

DOUBLE ENTENDRE IN THE FIRST SPEECH OF ELIPHAZ

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

I. Introductory. In an article on "The original Conclusion to the Book of Job" (*ZATW*, 1924) the present writer ventured to suggest a new approach to the solution of its critical problems. The main idea of the essay was that the author of Job made, at certain points, very effective use of *double entendre*. This literary device appeared particularly at 40 3-5, which was taken to be the original end of the book, in the Jahweh speeches, Chapters 38-39, and in the Prologue. These passages were all supposed to be written in such a way that the orthodox reader could peruse them with approval, whereas the more attentive reader would find in them an indirect but none the less real criticism of the orthodox position. Thus the orthodox reader would see in 40 3-5 a confession of repentance; but what the author meant to suggest to one who could read between the lines was that nothing further could be said on the subject. Similarly, in the Jahweh speeches, the orthodox reader would see a well deserved rebuke of Job, but the more attentive reader would find in them a suggestion that the world is an insoluble enigma. In the Prologue, once more, the orthodox reader would be highly edified by the scenes on earth in which the patience and piety of Job were so beautifully exemplified, while the one who looked below the surface would be more interested by the scenes in heaven, which are described, not naively as is commonly supposed, but with great sophistication, and are in-

tended to suggest in cryptic fashion the inexplicability of suffering. It is believed that Chapters 4-5 furnish another example of the same subtlety of method. If the interpretation of these chapters offered in what follows does not carry conviction, this will not necessarily disprove the previous positions taken in the above-mentioned article, though it might suggest a doubt of them. On the other hand, if it is accepted, it will add greatly to their strength.

The accompanying translation is a specimen of what the writer would like to do for all the original parts of Job if time and strength should permit. The audacity of adding one more to the numerous translations of this poem is fully realized and probably the writer will be made to realize the folly of it as well. The comments are intended primarily to explain the translation, and to support the criticism which underlies the interpretation. The bracketed passages are inserted either to help out the interpretation or to strengthen the rhythmical effect in the English. The ancient versions have been used rather to illustrate how Job was understood by the early translators than to correct the Massoretic text. Textual criticism is, of course, fundamental to exegesis and interpretation, but if the exegete or interpreter were to wait till the final returns from textual criticism were all in, he would be compelled to take an enforced holiday for many a year to come. But while the highly technical and exceptionally delicate work of the textual critic is going on, a work for which the writer must admit his incompetence, the interpreter may nevertheless feel free to do his bit, provided, always, that he realizes the tentative character of his conclusions. But this is only one expression of the humility which all those who are seeking for certitudes among the fragmentary documents of the past, or for the originally intended meaning of some great work of the imagination, such as the Book of Job, should studiously cultivate. The comments also seek to provide a sufficient, though by no means exhaustive, history of the main trends in the interpretation of Job.¹

¹ I list herewith the works which have been most frequently consulted, indicating the abbreviations used in referring to them:

Ewald (Ew.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 2nd ed., 1854. Merx (Mx.), *Das Gedicht*

II. Translation. Job 4 and 5.

4 1. And Eliphaz the Temanite answered and said:

I. Expostulation

1

4 2. 1a. If one essay a word with thee, wilt thou take it ill?

2b. Yet who (under like provocation) could keep from speaking?

2

4 3. 1a. Consider how thou didst (once) admonish many,

2b. To weary hands new strength thou wouldst impart,

4 4. 3 c. Him that stumbled thy advice would steady,

4d. And tottering knees by thee would be confirmed.

3

4 5. 1a. Now that it cometh to thy turn thou takest it ill,

2b. Now that it toucheth thee, thou art confounded!

4 6. 3 c. Should not thy religion be thy confidence,

4d. And thy blameless life thy hope?

4

4 7. 1a. Bethink thee, what innocent man ever perished,

2b. Or where have the upright been destroyed?

von *Hiob*, 1871. Hitzig (Hitz.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 1874. Delitzsch (De.), *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job*, 2nd (English) ed., 1881. Davidson (Da.), *The Book of Job* (Cambridge Bible), 1889. Dillmann (Di.), *Hiob*, 4th ed., 1891. Duhm (Du.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 1897. Beer (Be.), *Der Text des Buches Hiob*, 1897. Peake, *Job* (New Century Bible), 1905. Barton (Bart.), *The Book of Job* (*Bible for Home and School*), 1911. Schmidt, N., *Messages of the Poets*, 1911. Budde (Bu.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 2nd ed., 1913. Ehrlich (Ehr.), *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, Vol. VI, 1913. Jastrow (Jast.), *The Book of Job*, 1921. Volz, *Hiob* (*Schriften des Alten Testaments*), 1921. Driver-Gray (Dr.), *The Book of Job* (*International Critical Commentary*), 1921. Ball, *The Book of Job*, 1922. Steuernagel (Steuer.), *Hiob* (Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 4th ed.), 1923. Butenwieser (Bt.), *The Book of Job*, 1925. König (K.), *Das Buch Hiob*, 1929.

The Commentaries of Torczyner (1924) and Thilo (1925) have, unfortunately, not been accessible to me except indirectly through König's work. Other abbreviations:

Aq. = *Aquila*, G. = *The Septuagint*, Sym. = *Symmachus*, Syr. = *Syriac*, Th. = *Theodotion*, T. or Targ. = *Targum*, V. = *Vulgate*, EV. = *AV and RV*.

4 8. 3 c. As I have observed, (only) they that plow evil

4d. And sow (the seeds of) harm, reap the same.

II. Instruction and Warning

A. The Oracle on the Universality of Sin

1

4 12. 1a. A word (once) stole upon me,

2b. Mine ear caught a whisper thereof,

4 13. 3a. When visions of the night yield thoughts confused and vague,

4b. And trance more deep than sleep descendeth on mankind.

2

4 14. 1a. Dread came upon me and quaking,

2b. The very marrow of my bones was filled with dread;

4 15. 3a. (Furtively) there hasteth by, brushing my face, a breath of air,

4b. The hair of my head standeth up, my flesh doth creep.

3

4 16. 1a. I feel a presence,

2b. But recognize no shape,

3 c. A shadowy semblance (wavereth) before mine eyes,

4d. And through the stillness a voice, from stillness scarce distinguishable, reacheth mine ears.

4

4 17. 1a. CAN MORTAL MAN BE INNOCENT IN GOD'S SIGHT?

2b. IN THE PRESENCE OF HIS CREATOR CAN (EARTH-BORN) MAN BE CLEAN?

5

4 18. 1a. E'en in His angelic ministrants no confidence he placeth,

2b. And to His messengers He imputeth error;

4 19. 3 c. What then shall be said of those whose housing's clay,

4d. Whose foundations in the dust are laid?

5a. Who, like an empty birds-nest, are destroyed,

- 4 20. 6b. *Betwixt morn and even are shattered utterly,*
 7d. *Who, with none to lay it to heart, perish forever?*
 4 21. 8a. *When their tent-pin is pulled up,*
 9b. *Shall they not die the death of ignorant men?*

B. On the Danger of Impatience

1

- 5 1. 1a. ***** (?)
 2b. ***** (?)
 5 2. 3a. *Yea, impatience killeth the fool,*
 4b. *And passion slayeth him that is without self-control.*

2

- 5 3. 1a. *I myself once saw a fool taking root,*
 2a. *And suddenly accursed became his homestead;*
 5 4. 3a. *And now that man's sons are of help bereft,*
 4b. *The Court abandons them to oppression sore, with none to save them.*

3

- 5 5. 1a. *What they harvest the famished eat*
 2b. ***** the thirsty *****
 3a. ***** thorns *****
 4b. ***** (?)

III. Consolations

A. Job is urged to turn to God, the Omnipotent, for Help.

1

- 5 8. 1a. *But I, for my part, would turn for help to God,*
 2b. *Yea, unto God would I make my appeal;*
 5 9. 3a. *(God) who doeth great things, and things unsearchable,*
 4b. *Wonderful things beyond all reckoning;*

2

- 5 10. 1a. *Who giveth rain unto the (parched) earth,*
 2b. *And sendeth showers upon the pasture-lands all open to the sky;*
 5 11. 3a. *Lifting the lowly to the heights,*
 4b. *While they that mourn to safety are exalted;*

3

- 5 12. 1a. *Frustrating the intrigues of the crafty,*
 2b. *So their power effecteth nought that endureth,*
 5 13. 3c. *Capturing the cunning in their own craftiness.*
 4d. *While the counsel of the crooked is surprised by sudden disaster.*

4

- 5 15. 1a. *So He saveth the afflicted from the sword,*
 2b. *And the poor from the power of the strong,*
 5 16. 3a. *And hope hath come to the dejected,*
 4b. *And injustice hath stopped her mouth.*

B. The Promise of a happy End

1

- 5 17. 1a. *Happy the man whom God reproveth!*
 2b. *The discipline of the Almighty do not thou despise,*
 5 18. 3c. *For He that causeth the pain dresseth the wound,*
 4d. *He smiteth, but 'tis His hands that heal.*

2

- 5 19. 1a. *In six misfortunes will He deliver thee,*
 2b. *In seven thou shalt be untouched of calamity;*
 5 20. 3a. *In famine He redeemeth thee from death,*
 4b. *In war from the power of the sword.*

3

- 5 21. 1a. *From the lash of the (slanderer's) tongue protected thou shalt be,*
 2b. *Thou shalt have no cause to fear when ruin draweth nigh;*
 5 22. 3a. *At ***** thou shalt laugh,*
 4b. *And of wild beasts thou needest not be afraid.*

4

- 5 23. 1a. *The (very) stones of the ground are in league with thee,*
 2b. *And the wild beasts are (all) at peace with thee;*
 5 24. 3a. *Thou shalt have the assurance that thy tent is secure,*
 4b. *When thy estate thou dost inspect, not one thing shall be missing.*

5

- 5 25. 1a. *Thou shalt have the assurance of a numerous seed,*
 2b. *Of descendants (as many) as the wild-flowers;*
 5 26. 3a. *In a ripe old age thou shalt come to the grave,*
 4b. *As a sheaf of grain to the threshing-floor in its season.*

6

- 5 27. 1a. *See! thus have we searched truth out; so is it,*
 2b. *(It agrees with what) we have heard; do thou also lay it to heart.*

III. Interpretation. In spite of certain obscurities in its phrasing and connections, probably due to text corruption, the first speech of Eliphaz is one of the most carefully thought-out and artistic speeches in the book. Its meaning, however, does not lie on the surface. Yet the attempt must be made to discover it if the subsequent argument in the Dialogue is to be intelligently followed. Whatever may be thought of the interpretation of the speech here offered, it is hoped that at least a more precise definition of its problems has been attained than has hitherto been given. The author appears to have two main objects in view in its composition. In the first place, Eliphaz is to sound the key-note for the Friends and accordingly to present their case in as strong and attractive a way as possible. The complaint of Job in Chapter 3 suggests, at least at first sight and when taken by itself, that Job was in the wrong. In agreement with this the rejoinder of Eliphaz is intended to suggest, at first reading, that the Friends are in the right. Job's queries would raise uncomfortable thoughts in the minds of the pious. The affirmations of Eliphaz, doctrinally so sound and steadying, bring a welcome relief. Further, the dignity, sobriety, and beauty with which Eliphaz enforces his views contrast with the vehement, almost ungovernable outbursts of Job, to the great initial disadvantage of the latter. A contrast so unmistakable must be intended by the author. But is this all that was intended? Is there not another note in the discourse than that of serenity and gentleness, a note which is only faintly sounded, it is true, but which may furnish the key to all that follows?

In order to detect this subtle overtone one must consider exactly in what mood Eliphaz addressed Job, what was the impression which he intended to make upon him; and also, and this is all important, what impression he was likely actually to make upon a man of Job's temperament, and experience. In other words, we must listen to this speech first with the ear of Eliphaz's colleagues and of the orthodox circles in Judaism which they represent, and afterwards with the ear of Job himself. We may then discover that the author's second object in the composition of Chapters 4 and 5 is to hint at certain flaws in Eliphaz's position. But these flaws are purposely obscured, these other notes muffled, in order that the Friends may seem gloriously in the right as against Job. The subtle skill with which all this is done is proved, as Delitzsch long ago pointed out, by the difficulty which the Expositors have always experienced in detecting just what was false in the speech. We may discover that they have not sufficiently allowed for the power of psychological analysis which the author of Job possessed to an extraordinary degree.

The speech falls into three main divisions: a) Eliphaz's apology for expostulating with Job, 4 1-8; b) the main didactic section, 4 12-5 5, subdivided into two parts, the oracular instruction, 4 12-21, and the warning to Job of the danger of impatience, drawn from Eliphaz's own experience, 5 2-5; c) the final consolations, 5 8-27.

A. If we look at the argument of Eliphaz from his own point of view, we note, in the first place, that the longest portion of it, which is at the same time its culmination, is consolatory. These consolations are couched in really beautiful language, especially as Eliphaz warms to his subject, and, turning directly to Job (5 17-27) in what is probably the finest stanza of the speech, (5 17-18) substitutes, very significantly, the kindlier doctrine of suffering as chastisement for the harsher doctrine of retribution, and closes with the exquisitely tender and beautiful figure of the sheaf of grain brought to the threshing-floor in its season. A ripe old age, gently mellowing as nature mellows, coming to its transformation at the end of life as nature comes to its autumnal change, a thought

from which the abnormality and repulsiveness of death are entirely eliminated—all this may be in store for Job, purified in character and refined through God's fatherly chastisement! No hypocrite can utter such words as these. Here, at least, speaks a true and kindly friend.

But even in the didactic portion of the speech, 4 12—21, which is elaborated in the present text at great length and given an added emphasis through its oracular form, Eliphaz seems to show the greatest considerateness for Job. He implicates him in sin, it is true, but in the gentlest possible way. He does not accuse him of any specific transgressions which might account for his sufferings. He refers only to the general sinfulness of man which is inherent in man's creatureliness. Job, it is implied, must expect to suffer, not because he was a sinner above all others, but because he was a man. And what man can be clean in the eyes of his creator? This train of thought agrees with the consolations at the end of the speech, and especially with the doctrine of suffering as chastisement, in the fact that both this doctrine and the doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of man as man equally divert the attention from the doctrine of retribution and therefore from Job's own individual sins. In this passage, as in the concluding one, the nobility of the language, the impressive way in which the oracle is described, and the truth of the oracle itself, which few people in antiquity would refuse to accept—all these admirable qualities strongly recommend the position of Eliphaz to the reader. They show the assured calm and the profound reverence of this friend of Job to advantage as contrasted with Job's fury that verges on blasphemy. Thus, in these two longest and most important sections of the speech Eliphaz evidently makes a sincere attempt to be fair to Job. He studiously refrains from any direct or personal attack upon him as a sinner.

In the introductory section, 4 1—8, there is, indeed, a word of rebuke. But how justifiable it is in the circumstances, and how very gently administered! Eliphaz finds no fault with Job's past life; that was beautiful and ideal. Job was a religious man and of blameless conduct. In times past he was able to minister conso-

lations to others not so fortunate as himself. All this Eliphaz freely acknowledges and in doing so unwittingly confirms Jahweh's judgment of Job given in the Prologue and is thus represented by the author as tacitly ignoring for the moment the doctrine of retribution as an explanation of his friend's predicament. But what Eliphaz cannot understand, and the pious, orthodox reader would again sympathize with him at this point, is why Job should feel so distraught. He cannot refrain, (what faithful friend could?) from reminding Job that his religion and his upright life should now stand him in good stead. "For what innocent man ever perished or where have the upright been destroyed?" Here, unquestionably, the doctrine of retribution is introduced, but, most significantly, *in its consolatory aspect*. V. 7 in its present connection can only be meant as an encouragement. Furthermore, all this very careful and clearly deliberate consideration for Job's feelings on the part of Eliphaz is especially creditable to him in view of the fact that he was appalled at Job's condition and yet was compelled to listen to a speech from his friend which would undoubtedly shock his own sensitiveness to the sanctities of life most deeply. It violated that "fear of the Lord," that reverence for the Holy, which Eliphaz regarded and rightly so as a fundamental element in religion. It would thus appear from the portions of the speech already examined that Eliphaz, who, as is generally recognized, is an elderly man, has managed, under the greatest provocation, to control his feelings quite admirably. As he supposed, he was doing the very best he could by his friend. What more could be expected of him? In all this there is no indication of any insincerity or unkindness, and doctrinally he was true to the deepest convictions of the pious of his day. They would certainly understand the statements of Eliphaz thus far brought under review in the way indicated above and would heartily approve of them. But would Job? If we now turn to listen to Eliphaz's speech as Job listened to it, we receive a quite different impression.

