significance will be pointed out later.

^l It will be asserted, but it is untrue, that this interpretation of the two verbs depends upon emendation. The contrary is true; the emendations *yigbāb* and *yrummūn* are suggested by the meaning, which is itself inferred from the context.

^m Probably vocalize *taššib*.

ⁿ Lit. 'produce from your mouth'.

^o I.e. God. But why isn't he named? This is an additional argument for taking vss. 14-16 as a quotation. Eliphaz is quoting or paraphrasing from a lost passage in one of Job's speeches, in which the quoted lines were preceded by a direct naming of God—just as the parallel lines iv 18-20 are preceded by iv 17, which makes it clear that the subject of vss. 18-20 is *'elōh*. But the absence of an antecedent for our "he" is, as we shall see, only the least of the reasons for ruling out the possibility that xv 14-16 represents Eliphaz's own thoughts and any doubt that it is a citation—for the purpose of refutation—of Job's opinion. See note r.

^p Read, with the ketib, *qōdšō*; cf. the parallelism with that in Ps. cl 1.

^q Which are proverbially pure; see Exod. xxiv 10.

^r To date, to be sure, only TUR-SINAI and I have taken this as a quotation of Job's thesis. Others place before it not a colon but a period, and of course do not enclose it in quotation marks, because they understand it as an expression of Eliphaz's own views. But first of all, "and you produce words from your mouth" is a remarkably lame ending for a tirade. What is so wicked about uttering words; isn't Eliphaz doing the same thing? How different if the phrase is followed by a quotation of the offending words, as is—and this nobody questions—the virtually identical

- 17 Listen, and let me tell you,
relate what I have seen,
18 that which is taught by sages,
the things they revealed to our fathers.^s—
19 To them alone ^t has the earth been given,
among them has no outsider passed.—

phrase in viii 10 see above p. 97). And secondly, to make xv 14-16 Eliphaz's own argument is to accuse either him or his author—or both—of feeble-mindedness. For it makes Eliphaz, who has just excoriated Job for claiming to have received information from a celestial source, proceed to assert something which he can only have learned from just such a source—something, in fact, which is attributed to just such a source in iv 12 ff.—and it makes him do so for the purpose of proving to Job what Job has just asserted himself, at least by implication. What is supposed to be the point of Eliphaz's alleged pains to demonstrate that unclean, sinful "man, spawn of woman" cannot possibly *be judged* good and pure by a fastidious God to a Job who has just argued (in ch. xiv) that "man, spawn of woman" (xiv 1) cannot possibly *be* good and pure by reason of his tainted source (xiv 4):

Who could bring forth clean
from the unclean? No one!

Even supposing, as some do, that this verse is a gloss, there is no reason for doubting that the idea it expresses was meant by Job to be conveyed by means of the epithet "spawn of woman" (xiv 1), seeing that the whole argument of the chapter is that in view of the unreasonableness of expecting purity from a being of man's impure origin, and in view of man's pitifully short span of life, God ought, in fairness and generosity, to forbear judging him and to let him live his allotted days in peace. For that Job claims to be without sin can only be believed by readers who were watching television while turning the pages of Job; see vii 20-21; x 6; xiii 26; and—right in this very chapter—xiv 16-17.

^s MT's □ is again the result of a misreading of a ligatured נ. See above, p. 96 bottom. "Revealed to" is literally "did not withhold from".

^t Of course not to the wicked (against Job, ix 24), but not to foolish saints like Job, either (who refuse to accept the teachings of traditional *hokmah*): only to "sages".

In the preceding pages we have, we believe, proved that vi 10; v 1, 8; and xv 1-19 are mutually consistent in having Job rely on a declaration by a "holy being" and in having Eliphaz ridicule both the alleged source of the declaration and its content. Consequently, iv 12-20 is a problem. For the speaker of those verses, who invokes the very same source ("a spirit", iv 15) as authority for virtually the same sentiment, is represented as Eliphaz. The same is true of xxv 4-6, which does not invoke any authority but does make a very

