

NOAH, DANIEL, AND JOB

touching on

CANAANITE RELICS IN THE LEGENDS OF THE JEWS

By SHALOM SPIEGEL

1. Daniel or Danel?.....	307	[3]
2. The Lay of Aqhat.....	310	[6]
3. Ezekiel 14:14 ff.....	318	[14]
4. The Primitive Tale of Job.....	323	[19]
5. The Conclusion of the Poem of Job.....	330	[26]
Note 1: Danel in the Book of Enoch.....	336	[32]
Note 2: Heyyin and his Brother in Rabbinic and Moslem Legend.....	341	[37]

Toward the end of the book (Job 42:10), the Lord is said to have "turned the fortunes" of Job, or restored him to grace. He similarly revives, it would seem, the theories on Job. When they complete their cycle of mortality, the old doctrines start afresh on a new period of favor or fashion.

Richard Simon¹ was the first to doubt the integrity of the book of Job. Cautiously, almost cursorily, he suggested that chapters 1 and 2, like the superscriptions to the Psalms, were added by the makers of the biblical collection. More than half a century later, Albert Schultens² ventured the guess, also rather hurriedly, that the prologue and epilogue, or chapters 1, 2 and 42:7-17, were appended to the book at the time of its admission to the canon. Another half a century was to elapse before the conjecture was elaborated, and the discrepancies between the

¹ *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, Rotterdam 1685, p. 30.

² *Liber Jobi*, Leiden 1737, Praef., p. 34.

poem and the framework of Job were set forth in detail.³ The original dialogue was still believed to date from the days of king Solomon,⁴ but the prologue and epilogue were assigned to the age which assembled the literary remains of Hebrew antiquity.

The disagreements between the dialogue and its framework led later, after the abandonment of the Solomonic date for the poem, to the hypothesis of an earlier folk-tale, or even a separate *Volksbuch* of Job.⁵ The commentaries of K. Budde⁶ and B. Duhm⁷ made this view quite popular in their day. It seems to have been advanced for the first time by J. Wellhausen.⁸ He believed that both the prologue and epilogue embodied a genuine folk-saga which survived, intact in substance as well as in form, within the present text of Job.

The rebuttal of this thesis, mostly on linguistic grounds,⁹ made it necessary to revise the view. It was now commonly held that the poet of Job availed himself of the older folk-story in creative freedom, just as Plato borrowed ancient myths or Goethe reshaped the legend of Faustus to unfold their own

³ Joh. Gottfr. Hasse, "Vermuthungen über das Buch Hiob," in: *Magazin für die biblisch-orientalische Litteratur und gesammte Philologie* I, 1789, 161-192, esp. 162-171.

⁴ יהוה מלכות שבעה Gen. R. c. 57.4; Yer. Soṭa V.8, 20d; b. Baba Bathra 15b reads מלכות שבעה and argues against the view that King Solomon as the author of Job is assumed by Gregory Nazianzen (*Oratio* XIX., Migne, *P. G.* vol. 35, p. 1061) and contemplated by Luther (*Tischreden*, Weimar 1912, vol. I, p. 207: "*Possibile est Salomonem ipsum scripsisse eum librum*"). Otherwise the Solomonic age is postulated by Luther (*ibid.*, p. 68: "*Videtur mihi scriptus esse tempore Salomonis*"). See also *ibid.* p. 375, and vol. III, 1914, p. 9), a view still upheld by K. Schlottmann, *Das Buch Hiob*, Berlin 1851, p. 105 ff. and Franz Delitzsch, *Das Buch Job*, Leipzig 1876, p. 13 ff.

⁵ T. K. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, London 1887, p. 66 ff. conjectured that the first two chapters originally formed the principal part of a distinct "prose book of Job" which could not be dated "before the Chaldean period."

⁶ *Das Buch Hiob*, Göttingen 1896, 1913.

⁷ *Das Buch Hiob*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1897.

⁸ In his review of Aug. Dillmann, *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig 1869 in: *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 16, 1871, p. 555. See also his *Israëlitische und jüdische Geschichte*, Berlin 1914, p. 207, n. 2.

⁹ Karl Kautzsch, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob*, Tübingen 1900.

insights. So amended, the theory may be said to have gained wide acceptance.¹¹

Recent investigations,¹² however, seem to hark back to the first stirrings of critical doubt in the days of Simon and Schultens. Once more the poem is asserted to antedate the framework of the book. The wheel has come full circle, and it now appears as if the cycle of Job were to be reversed and the discarded theories returned to new vogue.

Is the evidence available simply inconclusive? The history of interpretation seems to suggest it. Somehow all attempts at a definite solution end in the ancient sigh of Jerome: "*Obliquus . . . totus liber . . . et lubricus: . . . ut si velis anguillam aut muraenulam strictis tenere manibus, quanto fortius presseris, tanto citius elabatur*."¹²

1. DANIEL OR DANIEL?

"*Celängt es aber zu ermitteln, wer eigentlich Ezechiels Daniel ist, so werden wir auch weitergeleitet werden auf die Spur Hiobs*." — Ferd. Hitzig, *Das Buch Hiob* (1874) p. xiv.

Ez. 14:14 ff. remains the basal passage with which all inquiry into the pre-literary tale of Job must begin. The curious collocation of the names has baffled centuries of exegesis: What did Noah, Daniel, and Job have in common to be mentioned in

¹⁰ J. Meinhold, *Einführung in das A.T.*, Giessen 1919, p. 278; Paul Dhorme, *Le livre de Job*, Paris 1926, p. LXVII; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das A.T.*, Tübingen 1934, p. 512; Adolphe Lods, "Reserches récentes sur le livre de Job," in: *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, 14, 1934, p. 501 ff.; Gustav Höischer, *Das Buch Hiob*, Tübingen 1937, p. 5, and Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the O.T.*, New York 1941, p. 670 ff. where a full review of the literature will be found.

¹¹ B. D. Eerdmans, *Studies in Job*, Leiden 1939, p. 5, 17, 19 f.; E. G. Kraeling, *The Book of the Ways of God*, New York 1939, p. 189, 206 and N. H. Torczyner, *ספר איוב*, Jerusalem 1941, p. 17, 534 ff.

¹² Hieronymus, Praefatio in I. Job (Migne, *P. L.* vol. 28, p. 1081). Cf. also his Second Preface to Job (*ibid.* vol. 29, p. 62): "*decurtatus et laceratus currosusque liber*."

Closer scrutiny did not fail to notice that whenever the name occurs in the book of Ezekiel, it is spelled consistently Danel,⁹ and not Daniel. May not another person be meant?¹⁰ The discovery of the Ugaritic legend of Danel¹¹ seemed at once to resolve the chronological difficulty, and the identification with the biblical Daniel was dropped with relief. Recent commentaries carry invariably some reference to the epic of Ras Shamra.¹² But even now, neither the passage in Ezekiel, nor the story of Job seem to be understood any better. Moreover, the disagreement in the interpretation of the fragments of Danel, and their want of relation or relevance to the biblical text, soon raised the doubt whether, after all, there is any real connection between the myth of Ugarit and the passage in Ezekiel.¹³

2. THE LAY OF AQHAT

Since its publication in 1936, the legend of Danel has engaged the attention of a number of scholars whose patience and perspicacity has penetrated the mists so that now the outline of a story is slowly emerging.¹ It is true, several salient passages

⁹ See David Kimḥi to Ez. 14:14 and 28:3: דנאל חסר הי"ד and N. Krochmal, טורה נבוכי הזמן, Lemberg 1851, p. 118 (ed. Rawidowicz, Berlin 1924, p. 138).

¹⁰ See H. A. Chr. Hävernick, *Commentar über den Propheten Ezechiel*, Erlangen 1843, p. 207. L. Zunz, *ZDMG* 27, 1873, p. 676 ff. (= *Ges. Schriften* I, Berlin 1875, p. 228 f.) suggests that the three saints were non-Israelites.

¹¹ *Syria* 12, 1931, p. 21 f. 77, 193. See also W. F. Albright, *JBL* 51, 1932, p. 99 f., *BASOR* 46, 1932, p. 19 and *ibid.* 63, 1936, p. 27.

¹² A. Bertholet, *Hesekiel*², Tübingen 1936, p. 53; G. A. Cooke, l. c. p. 153, and W. A. Irwin, l. c. p. 158.

¹³ See A. Bea, "Archäologisches und Religionsgeschichtliches aus Ugarit-Samra," in: *Biblica* 20, 1939, p. 445.

¹ Charles Virolleaud, *La Légende Phénicienne de Danel*, Paris 1936; James A. Montgomery, "Ras Shamra Notes VI: The Danel Text," *JAOR* 56, 1936, 440-445; Josef Aistleitner, "Zum Verständnis des Ras-Shamra-Textes I D," in: *Dissertationes in hon. Dr. E. Mahler*, Budapest 1937, 37-52; Theodor H. Gaster, "The Story of Aqhat," in: *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 12, 1936, 126-146; 13, 1937, 25-56 and 14, 1938, 212-215; A. Herdner, Quelques remarques sur "La Légende Phénicienne de Danel," in: *Revue des Études Sémitiques* 1938, 120-127; Umberto Cassuto, "La Leggenda fenicia di

still elude us, some tablets are broken at painful points of the narrative, and the beginning and the end are missing. Nevertheless, the areas of doubt are narrowing, and little by little the fragments assemble into a coherent account.

If *mlk* (I 2:152) refers to our hero, as seems likely, Danel was a king.² He is often called *mt hrnm* or man of *Hrnm* which 1 Enoch seems to have identified with the region of Mount Hermon.³ His palace (*hkl*) and court (*hqr*), his harness of silver and saddlery of gold (*gpnm dt ksp, dt yrq nqbnm*) comport with his station in life. His garments (*kst* and 'all) are not described, but he, too, must have been arrayed in his robes like the kings

Daniel e Aqhat," *Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Ser. VI, vol. XIV, p. 264-268; *idem*, "Daniel e la Pioggia fecondatrice nella tavola I D di Ras Shamra," in: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, Aug. 1938; *idem*, "Daniel e le spighe: Un episodio della tavola I D di Ras Shamra," *Orientalia* 8, 1939, 338-343; *idem*, "Daniel et son fils dans la tablette II D de Ras Shamra," *REJ* 105, 1940, 125-131; George A. Barton, "Danel, a pre-Israelite Hero of Galilee," *JBL* 60, 1941, 213-225; Cyrus H. Gordon, "The Saga of Aqhat, Son of Daniel" in his book *The Loves and Wars of Baal and Anat*, Princeton 1943, pp. 33-43; E. A. Singer, הסופית בשפת לוחות אונוריה, *Bull. Jew. Pal. Expl. Soc.* 10, 1943, 61; f. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, Baltimore 1942, p. 106 and p. 203 n. 31; W. F. Albright and G. E. Mendenhall, "The Creation of the Composite Bow in Canaanite Mythology," *Journ. Near East. Stud.* 1942, 227-229; W. F. Albright, "The 'Natural Force' of Moses in the Light of Ugaritic," *BASOR* 94, 1944, 32-35; H. L. Ginsberg, "A Ugaritic Parallel to 2 Sam 1:21," *JBL* 57, 1938, 209-213; *idem*, "Women Singers and Wailers among the Northern Canaanite," *BASOR* 72, 1938, 13-15; *idem*, "Two Religious Borrowings in Ugaritic Literature II," *Orientalia* 9, 1940, 40-42; *idem*, "The Ugaritic Texts and Textual Criticism," *JBL* 62, 1943, 111 f.; *idem*, "The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat," *BASOR* 97 and 98, 1945.

I take this opportunity to thank Professor Albright for his ever ready helpfulness, and for his kindness in communicating to me his version of II Aq 1:27 ff. before it appeared in print. I am indebted also to my friend and colleague Professor H. L. Ginsberg with whom I have frequently discussed various texts of Ras Shamra and who always generously has lent me not only his books and pamphlets on *Ugaritica*, but also his third ear for all matters of Ugaritic language and literature.

² So also Johs. Pedersen, "Die Krt-Legende," *Berytus* VI, Copenhagen 1941, p. 64.

³ Cf. Additional Note 1.

of Israel and Judah (1 Re. 22:10 = 2 Chr. 18:9), whenever he sat to perform the duties of his office, as is twice told in the poem (I 1:21–25 and II 5:6–8).