B. A jarring note is struck first of all at 4 8. The verse in itself and apart from its context undoubtedly sounds like a rather harsh

warning. Yet it evidently goes with v. 7, for the two verses, taken together, formulate the doctrine of rewards and punishments in a very striking way and hence should not be separated. The innocent man cannot perish, v. 7, that is the consolatory side of the doctrine; the wicked man is bound to perish, v. 8, that is its menacing side. But v. 7, in view of the preceding verses, is clearly intended to encourage Job. If v. 8 were meant to be a warning to him, it would conflict with vv. 1-7 in a most unfortunate way. After the recognition of Job's goodness in v. 6 and the encouragement based on it in v. 7, nothing could be more ill-timed than the warning in v. 8 if that were deliberately aimed at him. Thus interpreted, v. 8 would also be equally irreconcilable with the spirit of vv. 12-21. In them, as we have seen, it was Eliphaz's purpose to implicate Job in sin only generally and indirectly. He was a sinner as all men are sinners. Sin is inherent in mankind. Sin and therefore suffering are racial concomitants. V. 8, on the other hand, suggests immediate personal responsibility for suffering because of specific transgressions. If v. 8 were intended as a warning, it could only suggest to Job that his very unusual sufferings were due to exceptionally heinous sins. It is obvious that v. 8, interpreted as a warning to Job, has no place in its present context. It would spoil the impression of friendliness toward Job which Eliphaz in those parts of the speech already examined so evidently desires to create. Accordingly, if v. 8 is to be retained as an integral part of the text, it must be interpreted as a further expression of Eliphaz's desire to comfort his friend. This can be done very easily if it is assumed that Eliphaz impliedly excludes him from the class of the trouble-makers. Job can console himself with the thought that no innocent man ever suffered; it is only the sinners, who inevitably reap the trouble which they have sown for themselves. *And Job is not to be included among them.* This would seem to be the necessary implication of 4 s in its present connection.²

² There would never have been any questioning of this interpretation had it not been for vv. 9-11. It is true that these verses might also be interpreted as excluding Job from their threats and this has often been done (cf., with more or less explicitness, De., Da., Peake, Dr., Bu., Volz, Steuer.,

But the question now arises, would Job perceive this implication? Would he naturally take v. 8 as an encouragement rather than a warning? This is difficult to suppose under the circumstances. It must not be forgotten that at the outset Job shared with his Friends the current doctrine of retribution. But in the overwhelming nature of the trouble which had overtaken him this particular explanation of it had been lost sight of. He could only gasp out, Why, Why, Why? But now, as he pondered the doctrine of which he had just been most unfortunately reminded by Eliphaz, and then considered his own plight, would it not seem to him that the minatory side of the doctrine in v. 8 applied to him much more exactly than the consolatory side in v. 7? Had he not reaped a harvest of suffering almost overwhelming in extent, and must he not draw the conclusion, unintended by Eliphaz, that he was among those who plowed evil? At this point it is most important to distinguish between the effect which Eliphaz intended to produce by his words and the effect which he actually did produce, for it enables us to see into the remarkable subtlety of our author's method. The doctrine of retribution in its minatory aspect was to be the major premise of the Friends in the great debate that follows. It is highly important, therefore, that it should be introduced at the very beginning of the argument. On the other hand, the author did not wish to make Eliphaz prejudice Job's case at the outset or to be intentionally unkind to him as he would have been if the statement in v. 8 were intended as a solemn warning to his suffering friend. Accordingly, Eliphaz is allowed to couple the threatening aspect of the doctrine in v. 8 with the consoling aspect of it in v. 7 in such a way as to suggest that Eliphaz

Ball). But it is not natural to do so. If these verses are included, the warning is no longer simply the reverse side of the promise in v. 7. It becomes, so to speak, an end in itself, and arrogates to itself the chief emphasis of the first part of the speech (cf. Ew., Di., Bt., K.). By elaborating to such an extent the warning in v. 8 rather than the consolation in v. 7 Eliphaz would betray an entirely different animus toward Job from the one with which we have found him to be inspired. Thus, from the point of view of the speech as a whole serious doubt is cast upon the originality of 4 9-11. See, further, Explanatory Comments.

meant to have Job interpret what was said in v. 8 by what was said in the preceding verses, that is, in a way favorable to himself. But alas! Job interpreted it (he could hardly do otherwise) out of his own experience. He therefore saw an unsympathetic warning in what his friend intended to be an additional word of comfort. Thus the author secured an remarkably serviceable starting-point for the Debate. The great theme of it is announced at the outset. But it is introduced in a purposely ambiguous way which leads to an initial misunderstanding between the Friends and Job and thus prepares the way for all the tensions and complications that are to follow.³

But did the author have any ulterior motive in the way in which he permitted Eliphaz to introduce the thought of v. 8 in addition to providing a suitable beginning for the discussion of the doctrine of retribution? Eliphaz cannot be supposed to be interested in the exigencies of what may be called the author's plot. Why should he feel it necessary to add the unfortunate suggestion in v. 8 which Job would so easily misunderstand? Granted that the latter verse was also intended to afford consolation to Job in its own way, it is quite unnecessary after v. 7. Is it possible that the author, by putting v. 8 into the mouth of Eliphaz, wishes to suggest to the attentive reader that there is a certain flaw in his character? Has Eliphaz made a *faux pas* in supplementing the thought in v. 7 by the one in v. 8, and did the author intend to have him do this? Is it possible that Eliphaz is pictured as so obsessed by the orthodox doctrine of rewards and punishments that, having formulated the comforting side of it, he almost unconsciously and automatically adds the threatening side as well, unmindful of the unfortunate inference Job might draw from it with regard to himself? And is this unmindfulness to be explained by the fact that Eliphaz, in the author's conception of him, is so addicted to general formulas as solvents for life's problems that he has lost all sense for reality

³ If the above interpretation of the author's purpose is correct, it is clear that 4 s is exactly in the position he intended it to be and cannot be deleted, as some critics (e. g. Du.) have suggested should be done, without marring most unfortunately the author's artistic achievement.

and is therefore unable to bring to the consideration of Job's peculiar case the sympathetic imagination which would prevent him from saying the wrong thing or even the right thing at the wrong time? If there was only v. 8 to consider it would be venturesome to answer these questions in the affirmative, but there are other features in this speech which may warrant our doing so. An examination of 5 2-5 is of great importance in this connection.

If the probable effect of 4 s upon Job is not altogether a happy one, still less so are Job's strictures upon the Fool in 5 2-5.⁴ This passage is unquestionably an organic part of the speech and a very important part, for Job makes it the starting point of his reply. What Eliphaz says in it touched Job to the quick. But again the question must be raised whether Eliphaz meant to hurt his friend. Does the real hardness, one might almost say savagery, of the man suddenly break out here in an unguarded moment, or is Eliphaz unaware of the pain he was inflicting? Owing to the somewhat uncertain character of the text at the end of Chapter 4 and the beginning of Chapter 5 we cannot be quite sure of how the author wished to relate it to what precedes. The passage has nothing to do with any theoretical explanation of suffering. It is a warning against the danger of impatience. This warning can only refer to Job's speech in Chapter 3. Job's retort at 6 2 makes this clear. The thought would seem to turn back, after the paragraph upon the universal sinfulness of man, to the restiveness of Job noted by Eliphaz at 4 5 in his introductory expostulation. It is as if Eliphaz, himself, seemed to realize that he had not quite met the situation when he urged the universal sinfulness of man as explanation of Job's troubles. Job's impatience and passion, as exhibited in his speech, needed a rebuke. Granted that his *sufferings* could not be traced to any specific transgressions in the past that merited them, but only to the fact that he participated in the racial sin of mankind, his *speech* was another matter. Job's past life may have been all that could be desired (4 2-5) but this speech of his

⁴ The omission of 5 1 and 5 6-7, on the usual explanation of the latter passage, has no effect upon the following interpretation of 5 2-5. See Explanatory Comments.

was unpardonable. What right had any man, frail and sinful as he was by his very nature, to complain against the Almighty? These fierce outbursts of Job threatened to compromise that "fear," that reverence, due to the Creator from the creature and without which no religion worthy of the name could exist. They savored of impiety, rebellion.⁵ With all his effort to be considerate of his friend, Eliphaz felt it to be his duty to warn him of the spiritual risk he ran. But even so, he did not do this directly. He began by stating the danger of impatience only as a general principle. "Impatience killeth the fool and passion slayeth one who is without self-control." Unfortunately, he went on to illustrate the principle by citing an experience of his own with such a person. He himself had once seen a fool taking root, as if his prosperity were permanently assured; but suddenly his homestead was accursed, his family scattered. Here was a picture drawn pat to Job's situation. Listening to these lines with Job's ear, one can readily understand how he could not fail to apply them to himself. Had he not been prosperous? Had he not come to grief? Had he not given way to impatience? That word, "suddenly," in Eliphaz's mouth was particularly unfortunate. It would inevitably remind Job of those visitations, so swiftly following each other, described in the Prologue. But did Eliphaz mean to suggest these painful comparisons? Did he intend by means of v. 3 to say: Thou art the man? If so, this passage would fall as completely out of line with

⁵ I take it that 5 2-5 thus goes back in thought to 4 5, but the rebuke which Eliphaz feels it his duty to administer at this point receives added emphasis from what is said in 4 12-21. This section is not intended to be simply the introduction to the rebuke in 5 2-5. It has an independent value of its own as a theoretical explanation of Job's sufferings, but it does serve at the same time to give emphasis to the sin of Job's impatience. How can Job, a creature frail and sinful, dare to complain against his Creator? It is most important to remember that in 5 2-5 Eliphaz is not raising the question of Job's sins *prior* to his sufferings and which therefore, on the basis of the doctrine of retribution, would account for them, but to the sin of his speech which occurs *after* his sufferings and therefore cannot account for them. The debate formally opens when Eliphaz raises the question of the propriety of Job's speech. The interesting implications of 4 8 for the development of the debate are as yet unutilized.

the speech as a whole as 4 8 does when interpreted as an intentional warning. Are we, then, to revise the view of Eliphaz's character, tentatively suggested above, and see in 4 8 and 5 2-5 a reflection of the real attitude of Eliphaz toward Job, though he permits himself the luxury of expressing it only at these two points, an attitude of hateful suspicion and cruel vindictiveness? If Eliphaz fully realized how naturally Job could apply these words to himself, no other interpretation of his character is possible. But in that case the labored attempt to implicate Job only in the general sin of mankind, in order to avoid accusing him of specific sins, would be purposeless,⁶ and the final consolations, in spite of their great beauty, would not be honestly meant. This venerable man would then have to be regarded as a master of irony and bitter innuendo and a most offensive hypocrite, masking his real feelings for the most part under the guise of friendship, but now and then allowing the unloveliness of his true character to break out in cruel flings at Job. This is undoubtedly a possible interpretation of the character of Eliphaz as revealed in this speech. But in spite of the fact that it has been advocated more or less clearly by a number of scholars, I do not think it does justice to the real intentions of our author or to the fineness of his method. If it were adopted, the ensuing Dialogue would have to be understood as only bringing to increasingly clear expression the Friends' abhorrence of Job which they had entertained from the beginning. But I believe the author's conception of the character of Eliphaz and of the function of the Dialogue to be a far more subtle one. The Dialogue, so far as the attitude of the Friends toward Job is concerned, is not designed to illustrate merely an intensification of their original abhorrence of him, but rather a change from a friendly, though a bit suspicious attitude at the outset, occasioned by Job's first speech, to one of the fiercest opposition, occasioned by their growing con-

⁶ 4 12-21 would have to be reinterpreted, not as an expression of Eliphaz's consideration for Job, not as having independent value as a theory of suffering, but as intended to serve only as an introduction to the warning at 5 2ff. and to give added emphasis to it.

viction of his previous sins. And this change, as we shall see, is due to the logical working out of the Friends' fixed principles.

But how, it may be asked, was it possible for Eliphaz to be oblivious to the application of what he was saying in 5 2—5 to Job? In the first place Eliphaz was thinking at this point in his speech primarily of the sin of Job's complaints and the danger of punishment he ran because of them. The punishment of the fool *followed on his impatience*. He was therefore thinking of the punishment which might *hereafter* follow on Job's complaints; he was not thinking of Job's sufferings or of their cause. That subject was sufficiently treated in 4 12—21. Hence he overlooked the fact that the fate of the fool which *followed* on his complaints was much the same as the fate of Job which *preceded* his complaints. But Job, whose mind was so deeply exercised over the cause of his sufferings, would apply to himself what Eliphaz had said with a different intention, exactly as in the case of 4 8. Eliphaz's fool had perished for the sin of his impatience. Instead of taking it as a warning as to what might happen to himself in the future, Job took it as a hint of Eliphaz's belief concerning the meaning of what had happened to him in the past. He had suffered like this fool; Eliphaz must have thought that he was a sinner like this fool. So again we find Eliphaz expressing himself in a way that could be very easily misunderstood by Job, though he did not intend to refer directly to Job as is clear from 5 1b which does not correspond to the fate of Job's sons. But this explanation by itself is probably not sufficient to account for Eliphaz's seemingly total obliviousness to the probable application which Job would give to his words. At this point the author's conception of the character of Eliphaz must be taken into consideration. It is unquestionable that Eliphaz, in the thought of the author, is the exponent of current orthodoxy.

If my interpretation is correct, he is also thought of as a type of a certain kind of dogmatic theologian whose presuppositions are supposed to be divine revelations—Eliphaz claims to have received his doctrine through an oracle—and whose eyes are therefore blind to all that does not fit into the preconceived pattern. Now the

difficulty with such persons is that they are *unintentionally* cruel. Confident of the final authority and universal applicability of their divinely revealed dogmas, they are unable to put themselves into the situation of another man and look at his problems from his point of view. They may have sympathy but it is an abstract sympathy, which is no helpful sympathy. They are unable to feel their way into ideas or experiences alien to their own. Dogma has a terrible power to dull the imagination, and without imagination sympathy is unable to help. So it was with Eliphaz. Appalled by Job's sufferings which he lamely attempts to account for by one or the other of his general formulas (4 12—21, 5 17f.), shocked by Job's complaints, the fierceness of which he does not try to condone because he has just attempted to generalize away the poignant personal agony of Job into the more or less impersonal suffering of mankind, he blunders through lack of any true understanding of the situation into language at 4 8 and 5 2—5 which only adds to Job's torment and increases his doubt. In other words, the sting in Eliphaz's allusions at 4 8 and 5 2—5 which the ear of Job was so painfully aware of was unintended by Eliphaz. He was too well satisfied with the all-sufficiency of his general formulas to realize what their effect might be upon one so peculiarly circumstanced as Job. If it be urged that such a conception of Eliphaz's character is a modernization altogether unlikely in an ancient author, I cannot admit the validity of the objection. The orthodox and dogmatic type of mind which trusts in inherited formulas is not confined to our era. It has found its incarnations in all ages and the probability is that it was a more prevalent phenomenon in ancient than in modern times. The astonishing thing is to find another mind in ancient times capable of understanding this type so fully and portraying its operations so accurately. Can we believe that the author of Job really had this power? I think we can. A study of Chapter 9, for example, reveals a truly amazing power in our author of psychological analysis. And several other features in those parts of the present speech which are especially intended to comfort Job, when listened to with Job's ear distinctly favor the view of Eliphaz's character here advocated.