similar assertion, and which as attributed by xxv to Bildad. Changes of heart certainly do occur both in real life and in fiction, but consider what we have here. First Eliphaz quotes "a spirit" to the effect that God accounts no man just since he even accounts no angel just (iv 12-20), but only two verses later, and without any explanation, he ridicules Job for attaching any importance to "holy beings". Consistently with his new attitude, Eliphaz later mercilessly flays Job for citing any such source as a leak from on high in support of any such doctrine as the one that God accounts no impure mortal just since in his sight even the heavens are maculate (xv, as just interpreted), but shortly thereafter (xxv) Bildad, one of Eliphaz's two faithful echoes, turns around and draws precisely the same conclusion from precisely the same premise—a premise the knowledge of which can hardly have been derived from any source but "a spirit" or "a holy being". Only Job is consistent. He says flatly (vi 10), "I have not withheld the words (i.e. suppressed the communication) of a holy being", and consistently with that communication he argues over and over that God is unreasonably harsh with him: vii 11-21; ch. x; xiii 23-xiv 7; xvi 7-22¹; xix 6 ff. As for the friends, not only is Eliphaz, as we have seen, explicitly anti-"holy being" and anti-"information leak" outside iv 12-20, but the basic premise of all the friends (outside iv 12-20 and ch. xxv) is the opposite of that developed by Job in the passages just cited; they are convinced that God is eminently reasonable, and that he distinguishes sharply from the thoroughly rotten (*rōš'im* and its synonyms) a class of basically good, even if not impeccable, men (*šaddiqim* and its synonyms) and rewards each class according to its deserts. Thus Bildad quotes tradition at length (viii 8-19) in order to conclude (vs. 20), in pointed opposition to Job:

Certainly, God does *not* reject the blameless
and does *not* elect²) the evildoing.

¹) As T-1, p. 110, realized (but the subsequent T's unfortunately forgot or choose to ignore, which is why it did not occur to me to look up T-1 in 1957 and I consequently omitted to give it credit for this mendment in *Lešonenu* 21 [1957]: 113), vs. 7-az are to be read *אֵל וְעֶדְוָתוֹ תִּקְמָטִי* אל ועדותו תקמטי, as is obvious from the continuation of vs. 7 and from vs. 19. On *עַד* 'accuser' see most recently I. L. SEELIGMANN, *Hebräische Wortforschung, Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VTS 16, 1967), pp. 262 ff.

²) Cf. Isa. xli 9-10, 13; xlv 1; Ir. xxxi 31 (32). In Isa. viii 11, *בְּחֻקֵּי הַיָּד* means 'when he singled me out.' Isaiah believed that both he and his family were something set apart from "the many" (Isa. viii 15; cf. lii 14; liii 11, 12; Mal. ii 6, 8; al.). That it is Isaiah's children who are meant by the 2nd pers. plural verbs and pronom-

Whoever knows his Proverbs (and certain Psalms) knows that spokesmen for traditional wisdom could not speak otherwise.

Moreover, in the case of Job iv 12-20 we have more to go by than the fact that the substance of it points to Job and away from the friends. There is, in fact, additional evidence for Job's authorship of at least one specific feature of it, vs. 12a. This reads, "*A word was vouchsafed me in secret*", and in xv 11, as we have seen, Eliphaz demands of Job:

Do these men's comfortings fail to satisfy you
because you know *some word* that *reached you by stealth*? ¹⁾

But if iv 12-20 and xxv 4-6 express only Job's sentiments, what is the explanation of their apparent ascription to Job's opponents? Is it that the ascription is only apparent, or that it is erroneous? In other words, are these passages, like xv 14-16, quotations, or are they out of place? On this question TUR-SINAI's opinions have fluctuated. Whereas T-1 ²⁾ and T-2 believed that both iv 12-20 and xxv 4-6 were out of place, T-3, and T-4 retained the position of T-1 and T-2 as regards ch. xxv but maintained that iv 12-20, like xv 14-16, was a quotation. It is too bad he did not retain his original position as regards ch. iv as well as ch. xxv. For to make iv 10-11 a sarcastic introduction to a quotation from Job (especially when the alleged quotation expatiates in unleonine fashion on the unleonine terror which the speaker experienced) is artificial, and hardly more natural would be a repetition by Eliphaz of Job's detailed description of the circumstances of his experience and of his feelings while going through it. (The natural thing is what we have in ch. xv, where Eliphaz quotes only what is relevant.)