*b ap tgr
tht adrm d b grn
ydn dn almnt
ytlpt lpt y'm*

At the entrance of the gate,
Under mighty trees near the threshing-floor,
He judges the case of the widow,
And helps the fatherless to his right.

Lady *Dnty* was a dutiful wife, efficient in her household and quick to accommodate any guest even at short notice (II 5:16 ff.). But she had no son, and that made the couple very sad. When the years passed, and all hope for an heir proved futile, Danel decides in desperation to storm heaven with supplication and sacrifice. It is here that our poem commences, the broken lines narrating, how he offers viands and oblations, lodging in the sanctuary for days and nights, even for a whole week. The missing verses in all likelihood described his grief, as in the epic of *Krt*: sobbingly he repeats his prayer, and sheds his tears like quarter-shekels.⁴ Until Baal is moved to mercy, and takes up Danel's case before the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, the kindly El (II 1:20):

*in bn lh km ahh
w šrš km aryh*

He has no son like his brethren,
Nor a root like his kin.

El promises to grant *Dnty* a male issue. Danel proceeds in joy to his home, and bids welcome to the *Krt*, the biblical *בושר*,⁵ guardian goddesses of the newborn and givers of all

⁴ Comp. I 2:82 *ytk dm'lh k'm rb't tqlm*. See Charles Viroleaud, *La Légende de Keret*, Paris 1936, p. 34 l. 28 f.: *tnkn udm'lh km tqlm arsh*.

⁵ See Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72, p. 13 and Cassuto, *Tarbiz* 12, 1940, p. 11. It seems to me that in Ps. 68:7 deliverance in *childbirth* is meant. Comp. מושיב with Ps. 113:9: He helps the solitary to a family and a barren woman to a houseful of children. Contrast Job 3:10 ff. and cf. Gen. 29:31 or 30:22, and for the verb יצא Gen. 38:28, Job 1:21 and Isa. 65:9. Comp. Gen. R. 71:1.

The craft of the *בושרות* combined skill in word and deed, cf. the *הסילרה* Gen. 35:17 and 38:28 f., also Gen. R. 82:8 נפשה של חיה cf. Yeb. 42b: ממשכסין נפשה של חיה. Comp. also the various etymologies of the name פועה (Sota 11b) שהיתה פועה באשה והולד יוצא; Keh. R. 7:1 שהיתה פועה [ומוציאה] לוולד; Ex. R. 1:13 פועה שהיתה נופעת בחינוך or שהיתה מפיעה את החינוך כשהיו אוזרים טה; which Dr. S. Lieberman (in: Rabbi M. M. Kasher's *שלמה* vol. 8,

good bounty, like the Greek Charites.⁶ He lavishly feeds them for fully seven days, until they depart. Thereupon he numbers the moons, eagerly keeping count for the blessed day. Three months pass and four,— and here the tablet breaks off.

The narrative seems resumed in II 5:2 ff. One morning, when Danel attends his court-session in the gate, he sees *Ktr* coming, the craftsman-god or Hephaestus of Ugarit. He brings a gift

1944, p. 263) connects with Yer. Sab. XVIII.3 f. 16c: *אי זהו סיועו מביא יין* Knowledge of the proper spells and swaddlings is ancient ore of women (cf. Sab. 66b: *אמר לי אם כל מנייני בשמא דאימא וכל קטרי*), but it is especially the business of the *sage-femme* or *חכמה* (Sab. XVIII.3, Rosh Hash. II.5).

Th. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachforschung*, Strassburg 1910, p. 79 and 88 discussed the meaning of *חיה*, Aram. *חיה*, Mand. *חיה*. But perhaps just as the *Krt* are related to *Ktr*, so *חיה* is related to *Hyn d hrš ydm* (II Aq. 5:18 f. and 24 f.) or "Heyyin of the Handicrafts." See Bauer, *OLZ* 37, 1934, 245 and *ZAW* 53, 1935, 57 who compares Arab. *hayyin* "facile" and Syr. *haunā* "cleverness." The Targumim understood similarly Ex. 1:19 *כי חיה הנה*, Pal. Tg. I: זריין וחכין. The *חיה* must be "quick" and "deft," for bungling or tarrying may cost the life of the child (cf. Gen. R. 60:3: *בין חיה בין דרביהא* (למחנלהא אול ברא דרביהא)).

Perhaps in this connection של חיה may be mentioned (Ta'anith 2a bottom and Bekhoroth 45a, also Yer. Targ. Dt 28:12 *דחיהא*). Damascus, *De Primis Principiis* § 125 ed. Jos. Kopp p. 385 calls *Ktr* "the Opener" (*ἀνογρεῖς*), thus identifying him with the Egyptian smith-god Ptal. The authors of the Ugarit religious texts were conscious of this identity, see Ginsberg, *Orientalia* 9, 1940, 42. Besides, the ancients associated fire with fecundity, cf. Varro, *De lingua latina* 5, 61: "mas ignis, quod ibi semen"; Joh. Lydus, *De mensibus* 4, 54: "Ἡφαίστος γόνιμος πῦρ"; Servius to Virgil's *Aeneid* 8, 389: "Vulcanus maritus fingitur Veneris, quod Venerium officium non nisi calore consistit." See O. Gruppe, *Griech. Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Munich 1906, p. 726 f., 859 f. and 1311 ff.

Professor Saul Lieberman was kind to bring to my attention a reading in Tosefta Baba Bathra X.2 (see his *Tosefeth Rishonim* vol. 2, Jerusalem 1938, 148): *האשה שהיתה כושרה ועמדה והשכיבה את הנכס: כושרה* means: skilful, adroit, efficient.

Perhaps *כושרה* and *חיה* were synonyms for *חכמה*. They were thought alike to be disciples and devotees of the *Krt*, or the patron goddesses of *minstrelsy* and *midwifery*, twin arts in antiquity. See Additional Note 2 n. 10 and 29.

⁶ So rightly Th. H. Gaster, "On a Proto-Hebrew Poem from Ras Shamra," *JBL* 57, p. 82. R. Dussaud, *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancient Testament*, 1937, p. 82 compares the *Parcae* of the Romans. See also A. Goetze, "The Nikkal Poem from Ras Shamra," *JBL* 60, 1941, 360 f.

from his heavenly workshop, a bow for Danel's son, Aqhat. (The *Klrt*, as their name implies, stand in some special relation to *Klr*—one of the Graces is the wife of Hephaestus⁷—and we may surmise that the generous hospitality shown by Danel to the *Klrt* is now being rewarded, perhaps at their request, by *Klr*).

The bow of the divine smith did not bring luck to Aqhat. It aroused the envy of the war goddess Anath who resolved to obtain the bow at any price. She offered to pay for it in precious ore, and even promised to make Aqhat immortal.⁸ But the lad would not part with his weapon, the grant of a god to his father. Offended by such *hybris* of a mortal, Anath threatens to humble Aqhat on his "path of pride and presumption" (*b ntb pš' / bntb g'an*, II 6:43 f.). She sets her face toward the source of the rivers where the father of the gods resides. At the feet of El she bows, and at once denounces Aqhat, — but little more is recoverable from the mutilated tablet. One can only guess that the infuriated goddess did not hesitate to slander the youth, or even swear at the godhead himself (if III 6:11 f. is properly rendered or related to this point of the narrative): "I will make thy hoar beard flow with blood!",⁹ Anath threatens, browbeating the wrinkled El to some sort of compliance.

The story appears to be continued in III:1 where Anath instructs her henchman *Ylpn* in *Qrt Ablm* or its vicinity. She promises to make *Ylpn* "like an eagle in her scabbard, like a vulture in her sheath" and set him over Aqhat. *Ylpn* is then to strike the lad "twice on the head, thrice on the ear." The orders of the goddess are obeyed, and Aqhat is killed: "his soul went out like a wind, his spirit like smoke."

There is no need to trace in detail what follows, or what is legible. Bereaved of his only son, rent with grief and rage,

⁷ *Iliad* XVIII 382: "Charis of the gleaming veil" (Χάρις λιπεροκρήδεμνος), later identified with Aglaia, youngest of the Charites (Hesiod, *Theog.* 945: 'Αγλαΐην δ' Ἡφαιστος . . . ὀπλοτάτην Χαρίτων θαλερὴν ποιήσας' ἄκουιν).

⁸ II Aq 6:17 ff. See Albright, *BASOR* 94, 32 ff. and Ginsberg, *ibid.* 97 and 98.

⁹ III Aq 6:11 f. as restored by Singer *l.c.* and now rendered by Ginsberg, *l.c.* 97, p. 5, n. 13.

Danel prays to the gods to scorch the land by drought for seven years: "Let there be no dew, nor rain! No surging of the two deeps, nor the goodness of Baal's voice!"¹⁰ Even fiercer are the curses he hurls upon the cities round about his slain son (cf. Dt. 21:2): "Woe unto thee, *Qrt Ablm*! If the murderer of Aqhat be in thy midst, may Baal strike thee with blindness, from now on and forevermore, henceforward throughout all generations!"¹¹

We do not learn whether the death of Aqhat was avenged, but in the last lines of the lay (I 4:220 f.), we find the assassin *Yl'n*, drinking heavily, in the company of Danel's daughter *Pgt*. He brags as his tongue is loosed by liquor:

yd mħst Aqht ġsr
lmħš alp'm 'ib

The hand that smote Aqhat, the Mighty,
Will smite thousands of foes!

He thus betrays himself to *Pgt* who had not hidden for nought a sword under her raiment, nor asked in vain for her father's blessing (I 4:196 f.):

'lmħš mħš aħy
a[kl m]kly ['l] umty

Let me smite him that smote my brother,
Slay the slayer of my mother's [l]ad!

However, as has been said, the tablets stop abruptly, leaving the reader haunted by the shades of Jael and Judith. Or is one to think rather of Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, the gods having been entreated for the famished land (II Sam 21:14) to give it rain after seven years of drought only when the bones of Aqhat had been buried?

Anyway, Danel does sedulously bury whatever remains of Aqhat he is able to retrieve. Such care in collecting and conserving the limbs of the dead seems to be the prerequisite of resurrection. So, too, Anath inhumed Aliyn Baal: "She weeps for him and buries him, she sets him in the hollows of the silent ones of the earth",¹² acts not only of piety, but apparently also

¹⁰ Ginsberg, *JBL* 57, 209 f. and 62, 111 f.

¹¹ I Aq 4:167 f. On the meaning of *l-ht w'lmħ 'ut p-drdr* see Ginsberg, *Orientalia* 7, 1938, p. 9, n. 4.

¹² I AB 1:16 f. (*lbkynh wqbrnh lštnn bħrt 'ilm arš*) and I Aq 3:111 f. (*abky w aqbrnh ašt bħrt 'ilm arš*). On *'ilm* = 𐤀𐤋𐤍 see Ginsberg, *Orientalia* 5, 1936, p. 167.

of preparation for his rebirth. Probably the same idea underlies the ritual of Aqhat's interment. There are indications in the poem that Aqhat will be recalled to life,¹³ and Anath seems to be charged with the duty of making him whole again, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of new life.¹⁴ The details escape us, but El in his gentle wisdom must have found a way to calm or compensate the bellicose goddess, perhaps by ordering for her another bow from the smithy of *Ktr*.¹⁵ There is reason to expect that in the end Danel is not left uncomfortable, and his son Aqhat is given back to him.

One is even tempted to conjecture how the minstrel of Ugarit might have completed his lay. If repetition, especially frequent repetition betrays the point the poet is eager to make or the

¹³ I first suggested the resurrection of Aqhat, mainly on the basis of Ez 14:14 ff., at the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature on Dec. 28, 1939 (*JBL* 59, 1940, p. VIII). The suggestion was adopted by Dr. C. H. Gordon, *The Living Past*, New York 1941, p. 155 who aptly observes that the story was known in antiquity not as the epic of Danel, but as the epic of Aqhat (cf. the rubric I Aq 1:1 *I Aqhat*).