The entire absence from the speech of any expression of sympathy for Job's sufferings has often been noted.⁷ Is this just accidental? Scarcely. It might, indeed, be thought that this peculiar fact favors the view that Eliphaz was completely hostile to Job from the start. But this by no means necessarily follows. Eliphaz might easily fear that an expression of sympathy on his part would be understood by Job to condone his complaints, the last thing Eliphaz wished to suggest. It is very clear that the alienation between Job and his Friends begins, not with any misconstruction by them of his past life (see again 4 1-8), but with their criticism of his speech. Eliphaz could not bring himself to pass over in silence what seemed to him to be so dangerously near to blasphemy. At this point he felt himself entirely in the right. And hence he was led, most unfortunately, to omit all words for Job's misfortunes which might compromise the rebuke he thought it necessary to administer. But this does not mean that Eliphaz already secretly believed in Job's guilt and that his consolations were insincerely offered. The author may have intended to suggest another thing by the failure of Eliphaz at this point. A deep and understanding sympathy would have compelled him to face the problem presented by the extent of Job's suffering more frankly than he wished to do. As a matter of fact he sought to avoid this problem. To implicate Job only in the general sin of mankind (4 12-21), though it was done with a kindly purpose, was to dodge the real issue. This explanation did not fit Job's case at all. If he shared only in the general sin of the race, why was he visited with such unusual and terrible suffering? Pain as acute as his was not the common lot of mortals. Job's ear did not fail to note this dissonance and his reply to Eliphaz on this head in Chapter 6 was crushing. The same lack of any real relevance to Job's case is found in the consolatory conclusion of the speech. Here, also, there is only broad generalization, expressed very beautifully, it is true, but without any sense of reality. The well-meant explanation of Job's suffering by the theory of chastisement at 5 17ff. was robbed of its intended effect by the preceding unfortunate state-

⁷ Cf. De., Di., Da., Volz, Ball.

ments in 5 2-5 which only alienated Job. And what good would it do Job to be told that he would be redeemed from famine and war? And the reference to the slanderer's tongue, why bring that in? It is, indeed, at first sight so incongruous that some scholars have sought to emend the text to get rid of it. But may it not be intended to show to what lengths a man of Eliphaz's mentality could go in the way of irrelevance? Incidentally, the Dialogue was to show that the Friends themselves were slandering Job. Did the author have this in mind and was this reference to Eliphaz's promise of safety from slander an ironical fling by the author himself at the fatuous character of Eliphaz's consolations? This must certainly be the case in what follows. It was a lovely picture to look at which Eliphaz painted, of Job's homestead with nothing missing in it, of his fields without stones, his numerous progeny (one can almost see Job wince at the allusion) and his harvest home in the mellowness of old age. But was not his home blasted? Were not his children slain? Was not he, himself, afflicted with an incurable disease? Comfort which does not flow from any real understanding of the situation is vain, however well-meant or beautifully expressed. In such circumstances kindness is ineffectual and consolations become irrelevant. That all these dissonances are actually in this introductory speech of Eliphaz is conclusively proved from Job's reply in Chapter 6 and 7 which points them out.⁸

Thus in conclusion, we are to see in Eliphaz an aged, dignified, well-meaning man, dominated by the current doctrine of retribu-

⁸ It might be supposed that the more or less conventional promises in 5 12-26 are the usual verbiage with which Oriental poets delight to adorn their pages, and hence that the author himself is not aware of the irrelevancies which he is putting into the mouth of Eliphaz. But if we study the speeches of Job in the Dialogue we do not find, except in a few critically doubtful passages, such irrelevancies. In Job's speeches the poet hews to the line with a concentrated power that is amazing. Hence it seems fair to conclude that when the author does introduce irrelevant material in the speeches of the Friends he intends to do so. In the case of the author of Job we are dealing with a great poetical genius, and we are bound to interpret his work from this point of view and not reduce him to the level of an ordinary oriental poet. Oriental he is, but a great Oriental.

tion, who wishes to spare Job's feelings and comfort him, but is able to do neither the one nor the other because he is a doctrinaire, unable to sense the tragic realities of life. He is not a malignant person. He is not hiding his real feelings toward Job under a mantle of hypocritical sympathy while indulging in bitter asides at his expense. He is simply a rather stupid good person, blundering into words that would cut Job to the quick because he did not have a sufficiently sympathetic imagination to realize what impression he was likely to make by them. So interpreted, the speech reveals a double character exactly as the Prologue does. On the surface Eliphaz appears to be in the right, not only in kindly minimizing Job's responsibilities for his present plight, not only in his well-meant consolations, but also in the merited rebuke of the temper of Job's speech. The average orthodox reader would heartily approve of Eliphaz. There can be no doubt of that. But on closer investigation and when listened to with the ear of Job, the speech of Eliphaz is found to be hopelessly in the wrong. The subtlety of it lies in its irony and innuendo. But these are not the irony and innuendo of Eliphaz at the expense of Job but the irony and innuendo of the author at the expense of Eliphaz and of the orthodox reader whose position he represents.⁹

* A careful examination of the Commentators reveals the fact that there has been little systematic attempt to relate the different parts of the speech of Eliphaz, with their varying moods, to each other, and this in spite of the fact that the artistic nature of the speech is much insisted upon. In general the Commentators may be divided into two main groups: (1) Those who see in Eliphaz a sincere and well-meaning friend of Job whose consolations, though somewhat irrelevant and given without a sufficiently sympathetic understanding of the situation, are nevertheless honestly meant (Hitz., De., Da., Du., Peake, Bu., Dr., Volz, Steuer., Bart.), (2) Those who see in Eliphaz a secret enemy of Job whose consolations are more or less hypocritical (Ew., Di., Jast., Bt., Ball; König may also be grouped with these because of his view of 4 6-11, though he does not formally discuss the question). Duhm is the most consistent exponent of the first view and Battenwieser the most uncompromising advocate of the second. Within the two poles of opinion represented by these two men there all sorts of shadings and conflicting interpretations of details. The first group of scholars relies mainly upon 4 2-7 and 5 8-26 for the support of their view, the second group upon 4 8-11 and 5 2-5. The most important line of cleavage between the two

IV. Explanatory Comments.

4 2. *Essay a word.* The verb usually means "prove" in the sense of "test." Yet cf. Dt. 4 34 (EV., "assay"); 28 56 (EV., "adventure") for the meaning "essay" or "attempt." In these two cases the verb is followed by the infinitive, and possibly it would be safer to change דָּבַר (a word) to דִּבֶּר (to speak).¹⁰ Yet the verb in the sense of "test" takes a direct object at Eccl. 7 23 and may do so here. Eliphaz begins with a polite apology. Further emendations, especially those based on the reading נִסָּה for נִשָּׂא in Aq., Sym., Th., Syr., (e. g. Be., Du., K.) are quite unnecessary. G.'s paraphrase is certainly not to be followed.

Take it ill. Lit. "be weary," and then "impatient;" cf. the use of the noun at Mal. 1 13, "what a bore!"

4 6. *Religion.* Lit. "fear," an abbreviation for "fear of God" (RV.) which is often a synonym for "religion." Cf. Ps. 19 9 (10) where "fear of Jaweh" is in parallelism with Law, Precepts, Commandments, and refers, like them, to the Religion of Israel as an objective fact and not simply to a subjective experience. When religion is called "the fear of God," the sense of awe or reverence is emphasized. Without this quality no religion in any deeper sense can exist. This conception of religion is fundamental in the theology of the Friends and is a true element in it which must be reckoned with. However, such fear is quite compatible with joy. "The fear of the Lord is glory and exultation and gladness and a crown of rejoicing," sings the Son of Sirach, 1 11ff. and Faber describes God in one of his *Hymns of Childhood* as "my welcome fear at night." The saints have never shrunk from the idea of the "fear of God."

Should not. The EV. and the great majority of modern commentators translate by the present indicative and this is grammatically more correct,

groups is in their respective criticism and interpretation of 4 8-11. The one group construes 8 by vv. 9-11 as a very pointed warning to Job, whose guilt Eliphaz assumes from the start and therefore feels it necessary to threaten him. The other group is divided. Some of them seek to interpret vv. 8-11 in the light of the kindly expressed introduction in vv. 2-7 and therefore infer that it was Eliphaz's intention to exclude Job from the threats in vv. 8-11. In this case vv. 8-11 are also considered to be intended as consolatory. Others of this group prefer to regard either all or part of vv. 8-11 as secondary. In either case it is possible to hold that Eliphaz at the start assumes the essential goodness of Job though he is undoubtedly alarmed by his speeches. The interpretation of the speech given above follows this last method of attack upon its problems, but by the retention of v. 8 and its interpretation as intentionally consolatory it is believed new beauty and new subtlety in this first speech of the Friends are revealed. For details see Explanatory Comments.

¹⁰ Bu. after Aq., Th., V.

but the implication is that Job should find comfort in what he possesses. The translation by the past tense (Mx., Bu., Jast., Bt.) seems to be due to a disinclination to admit that Eliphaz could recognize Job's virtues in the present.

The differences in the translation of v. 6 in AV. and RV. are probably due to a difficulty in the Hebrew text which reads as if there were three predicates: Is not thy fear thy confidence, thy hope and (!) the blamelessness of thy ways?

The construction of the λ , "and" as the λ of the apodosis (K.) is harsh. Either remove "thy hope" to the end of the sentence, in strict parallelism of form with the first line (Mx., Du.), or place "and" before "thy hope," cf. the italicised "and" in RV. which follows G. and Syr., and five Hebrew manuscripts (so Di., Bu., Be. alternatively, Dr., Ball), or omit it altogether (Volz). The AV.'s rendering with its introduction of "this" without any clearly defined antecedent is clearly incorrect. G.'s reading of v. 5 is interesting:

Is not thy fear foolishness ($\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$),
And thy hope, and the evil ($\eta \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$) of thy way?

This implies a blunt attack upon Job's character which anticipates later developments in the Dialogue but is entirely inappropriate in this opening speech of the Friends. The Hebrew word בְּסֵלֶת , translated by "confidence" in EV. and "foolishness" in G., is found only here with certainty (Ps. 85 8 (9) is a questionable text) but is the equivalent of כֶּסֶל which has both these meanings ("foolishness" in the one certain passage, Eccl. 7 25; "confidence" at Job 8 14, 31 24, Prov. 3 26, Ps. 78 7; at Ps. 49 13 (14) both renderings have been given, cf. RV. text and mg). G. has adopted the rarer meaning, "foolishness." How did it come to do this? It is just possible that the answer to this question may be found in the next line. Here $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$, "evil," has been substituted for the Hebrew דָּלָה , "blamelessness." Beer holds that this represents the original text in G., but more probably it is due to a corruption of an original $\eta \acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (Ball) which is still preserved in Holmes-Parsons 157 and noted in Field. In favor of this latter view is the fact that $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ along with $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ is G.'s equivalent for derivatives of the Hebrew root כָּסַח , in a considerable number of instances in Job, Psalms and Proverbs (cf. Job 27 5, 31 6, and especially 2 3, to which, along with 1 1, 8, our present passage is an allusion). If $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is a text corruption it must be a very ancient one, for the conjectured original appears in but one manuscript. This ancient corruption might then be responsible for the translation of בְּסֵלֶת by "foolishness." The wide-spread character of the corruption was favored by the tendency to import into this first speech of Eliphaz the mood of his subsequent speeches, a tendency reflected in V. (Where is thy fear, thy courage, thy patience and the perfection of thy ways?) and many modern commentaries (see also below at v. 12).

4 7. The words "thy religion," "blameless," "innocent," "upright" in

vv. 6 and 7 are intended to remind of 1 1, 8; 2 3. The characterization of Job by the author and Jahweh in the Prologue is here echoed by Eliphaz. Eliphaz is, of course, not aware of the coincidence. But it is clearly the intention of the author to put the earlier encomium of Job into the mouth of Eliphaz also, and by this device to suggest that Eliphaz's recognition of Job's piety was an honest one, not ironical as König maintains. This in turn implies that v. 7 was also spoken in order to comfort, not to warn as König again holds (cf. Dillmann's characterization of v. 7 as "double edged"). The ancient Jewish interpretation of vv. 6 and 7 as intentionally "injurious" to Job (Baba Meši'a 58b, cited in Moore, *Judaism*, II, p. 147), which, along with the present tense in v. 6 (see above), seems to have influenced König, is certainly mistaken. Vv. 2-7 are honestly and kindly meant. They include a rebuke, it is true, but this is natural under the circumstances and it is not at all harsh (see Interpretation).

4 8. *Evil*, as RV. at Jer. 4 15. The Hebrew word, 'awen, may be used of the sin or wickedness that leads to misfortune¹¹ or to the misfortune itself which results from sin.¹² On the other hand the Hebrew word, 'amal, translated "harm," never in itself refers to sin. Yet occasionally, as here, it refers to the injury or harm done to others as at Ps. 7 16 (17): "His mischief ('amal, i. e. the harm that he does to others) shall return upon his own head and his violence upon his own pate"¹³ (RV.). We might expect at Job 4 8 that it would be explicitly said, as at Prov. 22 8, that "they that plow iniquity ('avlah) shall reap calamity ('awen)."¹⁴ But in the current doctrine of retribution sin is thought of as so inherent in trouble that the one meaning almost imperceptibly shades off into the other in 'awen. I have chosen "evil" and "harm" as suggesting the moral taint that was found in misfortune.¹⁵ The rhythm in v. 8 is awkward as there is no caesura between the two lines. Since there is no defect in the thought or expression, this awkwardness would seem to be an intentional variation. If we examine the stanza arrangement of vv. 2-8, it would seem best to separate v. 2 from what follows as an introductory couplet.¹⁶ This permits vv. 3-8 to fall into three beautifully constructed quatrains:

¹¹ Jer. 4 14 (RV., "evil" in sense of "sinful"); Ps. 36 3 (4), 66 18, Prov. 19 28 (RV., "iniquity"); Prov. 17 4 (RV., "wicked").

¹² Jer. 4 15 (RV., "evil" in the sense of "misfortune"); Prov. 12 21 (RV., "mischief"); Prov. 22 8 (RV., "calamity").

¹³ Cf. Hab. 1 3.

¹⁴ Cf. also, for the thought, Hos. 8 7; 10 13.

¹⁵ G. has for 'awen and 'amal τὰ ἄτοπα and ὀδύνας. The former word is found 5 (6?) times in Job, once in Prov., and once in II Macc. It is used four times in these places for 'awen. The latter Greek word is used for 28 different Hebrew words, but only three times for 'amal, all in Job, 4 8; 7 3; 15 35. The first of these words is thus a mark of G.'s style.

¹⁶ So Volz. Hitzig separates it in thought, though not in the stanza arrangement, from what follows.

a) vv. 3, 4, Job's attitude in the past toward the sufferings of others;
 b) vv. 5, 6, by contrast, his very questionable attitude toward his own sufferings in the present—a quatrain made up of two antithetic couplets;
 c) vv. 7, 8, the great doctrine of rewards and punishments which should be his support at such a time as this, again expressed in two antithetic couplets. In this quatrain the major promise of the friends is announced in both its consolatory and minatory aspects. For the propriety of v. 8 in its present position, see Interpretation.

4 9, 10—11. The quatrain in vv. 10, 11, is an effective description of the breakup of the lion's den.

(Hark to) the roar of the lion, the growl of the king of beasts,
 The teeth of the young lion are dashed out,
 The lion perishes for lack of prey,
 The lion's cubs are scattered.

It is impossible to translate the five synonyms for lion in this stanza without becoming pedantic. The language of the desert is full of such synonyms. In the vast general uniformity of it the mind seems to find relief in fine discriminations. The lion is usually taken to represent the powerful and violent sinner who will finally be overthrown. This must be the meaning if the stanza is an original part of the context. In that case we have here, not a simile, but a metaphor, the interpretation of which is left to the reader's imagination. But the context certainly does not stimulate his imagination to this interpretation. There is no emphasis in the context upon the power or violence of the wicked man. Job was, indeed, powerful in the days of his prosperity, but he was certainly not violent. He may have been violent as he later sat on his dunghill and complained of his lot, but he was assuredly not powerful. Again, the change of figure from sowing-time and harvest in v. 8 to that of the lion's den in vv. 10f. is abrupt in the extreme and is unmediated by v. 9. The same figure of the crippled lion in less elaborated form underlies 29 17 (a doubtful verse); Ps. 3 7 (8); 58 6 (7). Vv. 10f. may well be a more fully worked-out form of this metaphor, either composed by some commentator to emphasize the warning in v. 8, or, more probably, cited from some other source for the same purpose by some copyist who wrote it originally on the margin. The quatrain is rejected by an increasing number of scholars.¹⁷ Duhm has also suggested the deletion of v. 9:

By the breath of God they perish,
 By the blast (lit. wind) of his anger they are consumed.

This verse cannot be combined with the perfectly rounded quatrain, vv. 10 to 11, without destroying its intentional symmetry. But the result would be equally unfortunate if v. 9 were attached to vv. 7—8 which, as we have

¹⁷ Mx., Sieg., Du., Jast.

seen, also forms an excellent quatrain, intended to express in classic form the great doctrine of the Friends. The artistic effect of this quatrain would be distinctly weakened by such an addition. It may be added that v. 9 is a rather vague generalization. Are the breath and wind of God figures of anything in particular? Scholars who make any comment on the verse at all usually see in it an allusion to the withering of the wicked as herbage withers under the sirocco, the hot wind of God.¹⁸ In that case v. 9 is not quite homogeneous with v. 8. In v. 8 there is to be a harvest of a sort; in v. 9 there is to be no harvest at all. But this argument by itself would have little weight.¹⁹ The fact, however, that v. 9 is wedged in between two excellent quatrains, to neither of which it can be attached without destroying its effectiveness, is a real objection to this verse.

Duhm, followed by Schmidt, goes so far as to reject v. 8 also, against which he urges its unrhythmical character and its contextual difficulty. But the contextual difficulty, as shown above, is no real difficulty. On the other hand, the rejection of v. 8 requires a rearrangement of the quatrains in vv. 1—7 far less satisfactory than the one proposed above and sacrifices the full statement of the doctrine of retribution which it is the deliberate purpose of the author to put into the mouth of Eliphaz in this, the opening speech of the Friends. If it were not certain that the book of Job was subjected to a later revision on a large scale in the interest of orthodoxy, the doubts of the originality of vv. 9, 10—11 might not carry conviction. But when once the resolution is taken to eliminate these verses as a premature emphasis upon the thought of v. 8 in a dogmatic interest, the movement of thought in this first speech of Eliphaz and the real intention of its author in its composition can be much more easily understood.²⁰

¹⁸ Cf. Hos. 13 15; Is. 40 7. So Di., Da., Du., Bart., and especially Dr.