The case for transposing iv 12-20 is, if anything, stronger than that for transposing xxv 2(4)-6. For whereas the fragmentary state of chs. xxv-xxvi ³⁾ makes it impossible to determine the exact original location of any part of them, that of iv 12-20 can be decided with a, for research in the humanities, very high degree of probability.

inal suffixes Isa. viii 12, 19 is indicated clearly enough by vs. 18, in light of which בִּילְדִים is also to be read for בְּלִמְדִי in vs. 16. The special character extends to Isaiah's wife, which is why she is referred to by the title "the prophetess" in vs. 3.

¹⁾ See above, p. 100. ²⁾ See above, p. 94, n. 2.

³⁾ Most scholars attribute a part of xxvii to Zophar, but this is opposed by both TUR-SINAI and me, though for different reasons (see above, pp. 91f). On the other hand, it is for identical reasons that we both deny xxv 2-6 to Bildad. Thus we both maintain that no third speech by any of the friends but Eliphaz has certainly been preserved.

For years I have been convinced that iii 3-26 and iv 12-20 constitute, with some changes in the order of the verses, a single speech of Job. In iii 3-26. ¹⁾ Job says in effect, "I wish the day I was born and the night I was conceived had never been ²⁾". Alternatively, I wish I had been stillborn, so that I would never have known anything but the peace of the nether world. For as it is, sighs and groans are my daily food and drink ³⁾". This ought to be followed immediately not by vs. 25 but by vs. 26:

I have no ease, I have no calm; ⁴⁾
I have no repose, ⁵⁾ and I have harassment. ⁶⁾

And vs. 25 is the perfect transition from iii 3-24, 26 to iv 12-20 and the perfect introduction to the latter. It reads:

For I had a dread (*pāḥad pōḥādī*), and it has come true;
Just what I feared has come to pass.

Conceivably, this could dispense with a continuation. But since iv 12-20 exists, and since we have shown that it conforms to Job's ideology and is repugnant to Eliphaz's, one should ask oneself this: For what purpose is an intelligent person likely to cite a fact of life the discovery of which made him quake with horror: as a text for the optimistic reassurances of Eliphaz in chs. iv-v minus iv 12-20, or as a continuation of the terrible mood of iii 3-24 and in explication of iii 26? Here is how it reads (ix 11 is added, minus the initial *ben*, which is to be read rather at the beginning of ix 13 [as the necessary complement of the *'ap kē* of ix 14]):

- iv 13 In troubled thoughts from visions of the night,
when deep sleep falls upon men,
14 a dread (*pāḥad*) came upon me and shudders,
a shiver ⁷⁾ rattled my bones.

¹⁾ Probable original order (mainly after TUR-SINAI): 3-4a, 5b, 4b-c, 5a, 5c, 6b-c, 7-8, 6a, 9-10, 16, 13-15, 17-19, 11-12, 20-24.

²⁾ With only the last letter actually changed (from *ר* to *ו*), but with the last nine letters rearranged, vs. 4 reads: יֵאֵבֶד יוֹם אוֹלָד בּוֹ וְהַלִּילָה בּוֹ נָמָר. 'If only the day I was born had perished, and the night I was conceived had lapsed!'

³⁾ The *liḥnē* in vs. 24 stands in synonymous parallelism to 'like'. It is the same *liḥnē* as we have in 1 Sam. i 16. (Do not treat your handmaid as a base woman.) and in Ps. lxxii 5 (*liḥim*, which also means 'like,' as e.g. in Job ix 26).

⁴⁾ Such as I would have in Sheol, vs. 13a.

⁵⁾ Such as I would have in Sheol, vs. 13b.

⁶⁾ Such as I would *not* have in Sheol, vs. 17a.

⁷⁾ See Tur-Sinai on iv 3.

- 15 A spirit passed before me,
and a tremor ¹⁾ shook my frame.
ix 11 It passed me without my seeing it,
flitted by without my beholding;
iv 16 it stood, but I saw no shape
or form before my eyes.
A murmuring voice I heard,
12 and a word was vouchsafed me in secret—
terror ²⁾ gripped me when I heard it:
17 "Can a mortal be just in God's sight,
a man appear pure to his Maker? ³⁾
18 If he even faults his attendants,
and saddles his angels with blame,
19 how much more mere men of clay, ⁴⁾
who originated in the ground;
who are snuffed out before day's end, ⁵⁾
20 stamped out between morn and dusk,
ere night falls ⁶⁾, wiped out forever!