¹⁴ I Aq 1:8 f. *khṛṣ abn ph* "I will shape (rebuild) his mouth like clay (in the potter's hand? Jer 18:6 and 19:1, or (molten) glass? See II Aq 6:37 and the remarks of Ginsberg and Albright *BASOR* 98, p. 22 and 24 f.). The speaker may be Anath, as would seem from I Aq 1:14-17 where the warrior goddess offers her regrets or apology for having slain Aqhat — just to obtain his bow, but "him will I revive" (*hwt l ahw*, first rendered correctly by J. A. Montgomery, *JAOS* 56, 441. See C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Grammar*, Rome 1940 p. 23 and 57). In III Aq 1:13 Ytpn makes sure before the murder that Anath will keep Aqhat alive: "him wilt thou revive" (*hwt l t[hwy]*, see Montgomery *ibid.* p. 443 and now Ginsberg, *BASOR* 97, p. 7 n. 15). Anath ends her instructions to her partner in crime: *b ap mhrh ank l ahwy* "into the nostrils of his *mhr* I will blow life," l. 26 f. Lastly, when Aqhat falls dead, Anath weeps (*w tbk*, l. 39) and apparently promises once more to bring him back to life l. 40 f.): *abn ank k (!) l[qṣtk mḥṣtk mḥṣtk 'l] qṣ'tk at lḥ[wt]* "I will (re)build thee, for I slew thee (but) for thy bow, I slew thee for thine arc. As for thee, mayest thou live!" See Ginsberg, *l. c.*

¹⁵ IV Aq is too fragmentary, and the new fragments published by Virolleaud are inaccessible to me. I desist therefore from speculating whether El achieved another compromise by consigning Aqhat for a part of the year to the shades. On the connection with the Adonis myth see Albright, *BASOR* 94, p. 34 and Ginsberg *ibid.* 97, p. 4, n. 8.

interest he has at heart, one cannot fail to notice a long passage reproduced in the preserved portions of the epic fully four times.¹⁶ It is an enumeration of the services a dutiful son performs for his father. Indeed, what a son means to a father appears to be the central theme of the tale. It is no accident that the passage each time consists of fourteen hemistichs, or twice the sacred number *seven* which recurs so often as an element of the cult or embellishment of the style in these ancient texts.¹⁷ One suspects, therefore, that the *catalogue of filial duties* was likewise reproduced seven times. Following this clue, one might hazard the guess that the anguish of the bereaved father was brought once more to the attention of El, whereupon there followed, for the fifth time in the poem, the list of kindnesses rendered by a devoted son. El cannot well refuse such a plea, for after all, it was he who awarded a son to the pious parents. He must cheer them again, probably by the annunciation of Aqhat's rebirth.¹⁸ Here, for the sixth time, all the loving deeds of a loyal son are rehearsed. When at last his lad is revived, and Danel sees for himself, and his eyes behold, and not another, Aqhat actually waked from the dust, the love of the heptad and of the happy ending made perhaps the bard of Ugarit wind up his tale with a refrain now sufficiently familiar to his hearers to join in it. Danel breaks sorrow and laughs, resting his foot on a footstool.¹⁹

¹⁶ II Aq 1:26 ff. and 43 ff. II Aq 2:1 ff. and 14 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. U. Cassuto, *Tarbiz* 13, p. 207 and in his new book *מאדם עד נח*, Jerusalem 1944, p. 4 f. See also Robert Gordis, "The Heptad as an Element of Biblical and Rabbinic Style," *JBL* 62, 1943, p. 17 ff.

Dr. Saul Lieberman suggests as a parallel לעשה לאביו מצותים Yer. Kidd. I 7f. 61a: מאכיל ומשקה מלביש ומנעיל מכניס ומוציא. On מכה see Ex 22:2b (במה ישכב); Jud 4:18; Jer 3:25. These *seven* services are condensed to *five* in agreement with the five obligations of the father, *ibid.*: וכשם שהוא [האב לבן] זכה לו בחמשה דברים, כך הוא [הבן לאב] חייב לו בחמשה דברים. ואילו הן מאכיל ומשקה מלביש ומנעיל מכניס ומוציא. To מנהיג we read again מוציא ומכניס. Cf. Is 51:18, and Yeb. 65b זוטרא לידה. On the number *five* in Rabbinic literature comp. Gerhard Kittel, *Rabbinica*, Leipzig 1920, p. 39 f. and S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York 1942, p. 31, n. 18.

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. I AB 3:8 ff.

¹⁹ II Aq 2:10 ff. = I AB 3:15 ff.

The book of Ezekiel spans the years of his captivity, 593–568 B.C., including perhaps a few earlier oracles, spoken while the prophet was still in Palestine, before his departure for or deportation to Babylonia.⁵ If מעל is not loosely used in Ez. 14:13, but refers to a definite event, as it does unmistakably in Ez. 17:20, one could venture a closer date for our passage. Rabbinic tradition would see in Ez. 17 the beginning⁶ of his prophetic career in Palestine.⁷ This may well have been the case,⁸ and the prophecy may be understood as a warning against the war-propaganda and the hopes bound up with the accession of Psammetichus II (cf. Ez. 17:15), the real power behind the revolt of the principalities of Canaan against Babylon (cf. Jer. 27:3). Chapter 17 in Ezekiel could accordingly be dated in the fourth year of Zedekiah (Jer. 28:1) or about 593 B. C. As is known, Judah soon withdrew, or was forced to withdraw, from the anti-Babylonian coalition, and the penalty then exacted from Zedekiah and his people can be inferred only from Jer. 51:59. Be that as it may, shortly thereafter we find the prophet Ezekiel among the captives “in the land of the Chaldeans by the river Chebar” (Ez. 1:2 f.).⁹

Ez. 14:12 ff., also, contains a grim warning to the nation about the horrors that a reckless and hopeless rebellion will unleash upon the land: “the sword, and the famine, and the evil beasts, and the pestilence, to cut off from it man and animal” (v. 21). But unlike c. 17, Ez. 14:12 ff. seems to stress more particularly the peril to “sons and daughters”, thrice mentioned in the speech (vs. 16, 18, 20). In 24:21 the prophet plainly told the parents in Babylonia, separated from their children in Palestine: “Your sons and daughters whom ye have left behind shall fall by the

⁵ JBL 54, 1935, 169 f.

⁶ Mekhila, Shirah 7,40b (ed. Lauterbach II 54): בן אדם חור חיה' זה היה. החלה הספר.

⁷ Targ. Ez. 1:3; Mekhila, Bo 1b (ed. Lauterbach I 6); Tanhuma, Bo 5; cf. also the anecdote in Mo'ed Katan 25a. On the symmetrical rather than chronological sequence of chapters see Tosefta Soṭa 6,11 and Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, p. 60 ff.

⁸ Ez. 17:20 must have been spoken before the events II Ki 25:6 which disproved it. See JBL 56, 1937, 407.

⁹ See מתי נלה יחזקאל? in: ספר זורוב, Boston 1938, p. 206–212.

sword.” Ez. 14:12 ff. would seem to presuppose a similar *exilic situation*, and bespeak the anxiety felt among the captives for their children in Judaea. If so, the utterance is to be dated after 590,¹⁰ when Zedekiah finally succumbed to the war party and openly broke with Babylon, or perhaps was about to do so.

Ezekiel condemned all attempts at insurrection as a breach of good faith and repudiation of solemn treaties (Ez. 17:19 f. and 14:13) and hence as predictable disaster. He believed it his duty to prepare the exiles for the worst: The Lord abandoned Jerusalem, and will consign to flames even His own shrine. One can easily comprehend the consternation and the resentment of the captivity when it first heard such direful predictions. No wonder that they sought to restrain or even silence altogether such dismal divining (cf. Ez. 3:25). Ezekiel himself is fully aware of the offense he must give and often hesitates to heap more “moaning and woe” upon the sorrow-laden exiles (2:8 ff.). But “the hand of the Lord was strong” upon him, and obey he must “in bitterness” (3:14). There are days in which he simply cannot “open his mouth” (3:15, 26 f.; 24:27; 29:21; 33:22), sick of rubbing salt into the gaping wounds of his people. In the light of subsequent history, one must admit that it was precisely the unrelenting consistency of the prophetic monition that helped the people to survive the political defeat. Forewarned by their seers, the Jews learned to accept deportation, debacle of the kingdom, even desecration of the sanctuary, as the design, and not the defeat of God. The shock was salutary, as it paved the way toward the future reconstitution of Israel on the foundations of the prophetic faith.

But the death of the children left behind in Jerusalem, such personal hurt to the parents, punished enough by banishment and separation, was it not needless and pointless cruelty? Why should the prophet outrage paternal feelings of the exiles and, in advance of the final catastrophe, threaten the youth in distant Judah with wholesale slaughter? He had to correct himself in Ez. 14:22 f., a postscript written after 586, where he candidly

¹⁰ Albrecht Alt, in: *Festschrift Procksch* (1934), p. 15.

concedes that his threat, and the theology behind it, were refuted by the facts of history.¹¹

Since the prophecy did not come true, it is a genuine prophecy, spoken undoubtedly before the events, and not thereafter retouched to suit them. Does Ezekiel intend to frighten the captives, and dissuade them from embroilment by the spokesmen of intransigence in Babylonia? Or does he even aim at having the influence of the captivity exerted at home to prevent the rebellion of Zedekiah? They could avert the death of their children by opposing the war party in Judah. The most prominent leaders and trusted elders of the nation were in Babylon and, if consulted, could caution and calm the rebels in Jerusalem. If this be the case and such the purpose of Ezekiel, the utterance precedes the revolt of Zedekiah, and is to be dated before or about 590.

But if spoken after the outbreak of the ill-fated war, when the exiles could not any longer arrest its course, the words were meant perhaps as an *apology* rather than as an admonition. The primary business of a prophet was to intercede on behalf of the people,¹² and the captives must have asked Ezekiel to pray for their children in the embattled city, indeed to pray for the rescue of Jerusalem. But like Jeremiah,¹³ Ezekiel could not do so, convinced that it was too late to "stand in the breach before Him for the land, that He should not destroy it" (Ez. 22:30).¹⁴ All one could do now was to salvage the belief in a just and holy God, hence the particular pains Ezekiel takes to emphasize the doctrine of retribution. The righteous alone will escape, at best, and there is not anyone, alive or dead, whose prayer could stave off disaster. Were Noah now in the land, he could save no

¹¹ See also Ez 12:16. Reality played havoc with his theories, hence the theological inconsistencies of Ezekiel which translators and commentators tried to read away, cf. Sept. Ez 21:8 and 'Aboda Zara 4a. See also Baba Kama 60a, or the realistic observation in the Mekhilta, ed. Lauterbach I 85.

¹² Jer 27:18; 1 Sam 12:23; Gen 20:7.

¹³ Jer 7:16; 11:14; 14:11; 21:2 ff.; 37:3 ff.

¹⁴ Cf. Ps. 106:23 and Gen 18:22. See *JBL* 54, 1935, 152.

one but himself, Daniel could not redeem Aqhat, nor would Job's piety avail his children. When such holy men and masters of intercession must fail, how much more helpless must be Ezekiel, the son of Buzi. How can he be asked to try by his feeble prayer to stay divine justice, or exempt therefrom the sons and daughters left in the hapless land!¹⁵

4. THE PRIMITIVE TALE OF JOB

The legend of Job, as preserved in chapters 1 and 2, revolves about the question: "Doth Job fear God for nought?" (Job 1:9). The same thought underlies the discussion of the rabbis, whether Job served God out of fear or out of love.¹ Translated into modern idiom, the issue may be stated: *Is there such a thing as unselfish virtue?* The legend of Job answers this question in the affirmative. Job stands the test of suffering and proves thereby that disinterested piety does exist.

It has been long observed that the last chapter of the book contains variant versions which in their present location do not jibe with the story and mar its sequence. When Job has been restored and the Lord has doubled all his possessions (ib. 42:10), the condolence call of his family and friends (42:11) is both belated and pointless. And so is their charity, each presenting him with a coin and an earring, a poor pittance for a man who now possesses twice his original, very handsome, fortune. It is amusing to watch the straits to which exegetes are driven: the verb "to condole" is pressed to yield — here alone and nowhere else — precisely the opposite of its meaning, and so the visit

¹⁵ Jer 15:1 is an instructive parallel. Jeremiah himself became later the intercessor par excellence, cf. II Mac 15:14. Ezekiel chose three fathers whose probity or prayer saved their children.

¹ Mishnah Soṭah V 5: Johanan b. Zakkai infers from ירא אלהים in Job 1:1 לא עבר איוב את המקוב אלא מיראה. Joshua b. Hyrcanus cites Job 13:15 and 27:5 as proving מראה אלהים אלא עבר איוב את הקב"ה. See also Tosefta Soṭah VI 1. Yer. Soṭah V 7 f. 20c and b. Soṭah 31a.

becomes one of congratulation.² It has been likewise noticed³ that the succeeding verses, 42:12-17, while showing ample concern for Job's property and progeny, say nothing about his own recovery. Albrecht Alt,⁴ therefore, concluded that 42:12-17 originally followed chapter 1, forming with it an earlier phase of the saga: Job himself was as yet unscathed, he lost his wealth and his children, but "for all this he sinned not" (1:1-22). At this point of the narrative, in 42:11, his immediate family and acquaintances — not the three friends as in 2:11 — come to console him and help him to a new start in life, all chipping in with a small gift. The Lord, however, did beyond compare, He "blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning", and our story-teller delights in detailing the bounty of heaven.