¹⁹ Jastrow translates "breath" and "blast" by "wrath" and "anger," cf. Ps. 18 15 (16) = II Sam. 22 16. But whether the Hebrew word for breath, נִשְׁמָה, can, by itself, mean wrath is questionable. It is used again of anger only in the Psalm passage just cited, but there it is accompanied by "nostrils," "the breath of thy nostrils."

²⁰ See Interpretation. The poetical structure of 4 2—11 is much disputed. The older commentators incline to divide the section into two strophes, vv. 2—6 and vv. 7—11, each of ten lines (Ew., Hitz., Di.), but with no attempt to further divide into quatrains. On the basis of these arrangements it is noticeable that, while vv. 7 and 8 can be taken together as contrasted with what precedes, yet, if vv. 9—11 are retained, the whole emphasis of the second strophe would fall upon the warning in v. 8, of which vv. 9—11 would be an elaboration, not upon the hope in v. 7. The result is to isolate v. 7 in a measure and to combine v. 8 with vv. 9—11. Again, vv. 2—11 have been divided according to the supposed sequence of thought into two sections, vv. 2—5 and vv. 6—11, i. e. 8 × 12 (so De., Bu., Dr., Ball, K.) or,

4 12. *Whisper*. A doubtful word. It occurs again only at 26 14; yet cf. Ex. 32 25. The meaning "whisper," (so RV.) follows Sym. and V. "A little" (AV., cf. "inkling," Jastrow) follows Targ., Syr., and the mediaeval Jewish tradition. If "whisper" is adopted, this does not mean that only a part of the revelation was heard, but that it came to Eliphaz as a whisper, as a faint and far off sound. This seems more in line with the parallelism and the following context, generally, which emphasizes the mystery of the revelation. G. has ἐξαισία, "portentous" or "ominous" things. This is a pure guess, but shows that the translator had a feeling for the passage. There seems to have been another attempt to translate the verse in G.:

If there had been any word of truth in thy speeches,
No one of these evils (G^A) would have befallen thee.

The first line with its mistaken reading of נאלי for נאלי corresponds to v. 12a. The οὐθὲν of the second line probably reads נין for נאלי and וחקר for חקח and takes שמץ in the sense of "little" (cf. Be., Dr., and Ball with varying suggestions). At 26 14 the word is translated by ἡμᾶδα, "moisture" (cf. Jer. 17 8, the only other occurrence of the word in G.) and then "drop" as something very little.

The result is a curious but interesting perversion of the passage. It seeks to account for Job's sufferings by his speeches. But this is just what Eliphaz does not do at this stage of the Debate.

omitting vv. 10–11, into 8×8 (Mx.). The tendency of this arrangement is to combine vv. 6–7 together and vv. 8–11, in other words to separate vv. 7 and 8. This comes out very clearly in Ball's quatrain arrangement which is based on Duhm's: vv. 2–3; 4–5; 6–7; 8–9; 10–11. But thus to wrench apart vv. 7 and 8 is against all probability, for when combined they form a natural quatrain in which the doctrine of retribution finds a classical formulation. On all the above theories which retain vv. 8–11 it is further noteworthy that this first part of the speech closes with a most emphatic warning which fairly smothers the consolatory suggestion of v. 7 and is quite unexpected after the introductory verses. Hence Duhm, as we have seen (cf. also Schmidt), rejects vv. 8–11 and arranges vv. 2–7 in the series of quatrains later followed by Ball. By this means he eliminates the note of warning altogether, but again at the expense of separating vv. 7 and 8. But, as I believe, it is only when these two verses are taken together (so, most precisely, Hitz. and Da.) and v. 2 is separated from what follows as an introductory couplet, that a quatrain arrangement, which at the same time serves to clarify the thought most fully, can be obtained. The quatrain, vv. 7–8, contains, it is true, a warning, but if vv. 9–11 are rejected, the warning is not so predominant in this first part of the speech as it is in its present form. The bearing of all this upon the interpretation of the speech as a whole is important.

4 13. *Thoughts confused and vague*. A paraphrase of a doubtful word, שְׁעָפִים.

It is found again in this form only at 20 2, in a slightly different form (שְׁרָעָפִים) at Ps. 94 19, 139 23. It is connected by some scholars with an Arabic root "to excite," "disquiet," hence anxious, or troubled thoughts;²¹ by others with a root of slightly different form (שָׁעַף) "to cleave," "divide," "branch," from which the noun, "branches," comes.²² The paraphrase follows the latter derivation and suggests the blurred and indistinct impression which comes at the outset of this supernatural experience. "Thoughts" (T. and EV.) is too colorless a word. The verb, "yield" paraphrases the preposition "from" (EV.) in its sense of source or origin. To delete the preposition,²³ or to change it to ו ("and")²⁴ is quite unnecessary, in spite of the imitation at 33 15, where "dream" takes the place of "confused thoughts" and the preposition is omitted.

Trance more deep than sleep. The Hebrew word (תַּרְדֵּמָה), thus paraphrased and found again in Job at 33 15, is usually employed of a trance condition induced by supernatural influences. Cf. Gen. 2 21, I. Sam. 26 12, Is. 29 10, and especially at Gen. 15 12 where it is directly connected, as in Job, with a revelation. The verb is used in the same sense of "trance" at Dan. 8 18; 10 9, and very effectively at Jonah 1 5f. (cf. Is. 29 10), in a chapter whose atmosphere is saturated with the supernatural and the mysterious.²⁵ At Ps. 76 6 (7) the verb is used of the sleep of death which, through God's agency, overcame the Egyptians. At Jd. 4 21, Prov. 10 5 and 19 15 the word (noun or verb) is used more generally of a very sound sleep. It is interesting to observe how the Versions also feel the connotation of the mysterious and the supernatural which the word possesses. At Gen. 2 21 and 15 12 G., and at Is. 29 10 Th. reads ecstasy (ἡσταισις). At Job 4 13 and 33 15 G. reads "fear" (φόβος) and "dreadful fear" (δεινὸς φόβος) and Th. at 33 15 again "ecstasy." Compare also the use of "stupor" (θάμβος) from Jahweh' at I. Sam. 26 12 and the same root as a verb in the A. text of Th. at Dan. 8 18. In view of all this it seems much better in this connection to take תַּרְדֵּמָה of a supernatural trance than, as Budde and König do, of a natural though heavy sleep.

4 14. *Dread and quaking*. Hendiadys for a shuddering dread. Cf. Prov. 29 15. The second line of v. 14 is uncertain. Lit. "The multitude of my

²¹ BDB, Ges-Buhl, Du., K. (?). This seems to be the view of G. ("fear"), Sym. (panic, ἐν ἐκπλήξει), V. (horror).

²² Hitz., Di., Bu., Be., Dr., Jast. ("play of thoughts"), Ball, cf. Aq. (ἐν παραλλαγῇ, alternations, changes).

²³ Hitz., Ehr.

²⁴ Be.

²⁵ G.'s translation in Jonah by "snore" (ἔρεγγεν) is quite out of keeping with the spirit of the chapter.

bones it filled with dread." "Multitude" (רַב) is regularly taken as the poetical equivalent of "all," though this is doubtful. Further, to say that dread or shuddering dread filled with dread (the hiph., הִפְחִיד is found only here) is not good usage in Hebrew. Ehrlich proposes to read רַב for רַב and to give it the sense of "doubt" or "anxiety" which it sometimes has in Arabic—"Doubt filled my bones with dread." G. reads "shook" (δίσσεισεν) which may point to an original הִחִיל, cf. G.'s συνείσκει for יחיל at Ps. 29:8—"Doubt shook my bones." Interesting, but G., T. and V. support רַב. The translation adopted is a somewhat loose paraphrase of the present Hebrew text.²⁶ The general thought is clear enough. The verse intends to suggest the feeling of uncanniness which precedes the vision itself.

4 15. *A breath of air.* "Wind" (רוּחַ),²⁷ like the wind at I K. 19 11. The Hebrew word is not to be translated "spirit,"²⁸ for it is never used as πνεῦμα is used at Luke 24 37 or Acts 23 9 of an apparition. This faint breath is not a part of the vision, but is a premonitory sign of what is to follow—a breath from the supernatural world.²⁹

Hasieth by, brushing my face. This is an attempt to convey the probable meaning or at least the feeling of the original. The Hebrew verb, חָלַף, translated "hasteth by," has various shades of meaning. As a verb of motion it is found only in poetry except at I Sam. 10 3, and several times in parallelism with עָבַר, the usual Hebrew word for "passing by,"³⁰ and so it is understood in the present passage by T., which translates it by עָבַר, Syr. and V.³¹ But חָלַף, unlike עָבַר, clearly has at times the sense of speed attached to it, as at Job 9 11; 9 26, where it is parallel to "dart" and describes the swift passing of the light reed-boats on the Nile; 20 24, where it probably describes the swift arrow which hurtles after and overtakes a fugitive;³² Is. 8 8 and

²⁶ Cf. Volz's similar paraphrase.

²⁷ So commentators generally.

²⁸ AV., RV. txt., Ew., Bt., K., Du. Duhm's reason is that רוּחַ is here masc. as at I K. 22 21. But it is also masc. at Job 8 2 where the reference is unquestionably to the wind.

²⁹ For the meaning, "wind," whether strong or gentle, cf. Mx., Di., Bu., Steuer., Volz, Dr., Jast., Ball. The line in the Gilgamesh epic: The shade of Enkidu he permitted to rise out of the earth like a breath of air, is therefore slightly different from our present passage (Gressmann, *Texte u. Bilder*, II, p. 185.).

³⁰ So at Job 9 11, Is. 8 8, Songs 2 11, Hab. 1 11 (uncertain passage). At Is. 24 5 it is parallel to עָבַר in the sense of "transgress." The same change of shading in both words in this last passage shows their close connection.

³¹ The ἐπὶ ἔλθεν of G., though this compound is used only here for חָלַף (παρίερχεσθαι at 9 11a, G.'s usual translation of עָבַר, ἀπέρχεσθαι at I Sam. 10 3 and Songs 2 11) seems also to take it in the sense of "pass by" as it is frequently used for עָבַר.

³² See Moore on Judges 5 26.

21 1, where it is used of the Euphrates sweeping through Judah and the whirlwinds sweeping through the South.³³ At Job 9 11 and here the context also suggests an element of furtiveness in the swiftness of the passing. The wind at Job 4 15 is not a great storm-wind as at Is. 21 1 or I K. 19 11, but, in accordance with the muted character of the entire passage, a mere breath of air, a draught, hasting by. What, now, is the force of the following prepositional phrase עַל פָּנַי? Nowhere else is חָלַף followed by a preposition, for the עַם of comparison at 9 26 is no real exception. If ruah meant a spirit or apparition, then undoubtedly the following phrase, עַל פָּנַי, would mean, as it often does, "before me."³⁴ But if ruah means "wind," this translation is by no means so obvious. Eliphaz wishes to say that he became aware of a wind. But how did he become aware of it? He could not see it. Nor did he become aware of it by observing its effects. Nothing is said of any observed effects (contrast I K. 19 11). He felt it. Hence the very similar phraseology at Ex. 33 19 in which עַל פָּנַי after עָבַר is translated "before thee"³⁵ is not determinative for Job 4 15. But if Eliphaz felt the wind, then it is altogether probable that עַל פָּנַי in the phrase עַל פָּנַי is not part of the prepositional phrase in the sense of "before me," but refers to the actual face of Eliphaz.³⁶ That פָּנַי preceded by עַל may, on occasion, refer to the actual face is clear from such passages as Ex. 34 33, 35; II K. 4 29, 8 15; Is. 25 8. But the exact force of עַל is not quite certain. "By my face," as at I K. 9 8; Jer. 22 8 and I K. 19 19 (reading עָלַי for עָלַי), in all three cases preceded by עָבַר, hardly fits, for, as we have seen, the wind is felt. "Over my face" is better, as at Gen. 8 1 or, more exactly still, at Nu. 6 5 and 8 7, in all of which cases עָבַר is again used.³⁷ The idea is that, as the wind hasted by, Eliphaz felt it on his face.

The hair of my head. Lit. "a hair of my flesh." The construction of the second line in v. 15 is uncertain though the general meaning is clear. The word שַׁעֲרָה is used elsewhere only of a single hair. If it is emended to the plural,³⁸ this conflicts with the singular verb of which it is supposed to be the subject.³⁹ If, on the other hand, it is taken as the object of the verb, the *pi'el* being now given a transitive force, then the subject of the verb must be ruah ("It, the wind, makes the hairs of my flesh to bristle up").

³³ The idea of a swift passing in חָלַף easily passes over into that of a sudden vanishing or disappearance, as at Is. 2 18, Songs 2 11.

³⁴ So Ew., Hitz., Di., Du., Volz, Steuer.

³⁵ G. πρότερός σου.

³⁶ Bd., Dr., Ehr., Ball, Jast. This is probably also intended by G.'s πρόσπονον μου.

³⁷ This seems to be the view of G. which translates Job 4 15 by ἐπὶ ἔλθεν ἐπὶ, exactly as at Nu. 6 5 and 8 7.

³⁸ Dr., Ball.

³⁹ תְּסַמֵּךְ (bristle up) occurs again only at Ps. 119 120 where it is an intransitive קָל.

But *ruah* is in this passage masc., whereas the verb is fem.⁴⁰ Under the circumstances my freer paraphrase is perfectly justifiable. The interpretation by T., followed by Mx., of שַׁעֲרָה, a hair, as the equivalent of *ruah*, a storm-wind, on the mistaken supposition that it is in parallelism with wind (*ruah*), is against all the other ancient Versions and the general context and is probably due to the influence of I K. 19 11. The change of tense from the past in v. 14 to the vivid historical presents in vv. 15f. is noteworthy.

4 16. *I feel a presence*. Lit. "it stands." The subject is intentionally indefinite, cf. *רוח* of Sym. and *quidam* of V. The first person, "I stood," of G., Aq., and Syr. is certainly incorrect. The Hebrew expressly refers to the objective though undefined ("it") presence and only suggests the uncanny impression which it makes. The paraphrase emphasizes the subjective impression rather than the objective appearance.

Semblance. (תְּמוּנָה, "image," AV.) Cf. for this word Dt. 4 12, 15, 16, 25; Ex. 20 4 (Dt. 5 8), in all of which passages G. has *ὁμοίωμα* (likeness). It occurs again only at Nu. 12 8 and Ps. 17 15, in both of which instances G. has, because of theological timidity, substituted "glory," and in our present passage, where G. has *μορφή* ("form," RV.). It has been remarked that the word is found only in connection with God or with something to be worshipped. It suggests the undefinable and mysterious just as the word דְּמוּת does at Ezek. 1 26; ⁴¹ not the supernal thing itself, only its dim and shadowy likeness that, as it were, comes like a veil between the observer and the divine reality. The word thus emphasizes positively what the preceding line expresses negatively. What Eliphaz sees is objective yet impalpable.⁴²

And through the stillness. The paraphrase seeks to draw out the real meaning of the more forcible, pregnant construction of the Hebrew: "Stillness and a voice I hear."⁴³ The sound is as impalpable as the sight. The physical sensations of sight and sound are sublimated until they almost vanish into a world of pure spirit. One hears stillness, sees what is but a semblance of a shape. To reject "stillness" as a gloss out of I K. 19 12, as one commentator has proposed to do, shows a lack of imagination appalling to think of in an interpreter of Job. The allusion to "the still small voice" of Elijah's vision at Horeb is, indeed, quite certain in spite of the slight

⁴⁰ Yet cf. 1 19 and I K. 19 11, where *ruah* is both masc. and fem. in the same sentence.

⁴¹ Cf. תְּמוּנָה parallel to תְּבוֹנָה at Dt. 4 16.

⁴² G. I saw and there was no form before my eyes,
But a breath of air (*aëon*) and a voice I heard.

G. under the influence of Dt. 4 12 draws a distinction between the "semblance" or "form" which is not seen and the voice which is heard, clearly incorrectly.