Why this revelation made Job's teeth chatter and filled him with foreboding ought to be obvious to us who have the benefit of hind-

¹⁾ Rd. שַׁעֲרָה.

²⁾ With TUR-SINAI, cf. Arab. *šamaša* VII 'to shudder with fear.' The meaning also fits in xxvi 14; cf. xxxvii 1-2. On *šimšū*, Exod. xxxii 25, cf. the new Jewish Publication Society translation of the Pentateuch (*The Torah*, 1962) *ad loc.*

³⁾ The preposition *mi-* is used here as in Num. xxxii 22; 2 Sam xxii 22//Ps. xviii 22.

⁴⁾ Rd. אֶפְרַיִם בְּאֶשׁ חֲמֹר, *ap̄alone*, instead of *ap̄kēl*, introducing the apodosis in a reasoning *a minore*, is otherwise unexampled; besides, since the "apodosis" is not a clause but a phrase, the latter would naturally be constructed in a manner paralleling the corresponding phrase in the "protasis", that is to say, the absence of the preposition ב would be harsh. A third objection to MT is the fact that it expresses not a Hellenic but a Hellenic idea. What Hebrew ever thought of a person as a soul inhabiting "this mortal shell" rather than as a body animated by a breath? Does Job, for example, say in xxvii 3, "so long as I inhabit this body", or "so long as my breath remains in me, the life-breath from God in my nostrils"? When the breath leaves the body, it does, according to one passage (Eccl. xii 7), return to the God who bestowed it, but the individual is not the said breath but just the dust that (according to the same verse, among others) returns to the dust. "When his breath departs," says the Psalmist (Ps. cxlvi 4), "he returns to his earth." The Rabbis also speak of the *nšōmō* as something that enters or leaves the person, not as the person himself, even though it has, in their usage, come to mean not 'breath' but 'soul' in our sense.

⁵⁾ MT's עַשׂ surely represents a mutilated Hebrew etymon of the Arabic 'ašā' 'evening.' The fact that the Heb. etymon of Arab. *samā* is *šādiyim* suggests that that of Arab. 'ašā' is perhaps to be reconstructed as *šādiyim* (with ש).

⁶⁾ Similarly, כִּשְׁמִים must be the Heb. etymon of Arab. *mašā* 'evening,' and its proper pointing must be כִּשְׁמִים.—I first published the foregoing interpretation of iv 19-20 op. cit. (above, p. 103 n. 1), p. 111.

sight. He naturally did not assume that it was just a theological insight of only theoretical interest but realized that it was accorded to him because it was of relevance to him. This relevance may be paraphrased as follows: "Job, you are living in a fool's paradise. Your righteousness is no guarantee against total ruin, because God recognizes no such category as righteous men". And how right poor Job's inference soon proved to be! We have here a brilliant variation of the premonition motif ¹⁾, by means of which the resourceful author of JIP achieves both dramatic effect and an "authority" and a thesis for his Job.

C. The Respective Theses of Job and the Eliphazites

In the course of our inquiry into the respective authorities on which the parties rely, we have had occasion to refer to practically all the points of Job's thesis. We have seen that Job is fully aware that he is not without sin, but that he feels that as men go he is a good man. He believes, however, that God, in his severity, makes no practical distinction between good men and bad, since none can measure up to his impossible standards. That is why not only Job but countless other good men have been appallingly unfortunate and why, conversely, countless scoundrels have been scandalously lucky (ix 24; x 3a ²⁾; ch. xxi).

The thesis of the three friends, on the other hand, has still to be clarified. William Barron STEVENSON, who devotes a whole chapter to the subject of "Job's comforters" and begins with the sentence, "Job's comforters have a bad reputation" ³⁾, maintains that they don't deserve it, and so does TUR-SINAI. Theirs is a minority view; but so, at first, was the Copernican system.

¹⁾ Parallel in one way or another are, on the one hand, the cases of Saul (1 Sam. xviii 3), of the hero of the Babylonian poem "I Will Praise the Lord of Wisdom" (sometimes referred to as "the Babylonian Job"), and of one of the Cassite kings (see W. G. LAMBERT, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, 1960, p. 22, 33), all of whom were unable to obtain oracles or significant dreams on the eve of disaster, and, on the other hand, the cases of Pharaoh's chief baker (Gen. xl), who had a dream, and of Belshazzar (Dan. v), who witnessed a prodigy, which were interpreted to them by experts as portents of disaster.