There is no gainsaying that such a sequence of events makes smoother sense. The remainder of Alt's reconstruction (1:1-2:13 and 42:7-10 representing the later phase of the saga) seems less convincing, as will be shown.⁵

Whatever the particular distribution of the verses may be, of greater consequence is the fact, observed repeatedly by former and newer students, that the epilogue to the book of Job preserves *older layers of the tale*. Frequent retelling froze the story, crystallizing its salient features, or even the elements of its form.⁶ They sank so firmly into the popular mind and memory

² See A. Schultens, *Liber Jobi*, f. 1227 b. Zerahiah of Barcelona (ed. I. Schwarz, *תקנת אנוש*, p. 293): "וינחמו איתו"; F. Volz, *Hiob und Weisheit*, Göttingen 1921, p. 8: "Die Freunde kommen hinterdrein, denn bis sie das Geschehene gehört haben und den umständlichen Weg zurücklegen konnten, hat sich alles schon abgespielt." Friedr. Delitzsch, *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig 1902, p. 11 deletes 42:10c since in the following verse Job is "doch noch ein armer Mann." See Tosafoth Bata Bathra 116a s. v. "כי: ויחמו לו איש קשיטה" לא ספני שהיה עני אלא דרוון הי: מביאין לו.

³ L. W. Batten, "The Epilogue to the Book of Job," *Anglican Theol. Review* 15, 1933, p. 125 ff. and B. D. Eerdmans, *Studies in Job*, p. 19.

⁴ "Zur Vorgeschichte des Buches Hiob," *ZAW* 55, 1937, 265 ff.

⁵ See § 5, n. 1.

⁶ Cassuto, *שירת העלילה בישראל*, in: *בנסח* 3, 1944, 142 presupposes the existence of a poetic version of the story of Hiob upon which our Job chs. 1-2 and 42:7-17 is based.

that taking liberty with the familiar parts or passages seemed almost frivolous or bad taste. Only so do we understand why vestiges of older versions were not obliterated or retouched. To cite an observation often made: 42:11 speaks of "all the evil *the Lord* had brought upon Job." Satan is not yet the author of all the evil in the story.⁷ This would seem to tally with 1:13, perhaps another trace of the earlier tale.⁸ If the verse followed once closely after 1:5, the subject of the sentence was perfectly clear. In its present position, preceded immediately by the figure of Satan,⁹ the reference to "his sons and daughters" (1:13) is ambiguous, and needs clarification as in the Septuagint: *Job's* sons and daughters (οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰὼβ καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ). The failure to smooth over the inconcinnity in both instances (42:11 and 1:13) is not due to negligence, it is deliberate. It bespeaks regard for the earlier source or story (42:11), and respect for what was still remembered as the older tradition (1:13). The ancient poet retains the form, even when he transcends it in spirit, and his audience found particularly enjoyable such recurrence of the familiar in the new.

Awareness of this literary technique makes one wary of emendations which often miss a helpful clue by deleting it. The text in 42:10 is a good instance. The current commentaries complain that the phrase: "*when he prayed in behalf of his friend(s)*"

⁷ A. Heiligenstedt, *Comment. in Jobum*, Leipzig 1847, p. XVII ff. On earlier similar guesses cf. K. Kautzsch, *Das sog. Volksbuch von Hiob*, p. 7. So also N. Peters, *Das Buch Job*, Münster in Westf. 1928, p. 52* and Louis Finkelstein, *The Pherisees*, Philadelphia 1938, p. 235.

⁸ Joh. Hempel, "Das theologische Problem des Hiob," *Zeits. für syst. Theologie* 6, 1929, p. 643 f. First advanced by J. Hooymaas, *Gesch. der beoefening van de wijsheid onder de Hebreërs*, Leiden 1862, p. 191 ff. See the summary by A. Kuenen, *Hist.-krit. Eindl. in die Bücher des A.T.*, Leipzig 1894, III 1, p. 136.

⁹ Albert Brock-Utne, "Der Feind. Die alt-testamentliche Satansgestalt im Lichte der soz. Verhältnisse des nahen Orients," *Klio* 28, 1935, 219-227; N. H. Torczyner, "How Satan Came into the World," *Expository Times* 48, 1937, 563-565 and in the *Bulletin of Hebrew University*, no. 4, Jan. 1938, p. 14-20; J. Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," *HUCA* 14, 1939, 41 ff. and A. Lods, "Les Origines de la figure de Satan, ses fonctions à la cour céleste," in: *Mélanges Syriens offerts à R. Dussaud*, Paris 1939, II, p. 649-660.

has either come by error from verse 42:9,¹⁰ or is "a gloss to unite the two sections: its present position is almost meaningless."¹¹ Of course, it is easy to rewrite 42:9 to read: "and the Lord accepted Job, when he prayed for his friend(s)". This is usually accompanied by the alteration of רעהו which looks very much like a singular, into the more regular and expected plural רעיו.¹² But then, in turn, why does the author — only here and nowhere else in the book — single out for a special rebuke Eliphaz, adding, as if in postscript, his two friends (42:7)? The three friends alike had "not spoken the thing that was right". Indeed, why should the writer of Job have introduced the motif of prayer at all which seems alien and irrelevant in this connection?¹³

These difficulties, observed long ago and often enough, seem to dissolve when the workmanship of the ancients is remembered. *The older tale of Job had all these features*, and the poet wished to retain them. He accommodated his poem to the *familiar end* of the story of Job. In other words, 42:10 is not the result of corruption or carelessness. On the contrary, by design an ancient text is here left intact as the well-known conclusion of a cherished tale.

וה' שב את שבות איוב כהתפללו בעד רעהו	And the Lord <i>healed</i> Job when (as soon as) he <i>prayed</i> for his friend (neighbor, for the other)
---	--

¹⁰ First suggested, it would seem, by Ferd. Hitzig, *Das Buch Hiob*, Leipzig and Heidelberg 1874, p. 314 and often adopted, e. g. by G. L. Studer, *Das Buch Hiob*, Bremen 1881, p. 78; N. Peters *l. c.* p. 49*; E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Job*, Dublin 1939, p. 295. Comp. S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *The Book of Job*, I, p. 375.

¹¹ K. Fullerton, "The Original Conclusion of Job," *ZAW* 42, 1924, p. 127, n. 1. See B. Duhm, *l. c.* p. 204 ("vielleicht von einem Leser hinzugesetzt") or N. Peters, *l. c.* p. 498.

¹² I find it first emended by C. Fr. Houbigant, *Notae Criticae in V.T.*, Frankfurt a. M. 1777, II, p. 217. So also in Kittel-Kahle, *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart 1937, p. 1154.

¹³ Cf. J. Lindblom, "Die Vergeltung Gottes im Buche Hiob," in: *Abhandl. der Herder Gesellschaft zu Riga* VI 3, 1938, p. 82: "Sehr merkwürdig ist, dass die Wiederaufrichtung Hiobs nicht direkt damit motiviert wird, dass er im Leiden seine Treue behielt, sondern dass er für seine Freunde (bezw. seinen Nächsten) Fürbitte einlegte."

The traditional exegesis of the rabbis¹⁴ was quick to detect the moral burden of the story: for praying for someone other than himself, although one be himself in need of mercy, does attest the selflessness of virtue. Such a conclusion is indeed fitting for the ancient tale centering around the question: is piety calculated or disinterested?

The later legend of Job harks back to this theme. Witness e. g. the unknown midrash, quoted in late medieval commentaries,¹⁵ how Job, smitten with sore boils, would continue his deeds of charity, as he sat among the ashes. Whenever poor people passed by, Job would ask his wife to feed them. On one such occasion, she could refrain no longer and asked in astonishment: "Dost thou still hold fast thine integrity?" (2:9).¹⁶

In the *Testament of Job* there is a tender story of his wife's devotion: to keep her sick husband from starving, she cut off her hair, and purchased bread with it.¹⁷ It is at this point of the narrative, that the Arabic legend of Job¹⁸ makes the patient sufferer break down. Learning of the sacrifice and humiliation of his wife, he bursts into tears and prays for her sake, whereupon he is at once rewarded, God sending Gabriel to "renew Job as fully as the moon on the fourteenth night".¹⁹ Here too the implication seems to be that unselfish prayer is readily granted.

Something similar must have formed the conclusion of the

¹⁴ Baba Kama 92a derives from Job 42:10 והוא צריך על חברו והוא צריך על חברו, cf. Tos. B. K. IX 29 and Yer. B. K. VIII 10 f. 6c. See also Tanh. Buber I 104; Agadath Bereshith ed. Buber, p. 57 and Pes. Rab. c. 38 f. 165a והיה מדה הדין מוחה . . . וכיון שנתפלל על חבריו מיד נתרצה לו הקב"ה.

¹⁵ Meir 'Arama, מאיר אר"ם, Salonica 1517 f. 7a and Isaac b. Solomon Hacoheh, *l. c.* f. 11a. reprinted by Wertheimer, לקט מדרשים, Jerusalem 1904 and מדרש איוב, Jerusalem 1926.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* עוד מוזיק בהומתך מה ראתה לומר לו כך? אלא ללמדך שלא הויה צדקו והי' הענינים נכנסים אצלו והוא אומר לה: פרנסים את אלו. באוהה שעה אמרה: עודך מדיק בהומתך.

¹⁷ *Test. of Job* 23:7 ff. (ed. K. Kohler, V 20 ff., p. 302 and transl. p. 323, in: *Semitic Studies in Memory of Alexander Kohut*, Berlin 1897). See the comment of Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, vol. 5, p. 387, n. 29.

¹⁸ N. Apt, *Die Hieberszählung in der arabischen Literatur*, Heidelberg 1913, p. 27 f.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 65. See also the Moorish version quoted by M. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge zur semit. Segenkunde*, Leiden 1893, p. 269.

primitive tale of Job. Himself in woe and want, Job continued in his uprightness to "strengthen feeble knees" and "uphold him that was falling" (4:4) or even redeem the sinner "through the cleanness of his hands" (22:30),²⁰ traits apparently taken over from the old folk-tale. A particularly poignant example of self-abnegation probably served as the climax of the story, when Job, mindless of his own misery, invoked mercy upon some one else, praying *בעד רעהו*, for a fellow creature in pain. Then or only then, all the world, even Job's adversary in heaven, had to acknowledge with one voice: *חנם ירא איוב אלהים*.²¹

In the foregoing 42:10 was rendered: "The Lord *healed* Job", but although undoubtedly including the miracle of his cure as well,²² has a wider range of meaning. *Restitutio in integrum*²³ does not exhaust it, nor does it sound as a term borrowed from the legal sphere²⁴ or prophetic eschatology.²⁵ It

²⁰ The verse was so understood by the rabbis, cf. Taanith 23a: *ימלט אי נקי*. דור שלא היה נקי מילטתו בתפלתו, ימלט בבר כפיר' מילטתו בעטשה ירך הברורין. On Job 22:30 see now Robert Gordis, *Journ. Near East. St.* 4, 1945, 54 f.

²¹ Cf. *Aboth de R. Nathan* ed. Schechter, p. 164: באותה שעה האמין כל באי העולם שאין כמותו בכל הארץ.

²² Cf. Hos 6:11, 7:1 and Jer 33:6 f. where the parallel verb is *רפא*. See also Dt 30:3 Sept. *lāsetau*. Joseph b. David Ibn Yahya, ... פירוש ה' מנלות. Similarly Isaac b. Solomon Hacoheh: *הכונה זו רפאות איוב*. Bologna 1538: *שובת איוב*. שנתרפא ושב לאימו הראשון בריא אולם איוב.

²³ Hugo Winckler, *Mitt. der Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft* 11, 1906, p. 24 ff.: "ein Terminus des Staatsrechts."