⁴³ G., a breath of air and a voice; Sym., stillness of a voice; V., a voice of a gentle breath of air (*aurae lenis*).

change of expression; our author varies it in his own way. The great and strong wind which Elijah saw shattering the rocks is now subdued to the faintest breath of air, in keeping with the remainder of the description. The literary allusions in vv. 12–16 to the passages in I K. 19 and Gen. 15 12 (less certainly to the theophanies at Ex. 33 17–23; 34 5ff.) would add greatly to the power and beauty of these verses for the ancient reader. Jonah is similarly a past master in the art of literary allusion. It is sad to think that the general ignorance of the Bible at the present time, which seems to increase with the increasing output of our Bible Societies, makes it necessary for a commentator explicitly to point out such allusions. In this connection it may not be amiss to remind the reader of the beautiful paraphrase of our present passage in the last of Byron's Hebrew Melodies, *A spirit passed before me*. In vv. 12–13 there is an excellent quatrain introductory to the vision, in vv. 14–15 a quatrain descriptive of the uncanny effect of the supernatural experience into which Eliphaz is entering. In v. 16, which seeks to describe the almost indescribable character of the vision itself, we would expect another quatrain. But there are now only three lines. There is no indication that the thought is incomplete, nor any evidence of a corrupted text. Duhm suggests that the first line in v. 16 is intentionally abbreviated in order to concentrate attention upon the mystery of this intangible presence and thus secures a quatrain. This is a rather daring suggestion, but the formal and rhetorical beauty of the poem is enhanced by it and it has been followed in the translation.

4 17. *Mortal man*. Heb. מֵאִשׁ, often, as here, with the idea of frailty attached. G., *βροτός*.

Earth-born man. Heb. גֵּבֶר. While this word is used at times in prose connections, it is of special frequency in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and Lamentations, above all in Job. It may therefore be regarded as mainly a poetical equivalent for the usual Hebrew words for man, אָדָם or אִישׁ. I have inserted "earth-born" for the sake of the parallelism and the context, though the word etymologically refers to the strong male (G. *ἀνὴρ*, here and regularly in Job used as the equivalent of גֵּבֶר) as opposed to the female.

In God's sight. From God's point of view. This translation follows G., RV.mg., and the majority of modern commentators, as against the translation by the comparative (AV., RV.txt., Hitz., K. after T. and V.). The first translation involves a very rare usage of the preposition בְּ (only at 35 2; Nu. 32 22, G. *ἐναντι Κυρίου* in both cases; cf. also Jer. 51 5, G., *ἀπὸ*; Gen. 38 26, G., *ἡ ἐγὼ*) but is greatly favored by the following context which emphasizes the sharpness of the difference between God and man. The second translation is grammatically simpler but involves a gross exaggeration and is opposed by the following verses.

The brief, powerful couplet, v. 17, is best taken by itself as the oracle and what follows as its elaboration.⁴⁴ V. 17 is of great importance in this first

⁴⁴ Du., Jast., and compare the comments of Hitz., Ew., and Dr. The

speech of Eliphaz. It implicates Job in sin, but in the gentlest possible way. All men are sinners and hence Job must be one also. Eliphaz will not charge Job with any specific sin that might account for his sufferings. The whole passage, therefore, vv. 12-17, which culminates in the oracle is altogether kindly in its intentions.⁴⁵

4 18. *Error.* אֶלֶּה. The word is found only here and is uncertain. The ancient Versions are quite at a loss. Possibly to be explained out of the Ethiopic as "error" (Di., Bart., K.). Possibly to be emended to אֶלֶּה, "unseemliness" or "folly" (so Mx., Bu.), cf. the identical phrase at 24 12, though the text there is uncertain, and cf. also 1 22; or it is possibly to be emended to אֶלֶּה and, regarding the negative of v. a as also governing v. b, translate: "He imputeth nothing praiseworthy to his messengers" (so Ehr. and Ball, apparently independently of each other, but against the ancient versions which do not recognize a negative in v. b, cf. K.).

4 19. *What then shall be said of those.* This paraphrase answers to a certain lack of precision in the style at this point. The Hebrew word, הַנֵּל, which must be equivalent to the regular phrase הַנֵּל, means "how much more" after a positive sentence (cf. Prov. 11 31; 15 11) and "how much less" after a negative one (cf. Job 15 16; 25 6). But here both a positive and negative sentence precede. It is interesting to notice that AV. reads "how much less" and RV. after Syr., Sym., Targ. and V. read "how much more" (G. is quite different). The commentators divide along the same lines though the majority read "how much more."⁴⁶

Whose housing's clay. Lit., "who inhabit clay houses." This is probably to be taken figuratively for human bodies, not literally (as Hitz.) of the frail mud huts of the peasantry, though it is possible that these may have been in the author's mind when he thought of the human body. The next

characterization of this splendid passage, vv. 12-17, by Professor Jastrow as "rather ridiculous" and "banal" is certainly to be deplored as coming from a scholar usually so keen and stimulating.

⁴⁵ Cf. especially De., Da., Dr. for this interpretation of the passage. It seems to be overlooked by other commentators. Jast. goes so far as to call v. 17 a "stinging rebuke" of Job!

⁴⁶ So De., Du., Bu., Dr., Schmidt, Jast., Bt., K. The advantage of Ehrlich's and Ball's emendation is that both clauses are negative and hence "how much less" becomes the proper translation. *Geschwewe denn* (Ew., Bu., Di.) has also the lack of precision of the original. Ewald interprets it as (cf. Di., and AV. at 9 14) equivalent to "how much less" and so, apparently, Dillmann. Budde has "how much more". At 9 14 the phrase is usually translated as "how much less" as also at 15 16 and 25 6—the only other passages in which it is found in Job. The preceding clause at 9 14 is positive in form but negative in meaning and equivalent to "Even the helpers of Rahab are not able to oppose him, much less could I ****."

clause, "whose foundation is in the dust," certainly has in mind man's origin out of the dust.⁴⁷ But there is no direct allusion to the story of the Fall in Genesis (cf. Di.). The sin of man is impliedly connected with or a part of his frailty, not the result of his fall. The fact that man's frailty rather than his sinfulness is mentioned after v. 17 is at first sight curious, but the assumed premise is that the creatureliness of man as contrasted with God is compounded both of sin and frailty.

Who like an empty bird's-nest. This line is very uncertain. There are two main difficulties: 1) the force of לפני and 2) the meaning of עש. 1) לפני is supposed to mean "before" in the sense of "sooner than": They are crushed more quickly than the moth.⁴⁸ But this involves a rhetorically very poor exaggeration. Again it is translated "as the moth."⁴⁹ This interpretation is regularly based upon 3 24 and I S. 1 16. But this is to explain one doubtful reading by two others equally doubtful. Further, in both these translations the moth is taken as the symbol of what is easily destroyed, whereas it is used elsewhere in Scripture of a destroyer.⁵⁰ We would expect here some such word as בן, "gnat" (cf. Is. 51 6 and RV.mg.). Ehrlich, followed by Jastrow, has proposed to explain עש on the basis of the Arabic as an empty bird's-nest both here and at Job 27 18 and Ps. 39 11 (12). This would relieve one of the difficulties, but not the difficulty of לפני. I have, for want of a better solution, ventured to follow Ehrlich.⁵¹

4 20. *With no one to lay it to heart.* This follows the usual interpretation. It expresses a fine thought but involves the supposition of a probably unique verb form, מְשִׁים. Suggested emendations carry no conviction.

4 21. *When their tent-pin is removed.* The Hebrew word, יִתְּרֵם, is usually translated tent-cord. But the word is nowhere else used of a tent-cord but

⁴⁷ Gen. 2 7, 3 19; Ps. 103 14ff.

⁴⁸ AV. and RV. txt. both here and at 8 12, Du. (with emendations), Dr. preferably.

⁴⁹ So G. and RV.mg. and most scholars, e.g. Ew., Hitz., Di., Ehr., Jast., Bt., Bu., and Ball, K., but with grave doubts and various suggestions for emendation.

⁵⁰ Job 13 28; Is. 50 9, 51 8; Hos. 5 12; Ps. 39 11 (12), which verse should be read according to RV.mg., not RV.txt. Job 27 18 is text-critically doubtful. Hitzig's view which seems to follow V.'s *inea* (by the moth) and which takes the clause as equivalent to "they are crushed as by a moth," in order to retain the moth as a symbol of the destroyer, is impossible. The verb "to crush" cannot describe a moth's activity.

⁵¹ The verb in this clause is active, "they crush them." This is possible but not probable. Best point passive, יִתְּרֵם (Du., Bu.) omitting ׀ which is probably an accidental repetition of the ׀ in יִתְּרֵם, in spite of the fact that the pronominal suffix is already recognized in G.

only of a bow-string.⁵² The word for tent-cord is either מִיתָר⁵³ or חֶבֶל⁵⁴. Again, the verb נָסַע is never used with "cord" or any of its synonyms. The verb to break or snap a cord, rope, thong, etc. is always נָתַק.⁵⁵ The usage is so unmistakable that נָסַע can be joined with יָתֵר in the sense of tent-cord only with the greatest improbability.⁵⁶ Under these circumstances it is safest to emend, in accordance with the verb נָסַע to tent-pin, (יָתֵר), for which Is. 33 20, in its carefully distinguished use of נָסַע with the tent-pin and נָתַק with the tent-cord, is conclusive evidence. As against this usage the objection that בָּם agrees better with tent-cord than with tent-pin cannot weigh. It is easy to suppose that these two letters are due to dittography after יָתֵר, or to read מֵהֶם, "from them," with Syr. and V.⁵⁷ It must be noted, however, that whichever word is read the figure of a collapsed tent is unexpected at this point where the reference has been to the figure of clay houses—another instance of the rather unfortunate style of this section (?).⁵⁸

The death of ignorant men. Lit.: "Shall they not die, but not in wisdom?" The phrase, "not in wisdom," means "in ignorance" and is to be understood in the light of Job 36 12; Prov. 5 23; 10 21. This poor, frail life, lived

⁵² Jd. 16 7–9, cf. Moore ad loc., and RV.mg.; Ps. 11 2; Job 30 11.

⁵³ Used six times of the cords of the tabernacle (e. g. Ex. 35 18), and at Is. 54 2; Jer. 10 20; once of a bow-string, at Ps. 21 12 (13).

⁵⁴ Is. 33 20.

⁵⁵ Used of a sandal thong, Is. 5 27, of a tent cord, מִיתָר or חֶבֶל, Jer. 10 20, Is. 33 20; of a bow-string, יָתֵר, (the same word as at Job 4 21) Jd. 16 9; of a heavy rope, Jd. 16 12; of a thread, Jd. 16 9, Eccl. 4 12; and quite frequently with the more general word for bonds מוֹסָרָה, e. g. Jer. 5 5.

⁵⁶ This usage makes very strongly against Battenwieser's otherwise rather attractive theory that the allusion here is not to a tent but to weaving, and the figure is of the woven life cut off from the thrum (cf. K., "life-cord"). Cf. Is. 38 12, where this figure is expressly found, and Job 6 9, 27 8, where there may well be an elliptical allusion to the same figure (cf., also, the Greek myth of the Parcae). But נָסַע is not found in any of these passages, but נָסַע as we would expect (cf. karada in the Arabic parallels which Battenwieser adduces). Jd. 16 14 is no support for this interpretation (cf. Moore ad loc.).

⁵⁷ Cf. Be. For tent-cord, Ew., Mx., Di., Du., Bu., Dr., Jast.; for tent-pin, Olshausen, Hitz., Volz, Steuer. Ball does not decide. Ehrlich's interpretation is unconvincing. AV's "excellency" (cf. T.) and V's reliqui are certainly mistaken.

⁵⁸ G. has an entirely different reading: "He hath blown upon them and they have withered away," apparently a quotation from Is. 40 24, though the phraseology differs slightly in the Greek of the two passages. It can hardly be explained out of the present Hebrew text as Beer and Ball would have us believe.

in ignorance, inevitably ends in death. Ignorance and death are, so to speak, organically connected. But just as wisdom has a moral shade of meaning, so has ignorance. It involves sin. When it is said in Proverbs:

The lips of the righteous feed many,
But the foolish die for lack of understanding (10 21).

it is clear that the fool who is contrasted with the righteous must be also a wicked fool. Frailty, ignorance, sin, death are inseparable. How different is the lot of those who follow wisdom!

Length of days is in her right hand,
In her left are riches and honor.
Keep sound wisdom and discretion,
So shall they be life unto thy soul.⁵⁹

This contrasts with the pathetic ending to our present section. Yet in spite of the moving quality of vv. 18–21, it cannot be denied that the text is suspicious. The confusion of the two figures of the mud-brick house and the tent, the great doubt as to v. 19c, the stylistic awkwardness at v. 19a, raise doubts as to the originality of this elaboration of v. 17. The poetical structure of vv. 18–21 is also uncertain. At present there are nine lines arranged in a quatrain, vv. 18–19a, b; a tristich, vv. 19c–20; and a closing couplet, v. 21. The attempts which have been made to rearrange into an orderly structure⁶⁰ must be considered quite unconvincing. While the mood of the passage is appealing and reminds of the pathos in the story of the Fall, the phrasing of it remains unsatisfactory. Vv. 19–20 are best taken as a series of relative clauses, not coordinate clauses as is often done.

5 1. The meaning of this verse in its present connection is extremely doubtful. The general subject of 5 1–7 is the danger of impatience. Impatience killeth the fool. It is clear from Job's reply at 6 2 that he saw in this section a rebuke of his first speech (c. 3) and, indeed, this is the only way the section as a whole can be interpreted. It is in no sense an attempt to explain Job's sufferings, for these had already overtaken him *before* his outbreak in c. 3. No doubt it assumes the doctrine of retribution but it is

⁵⁹ Prov. 3 16, 21f. The commentators are rather indefinite as to the exact meaning of the expression, "not in wisdom." E. g. "without having attained unto wisdom" (Dr.); Ball compares the line from a Babylonian poem: "How have mortals learned the way of God?"; "in ignorance and therefore unprepared" (Di. after De.); "through lack of foresight" (Jast.); opposed to wisdom as "the unconditional submission to the will of God" (Du.); "in ignorance, causing their own death" (Hitz.), etc.

⁶⁰ E. g. Duhm's or Ball's quatrain arrangements. The older commentators (Ew., De., Di.) divide vv. 12–21 into two strophes: a) vv. 12–16, b) vv. 17–21, each of eleven lines. Merx divides into three strophes, 8 × 7 × 7!

not a theoretical formulation of that doctrine or application of it to Job's case. What we have in this section is a solemn warning of the danger in which he now stands because of his attitude toward his sufferings. It is the sin of his complaints because of his sufferings, not an explanation of his previous sufferings, that Eliphaz is here thinking of. Accordingly 5 1-7 returns in thought to 4 2-8. But there is an obviously increased emphasis in the latter section upon the danger of his attitude. In the introductory section there is only mild expostulation; here there is a very pronounced warning. But is there, then, no relationship to the section immediately preceding, 4 12-21? The transition from 4 12-21 to 5 1-7 is admittedly not quite clear. The obscurity may be due to the fact that 4 18-21 has become more or less corrupted, as we have seen.⁶¹ But when the two sections are put into juxtaposition to each other, it suggests that the probably intended transitional thought is this: If man as man is so frail and sinful, how foolish it is for him to complain!⁶² But the question now arises: How is 5 1 related to its context?

At this point the commentators find themselves in difficulties. It is interesting to observe how Dillmann, in his paraphrase of the sequence of thought, in which he formulates Ewald's position more precisely, passes over 5 1 altogether: "5 1-7. The consequences which result for Job from the truth of the (preceding) revelation. If no man is just or pure before God, then impatience over suffering, which man has to bear, is not merely unjustifiable and useless, but foolish, sinful, and worthy of punishment." Driver has, almost word for word, the same paraphrases. But this gives no light on the contextual meaning of 5 1. On this verse Dillmann remarks, again reformulating Ewald's view: "Try to call for help against supposed injustice on one who, because of his position, could represent you before God—you will find that not one will hear your cry." This is a paraphrase of the verse but fails to illuminate its relationship to the context. Budde makes a sharp break in the speech between 4 12-21 and 5 1-7. He holds that the two sections have nothing to do with each other. The first deals with the universality of man's sinfulness, the second with the particular folly of the fool. 5 1, it is now claimed, is necessary in order to introduce the second thought. It is an expression of the impotent passion of the fool, the danger of which is elaborated in what follows. Driver gives a more precise statement of the same idea: "Let not Job appeal unto the angels, thereby manifesting the irritation of the foolish; but let him turn in the right temper unto God (v. 8)."⁶³ But it may be asked whether 5 1 is a

⁶¹ G.'s variant (see note 58 above) may also testify to the fact that the original literary transition has been lost through text-corruption.

⁶² So Ew., Da., Di., Du., Dr., Ball; with more or less precision of statement.