²⁾ TUR-SINAI rightly feels that the middle clause of this verse is out of place. His suggestion as to its original position is, however, not very clear. I incline to think that the sequence was originally 3a, 3c, 4, 6-7, 5, 3b, a now missing parallel sequent to 3b (e.g. וְהִשָּׁנָה מִעֲשֵׂה יָדָךְ, 8 ff).

³⁾ W. B. STEVENSON, *The Poem of Job* (The Schweich Lectures of The British Academy, 1943), 1947, p. 37.

If the passage ii 11-13 were from JIP, it would suffice to settle the matter. For it narrates in quite unmistakable language, that on hearing the news about Job they met in order to pay him a joint visit of condolence; that as soon as they saw how much his appearance had changed for the worse, they wept loud; and that they strewed dust on their heads and sat on the ground with him seven days and seven nights without saying anything to him because they saw in what terrible pain he was. Unfortunately the passage is JP¹). However, the natural implications of JIP make the friends no less sincere comforters of Job than the natural implications of JP.

To be sure, there is a remarkably widespread belief that to convinced adherents of the doctrine of individual retribution like Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar Job's plight was conclusive evidence that he was a villain. But this is merely an a priori assumption, not a logical a posteriori conclusion from the facts. As is well known, there are three cycles of speeches. Now, in both the first and the third cycle, all the extant speeches of the friends end with the assurance that Job has but to make his peace with God and he will enjoy better fortune than he has ever known (v 8 ff.; viii 5 ff.; xi 13 ff.; xx 21 ff.)—in dazzling contrast to the wicked, add the two middle passages (viii 22; xi 20). One verse (v 17) sounds as if the speaker (Eliphaz) had anticipated the unwarranted a priori assumption of modern scholars and was trying to obviate it:

Nay, happy the mortal whom God chastises:
By no means reject the discipline of Shaddai.

The reason is stated in the following verses, but it is better expressed in what is clearly the source of this passage, namely Prov. iii 11-12:

- 11 My son, reject not YHWH's discipline;
By no means abhor his chastisement.
- 12 For YHWH chastises him whom he loves,
as a father does the son he favors.

From this passage, no doubt, is derived the Amoraic term **סורין של אהבה** 'chastisement out of love'. Though the Amoraim mean by it something different from what the friends believed Job to be suffering²), it describes the latter even better than what the

¹) See above, p. 83-91. SPIEGEL, (see *ibid.*) who attributes the passage to JIP, finds the conduct of the friends in it discreditable!

²) What they mean by it is chastisement not at all as punishment for sins committed but as a sort of forced loan exacted from a righteous man, to be repaid to him with interest in the future life.

Amoraim designate by that term, and we ought not to hesitate to apply it to the sort of chastisement that Prov. iii and Job v speak of.

The doctrine of retribution that emerges from the speeches of the friends is that the wicked are overtaken by early and terrible catastrophe from which they do not recover. It is different with the righteous. Righteous does not mean impeccable, and when a good man sins God punishes him. But he punishes him, as a father does a child he loves, precisely because he loves him and desires his well being. Just as Job is as aware as his friends that he is not impeccable, so they are as firmly convinced as he that he is a good man. What the parties differ about is not Job's character but his theory. If he subscribed, like his friends, to the teaching of the *hokmah* tradition, that God does not want the good to perish but only chastises them for their aberrations in order to restore their good fortune once they accept their chastisement in the right spirit (for an idea of what that entails see v 8 ff.; vii 5-6; xi 13 ff.; xi 23-25), he would react not with abysmal despair and fierce resentment but with calm and optimism. But we know what a different view Job has accepted from the "spirit" or "holy being".

Apart from the a priori view of what orthodox retributionists ought to think, the detractors of the friends point to certain passages in the text which, it is claimed, clearly betray a negative attitude on the part of the friends toward Job. Owing to limitations of space, they can only be considered briefly here, a full treatment being reserved for another occasion.