²⁴ Eberhard Baumann, *ZAW* 47, 1929, 17 ff.: "ethisch-juridische Sphäre: 'die Schuldhaft aufheben'." The derivation from *שבה* renews the argument of Erwin Preuschen, *ZAW* 15, 1895, 18 ff. and is attested by the versions [Theodotion and Symmachus: ἀποστρέφειν (ἐπιστρέφειν) γὰρ αἰχμαλωσίαν Targ. חוב (אחיב) נלוה, Syr. שביתא (אפני) שביטא, Jerome: *convertere* (*avertere, redocere*) *captivitatē*, also *captivos reverti iucere*].

²⁵ Ernst L. Dietrich, *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten*, Giessen 1925, p. 60. Similarly H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*, Göttingen 1926, p. 234, 373, 551: "Kunstausdruck der prophetischen Endverkündigung."

J. Barth, *ZDMG* 41, 1887, 618 f. connects it with Arab. *lāba* and *ṭabā* "die Sammlung sammeln." A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebr. Bibel*, Leipzig 1909, II 337 construes *שבות* as a partic. pass. of the verb *שב*, translating the entire phrase: to restore what was (temporarily) interrupted. Nivard Schlögl, *WZKM* 38, 1931, 68-75 vocalizes *שבות*: "die Schicksalswende (von Unheil zum Heil) herbeiführen."

seems older than both,²⁶ and to reach back to the world of myth and fable, where time is reversible, and death not beyond remedy as in stubborn reality. In that dream-land a loss can be retrieved, life recalled from the beyond,²⁷ and the joys of a former day restored by the grace and goodness²⁸ of a god who can *make bygones come back*.²⁹

If such be the signification of *שב שבות*, as the broad scope and varied use would suggest, the old tale concluded in 42:10 not only with Job's recovery, but with the return of his children as well. Selfless prayer achieves the humanly impossible, and Job regains all that life holds dear. Or to quote Ez. 14:14 ff. once more, by his righteousness Job delivered both himself and his sons and daughters.³⁰

The poet of Job resolved to dismiss his hearers with the household words of the ancient tale. The original conclusion

²⁶ Job 42:10 is the only occurrence of the phrase with the name of an individual, hence very likely older than the figurative application to a city (Ez 16:53) or land (Jer 33:11), people (Hos 6:11, Ps 14:7) or nation (Ez 29:14).

²⁷ Cf. Ps 85:2, 5, 7 and 71:20 f.

²⁸ Accompanied with *רחם* Dt 30:3, Jer 30:18 and 33:26. Cf. *Pes. Rab.* c. 26 f. 132a *אחזקתי את איוב*.

²⁹ The stress on *τὰ πρῶτα* seems characteristic of the phrase: *כבראשונה* Jer 33:7, 11. לקדמתן, *לדעתן* (thrice) Ez 16:(53)55. Job 42:11 f. *לפנים*. *מראשיתו*, though an independent version, convey a kindred thought. See also Is 1:26 and 58:12 (cf. Am 9:14) and especially Lam 5:21 which may be said to state best the wish which was father to our phrase: *השיבנו ה' אליך*. *השיבנו ה' אליך*. "To return the returning" = "to renew the renewal." Comp. also the imagery of Ps 126:4, born in the Palestinian landscape where seasonal rains bring plenitude after dearth.

The Masorah oscillates not only between *שבות* and *שבי*, but also the plural: *בשובי* Zeph 3:20. The plural *זו* easily blends with the abstract *זית* Am 9:11 *הרסתי* Is 49:19, cf. also *הרסתי* Is 54:4. The early confusion with the root *שבה* may have caused the variant *שבי*, although such changes are known also elsewhere, cf. *הרסתי* and *הרסתי* Jer 14:14 Ket. A similar confusion of all three forms is to be found in Koh 5:10 *ראית ראות*. See P. Kahle, *Der masoretische Text des A.T. nach der Überlieferung der bab. Juden*, Leipzig 1902, p. 82 and Alexander Sperber, "Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations," *HUCA* 12-13, 1937/8, p. 129.

On transitive *שוב* (Ps 85:5) see Abraham Ibn Ezra, *צחוק* ed. Lippmann 1. 49a.

³⁰ See § 3 n. 3.

(42:10) was too often quoted and too well-known to permit any modification or deviation. The poet had, therefore, to introduce *the feature of prayer*, extraneous to his own narrative, but forming the climax of the older story. This is achieved by having the Lord command the friends to beg for Job's forgiveness and intercession. The poet had to adapt, also, the plural of his *dramatis personae* to *the singular* in the conclusion of the tale. True, *בעד רעהו* could be made to mean, as the ages in fact have understood it: "as Job prayed for each of his friends"³¹ or "as Job prayed for his neighbor", i. e. for people other than himself,³² which could then refer to the three friends as well.³³ But the ground had to be prepared, and the reader forewarned for the sudden transition from the plural of the dialogue to the singular of the tale. It is, therefore, that the poet *singles out Eliphaz* (42:7), probably as the oldest among the friends (cf. 15:10), again a feature otherwise inexplicable or irrelevant in the poem. In short, the poet's procedure becomes at once obvious, if the finale of the primitive tale, or 42:10, was too familiar to brook the slightest change.

5. THE CONCLUSION OF THE POEM OF JOB

Skillful accommodation to the last line in an ancient tale might elicit some admiration for the art or artifice of the poet. But from the author of Job — "one of the grandest things ever written with the pen" (Carlyle) — we will expect more, a message and meaning worthy of his poem.

³¹ Rashi *ad loc.*: על כל ריע וריע. Zerachiah of Barcelona *l. c.*: אחד מהבדיו. Moses Alshekh, חלקת מחוקק, ס', Venice 1603: עצמו. Cf. E. F. C. Rosenmüller, *Scholia in V.T. Jobus*, p. 1003: *pro unoquoque ex sociis, singulare partitium pro plurali*.

³² K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob*, Göttingen 1896, p. 255: רעיו nicht רעהו: für den Nächsten, nicht die Freunde." See also Ehrlich *ad loc.*

³³ Moreover רעהו = רעיו I Sa 30:26, I Re 16:11 and Pr 19:7. Cf. also והסרה יוד הרבוי מהמכתב ונשארה I Sa 14:48. See David Kimhi ונשארה, ס', מכלול יופי, Amsterdam 1660. Repeated by Solomon Ibn Melekh, רעהו כמו רעיו... כי שמוש ההיא מצאנוהו בל' רבים: Simon Duran *l. c. f.* 199b: ובעלתהו (Ez 43:17) כמו ובעלותיו וכן אחרים.

Some of the prevailing theories about the conclusion of the dialogue in 42:7-10 betray a want of consideration which a great writer deserves as a matter of course. The assumption that the earlier tale of Job comprised a primitive dialogue of the friends, more lowbrow than the discourse in the poem, and that the author simply retained the words of the old narrative without change and without a meaning of his own,¹ bespeaks merely the embarrassment of the critics. It is incidental to a false exegesis of which the author, or even the editor,² are entirely innocent.

Even in its own setting, the supposed older dialogue of Job,³ and the fictitious restorations which have been attempted⁴ seem to fall short of the better insight and art of the folk-story. The friends are alleged to have tempted Job as his wife has done, and hence Job has to make an atoning sacrifice for them.⁵ One would expect a similar kindness shown to Job's wife, but

¹ See Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 16, and also p. 204 where he seems to admit that the verses 42:7 ff., borrowed from the old folk-book, do not fit the poem ("aus Quellen, die eigentlich nicht passen"). See the stricture of Budde, *l. c.* p. 271. A. Alt, *ZAW* 55, 1937, 263 revives the hypothesis that 42:7-10 is the conclusion of the folk story which originally contained also an argument among the friends, decided by God in Job's favor. No attempt is made to account for its retention by the poet, probably because the problem does not belong "Zur Vorgeschichte des Buches Hiob" with which alone the paper deals.

² It is difficult to charge the editor with the wording of 42:7 which appears to be older than its present position in the book. In it God is said to be the last speaker, but what precedes it in our text is spoken by Job (42:2-5).

³ First, and still most attractively, argued by Duncan B. Macdonald, "The Original Form of the Legend of Job," *JBL* 14, 1895, 63-71. See also his "Some External Evidence on the Original Form of the Legend of Job," *AJSL* 14, 1898, 137-164. T. K. Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, New York and London 1898, p. 161 essays to reconstruct the missing portion of the dialogue. He is followed, among others, by J. Lindblom, *Abh. der Herder Gesellschaft zu Riga* 6, 1938, p. 82.

⁴ Frants Buhl, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Buches Hiob," in: *Festschrift K. Marti* (BZAW 41), Giessen 1925, p. 52-61, thought to discover in Job 27:5-7 three verses which survived from the older disputation. His guess is endorsed by Joh. Hempel, *Zeits. f. syst. Theol.* 6, 1929, 642.

⁵ See Duncan B. Macdonald, *The Hebrew Literary Genius*, Princeton 1933, p. 31.

no entreaty is made on her behalf. Nor are her words adjudged as mildly as the fancied folly or blasphemy of the friends (contrast 2:10 with 42:7). The folk-tale makes the wife speak bitterly, but out of love and pity for the unbearable agony of her husband.⁶ But the ritual in 2:12 would seem to indicate that the friends think of their own safety first.⁷ This is outright the complaint of Job in the poem (6:21): "Ye see disaster, and are afraid!"⁸

⁶ The rabbis hesitate to consider Job's wife as *diaboli adiutrix*, as Augustine calls her. Theirs is the belief: אין מנוח מן הצדיקים נשים כשרות Midrash Mishle, ed. Buber, p. 111 top. It is true, his wife used the very words spoken to and by Satan (cf. 2:3.5 and 2:9 and the *Commentary on Job* by Berechiah, ed. Wm. A. Wright, London 1905, p. 6: אל' (השטן, ועודנו מזויק בהומתו, ובלשון ברבא אלקים שאמר לו השטן, אם לא על פניך יברכך, אמר ר' אליעזר חזו שאמרה אותה: but her intentions were altogether worthy: כשרה הדבר הפוס הוה... אפשר שהיה הוא כשר ואשתו לא הייתה כשרה? ולמה אמרה לו כן? אלא אמרה לו: התפלל לפני המקום שחממה. כדי שתקד מן העולם הוה שלם וצדיק עד שלא תבא לידי חטא, אלא, ברכך אלהים ומוח' שאין אתה יכול לקבל את הצער ותהא תוהא an unknown midrash preserved by Meir Arama l. c. f. 7a and Isaac b. Solomon Hacoheh l. c. f. 10b. See Wertheimer, לקט מדרשים, Jerusalem 1904, p. 5a (corrected by Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 386 n. 27) and *ibid.* 1926, p. 8.

Not that the rabbis did not enjoy a crack at women or Job, see the sermon of R. Meir (Yer. Hagigah II 1 f. 77b) now ingeniously recovered from Tosefta Kiddushin V 17 by Saul Lieberman, in: *Studies in Memory of Moses Schorr*, New York 1944, p. 186 f. Abba bar Kahana identifies Job's wife with Dinah on the basis of Gen 24:7 and Job 2:10, Gen. R. 57.4 and Baba B. 15b.

⁷ The rite of mourning calls for putting dust upon the head (Jos 7:6, Ez 27:30, Lam 2:10), not for throwing it heavenward (Job 2:2). The latter seems rather like a charm to ward off the danger of שחין with which Job was smitten (2:7). The similarity with Ex 9:8-10 did not escape Isaac b. Solomon Hacoheh l. c. f. 12b: כאלו היו מבקשים... להביא עליהם השחין... כדי שיצטערו הצער עצמו שהיה איוב מצטער. Morris Jastrow Jr., "Dust, Earth and Ashes as Symbols of Mourning among the ancient Hebrews," *JAOS* 20, 1899, 147 and M. Bultenwieser, *The Book of Job*, New York 1922 *ad loc.* cite Acts 22.23 where the same tearing of garments and throwing of dust into the air bespeak an act of repudiation.

⁸ Isaiah di Trani the Elder (ed. Schwarz, תקוה אנוש, p. 40 ff.): אחם רואים לו החתה שלי ואחם יראים ממנו ומחנפנים לו. Similarly Isaac b. Solomon Hacoheh l. c.: ראייתם חתה שבא לי ויראתם לנפשכם. The Sept. charges the friends with being "without pity: beholding my wound ye are afraid" (*ἀνελεημόνως, ὥστε ἰδόντες τὸ ἐμὸν τραῦμα φοβήθητε*). Fr. Baumgärtel, *Der Hiobdilog*, 1933, p. 23 unnecessarily seeks behind *τραῦμα* another reading (חלי cf. Jer 10:19 Sept.).