⁶³ Cf. Da. and Peake for the same view, that 5 1 is an illustration of impatience. Budde, Driver and Peake also bring 5 8 and 5 1 into anti-

natural expression of impatience. Further, it is very clear that in v. 2 Eliphaz is thinking of Job's complaints in c. 3. We would therefore expect v. 1 also to be an allusion to the same complaints, if v. 1 is an example of impatience. But there is nothing in c. 3 to suggest that Job was appealing to the angels or had ever done so. As a matter of fact, the thought of impatience is simply read into v. 1 from the context. The verse itself does not express such an idea. Hitzig long ago suggested that 5 1 is a parenthesis and that 5 2 follows on 4 21 (cf. Be.) and the meaning is: Men die in ignorance (there is none to answer when they call for help in the hour of death), for impatience slays the fool. This view, that the appeal to the Holy Ones is at the hour of death, is so strained that it has had no followers, but it is interesting as showing Hitzig's feeling that 5 1 is intrusive. Duhm, Siegfried and Schmidt hold that 5 1 is a gloss, either to 4 21 (Sieg.) or to 4 18 (Du.). Duhm's suggestion seems decidedly the best. The fact that the doctrine of the intercession of Angels is especially prominent in the later literature⁶⁴ may also cast some doubt on the verse, though not necessarily so.⁶⁵ Buttenwieser, in order to avoid this doubt, identifies the Holy Ones with the Welis or Saints, of which we find modern representatives in Syria and Palestine, but connects them with primitive Semitic beliefs rather than with belief in intercessory angels which Buttenwieser himself admits to be post-biblical. But the formula at 5 1 is too much like those in the passages just cited (note 64) for the connection between them to be successfully denied. Budde and Driver seek to defend the originality of 5 1 by 5 8 which is supposed to be in conscious antithesis to it. But v. 8 is much better taken as antithetic to vv. 2-5 (see below). Other commentators either have nothing to say on the contextual meaning or originality of 5 1 or add nothing of importance to the points of view already examined.⁶⁶

5 2. *Yea*. The exact significance of the Hebrew particle (ו) is doubtful because the connection of the verse is doubtful. Most commentators who maintain the originality of v. 1 take it in the sense of "nay" or "rather" after the implied negative in v. 1a.⁶⁷ Or it is connected immediately with 4 21 and given the sense of "for."⁶⁸ In view of the uncertainty of the ori-

thesis to each other. Driver, however, unlike Budde, brings 4 12-21 and 5 1-7 into immediate connection in the way suggested above.

⁶⁴ Cf. Tobit 12 12; Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Levi 3 5; and especially Enoch, 9 3, 15 2, 39 5, 40 6, 47 2, 89 76; 99 3, 104 1. For Holy Ones as a title of Angels, cf. Job 15 15; Zech. 14 5; Dan. 4 13, 8 13; Ps. 89 5, 7 (6, 8), and frequently in Enoch, e. g. 1 9.

⁶⁵ Cf. Zech. 1 12 for a possible fore-gleam of this doctrine; also Job 33 23.

⁶⁶ Cf. Volz, Jast., Steuer., Bt., K. The construction by which Ehrlich seeks to defend the originality of the verse is strained in the extreme.

⁶⁷ Ew., Bd., Di., Ball, Dr., K.

⁶⁸ Hitz., Du., and so G., Th., EV. It is interesting to notice that Volz, Jast., and Bt. omit the word in their translations.

ginal connection the particle has been given in the translation its asseverative force (cf. V.'s *vere*).

Impatience. "Wrath" (AV.) follows G. and Th. (*ὀργή*). Better "vexation" (so RV. here and at Prov. 12 18, 27 3; "fretful" at Prov. 21 19).

Passion. The Hebrew word (*קנא*) is taken here in this special sense, in which it is parallel to anger.⁶⁹ "Envy" of AV. and "jealousy" of RV.txt. (cf. G.'s *ζήλος* and V.'s *invidia*) are misleading, for Eliphaz is referring at this point to the fierce outbreak of Job in c. 3 as is proved by Job's retort at 6 2. "Passion" is also a more suitable word in the mouth of Eliphaz as a characterization of Job's speech than "indignation" of RV.mg.

Without self-control. The word in this form (*פְּתָה*) is found again only at Prov. 20 19 where both meaning and text are doubtful (cf. Toy ad loc.) and Hos. 7 11 ("a silly dove"). The root has the idea of "open" or accessible, either to good influences, or more frequently to bad ones. In Arabic it often has the sense of youthfulness (cf. Sym.'s *νηπιον* and V.'s *parvulum*), probably with the suggestion of lack of foresight, heedlessness, rashness. Cf. especially the noun *פֶּתַח* at Prov. 22 3; 27 12 where it is set in antithesis to *עָרוֹם* in the sense of "shrewd," "prudent."⁷⁰ The allusion in 4 2 is to the rash and uncontrolled outburst of Job. The proper translation of this verse which should show its relation to c. 3 is of the greatest importance since it is made at the same time the starting-point of Job's reply in c. 6.

5 3. *Taking root.* Supported by the ancient Versions, and cf. Ps. 37 35f. There is here an intended allusion to the former prosperity of Job (see Interpretation). The proposed emendation to "uprooted"⁷¹ misses the subtlety of this reference.

Accursed. The first person, "I cursed,"⁷² of the present Hebrew text is almost certainly incorrect. That Eliphaz prophesied the fool's ruin, cursing him because he anticipated God's curse upon him, (Ew.) or that Eliphaz's curse recognized the curse of God that had already fallen upon the fool, a retrospective curse rather than an anticipative one,⁷³ or that the curse of Eliphaz himself accomplished the fool's ruin, which is the most natural interpretation of the Hebrew, are suggestions which introduce Eliphaz's activity into the picture in a most improbable way. Nor does any of them do justice to the "suddenly." But if the slight emendation to the third person passive (*יִקָּח*) is adopted,⁷⁴ then the striking picture is obtained of the fool taking root but suddenly brought to ruin by the curse of God, a picture which

⁶⁹ Cf. Dt. 29 20 (19); Zeph. 1 18; Ps. 79 5, in all of which passages it is associated with various words for anger.

⁷⁰ The "silly one" of EV. is hardly suitable here.

⁷¹ So Be., Du., Volz, Ball.

⁷² So Aq., T., V., EV., followed by Ew., Hitz., De., Da., Di., K.

⁷³ Hitz., De., Di., Da.

⁷⁴ Dr., Bt.

greatly impressed Eliphaz but which would unfortunately remind Job of the visitations that had so swiftly fallen upon him. The various emendations of the verb "curse" in modern times,⁷⁵ following the unfortunate lead of G.'s *ἐβρώθη* ("gnawed" or "devoured"), are not only quite unnecessary but also overlook the allusion to the series of sudden calamities which overtook Job according to the Prologue. (See Interpretation.)

Homestead. G.'s *δαίρα* is peculiar to the author of Job in the Old Testament, and a favorite word. It is found thirteen times in Job and again only at Judith 12 15.

5 4. *The Court abandons them* etc. Lit. They are crushed in the gate. For "gate" in the sense of a court of justice, cf. Job 31 21; Prov. 31 23; Amos 5 10; Is. 29 21 and often. For the verb "crush", used of the "sore oppression" of a court of Justice, cf. Prov. 22 22. 5 4b shows that Eliphaz did not mean to hit at Job, for it does not agree with the Prologue. But Job's attention would be caught by v. a rather than by v. b.⁷⁶

5 5. *What they harvest.* Read the verb, with G., instead of the noun. The remainder of the verse is hopelessly corrupt. For "snare" (RV.; AV. has "robber"! of the last line we are probably to read "thirsty" with Aq., Sym., V. (G. seems to omit the word) and cf. G. at 18 9 where the same word is again read "thirst," though in this case certainly incorrectly. "Thirsty" would seem to be the parallel to "hungry" ("famished") in the first line, though "the hungry" is a singular and "the thirsty" is a plural. The probable parallelism suggests that the first and third line of the verse originally formed a couplet. This may in turn suggest that the unintelligible second line "and taketh it even out of the thorns" (EV.) is either not original or should be transposed as in the translation. In that case its companion line is probably lost. The translation indicates the impossible nature of the present text, but suggests that originally v. 5 was a quatrain, in keeping with the excellent quatrain in vv. 3 and 4, which describe the fate of the impatient fool and his children. Vv. 1 and 2 would form another quatrain. But we have seen that v. 1 is probably secondary. V. 2 must accordingly be considered either an initial couplet, of which the quatrains in vv. 3-4 and v. 5 are the elaboration, or that v. 1 has taken the place of a lost couplet which once formed with v. 2 a quatrain. The translation follows the second alternative.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Mx., Du., Be., Bu., Volz, Ball, Ehr., Bart.

⁷⁶ For the admission of flings at Job in 5 2-7 cf. Bu., at v. 3; Hitz. and Di. at v. 4; Ew. and Jast. at vv. 3-5 generally; Bt. at v. 7b. Most commentators unfortunately seem to ignore them.

⁷⁷ The quatrain arrangements of Duhm (vv. 2-3, 4-5, reducing v. 5 to two lines) and Ball (vv. 1-2, 3-4, 5-6!) seem to me theoretically less likely than the one suggested above. Volz arranges in a quatrain (vv. 1-2) and in a six line stanza (vv. 3-5, reducing v. 5 to two lines again). The older

5 6-7. For this quatrain, see Excursus at the end of Comments. The omission of these verses does not affect the argument in the Interpretation, if the Hebrew text is followed and the usual interpretation is given to it.

5 8. *But I for my part.* The very strong Hebrew adversative used here sets Eliphaz's suggestion that Job should turn to God in antithesis to Job's impatient complaints, v. 2, which, as Eliphaz had just shown by his picture of the fool's fate, are dangerous. It is quite clear at this point that Eliphaz really had Job's speech (c. 3) in mind at v. 2, even though he expressed himself in an abstract and theoretical way, and that Job did his friend no injustice when he saw in v. 2 an allusion to himself.⁷⁸ Eliphaz is therefore contrasting at v. 8 what Job *should* do with what he *had* done; Job should seek God's help instead of complaining against him as he had done in c. 3. The attempt to set v. 8 into antithesis to v. 1 and thereby to defend the originality of v. 1⁷⁹ is, accordingly, quite beside the mark. V. 1 is not accounted for by anything in c. 3; it is not an expression of impatience, and in its mode of expression, it refers to a future possibility rather than to the past fact of Job's complaints, whereas, as we have just seen, the proper contrast intended by the adversative of v. 8 is between what Job should do and what he already had done. These considerations still further confirm the view that v. 1 is an intrusion. It is also important to notice that v. 8 is in no natural antithesis to vv. 6-7.⁸⁰

Make my appeal. More literally, "address myself." This follows G., V., T., and cf. Hitzig. "Commit my cause" (EV.) or "lay my affair or concern before God" (so most commentators) suggest that Job had a case, a supposition which Eliphaz would be unlikely to concede. What Eliphaz wishes Job to do is not to defend himself but to turn to God for information, help, consolation. The Hebrew word (דברתי) here translated "appeal" is found only here in this form as a noun; elsewhere it is a part of a compound prepositional phrase. It is the equivalent of אמרה, "speech" or "utterance," not of "cause" or "affair."

5 9. This verse begins a kind of doxology characterizing the God to whom Job is privileged to address himself.

5 10. *Showers.* Lit. "waters."

Pasture lands. "Fields" (EV.). The Hebrew word, חוצות, means "open places" and often refers to streets in a city as contrasted with the houses, or, more rarely, to the open country-side as contrasted with the walled towns. Compare Prov. 24 27 where the word is translated "without" (EV.) and is parallel to "field," and Ps. 144 13 where it is used of pasture-land.

commentators (Ew., De., Di.) take vv. 1-5 as a single strophe of eleven lines. Merx reconstructs two eight-line strophes, vv. 1-4, vv. 5-7.

⁷⁸ See below at 6 2.

⁷⁹ See above at v. 1.

⁸⁰ See Excursus.

All open to the sky. I have here availed myself of the beautiful paraphrase, "upon the (land) under the sky" with which the first translator of Job (G.) renders חוצות. It is a favorite synonym of his for "earth" (ארץ) and gives a distinctly poetic touch to his translation.⁸¹

5 11. *Lifting.* To take the Hebrew לשום as an infinitive of purpose is exegetically poor, whether it is connected in thought with v. 8 (Ehr.) or v. 9 (Du.) or v. 10 (Bu.). The construction is either gerundial (Mx., Studer in Di., Jast.) or is to be emended after G. and V. to the participle, in keeping with the other participles in vv. 9-13 (Dr.), but without the article, in agreement with the other participles in these verses.⁸² The infinitive is probably due to the influence of the two ל that follow.⁸³

5 12. *Nought that endureth.* The Hebrew word (חשיה) thus paraphrased is of disputed etymology and uncertain meaning. "Enterprise" of EV. is found only here. Outside of Is. 28 29 and Mi. 6 9 the word occurs only in Job and Proverbs and thus seems to be a technical term of the Wisdom Literature. The idea of "practical value" seems to be associated with the word. At Is. 28 29 it might be translated by "efficiency"—Jahweh hath magnified efficiency—did not this rendering unduly endorse the great contemporary slogan by which, in the opinion of the apostles of Industrialism, the world is to be saved.

5 13. *Cunning.* The Hebrew word (חכמים) is used here in its rather rare bad sense. Cf. II Sam. 13 3 ("subtle," RV.), Prov. 3 7; 26 5, 12, 16.

Surprised by sudden disaster. A paraphrase of the rather rare and difficult Hebrew word נמורה meaning "precipitated," or "carried headlong" (EV.). G., ἐξέστησεν; Sym., παραχθήσεται. This is the only verse formally cited from Job in the New Testament, cf. I Cor. 3 19.

5 14. See below at 5 16.

5 15. V. a is undoubtedly corrupt (cf. txt. and mg. of RV.). T., Syr., V. and twenty Hebrew mss. support RV.'s text with its implied deletion of the preposition, "out of" (so Be.). The thought would then be interpreted by such passages as Ps. 57 4 (5); 59 7 (8); 64 3 (4) and refer to injuries wrought by the tongue—slander, cursing, lying, etc. This would relieve the grammatical difficulty, but the parallelism with v. b would suggest that some word corresponding to "the poor" should be read. Emendations seek in

⁸¹ Cf. 2 2; 9 6; 18 4, 19; 34 13; 38 18, 24, 33; 42 15. Outside of Job it is found once in Proverbs (8 26, for תבל, "world") and in Baruch 2 2, 5 3; II Macc. 2 18.

⁸² The article should also be omitted at v. 10a. Cf. a similar sequence of participles at Ps. 104 2-4, where, however, the construction of the participle with and without the article varies in the present text.

⁸³ Cf. for a similar cause of corruption 4 19 above.

various ways to better the parallelism. Some scholars find the difficulty in the phrase "from the sword" and variously correct to "the desolated" (Ew.), "the trembling" (Volz), "the orphan" (Bu. and Dr. tentatively); others find it in the phrase "from the mouth" (מִפִּי) and read either "the two-edged sword" (פֶּיִסוֹר) after Ps. 149 6 (Ehr.) or deliberately substitute "the afflicted" (עָנִי) for "from their mouth" (Du., Ball, Jast., Bart. after Siegfried). The translation follows this last suggestion which best satisfies the parallelism, though it is admittedly a pure guess and can scarcely be defended on strictly text-critical grounds (V.'s *egenum*, "needy" in v. a is hardly a sufficient support). The present reading may possibly be due to the פִּי in v. 16b. G. entirely ignores the word in v. 15, but little weight should be attached to this fact, as G. is at this point very free.

5 16. Cf. Ps. 107 42.

Vv. 8-16 forms the first section of the third and last part of Eliphaz's speech. The quatrain arrangement seems to be intended: Vv. 8-9, a general ascription of praise to God; vv. 10-11, the beneficent activities of God in nature and among men; vv. 12-13, the contrasting visitations of God upon the wicked, and finally, vv. 15-16, the return to the thought of God's saving kindness, by means of which the transition to the next section is effected. I suggest that v. 14 is a later addendum to the quatrain in vv. 12-13. This quatrain is complete in itself as the first and third and second and fourth lines correspond. Further, the thought of v. 14 is found again in the doubtful passage, 12 25a, and both thought and wording recur at Dt. 28 29. V. 14 is also outside the participial construction of the first lines in vv. 8-13 (see above).⁸⁴ Duhm and Volz secure a quatrain arrangement by retaining v. 14 and rejecting v. 10 on the ground that the reference to God's kindly activities in nature described in the earlier verse is outside the scope of the passage in which his activities in human society are emphasized. But Ps. 107 33f. shows the intimate connection of the two thoughts (Ball).⁸⁵

⁸⁴ This is also true of vv. 15-16. But these verses draw the conclusion of all that has gone before, and the construction is intentionally changed in agreement with the thought. This is not the case at v. 14. K. significantly regards v. 14 as a parenthesis.