1. Eliphaz's first speech iv-v. Whatever legitimate criticisms have been leveled against it disappear with the removal of iv 12-20. Eliphaz is neither insincere nor (so FULLERTON) clumsy. He believes everything he says with all his heart: that Job is a good man and his prospects are bright; that he is unfortunately acting foolishly and endangering his future; that he has but to forget about the "holy beings" and turn to God with a contrite heart for the sin he must have committed (for good men also sin), and the most enviable future imaginable will be his. All is right—once one takes out iv 12-20 and returns it to its original position between chs. iii and iv, as we did above.

2. Zophar's first speech (ch. xi), especially xi 6. If the last clause of v. 6 is correctly transmitted, it can only mean, as TUR-SINAI points out, 'God makes you forget some of your offenses', i.e. he has not given you the mental power to remember them all. That in

any case is the tenor of vss. 2-12, as KISSANE has also realized, namely that though Job may be quite sincere in protesting that he has not been guilty of any sin serious enough to merit his present suffering, the fact that God is inflicting it shows that God knows of some sin which does merit it, and surely his memory is the more reliable one. Actually the case is stronger than KISSANE, or even TUR-SINAI, realized. For by far the greater part of ch. xii develops this very theme of the superiority of God's intellect over that of men, whom he often makes fools of and misleads (xii 16 ff.). Zophar's speech comprises, roughly in that order: xi 2-9; xii 7-10; xi 10 (to be read approximately *ואם יפתח מי יסגר, ויקח לו ומי ישיבנו*); xii 15-25; xi 11 ff.

3. Eliphaz's second speech, ch. xxii. Eliphaz begins by asking, (2) Can a man benefit God, that by submitting to him he should prosper? (3) Does it profit Shaddai if you are righteous, is it any gain for him if you make your way perfect? (4) Does he fear you, that he should arraign you, enter into a lawsuit with you? (5) "See here, your wickedness is enormous, etc." (5-7, 9-11 are a tongue-in-cheek parody of the sort of bill of particulars of his offenses that Job has been demanding of God [xiii 18 ff.]; Eliphaz does not wish to imply that Job is such a monster.) (12) You surely can't expect God to deign to take the trouble to oblige you with such a bill of particulars (13-14, 8, 15-21). But that doesn't mean that he doesn't take the trouble to watch what men do and to execute judgment. He does, and you should by all means submit to him. Then everything will be fine. Please, Job; you won't be sorry you took my advice¹).

¹ In vs. 22 the text should be emended to read, "Come, accept instruction from *my* mouth, and take *my* words to heart." In v. 23, *חבנה*, I believe is to be emended to *תפנה* 'you clear out,' and either this is a gloss on the following word *תרחיק* 'you remove' or *vice versa*.—The concluding exhortation and promise is a feature of every friend's speech in the first cycle (the conclusions of chs. v, viii, and xi) and of the only extant friend's speech of the third cycle (the conclusion of ch. xxii) but is absent from every friend's speech in the second cycle (xv; xviii; xx). This negative feature is correlated with another: the absence from those speeches of any elaboration of the happy lot of the righteous, in contrast to lengthy disquisitions on the unenviable fate of the wicked. There is a reason for all this: the friends are piqued by Job's contemptuous dismissal in chs. xii-xiii of the wisdom they are so proud of (see above), and this is a subtle manner of expressing their pique. But of course they don't say that the righteous are not rewarded, for that is the opposite of what they believe; and they don't say that Job cannot assure himself of the highest measure of happiness attainable by mortals by just giving up anything he knows he gained wrongfully and begging forgiveness of God for all the offenses he knows of or does not know of, for again that is the opposite of what they believe of such a God-fearing man as Job. They leave Job to infer these things himself, and he understands

The friends are sincere comforters, and Job acknowledges it, though he insists that they are fallacious ones (xvi 2; xxi 2, 34).

In the end, God does answer Job (xxxviii-xli). He doesn't say that Job misrepresented reality; he merely impresses upon him that he cannot expect, with his puny mind, to understand it, and must not presume to ask for an explanation. And Job admits that he was wrong in this expectation and in this demand.¹)

that their words, for all their coldness, are intended to comfort him (xvi 1; xxi 2, 34).

¹) See above, pp. 89-90—Job's tone likewise changes subtly from cycle to cycle.