It seems much likelier, therefore, to see in the three speakers (introduced by their full name,⁹ unlike the nameless wife and sons of the tale) the invention of the poet. The folk-tale, as we saw in 42:11, does not know them. The poet created the interlocutors needed for the unfolding of the religious and philosophical problems which he engrafted in the primitive story. Incidentally, the suggestion would rid the poet of an attack of drowsiness which made him copy thoughtlessly words sensible in a conjectured lost setting, but senseless in his own extant creation.

If, therefore, 42:7-9 is the poet's own work and his conclusion to the colloquy on the ways of God with men, it must have a meaning of its own, and not be merely an adaptation to the familiar end of the old tale in 42:10.

The poem of Job does not pursue the issue of the folk-tale: Is piety unselfish? Instead, it concerns itself with the problem of *unmerited suffering*. Born undoubtedly of personal sorrow, the poem boldly assails the dogma of retribution as both untrue and unfair. Everyday experience seems to the poet to proclaim with a thousand tongues that disease has nothing to do with the moral worth of its victim. Moreover, a doctrine which takes sin to be the cause of all suffering, makes men view sickness with suspicion rather than sympathy, and thus heaps malice upon malady. It condemns without evidence, or turns misfortune itself into evidence of misdeed, and is therefore doubly odious: It drives the sufferer to despair, and his fellowmen to cruelty.

It is the glory of the poem, and of the faith of which it is a flowering, that this challenge of the prevailing doctrine neither issues, nor results in unbelief. Quite the contrary, it stems from the passionate conviction that although condemned by men, the innocent sufferer does not incur the displeasure of God, nor is he barred from His grace. However afflicted, his is still the nearness and fellowship of a loving God. Since such favor is forever denied to the wicked, the latter's lot, even in prosperity, is pitiable rather than enviable.¹⁰

⁹ Koh. R. 7:2 נהפרשו שמות... ג' ריעי איוב.

¹⁰ Cf. Job 13:16; 27:8-10.

The friends in the dialogue uphold the traditional dogma. They fear that its denial would imperil religion (15:4), and hence should never be allowed. They must therefore seek of necessity for some secret sin which will prove to their satisfaction that what failed is not virtue, for virtue cannot fail. The course of the dialogue discloses how a false principle will debase character. For if a doctrine cannot be abandoned, and being false, it must clash with the facts, a zealous adherent will sooner or later do away with the unwelcome facts. He will learn before long to find or invent the facts which invariably favor his theory, and wittingly or unwittingly he will end in mendacity.¹¹ Admirable is the art, and the restraint of the author who vehemently disagreed with the spokesmen of the orthodoxy of his day, and yet did not suffer ire or irony to creep into his pen and caricature the views of his opponents.

He could safely do so because of one exceedingly effective device: his selection of the folk-tale of Job as the framework for his dialogue. The poet availed himself of this fiction not in order to secure the admission of his book into the inner circle of the Synagogue, although such was the ultimate result. Rather was he prompted by the desire to communicate to the reader something of his own assurance of innocence despite all affliction. Without the setting provided by the tale of Job, the unceasing insistency on being blameless could easily be misunderstood. Where a cornerstone of the creed is at stake, one will always prefer to suspect that the writer was a trifle self-righteous rather than surrender a cherished belief. By the choice of the story of Job the poet succeeded in putting his entire argument upon a rock of certainty: there *is* undeserved suffering.

We can now grasp the full purport of the censure in 42:7 ff.: לא דברתם אלי נכונה כעבד איני. In the immediate context of the narrative, or on the level of fable, the words mean, first, the exoneration of Job. His friends must make amends for their conduct toward him and words about him which, as the outcome proved, were not proper.¹² In the sequel to the dialogue, or on the plane of the religious discourse, the words mean,

¹¹ I so interpret Job 22:5-9.

¹² Ex 8:22. לא נכון לעשות כן

secondly, the disavowal of the doctrine of individual retribution which the friends consistently championed, but which is here said expressly to be not true.¹³ To have God exhausted in a single formula is, to say the least, humorless. Lastly, at their summit, the words mean the recoil from all that is not sincere.¹⁴ In a farewell to the reader, the poet seems to sum up all his probings into the relation between God and man. There is little we may claim to know about God, but this much is certain, one cannot come before Him save in integrity of heart and mind. It would not do to try to feign or fib for the greater glory of God. It cannot be required of man, and surely it can never be made a duty, to plead falsely to the God of truth. For his refusal to do so, Job is blessed in the end, and his friends are rebuked who, in the interest of a doctrine,¹⁵ would have him confess sins he was unaware of committing. The fearless seeker of truth, even the honest blasphemer¹⁶ is nearer to God than the liars for the benefit of religion.

Will you serve God with words of fraud?

For His sake speak deceit?

Him do a favor? Play advocate to God!

What if He searches you through?

You tricking Him, as were He a man to be tricked!

¹³ Dt 13:15, 17:4. אמת נכון דבר

¹⁴ Ps 51:12. לב טהור ורוח נכון. Cf. Ps 5:10. אין בפה נכונה... לשונם יחליקון. The poet of Job is a subtle craftsman who deliberately plays with several meanings of a Hebrew word. Cf. e. g. Job 7:6 where הוֹקֵה is not only "hope," but in keeping with the metaphor of a weaver's shuttle, also "thread" (Job 2:18). See Abraham Ibn Ezra *ad loc.* Job 9:17 בשערה conveys the irony: a "hurricane" about a "hair"! (cf. Targ. and Syr. בשערה with which the parallel does agree. See Ehrlich, Dhorme, and Baumgärtel *ad loc.*). Comp. also the double meaning of בור in Job 9:30 (Targ. and Sept. בר as in Is 1:25) or of שח 9:31. See the note of J. N. Epstein, *Tarbiz* vol. 5, p. 16, n. 28a and the other examples, also from the book of Job, collected by David Yellin, *ibid.* = repr. כתבי נבחרים vol. 2, Jerusalem 1939, p. 104 ff. ("משנההוראה בהנ"ך").

¹⁵ Gregory the Great, *Morals on the Book of Job*, Part III, book XI: Whilst they set themselves to defend, they only offend God ("Deum dum defendere nituntur, offendunt." Migne, P. L. 75, p. 959).

¹⁶ Yer. Ber. VII 4f. 11c and Yer. Meg. III end f. 74c: אמר רבי יצחק בן אלעזר: יודעין הן הנביאים שאלוהן אמתיה ואין מהניפין לו.

He will, be assured, reprove you.
If you stealthily give Him the advantage.
Shall not His grandeur affright you,
Shall not fall upon you His dread?¹⁷

ADDITIONAL NOTE 1.

DANEL IN THE BOOK OF ENOCH

1 Enoch 6:7 and 69:2 names Daniel among the fallen angels. As long as only the biblical Daniel was known, his inclusion among the chiefs of the rebel angels made little sense, and the text appeared in need of emendation.¹ With the emergence of the Canaanite epic of Danel, one is struck by two other similarities in name. In 1 En 13:9 the defiled angels gather in a place between Lebanon and Senir called Abilene² which is reminiscent of the city of Abilim (*grī ablm*) in whose environs Aqhat was slain. Moreover, the conspiracy of the angels takes place on Mount Hermon, or rather Hermonim,³ which recalls the appellation of Danel in the Ugaritic epic as *mt hrnm*.⁴

Are these agreements mere coincidence, or have we in the pseudepigraph echoes, however distant, of the Canaanitish saga?

¹⁷ Job 13:7-11.

¹ G. Kuhn, "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Henoch," *ZAW* 39, 1921, 245 reads: "θανανήλ = תניאל d. h. Rauchengel." Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 5 (1925), p. 153: Danel is scribal error for Δανειήλ = Δαλειήλ "angel of the night," as in the Hebrew Book of Enoch: ליליאל ששנותה על הלילה. See Hugo Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, Cambridge 1928, p. 19 = Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* vol. 5, p. 176.

² The Gizeh Greek version reads: ἐν Ἐβελσαρά (Eth. 'Abelsjātī) ἦτις ἐστὶν ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ Λιβάνου καὶ Σενισήλ (Eth. *Sênêšêr*). See R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, Oxford 1912, p. 289 and his note on p. 31.

³ 1 En 6:5, the Greek version preserved in Syncellus has Ἐρμωνιεύμ and Ἐρμώμ (sic!). The Gizeh version 13:7 Ἐρμωνιεύμ. See Charles, *l. c.* p. 278 and 289. The plural חרמונים also Ps 42:7. See Ps 89:13 Sept. and M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine*, Paris 1933, p. 357 who distinguishes Ἐρμωνιεύμ from Ἀερμών *ibid.* p. 347 f.

⁴ In the manner of מצי Ex 2:11, II Sa 23:21? See Virolleaud, *La Légende Phén. de Danel*, p. 87 f.

In the case of the two localities, obviously a play upon the words is intended: The angels mourn in Abilene (אבילין באבילין) and bind themselves by an oath and imprecation on Hermon (חרם הרמון). This may be the nucleus of an old aetiological legend which sought to account for the name of the site *ablm*, and the fierce grandeur of Mount Hermon. Indeed, a fragment of the Book of Noah which Syncellus states was derived from the first book of Enoch (ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου Ἐνώχ) tells why from the mountain on which the rebel angels conspired "cold shall not depart for ever, nor snow nor hoar-frost, and dew shall not descend on it except it descend on it for a curse".⁵

One wonders whether in the epic of Ugarit which knows of a curse of Danel upon the city of Abilim,⁶ or of his prayer that no dew descend upon the land (although only for "seven, even eight years"⁷), the aetiological motive was also at work. The lacunae in the extant texts, and in our present understanding of them, leave us here in the dark. However, it may well be that *grī ablm* in the ancient epic did not suggest mourning or desolation at all,⁸ and only a later popular etymology read into the name such meaning as in Gen. 50:11. Similarly *mt hrnm* may have in common with Mount Hermon but the semblance of sound.^{8a}

As for Danel, he appears in the Book of Enoch as one of the leaders of the two hundred children of heaven⁹ who lusted after the daughters of men, and having married them, taught them

⁵ Charles, *l. c.* p. 14.

⁶ I Aq 4:163 ff.

⁷ I Aq 1:42 ff.

⁸ See Ludwig Köhler, "Ein hebräisch-arabischer Brunnen-Terminus," *ZDPV* 60, 1937, 135 ff.: Arab. *ibālatun* "Eindeckung eines Brunnenmundes" (to which perhaps the verb in Ez 31:15 may be related?). Comp. אבל II Chr 16:4 (see I Re 15:20) and I Aq 3:152 *qr mym*.

^{8a} *Hrnm* occurs in a Ramesside list as a place-name in Syria, see W. F. Albright, *JBL* 58, 1939, 97, and Virolleaud, *Syria* 21, 1940, 271, n. 4 who refers to Pap. Anast. I. (Hugo Gressmann, *Altorient. Texte zum A. T.*, Berlin and Leipzig 1926, p. 103), and again *Syria* 22, 1941, p. 7. I owe the reference to Dr. H. L. Ginsberg.

⁹ See now on Gen 6:2 U. Cassuto, "מעשה בני האלהים ובנות האדם" in: *Essays presented to J. H. Hertz*, London 1944, p. 35-44, and his commentary מארס ער נח, p. 170 ff.

the eternal secrets. "Azazel taught men to make swords, and knives, and shields, and breastplates, and made known to them the metals and the art of working them . . . Shemjaza taught enchantments and root-cuttings, . . . Baraqijal taught astrology, Kokabel the constellations, . . . Shamsiel the signs of the sun, and Sariel¹⁰ the course of the moon" (1 En. 8:1-3). What did Danel reveal to men?

The name of Danel seems to have been omitted or obliterated in 1 En. 8:3.¹¹ In the Ugarit epic, Danel received a gift from the heavenly armory, and could therefore appear as the inventor of the composite bow.¹² But since the art of making all kinds of weapons was taught to men by Azazel (1 En. 8:1), it seems more likely that as in the case of his companions, Danel's contribution to the knowledge of men is indicated in his very name. Danel is the promulgator of *dān*¹³ or such rudiments of law as make communal life possible. Not by chance is he figured in the Ras Shamra texts as sitting at the gate, judging the fatherless and pleading for the widow.¹⁴

Traces of such a cycle of legends are still discernible. The Book of Jubilees 4:15 knows of nobler motives for the descent: The angels of the Lord, those who are named the Watchers¹⁵

¹⁰ סהריאל = "angel of the moon." On the list of angels see Adolphe Lods, *Le Livre d' Hénoch*, Paris 1892, p. 106 f., and Charles, *l. c.* p. 17.