⁸⁵ Ball also adopts the quatrain system but wavers in the way he secures it. In his translation he brackets v. 12 but does not justify this in his notes. In the latter he suggests that v. 10 was a marginal quotation but does not bracket it in his translation. The older commentators adopt the longer strophical system. Ewald takes vv. 8-16 as one strophe of 18 lines (!). Dillmann divides into two strophes, vv. 8-11 (8 lines) and vv. 12-16 (10 lines). This recognizes a real thought division between vv. 11 and 12, which is also recognized by my quatrain division. Delitzsch divides as Dillmann does, but very inappropriately joins vv. 6-7 with 8-11. Merx very inappropriately takes v. 16 with v. 17 in order to secure his eight-line strophes, vv. 8-11 and vv. 12-15.

5 17. *Behold*. This exclamation in the Hebrew text (cf. EV.) is to be deleted (so G., Syr., V.), as it overfills the line. It was probably a note on the margin to call attention to the importance of the beautiful quatrain in vv. 17-18. Such comments are more numerous in the Old Testament than is often supposed and are psychologically very interesting as they reflect the impression which a given passage or verse made upon an ancient copyist or reader.⁸⁶ The quatrain in vv. 17-18, an exquisite example of the four line stanza, gives a classic formulation of the doctrine of suffering as chastisement.⁸⁷ It differs remarkably from 4 7-8 in which the doctrine of suffering as retribution for sin is announced, and from the oracle in 4 12-21 in which suffering and sin are attributed to man's creatureliness. It is interesting to notice, however, that Eliphaz does not recur again in the Dialogue to the thought of suffering as chastisement. It should also be noticed that from v. 17 to the end of the speech Eliphaz turns for the first time since the introductory verses (4 2-8) directly to Job.⁸⁸ There it was to expostulate with him; here to console him. This change in mood is of great importance for a true appraisal of the temper of the speech and of Eliphaz's attitude toward Job.⁸⁹

5 18. Cf. for the thought and expression of this beautiful couplet, Hos. 6 1 and Dt. 32 39.

5 19. *In six*. G. "out of six." Though G. agrees well with the verb "deliver" and is followed by Beer and Duhm, the Hebrew text is probably to be retained on account of the parallelism.

5 19-26. The text and poetical arrangement of these verses are uncertain. When it is said, "in six misfortunes and in seven," the author makes use of a rhetorical figure often found in the Old Testament to express emphasis. At Ex. 20 5, for example, the phrase, "Jahweh will visit the iniquity of the Fathers upon the children, upon the third and the fourth generation," means that He will punish enough and more than enough. Similarly, in the present instance, "in six misfortunes and in seven" means in every conceivable danger. But is it the intention to name just seven examples of misfortune in what follows? In Prov. 6 15-19 (six or seven) and in Prov. 30 15-16, 18-19, 21-23, 29-31 (in all four instances "three or four") the numbers and the examples exactly correspond. At Sirach 25 7 ("nine or ten"),

⁸⁶ Cf. Is. 2 22 for another example, and Duhm ad loc.

⁸⁷ Cf. Ps. 94 12; Prov. 3 11-2.

⁸⁸ This fact also makes against the originality of 5 1.

⁸⁹ According to Ball "the opening, 'happy is the man' etc., is quite general, and the repeated 'thou's and thee's' of the following verses are no more personal to Ejob than those of Ps. 91." I believe this statement expresses a view of the speech quite the contrary of the author's real intention. See Interpretation.

26 sf. ("three or four"), 50 25f. ("two or three"), the examples and numbers are probably again intended to correspond. On the other hand, in Amos I ("three or four") there is no such correspondence.⁹⁰ In the many instances of numerical sayings in the Talmud and Midrash⁹¹ only one number is regularly found. Wünsche explains this as due to the fact that the Rabbis in these sayings had dropped the principle of parallelism.⁹² The close affinities of Job to Proverbs and Sirach would suggest that in 5 19–22 we should also look for seven examples of misfortune. In the present text there are seven distinct references to misfortune. But are there seven distinct examples of it? There would seem to be; but the series is certainly a singular one. Hunger and war (v. 20), tongue and ruin (v. 21), ruin and hunger and wild beasts (v. 23).⁹³ There are several difficulties in this enumeration. a) The tongue unexpectedly intrudes into what seems to be a series of natural calamities. b) The repetition of ruin and hunger in v. 22 as compared with hunger in v. 20 and ruin in v. 21. c) The very vague generalization in the word "ruin" ("destruction"). We would expect a reference to something more concrete. Of these difficulties the second is probably the most serious. To hold that v. 22a simply intensifies the hunger and ruin of the two preceding verses (Di.), i. e. "thou shalt laugh at them," is unconvincing. If v. 22a is to emphasize what precedes, why should war and tongue be omitted? To maintain that hunger and ruin in vv. 20 and 21 are different kinds of hunger and ruin from those in v. 22a, i. e. differently caused (Ehr.) has no warrant in usage or etymology. To reject the verse altogether⁹⁴ because of its repetitiousness is tempting but not advisable, for the repetitiousness is as pointless in a gloss as it is in the original text. If it is supposed that a reviser wished to secure the exact number seven, unintended by the original author, why did he repeat "ruin" but give a different and very rare word for "hunger" in v. 22a? It is probable that the author, himself, wished to give seven examples of plagues,⁹⁵ in which case

⁹⁰ Examples such as Is. 17 6; 2 K. 13 19; Mi. 5 5 (4); Eccl. 11 2, cited in König, *Stilistik*, p. 163, are, like Ex. 20 5, of a different character, as no illustrations of the numbers are involved.

⁹¹ Wünsche in *ZDMG* for 1911, pp. 57ff., 421ff. and for 1912, 414ff.

⁹² Cf. Job 13 20; Ps. 62 11 (12); Prov. 30 24.

⁹³ The word for ruin ("destruction," EV.) in vv. 21 and 22 is the same word though spelled differently (רָוַן, v. 21 and רָוַן, v. 22). The word for "hunger" in v. 20 is a good Hebrew word (רָעַב); in v. 22 it is a so-called Aramaism (רָעַב), found only here and at 30 3, though the verb of this root may be found at Ezek. 17 7 (the reading is doubtful). AV. translates both times by "famine," RV. varies the translation, "famine" in v. 20, "dearth" in v. 22.

⁹⁴ Be., Du., Volz; and, tentatively, Bu. Cf. also the double reference to wild beasts in v. 22b and 23b.

⁹⁵ So also Ehrlich and Ball. This is contrary to the views of most commentators.

v. 22 is necessary. The only thing left to do is to assume a deep-seated corruption at v. 22a which cannot now be satisfactorily cured.⁹⁶ G. evidently has difficulties with the text and has substituted for it: "At the unjust and lawless thou shalt laugh." That G. intended this as a translation of our present text, as Duhm intimates, is highly improbable. Nowhere else is the root רָוַן (ruin) translated in G. by ἀδικεῖν, the word used here, or by any of its derivatives (cf. also, Ball). A further evidence that v. 22b, and therefore its parallel line, v. 22a, cannot be dispensed with is found in the conventional scheme of plagues which underlies vv. 19–22. The closest analogies to the passage are found in Ezek. 5 17 and, more elaborately worked out, 14 13–21. In these passages four major plagues are mentioned: hunger, evil beasts, sword, pestilence.⁹⁷ In Job, hunger, the sword, and wild beasts are mentioned, but not pestilence. The reference to wild beasts in v. 22b, in view of the conventional scheme of these plagues, would seem to be original. But if v. 22b is original, this would seem to require a parallel line now represented by the corrupted v. 22a. But if the author of Job is influenced by a conventional scheme of plagues, would we not also expect a direct reference to pestilence which is so prominent in the other illustrations? It is at this point that commentators have found difficulty at v. 21a. Why is the scourge or whip or lash of the tongue introduced into the midst of all these natural calamities? This has seemed so strange that scholars have sought to relieve the difficulty in various ways. Ehrlich, followed by Jastrow proposes to take the tongue as equivalent to a tongue of fire (!). Duhm would substitute רָשָׁה, Ball קָטַב, Driver, very tentatively, רָבַר—all three words synonyms for pestilence (cf. Bart., also).⁹⁸ But it is difficult to see how the present text could have arisen if the original text had referred to the scourge of pestilence, and since the proposed emendations are pure guesses it seems safer to retain the present reading. Yet its strangeness in this connection cannot be denied. Did the author have an ulterior purpose

⁹⁶ Ball's attempt to emend to "at the lion and young lion thou shalt laugh" is unconvincing.

⁹⁷ They are enumerated three times in the two passages, but each time in a different order. Cf. also Lev. 26 16–26 and Dt. 32 24f., where the phrasing varies but these four plagues are clearly meant.

⁹⁸ If it is urged that the Hebrew word שׁוּט ("whip" or "scourge") is not used of the tongue elsewhere in the O. T., it may be replied that neither is it used of pestilence. But almost the exact Hebrew phrase, "scourge of the slanderous tongue," is found in the Hebrew of Sirach 51 2 and no doubt underlies the Greek of 26 6, which would seem to vouch for the present reading in Job; and for the thought cf. Ps. 31 20 (21) and possibly Jer. 18 18, though the interpretation of this last passage is not quite certain (cf. Du. and Volz ad loc.).

in substituting the scourge of the tongue for the scourge of pestilence?⁹⁹ Could this have been intended by him as a gentle irony directed against Eliphaz? For Eliphaz to promise Job protection against slander, to which the scourge of the tongue would seem to allude, when from Job's point of view the Friends themselves were slandering him, may easily be construed as a covert criticism of Eliphaz by the author. Is there a hint at this point of the way in which the author wishes to have the more attentive reader understand the whole passage vv. 19-22? (See Interpretation.) Possibly, also, the vagueness of the word, "ruin," in v. 21b, which, as we have seen, gives difficulty, may be another hint in the same direction. It is no more vague and indefinite than is the application of vv. 19-22 as a whole to Job. The fact is, the author is working here with a conventional series of misfortunes which are quite irrelevant to the situation with the one exception of the scourge of the tongue, and this last becomes relevant only in a most unexpected way, namely, when it is interpreted as a sly fling at Eliphaz by the author himself. (See Interpretation.)

5 23. V. a, omitted in G^B, probably by accident, is found in G^A. The thought of the clause is of a field without stones. To any one familiar with the character of Palestine the meaning implied in this line would be at once understood and very appealing.¹⁰⁰ It is admittedly somewhat curiously expressed, but its originality is guaranteed by the parallelism.¹⁰¹ V. b, cf. Hos. 2 18 (20); Ezek. 34 25; Is. 11 6-8. The repetition of "field" (so the Hebrew text, cf. RV.) in both clauses of v. 23 is not in accordance with good Hebrew usage and in the present case especially unlikely, for "beasts of the field" (RV.) is equivalent to "wild beasts" just as "herb of the earth" is best translated "wild flowers."¹⁰² But "stones of the field" can scarcely be translated "wild stones" (!). Probably Duhm is right in proposing "stones of the soil" (אֲבָנֵי הָאֲדָמָה).¹⁰³

⁹⁹ The translation, "from the lash" at v. 21a implies a slight emendation of the Hebrew (בַּ to מִן) which is supported by G., Syr., V. and is adopted by most modern scholars. RV. so translates without acquainting the reader that it implies an emendation. Others read the form בְּשׁוֹט as an infinitive with varying significations (Bu., Ehr., Ball, K.).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Is. 5 2; II K. 3 19, 25.

¹⁰¹ Ball proposes to read "sons of the field" (אֲבָנֵי for בָּנֵי) i. e. beasts, in synonymous parallelism with v. b. Rashi's emendation to "lords of the field" (אֲדֹנֵי for אֲבָנֵי) i. e. earth-demons, connected with the satyrs (שַׁעִירִים) cf. Lev. 17 5-7 has been revived by K. Kohler and followed by Beer (ZATW 1915, p. 63) and Buttenwieser, and is much more interesting. The rejection of the clause by Jastrow, following G., is uncalled for.

¹⁰² To be corrected to "herb of the field"; cf. Comment at v. 25.

¹⁰³ Cf. the "stony ground," πετρώδες of Mark. 4 5, though the Greek word in Mark does not occur in G.

5 24. *Have the assurance.* Lit. "know." Cf. Dt. 9 3, 6, for this shade of meaning.

Inspect. Cf. Jer. 23 2, where the word ("visit," RV.) is used in both its good and bad senses. For the thought cf. Prov. 3 6f.

5 25. *Wild flowers.* Lit. "Grass or herb of the earth." To be corrected to "herb of the field," following G., T., and eight Heb. mss., as this is the standing phrase in the Old Testament. In Ex. 10 12b, 15a and in Ps. 105 35 which depends upon Exodus, RV. correctly translates "herb of the land," for the reference is to the Land of Egypt (Contrast "herb of the field" at Ex. 9 22, 25 and especially at 10 15b). Similarly, at Amos 7 2, "the grass of the land" (RV.) probably refers to the land of Israel. The only remaining place where the phrase occurs, Ps. 72 16, RV. translates it as in Job by "grass of the earth." But this passage is almost certainly dependent upon Job 5 25. It seems clear that אֶרֶץ (land or earth) is incorrect in Ps. 72 and Job 5 and "field" should be read.

To reject v. 25 as Jastrow does is again to ignore the purpose of the author. He wishes to portray Eliphaz as totally oblivious to the realities of the situation in which Job finds himself and thus he puts into the mouth of Eliphaz this most important blessing of descendants along with the other conventional promises with which he seeks to comfort Job, all the while remaining apparently quite unmindful of the fact that Job's children are all dead.¹⁰⁴ The author is here again indulging in irony at the expense of Eliphaz¹⁰⁵, just as he did when he put the reference to the scourge of the tongue into the mouth of Eliphaz in place of the usual pestilence.¹⁰⁶

5 26. *Ripe old age.* EV., "full age." The Hebrew word (בָּלֵחַ) occurs again only at Job 30 2. Its meaning is obscure. G. omits and no help can be gathered from the other versions, either here or at 30 2.¹⁰⁷ The emendation to לָח, "natural force," "vigor," which is found again at Dt. 34 7 is quite possible.¹⁰⁸

Sheaf of wheat. The word is found again only at Ex. 22 6 (5); Jd. 15 5;

¹⁰⁴ The Epilogue, 42 13, in seeing to it that Job begets seven sons and three daughters after his restoration in the place of those he had lost, adopts the view of Eliphaz!

¹⁰⁵ So, expressly Du. and Bu. Cf., also Peake.

¹⁰⁶ Ball's view that Eliphaz throughout vv. 18-26 has Job's ruined estate "always present to his mind" and "with an appalling lack of sympathy," draws an idyllic picture of what might have been, I believe to be quite beside the mark. The mistake lies in the phrase, "always present to his mind." In his beautiful but rather abstract contemplation of the goodness of God Eliphaz ignores the hopelessness of Job's condition. See above and Interpretation.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. the discussion in Dr.

¹⁰⁸ Mx., Ball.

Job 21 32 (?). In Ex. and Jd. it is parallel to קמה "standing grain" or "sheaves."

To the threshing floor. This phrase interprets the Hebrew word בעלות "goeth up," wrongly translated in EV. by "cometh in." The English version suggests the idea of coming in to the barn. The author of Job is thinking of "going up" to the threshing floor which is usually situated on some hillside where it is exposed to the wind which blows the chaff away. The present phrasing is an excellent example of the difficulties of translating an ancient poetic composition into modern speech. The atmosphere of a word, its natural associations and suggestions, which give to it its poetic significance and which would be felt at once by an ancient reader are often quite lost upon a modern reader. G. has a double translation of v. 26. In one the Hebrew word is translated by *θερίζουσας*, "mowed" or "harvested;" in the other by *συγκομισθείσα*, "gathered in." In neither is the peculiar nuance of בעלות reflected.

The very beautiful close in vv. 23-26 certainly indicates the sincerity of Eliphaz. Granted that the promises in these verses are the conventional anticipations of the pious Israelite which correspond to the conventional anticipations of the pious Christian, except that the former are to be fulfilled in this life while the latter are to be realized in the next one, yet there is nothing in this conventionality that necessarily qualifies the sincerity of the promises. They were honestly meant even if they were irrelevant. But it must be admitted that even here the note of sympathy is lacking.¹⁰⁹

5 27. *It agrees with what we have heard.* Lit. "We have heard it." Read first plural with G., Syr. and the majority of recent scholars instead of the imperative of the text (cf. EV.).¹¹⁰ This slight emendation is made almost necessary by the emphasis given to the following "thou" in the Hebrew which indicates that Eliphaz is exhorting Job to accept what he himself and his friends believe. Their belief is not only the result of their own experience and careful investigation, but it agrees with what they have heard from tradition. This last thought is introduced here at the close of the speech to be elaborated later on in the debate (8 8-10).

Lay it to heart. Lit. "know it for thyself." Let it become thy deepest conviction.

On the poetic structure of vv. 17-27. There are three things to guide us. 1) Vv. 17-18 forms an admirable quatrain. 2) V. 27 does not form a natural quatrain with v. 26, but is to be taken as a concluding couplet corresponding to the introductory couplet at 4 2.¹¹¹ 3) The intervening verses,

¹⁰⁹ For the more or less conventional and irrelevant character of the consolations in 5 17-26 and the absence of any direct expression of sympathy, cf. Du., Bu., Peake, at v. 25; also De., Di., Da., Volz, Ball, generally; Jastrow and König do not appear to discuss these peculiarities.

¹¹⁰ E. g. Du., Bu., Peake, Bart., Dr., Ball, Bt.

¹¹¹ So also Ew., Di., De., Volz, Steuer, K., and apparently Dr.

vv. 19-26, fall into two subsections so far as the thought is concerned. a) Vv. 19-22, the deliverance from the seven plagues, and b) vv. 23-26, the positive promises of future happiness. These two subsections are each composed of eight lines. There is no strictly logical or exegetical reason for dividing the first of these into quatrains. But in view of the fact that the quatrain arrangement seems to dominate the speech it does not seem to be unduly forcing matters to suppose that it obtains here also. Accordingly we secure the two stanzas, vv. 19-20 and vv. 21-22. The second group of eight lines can very easily be divided into two quatrains,¹¹² vv. 23-24, the promise of the fertility of Job's fields and the security of his estate, and vv. 25-26, the promise of numerous descendants and a long life. It is true that vv. 24-25 could also form a quatrain, as the first two lines in each verse begin in exactly the same way. But this disarranges both what precedes and what follows as it would bring vv. 26-27 together into one quatrain, which would be a very disparate and unlikely one, and would leave v. 23 stand as a lonesome couplet, provided it is separated from what precedes for the reason suggested above. It must be admitted, however, that the quatrain arrangement in vv. 19-26 is not as evident as elsewhere in the speech and it is possible that an eight-line division is intended here.¹¹³

Excursus on 5 6-7. Though with some hesitation, I have finally decided to omit this celebrated quatrain. Its meaning in itself and in its context is not at all clear.

A. To begin with v. 7a. When it is said that man is born to trouble, which is in accordance with the present text of the Hebrew and of all the

¹¹² For the two plagues in one line at v. 22a cf. Prov. 6 17a, 30 31 and Sirach 26 5 and 50 26.

¹¹³ Duhm rejects the admittedly difficult v. 22 and arranges his quatrains as follows: vv. 21-23, 24-25, 26-27. This destroys the probably intended scheme of seven plagues through the omission of v. 22 and results in the unfortunate union of vv. 26 and 27. Ball retains v. 22, thereby preserving the scheme of seven plagues, but brackets v. 23 in order to secure a quatrain arrangement. But he gives no reason for his suspicion of v. 23. Volz divides into vv. 17-23, or twelve lines when v. 22 is omitted, and vv. 24-26, six lines, with v. 27 as a closing couplet. But to take v. 23 with what precedes rather than with what follows does not seem to be advisable. The older commentators play with very long strophes. Thus Ewald takes v. 17 and v. 27 by themselves and divides vv. 18-26 into two strophes of eighteen lines each corresponding to his eighteen-line strophe at vv. 8-16. Delitzsch and Dillmann, also separating v. 27, divide vv. 17-26 into two strophes of ten lines each, vv. 17-21 and 22-26. This arrangement also ignores the scheme of seven plagues. This scheme demands that vv. 19-22 should be separated from vv. 23-26. Merx's division into eight-line strophes, beginning with v. 16(!): vv. 16-19, 20-23, 24-27 has nothing whatever to recommend it.

ancient versions, this is not an explanation of trouble, but the statement of the fact of trouble. It is not the intention to say that man is born to trouble in the sense that he is fated or foreordained to it by some power outside himself, for example, God. Rather, it means simply that trouble is the lot of mankind. The reason why this is so is not given. In the next place, v. 7a seems to be set in antithesis to the statements in v. 6 that "affliction" and "trouble" (EV.) do not spring out of the ground. By affliction and trouble is not meant subjective suffering, nor the suffering which one man occasions another as in 4 s, certainly not moral evil as Körig seems to hold, but the ills of life generally. But in precisely what does the antithesis between these statements and v. 7a consist? This is where the trouble begins. 1) Some commentators hold that it is between the external and the internal. "Sorrow and trouble," says Dillmann, "do not grow out of the earth like weeds, are not something external to man *** Rather, man is born to trouble; it is something innate in his nature. More especially it lies in his nature through sin to bring forth misery." (Cf. also Ew., Dr., with slight variations.) 2) Others find the contrast between the accidental and the necessary ^{or} inevitable, or else between the spontaneous and deliberate. According to Delitzsch, "Misfortune does not grow out of the ground like weeds; it is rather established in the divine order of nature."¹¹⁴ It is noticeable that all commentators thus far reviewed feel compelled to introduce the thought of *weeds* at v. 6 in order to make its vague generalization more precise and thus secure some sort of antithesis to v. 7a. For the same reason they all assume that trouble is due to man's sin. That is, they have read into the simple statement of a fact at v. 7a an explanation of it. The simple statement that trouble, external trouble, is the lot of mankind (v. 7a) furnishes no antithesis to v. 6. To secure this the sinfulness of man must be assumed. In view of what was said above at 4 s on *'awen* and *'amal*, it might be thought this assumption is a natural one. But the difficulty is that in the present case, where a sharp antithesis is supposed to exist between vv. 6 and 7a, it ought to be expressed. 3) The feeling that the active agency of man as a sinner ought to be stated here has suggested to still another group of scholars that the verb "is born" should be emended to the active "begets" which can be done without the change of a consonant:¹¹⁵ Affliction does not spring from the ground; man is directly responsible for (begets) his own undoing. This sounds like an antithesis, though even so v. 6 leaves something to be desired in the way of clarity.

¹¹⁴ So, with more or less confusion of statement, Hitz., Da., Ball. Ball also adds the contrast between "from below" i. e. "out of the ground" and "from above" which is left undefined. Peake, after Schlottmann, curiously suggests that the implied antithesis "from above" refers to the angels!

¹¹⁵ So Be., Bu., Du., Steuer., Bt., K., following a suggestion of Böttcher.

Unfortunately the unanimous testimony of the versions supports the passive (is born).

B. Can v. 7b throw any light upon the passage? Unfortunately, it only adds still further uncertainties to the interpretation. The translation of the Hebrew phrase *bene resheph* ("sons of flame") by "sparks," though it goes back to a variant translation in the Targum and to the Jewish commentators, Kimchi and Rashi, and has been the current translation in modern times, is quite improbable. The word "sons" does not make the difficulty, but the word *resheph*. "Sons of fire" (*bene 'esh*) might easily be interpreted as the poetic equivalent of sparks (cf. "son of the bow," for arrow at 41:28 (20)). But *resheph* is not an exact equivalent, not even a poetical equivalent, for fire. *Resheph* means "flame" but not an ordinary flame. There is always the suggestion of fierceness or danger in the word.¹¹⁶ It is also worthy of remark that none of the ancient versions recognizes this current translation of the phrase. They one and all see in v. 7b a reference to the flight of birds.¹¹⁷ Siegfried and Ball propose, on the basis of G., to emend *bene resheph* to *bene neshar* ("the vulture's brood"), in itself a simple emendation and in better accord with the verb which literally means "fly high,"¹¹⁸ and compare Job 39:27 for the exact phrase. The difficulty with this reading of the versions and the proposed emendation is that the same versions also find an allusion to birds at Dt. 32:24, and so also Sym., at Ps. 76:3 (4) and Aq. and Sym. at Ps. 78:48. But in none of these cases is the allusion contextual. The clear mistake of the versions in these other instances casts doubt on their reference to birds at Job 5:7 and on the proposed emendation.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Ps. 78:48; Dt. 32:24; Hab. 3:5; Ps. 76:3 (4); Songs 8:6. The usage in these passages, the only places where the word occurs in the O. T. outside of Job 5:7, certainly does not suggest that "sons of the flame" means sparks. The combination of lightning, pestilence and arrows in these passages just cited may seem odd at first sight, but the term, *resheph* has mythological associations which help to explain it. There was a Syrian, more particularly Phoenician god, *Resheph*. He was a fire god, especially a god of the lightning. At the same time he seems to have been a god of pestilence, for the Greeks identified him with their own Apollo, the "far-darter" who was armed with the bow and sent pestilences as his arrows. One of his titles was *Resheph of the Arrow*, not "of the streets" (Apollo Aiguis) as Clermont Ganneau earlier suggested (cf. Paton, *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, III, p. 181a, and IX, p. 890b; also Dr. at Dt. 32:24). These associations of the term also make strongly against the translation, "sparks." Is T.'s son of the daemons a reminiscence of this mythological significance of *Resheph*?

¹¹⁷ G., "The vulture's brood" (cf. Aq. and Sym.); V., "Man is born to sorrow and the bird to fly."

¹¹⁸ This verb fits neither lightning nor sparks. To weaken it to "fly upward" (EV.), in order to fit it to "sparks," is a dubious expedient.

which is based on it. In desperation Bittenwieser, following a suggestion of Böttcher, holds that *bens resheph* refers to passionate men, "hot-spurs," "high-flyers" (with a dig at Job). This would agree in a measure with v. 7a, if the verb were read as an active (begets), but we would expect in this quatrain which seems to be dealing with the ills of mankind a reference to such sons of Daedalus as crashing down to destruction rather than flying high.

It is clear that we have in vv. 6 and 7 a quatrain of almost insoluble difficulty. The only line in it that seems at all clear is v. 7a and this can be taken in two ways, according as the verb is read as a passive referring to the general lot of mankind, or as an active describing man's direct responsibility for his lot. As the rest of the quatrain seems intended in some way or other to reinforce v. 7a, we have next to ask whether either of the ideas it can express is in harmony with its context.

C. On the contextual relationship of v. 7a.

1) If the verb is read as a passive, "man is born to trouble," then v. 7a goes back directly to the thought in 4 12-21 and is a resumption of that thought. The assumption which, as we have seen, scholars regularly make at v. 7a that suffering is the general lot of mankind because sin is innate in man, can now be justified, for this is the explicit teaching of 4 12-21. This is a distinct advantage to the interpretation of v. 7a. But there is a corresponding disadvantage. If 5 6-7 is a resumption of 4 12-21, then 5 2-5 becomes a digression, as Dillmann long ago pointed out. But that the author intended it to be a digression is altogether improbable. In the first place this section forms the starting-point for Job's reply in his next speech. It is therefore a very important element in the author's conception of this first speech of Eliphaz and we would not expect it to be relegated to a digression. Further, 5 2-5 is not only a link between this speech and the next, but also a link between 4 12-21 and 5 sff. In view of the fact that Job as a man is sinful, 4 12-21, it does not become him to be impatient, 5 2-5, but he should follow the advice of Eliphaz and turn humbly unto God, 5 sff. It is clear that 5 2-5 is in no sense a digression but a very organic part of the speech and in its logical position. Other scholars, perhaps half-conscious of this fact, seek to connect 5 6-7 not only with 4 12-21 but also with 5 2-5. According to Driver, "Eliphaz justifies his position that it is foolish to complain of misfortune by the thought that misfortune, because of sin, is the lot of mankind." But this position has already been justified when 5 2-5 is placed after 4 12-21 (see above). Further, we have already seen that 5 2-5 is intended to point out the danger of impatience. But while the statement that it is *unreasonable* to complain since all men are born to trouble is a clear thought, to say that it is *dangerous* to complain because all men are born to trouble is not a clear thought. Davidson attempts to coordinate the two passages, 4 12-21 and 5 2-7, under the rubric: causes of affliction. "The general evil and imperfection of man, 4 12-21, and the particular rebelliousness of the fool, 5 2-5, show how affliction arises, and

Eliphaz confirms the whole by his general maxim, 5 6-7." Again, it must be insisted upon that 5 2-5 is not intended to explain suffering but to emphasize the danger of giving way to passion. Equally irrelevant is Ball's suggestion: "The ruin of the fool is not due to ill luck or mischance; for affliction is not spontaneous or accidental (v. 6) but an inevitable consequence of the congenital imperfection of man." Quite the contrary, 5 2-5 says very distinctly the opposite, namely, that the ruin of the fool is due to his own folly in yielding to impatience. Nothing reveals the tantalizing ambiguity of 5 6-7 better than these various attempts to relate this quatrain to its context. Can we obtain a more satisfactory connection if the verb in v. 7a is read as an active—"man begets trouble?"

2) Scholars who adopt this emendation do not discuss the connection of the passage with what precedes in any very precise way, but Budde very significantly brings v. 7a into parallelism, not with 4 12-21, but with 4 s.¹¹⁹ Undoubtedly the thought that mankind begets trouble or sows what he reaps follows on 5 2-5 more easily than the thought that man (because of sinfulness) is born to trouble. But the objection to this reading of the active verb in 5 7b, apart from the unanimous testimony against it in the ancient versions, is the present position of the verse. If it is the equivalent of 4 s its position after 4 12-21 is very unfortunate.

At 4 12-21 it was, as we have seen, the purpose of Eliphaz to implicate Job in sin in the least offensive way. No particular sins, no direct responsibility of Job for his sufferings are alleged. He is implicated only in the general sin of mankind. To insist upon the direct responsibility of man for his sufferings, as would be done if the verb in 5 7a is read as an active, would largely defeat the kindly purpose which Eliphaz had in mind in his very general formulation at 4 12-21. Thus, if the verb in 5 7a is read as a passive, the line will agree with 4 12-21, but it will be hard to relate it to 5 2-5. If the verb is treated as an active, in harmony with 4 s, it will agree better with 5 2-5, but 5 7a will then largely undo what Eliphaz meant to accomplish by 4 12-21, besides being opposed to all the early textual evidence. Thus, no satisfactory explanation of the quatrain in 5 6-7, either in itself or in its relation to the context, is to be found, and it must be regarded as an intrusion. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, when the offending quatrain is removed, 5 sff. is seen to attach in the most natural way to 5 2-5.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ So also Hitzig expressly (though retaining the verb in the passive, thereby confusing his exegesis) and Steuernagel impliedly.

¹²⁰ Wellhausen seems to have been the first to recognize the secondary character of 5 6-7 (*Jahrbücher f. Deutsche Theologie*, Vol. 16, p. 557). His reason is that the quatrain is alien to its context though he does not state in what respect it is alien. He has been followed by Siegfried, Beer, Duhm, Volz and Jastrow. Duhm argues the question at greatest length, but the alleged rhetorical inconsistencies between 5 6-7 and 4 12-21 carry little

conviction. Barton admits the "vagueness and uncertainty" of the verses. Peake points out some of their difficulties but still holds to their genuineness. Ehrlich's attempt to relieve their obscurities is unconvincing. König not only reads the verb in v. 7a as active (begets) but also holds that v. 6 refers not to physical suffering but to moral evil, and paraphrases: "The evil activity of man and its unfortunate consequences do not flow out of a physical source" to which admittedly platitudinous affirmation v. 7 forms the antithesis. As a corrective gloss to 4 12-21, which seeks to warn against the idea there expressed that physical frailty and sin are organically connected, v. 6a, thus explained, might have some meaning, but in its present position it would be pointless. In any case, the interpretation of v. 6a as referring to moral evil is more than doubtful.

THE DISLOCATIONS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER OF JOHN

W. RANDOLPH CHURCH

AMHERST COLLEGE

EVERYONE who has read attentively the Gospel according to John must have been struck by the confusion in the story of the trial of Jesus before the Jewish authorities (18 12-27). Jesus was led "to Annas first; for he was father in law to Caiaphas, who was high priest that year." Peter and another disciple who was known to the high priest followed Jesus (15-18), and here Peter made one of his denials. Jesus was questioned (19-23), by Annas we should have supposed, but we read that it was by the high priest, and we have just been informed that the "high priest that year" was Caiaphas, the phrase being a repetition of the phrase used of Caiaphas in 11 49, the only other place in this Gospel (outside the limits of this episode) where the high priest is mentioned.¹ "Annas therefore sent (*ἀπέστειλεν οὖν*) him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest" (24). The King James Version renders this "Now Annas had sent," which relieves the difficulty and which Robertson²

¹ To evade the difficulty as Bernard does (J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, Edinburgh, 1928, vol. i, p. xxviii) by arguing that, since ex high priests were sometimes referred to as high priests, the reference in verse 15 may quite well be to Annas, is to accuse the author of writing carelessly.

² A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*⁴, New York, 1923, p. 841. Cf. *contra* Friedrich Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, London, 1898, p. 58; Bernard, *op. cit.*, on 18 24.