¹¹ Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 153: "one name fell out." Comp. *ibid.* his remark about the two traditions or sources combined in the Book of Enoch, one enumerating *twenty* archangels (cf. the list in 3 *Enoch*, ed. Odeberg *l. c.* = Jellinek, *l. c.*, transl. Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 1, p. 140), the other *ten* (see Ginzberg, *Eine unbekannte Sekte*, 1922, p. 243 where Yer. 'Erubin I f. 19d משה אלהים עשרה is so interpreted. Comp. *idem*, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 23).

¹² See W. F. Albright and G. E. Mendenhall, *Journ. Near East. Stud.* 1942, 227 ff.

¹³ Cf. Gen. R. 26.5 (ed. Theodor-Albek, p. 247): בני האלהים ר' שמעון בן יוחי קרי להון בני דיינייה and Ginzberg, *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern*, Berlin 1900, p. 75. Comp. Eusebius, *Evangel. Praep.* I 10, 13 on the Phœnician genii Misor and Suduc (צדק and מישור), attributes of a judge (Is 11:4; Ps 45:7 f. and 67:5). It is perhaps not without significance that the name of Danel's son suggests "law-abiding" or "law-enjoining." See § 2 n. 22.

¹⁴ I Aq 1:22 ff. and II Aq 5:6 ff.

¹⁵ Dan 4:10, 14, 20; 1 En 1:5; 14:1; 20:1 etc. Ginzberg, *Eine unbek. Sekte*, p. 243, n. 4 translates: "the Wakeful," those who sleep not (1 En 39:12 f.;

were sent by God "to instruct the children of men to *do judgement and uprightness*".¹⁶ The Clementine Homilies portray the angels as grieving at the ingratitude of men, and asking for the permission to come into the life of men and to change into their nature, "in order that living holily, and showing the possibility of so living" (*ὅπως πολιτευόμενοι καὶ τὸ δυνατόν τοῦ πολιτεύεσθαι δείξαντες*), they help to establish on earth a righteous government.¹⁷ Commodianus, also, makes the angels visit the earth at God's behest in order "to beautify the nature of the world" and teach men the dyeing of wool and other skills and crafts.¹⁸ In like manner Lactantius speaks of God's forethought in dispatching the angels "for the protection and improvement of the human race" (*ad tutelam cultumque generis humani*).¹⁹ This view is still preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel²⁰ where Shemhazai and Azael ask and receive permission to descend among the creatures in order to sanctify the divine name among men.

It would seem, therefore, that originally these legends told how the arts and sciences were revealed to men by emissaries from heaven, benefactors of the human race and founders of civilization. To one of them, Danel, a beloved of the gods²¹

40:2; 61:12 and esp. 71:7), for sleep is a sign of mortality, cf. *Legends* vol. 5, p. 80, n. 25.

¹⁶ See Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, London 1902, p. 36 and Ginzberg, *Legends*, vol. 5, p. 154.

¹⁷ *Clementis Romani Homiliae* VIII. c. 12 and 13, ed. A. R. M. Dressel, Göttingen 1853, p. 188 f.

¹⁸ *Commodiani Carmina* I c. 3, ed. B. Dombart, Vienna 1887, p. 7:

"Cum Deus omnipotens exornasset mundi naturam,
Uisitari uoluit terram ab angelis istam . . .
Ab ipsis in terra artis prolatae fuere,
Et tingere lanas docuerunt et quaeque geruntur."

¹⁹ *Div. Institutiones* II.15, Migne, *P. L.* vol. 6, p. 330. Comp. *Epitome Div. Inst.* c. 27, *ibid.* p. 1035: "angelos suos misit, ut vitam hominum excolerent, eosque ab omni malo tuerentur."

²⁰ XXV.3, transl. by M. Gaster, London 1899, p. 53. See also Yalk. Gen. 44 (transl. Ginzberg, *Legends* I 149): הן לנו רשות ונרור עם הבריות ונראה איך אנו מקרשין שמך.

²¹ Minos, lawgiver of Crete, was Διὸς μεγάλου ὀδυσσῆς (*Odyss.* 19:79)

and a friend of men, the origins of law and order were attributed.

The later saga is not as cheerful: it stresses the abuses and vices of civilization, and inquires into the genesis of evil among men. It speaks no longer of messengers or servants of the gods, but of insurgents who abused divine favor, and "taught *all unrighteousness* on earth, and revealed the eternal secrets which were preserved in heaven" (1 En. 9:6) and thereby wrought harm to men and "filled the earth with blood and *lawless deeds*"²² (*ib.* vs. 9-10). For their indiscretion the rebel angels must suffer punishment: for seventy generations they will remain in chains and darkness,²³ pinned under the hills of the earth,²⁴ only to be hurled on the day of great judgment into the fiery abyss.²⁵

which already Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* II.5 (Migne, *P. G.* vol. 8, p. 952 f.) compares, or rather traces to Ex 33:11. See Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 207, n. 4 on "the beloved of God," and Fr. Dornseiff, *ZAW* 53, 1935, 166 on the lawgiver as *ἀϊτας* or *εἰσπνήλας* of the godhead. Comp. Ugaritic: *ḡr n'm 'ilm wnšm*, SS 17 f. and the passages quoted by Virolleaud, *l. c.* p. 89.

²² *ḡr* may mean also "torture" (see Saul Lieberman, *JQR* 35, 1944, p. 15, n. 99) or else, in the Arabic sense, "religion." See II Targ. Yer. Gen 10:9 where Ninrod demands of the people to follow an idolatry of his own making: ארבעין בדיני דמירו. The "fallen" Danel could be blamed for all manner of cruelty or impiety.

²³ Syr. Apoc. of Baruch 56:13 and 1 En 14:5 and 69:28. Comp. also Jude 6 and II Peter 2:4.

²⁴ 1 En 10:11 ff. and Jub. 5:6, 10.

²⁵ The interval of their being bound is ten thousand years in 1 En 18:16 and 21:6. Dt. R. 11 end: ענה ועזאל . . . חליה אותם בין הארץ לרקיע (cf. Yalk. Gen. 44) is embroidered in later legends. The giants are bound with "chains of iron" to "mountains of darkness" and shrink to fingerlings each year and then grow once more to their former size. They teach sorcery to those who consort with them. See introd. *Agadath Bereschith* ed. Buber, p. XXXIX as corrected by Ginzberg, *Haazofeh* 4, 1915, p. 30 (*ibid.*, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 171) on the basis of a citation from חופת אליהו in Jacob Sikli's תורה in ילקוט חלפיד תורה. See *Haazofeh* 3, 1914, p. 9 and now also David S. Sassoon, *אהל דוד*, Oxford 1932, II, p. 627b. Comp. the אשכנזי דפרזא and שוריי חסוכא and לבני נשא, a favorite theme of the *Zohar* I 9b; 58a; 126a; III 208a and esp. 212a and *Zohar Hadash*, Ruth (ed. Berdichev 1825 f. 96c). Bizarre items of still later sources are assembled in *Yalkut Rubeni* on Gen 6:2 (ed. Lemberg 1860, p. 53b) and discussed by M. Grüntaum, *ZDMG* 31, 1877, 235 ff. = *Ges. Aufsätze zur Sprach- und Sagerkunde*, Berlin 1901, p. 72 f.

A lingering memory of these "myths of civilization"²⁶ survives in the inclusion of Danel among the fallen angels. In the Book of Jubilees 4:20, Danel is made father-in-law of Enoch²⁷ "who was the first among men who learnt writing and knowledge and who wrote down the signs of heaven and recounted the weeks of the jubilee"²⁸ (*ib.* 4:17). The literature of the Synagogue did not view such heathen tales with favor.²⁹ It robbed Danel of his glory, and did not hesitate to enter Enoch into the register of the wicked:³⁰ ויחלהך חנוך את האלהים ואינונו. אשר ר' חמא בר' הושעיא: אינו נכתב בתוך טומסון של צדיקים אלא בטומסון של רשעים.

ADDITIONAL NOTE 2:

HEYVIN AND HIS BROTHER IN RABBINIC AND MOSLEM LEGEND

In the cycle of legends on the fallen angels there survived a curious story¹ about the first children born from the alliance with the daughters of men. These lusty fellows, we are told, consumed daily a thousand camels, a thousand horses, and a thousand steers.² With his sons having such a stake in the live-

²⁶ See Ignaz Goldziher, *Mythology among the Hebrews*, London 1877, p. 198 ff., and appended to it: H. Steinthal, "The Original Form of the Legend of Prometheus," *ibid.* p. 363 ff. Already Josephus, *Ant. I.* 73 observed that the deeds ascribed by tradition to the fallen angels resemble Greek myths.

²⁷ On the angelic names of the patriarchs and their wives in the Book of Jubilees see C. Kaplan, *AJSL* 50, 1934, 176.

²⁸ In the Ugaritic poem, *Pḡt* or Danel's daughter is repeatedly lauded as "knowing the course of the stars" (*yd't hlḳ kbkbm*, I Aq 2:51 f., 56). In Jub 4:20 her name is *Ednā*, but in 1 En 85:3 *Ednā*, like the wife of Methuselah (Jub 4:27).

²⁹ See Ginzberg, *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern*, 1900, p. 72, and *Legends* vol. 5, p. 156: "In the entire Tannaitic literature and in both Talmudim no mention is made of Enoch."

³⁰ Gen. R. 25.1, ed. Theodor-Albek, p. 238.

¹ Yalkut Gen. 44 = Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrash* IV, 127 f. In later editions (but not in the *ed. pr.*, cf. Ginzberg, vol. 5, p. 169, n. 10) the source is given as *Abkir*. On this midrash see A. Marmorstein, in *דברי* vol. 1, Berlin 1923, p. 141.

² The new-born babes *Š'r* and *Š'm*, as soon as they are weaned, stretch "one lip to earth and one to heaven" — or in a parallel passage, "one row of teeth to the ground, and one to the stars" (*špt l'arš špt lšmm*, [*šn lšdm*] *šn*

stock of the world, the father was naturally perturbed to learn that God had resolved to destroy all flesh: if a deluge is to come upon the whole earth, where will the two brethren find their daily meat rations? The lads, too, had frightening dreams. One saw lines upon lines of writing obliterated, until but four letters were left intact. The other dreamt of an orchard in which all the trees were cut down, and only a single tree survived with three of its branches. From their father they soon learnt the meaning of their dreams:

C ^s	B ⁱ	A ^s
"God is about to bring a flood upon the world, to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons'. They (sc. the brethren) thereupon cried in anguish, and wept, saying: 'What shall become of us, and how shall our names be perpetuated?' 'Do not trouble yourselves about your names. Heyya and A-heyya will never cease from the mouths of creatures, because every time that men raise heavy stones, or ships, or any heavy load or burden, they will sigh and call your names'. With this his sons were satisfied."	עתיד הב'ה להביא סבול לעולם ולהחריבו ולא ישיר בו אלא אדנ אחד ונ' בניו. מיד צעקו ובכו ואמרו: עכשיו מה תדא עלינו או במה יזכר שמנו? אמר להם: אל החושו ואל הצטערו. ששמותיכם לא יכלו מרוך שפירות שמותיכם הן מזכירין היווא והייא. מיד נחקרו דעתן.	עתיד הקב"ה להביא סבול ולא ישיר אלא נח ובניו. כיון ששמעו כך היו צועקין ובוכין. אמר להם: אל תצטערו. ששמותיכם לא יכלו מן הבריות, שכל זמן שנזכר נזירות או מעלין אבנים או ספינות שמותיכם הן מזכירין היווא והייא. מיד נחקרו דעתן.

lkbkbm) "and into their mouth went the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea." SS 61 f. Hans Bauer, *Die alphab. Keilschrifttexte von Ras Shamra*, p. 32. See L. H. Ginsberg, "Notes on 'The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods'," *JARS* Jan. 1935, p. 45 ff. and *idem. Orientalia* 5, 1936, 187.

In 1 En 7:2 the giants have the height of three thousands ells, in Test. 12 Patr., Reuben 5:7 they reach to heaven. See Ginzberg, *Eine unbek. jüd. Sekte*, p. 13 and *Legends* vol. 5, p. 181.

³ Yalk. Gen. 44, ed. princeps Salonica 1526.

⁴ *Midraṣ Bereṣit Rabbati*, ed. Ch. Albek, Jerusalem 1940, p. 30 f.

⁵ *The Chronicles of Jeraḥmeel*, transl. by M. Gaster, London 1899, c. 25, p. 54.

Light is thrown upon this fancy of the rabbis by a fragment from *The Phœnician History* of Sanchuniathon, as "translated" into Greek by Philo of Byblos and excerpted by Eusebius in his *Preparation for the Gospel*.⁶ It deals with the discoverers of the necessities of life whom grateful posterity revered as gods.⁷ Among these benefactors of the race are mentioned Agreus⁸ and

⁶ Sanchuniathon was said by Philo to be ἀνὴρ παλαιάτατος καὶ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν χρόνων, ὡς φασι, πρεσβύτερος (Eusebius, *Ev. pr.* I 9) which would place him about 1200 B.C. Before the finds of Ras Shamra, he was dismissed as pure fiction (see Otto Gruppe, *Die griech. Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orient. Religionen*, Leipzig 1887, p. 375) or set in the Seleucid era (so E. Renan, "Mémoire sur l'origine et le caractère véritable de l'histoire phénicienne qui porte le nom de Sanchoniathon," *Mém. de l'Acad. des inscript. et belles-lettres* 23, 1858, part 2, pp. 241-334). Contrast W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 70, 1938, p. 24 on the name סכניתן and the problem of date. O. Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchuniaton*, Halle S. 1939, p. 67 ff. infers a date before 700 B.C. or nearly a millennium before Philo of Byblos who lived under Hadrian. Eusebius of Caesarea wrote his *Ev. Praep.* ca 320 C.E.

⁷ Such approach is associated with the name of Euhemeros of Messene (ca 300 B.C.) and is of course the contribution of the Greek "translator," or Philo. See Eissfeldt *l. c.* p. 29, 83-88, 122 ff. The theory was known to the Jewish schools, cf. Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 150.

⁸ Among the later descendants of Agreus there appears also Agrotos to which usually Gen 25:27 אִישׁ יֹדֵעַ צִיד אִישׁ שֶׂרָה is compared. See Carl Clemen, *Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos*, Leipzig 1939, p. 52, and Eissfeldt, *l. c.* p. 147 n. 1. The midrash of R. Abbahu on the same verse: צִירֵי שׂוֹרֵי (Gen. R. 63.10 ed. Theodor, p. 693) resembles the Greek wordplay ἀγρευτῆς ἀγρότης (or ἀγρώτης), the latter in the sense of *agrestis* or *ferus*, uncouth or savage. Abbahu liked to play with Greek words, see S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York 1942, p. 21 f. Comp. *idem*, in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales* published by the Université Libre de Bruxelles in New York 1944, vol. 7, p. 397 ff. See also Ber. 44b, Men. 71a and Niddah 12ab where Raba, resident of "The City" or Maḥoza, nicknames Papa who lived in the townlet of Naresh: מוֹרֵי. It is not exactly a compliment, as gentle Rashi suggests: 'סוֹר ה' (הלם כ"ה יד) תלמד חכם על שם, סוֹר ה' (Niddah *ibid.*, differently Ber. *ibid.*, combined Men. *ibid.*), but on the other hand, as the Gaonim assure us: אינו מבוזר לקרא לבן כפר צירי וסורי. See *Otzar ha-Gaonim* ed. B. M. Lewin, vol. I, Haifa 1928, p. 85, and 104.

Haliëus, the inventors of hunting and fishing,⁹ and then the story of their children is told:¹⁰

ἐξ ὧν γενέσθαι δύο ἀδελφοὺς
σιδήρου εὐρετὰς καὶ τῆς τούτου
ἐργασίας· ὧν θάτερον τὸν Χου-
σῶρ¹¹ λόγους ἀσκήσαι καὶ ἐπω-
δὰς καὶ μαντείας· εἶναι δὲ
τούτου τὸν Ἡφαιστον, εὐρεῖν
δὲ καὶ ἄγκιστρον καὶ δέλεαρ
καὶ ὄρμιον καὶ σχεδίαν, πρῶ-
τον δὲ πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεῖ-
σαι· διὸ καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν
μετὰ θάνατον ἐσεβάσθησαν· κα-
λεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Δία
μελιχίον· οἱ δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν¹²
αὐτοῦ τοίχους φασὶν ἐπινοῆσαι
ἐκ πλινθῶν.

"From them (*sc.* Agreus and Haliëus) were born two brethren, discoverers of iron and of the mode of working it. One of them, *Khoussôr*, was skilled (*lit.* exercised himself) in words, and incantations, and divinations. It is he who was Hephaestus, and invented the hook, and bait, and (fishing) line, and raft, and was the first of all men to navigate: wherefore he too was worshipped after his death as a god, and he was also called Zeus Meilichios. And some say that *his* brother devised (the way of making) walls from stone blocks."¹³

⁹ Obviously ציד is derived from צר, used of fishing as well as hunting. Comp. Justinus (Trogus Pompeius) 18,3,4: a piscium ubertate, nam piscem Phoenices *sidon* vocant. Cf. Koh 9:12. The founder of ציד, one of the three districts of "Greater Sidon" (Jos 11:8 and 19:28) may be meant. See Clemen, *l. c.* p. 48 and Eissfeldt, *l. c.* p. 65.

¹⁰ Eusebius, *Evangelica Praeparatio* I 10,35bc (ed. E. H. Gifford, Oxford 1903, vol. I, p. 47 f.).

¹¹ Χρυσῶρ or Χουσῶρ are corruptions of Χουσῶρ.

¹² Does the plural τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς contain a trace of an original trinity of craftsmen-gods? See n. 31 and 43.

¹³ Usually translated: "walls of brick" (Gifford, *Preparation for the Gospel*, Oxford 1903), "le murs de briques" (M. J. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, Paris 1903, p. 375), "Mauern aus Ziegeln" (Clemen, *l. c.*). But this is refuted by the sequence, Eusebius I 10,35d, which knows in a later generation two other youths who "devised to mingle straw with the clay of bricks, and to dry them in the sun" (ἐπεσῶσαν τῷ πηλῷ τῆς πλινθου συμμειγνύειν φορυτόν, καὶ τῷ ἡλίῳ αὐτὰς τερσαίνειν). Still later men learned how to make "courts, and enclosures, and caves" or cellars, to establish "villages and sheepfolds," until at last Kronos "built a wall round his own dwelling, and founded the first city, Byblos." A similar progress is described in shipbuilding: the first raft is but a rude affair, and only after agriculture had made sail and ropes possible, did the Dioscuri or Cabeiri (Καβείρι) construct a real ship. See Gruppe, *Die griech. Culte*, p. 398.

In Attic building accounts, πλινθος (or πλινθίς) denotes ordinary blocks of a wall, or stones squared for building. See L. D. Caskey and B. H. Hill, *Amer. Journ. of Archaeol.* 12, 1908, p. 186. Comp. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-Engl. Lex.*, p. 1422.

Now, the first man to travel by water is the natural choice for a patron of פלחים or sailors, and it is Philo of Byblos who equates him with Zeus Meilichios.¹⁴ The first to make walls of stone is of course the patron of the נקרים¹⁵ or the masons. As inventors of iron tools, the two brethren made stonecutting and shipbuilding possible, wherefore their memory may be said to continue among the living:

שכל זמן שנודרין נדירותי
או נעלין אבנים או ספינות
שנוהכים הן מוכירין
"Whenever men build¹⁶ walls,¹⁷ or haul up stones or ships, they (will) invoke your names."

¹⁴ Heinr. Ewald, "Abhandlung über die phönikischen Ansichten von der Welterschöpfung und den geschichtlichen Werth Sanchuniathon's," *Abhandl. der Ges. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen* 5, 1851, p. 17 f., first suggested that Meilichios is a Grecised form of the Semitic word for sailor. Fr. G. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, Bonn 1841, I, p. 325 combined Meilichios with Moloch, a view which commended itself to sundry scholars including M. Mayer, in W. H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griech. und röm. Mythologie* II,1, p. 1521, see also Höfer, *ibid.* II, 2, p. 2561; H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*, Berlin 1895, p. 242 f., and W. Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griech. Sprache*, Göttinger 1905, p. 286. More recently, Greek scholars seem resolved to "turn a deaf ear to all Semitic Sirens and seek an explanation nearer home," see A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, vol. II pt. 2, Cambridge 1925, pp. 1091-1160 where the literature on Ζεὺς Μελιχίος is surveyed.

¹⁵ II Kings 12:13 and 22:6.

¹⁶ This is the reading in the Oxford Ms. of the Yalkut, photostats of which I was able to consult thanks to the friendship of Professor Saul Lieberman. נדירות can easily turn into נדירות, see Pes. Rab. c. 26 f. 131b של נדירות נדירות (heaps or ruins, cf. Lieberman, *נדרות*, p. 220) and Yalkut Jer. 300 where the parallel version reads אבנים נודות של אבנים. For a translation of the printed text, see Leo Jung, *Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian and Mohammedan Literature*, Philadelphia 1926, p. 105. Comp. Bernard Heller, "La Chute des Anges. Shemhazai, Ouzza et Azaël," *REJ* 60, 1910, p. 206, n. 1. Bialik and Ravnitzky, *ספר אנדרה*, rev. ed. I, p. 34 read: כשנודרין נדרות.

¹⁷ Moed Kat. 11a נודרין תנור, to build a stove, occurs, as I am instructed again by Professor Lieberman, twice in the Palestinian Talmud as נדר, Yer. Moed Kat. I 9 f. 80d bottom, and Ned. I end f. 37a.

¹⁸ Comp. Ez 42:7 where נדר is a wall, not a hedge or fence. See H. Guthe, "Gader, Gadara, Gedor," *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina Vereins* 1896, p. 8: "Das Hauptwort gader bedeutet eine aus unbehauenen Feldsteinen ohne Mörtel aufgeführte Mauer . . . Die Merkmale sind: unbehauene, oder doch nur roh behauene Steine, trockene Herstellung, ohne Verwendung von Mörteln."

Obviously the story is meaningful only if mariners and masons could be heard cheering each other at work, and perhaps occasionally even swearing, by something that sounded like Heyya and Aheyya. That this was actually the case with seamen, we learn from Pesahim 112b: "נוהא דארבא הייא הייא" "The sailor's cry is 'heyya!' 'heyya!'" Perhaps Samuel b. Meir²⁰ was right in interpreting the passage as referring to *clamor helciariorum* or the shout of bargemen towing ships or lighters against the current.²¹ From the midrash of the rabbis we may derive that like cries or calls accompanied the lifting of stones and the labor of masons.²²

¹⁹ Or חייא חייא. See R. Rabbinovicz, דקדוקי סופרים, VI (1874), p. 346.

²⁰ Disagreeing with Rashi *ad loc.*: כדי לחש אלא נעה... כדי למושכה בחבל ולחוליקה לנהר ניוהא דחורא... שיעשה מלאכה... ניוהא דארבא' כדי למושכה בחבל ולחוליקה לנהר דקדוקי (see the various readings in דקדוקי (סופרים) comp. Engl. *gee* or *haw*, in driving oxen or a team of cattle, used also as a verb, to *haw* and *gee*, or to *hie* horses (turn to the left) or *hup* them (in the opposite direction).

²¹ Comp. Martial, *Epigrams*, IV, 64, 21 f., describing the tranquility of a country seat

Quem nec rumpere nauticum celeuma
Nec clamor valet helciariorum.

The *celeuma* (or *celeusma*) is the summons or command of the *κελευστής*, the chief oarsman or boatswain, who gives the stroke to the rowers, and the *helciariorum* (from *ἔλκω*, to pull) is one who draws small vessels up the stream.

²² Comp. Aristophanes, *The Peace* 459 ff., where men bend down to the labor of pulling out Peace, as if they were to lift stones, or draw a boat up on the beach. The verb is *ἔλκω* (470), or *ἐξέλκω* (294), or *ἀφέλκω* (361 τοὺς λίθους, moving stones), and also *κατάγω* (458 *κάταγε* = "bring her in," used of boats), or exactly as in our midrash או ספינה או ספינה. Of course, the idea of *Peace* being hauled up is the contrivance of the comediant, but the exertions and exclamations of the workers, as they tug and labor at the ropes, are drawn from real life (I quote lines 459-463, 487-489, 517-519, and the transl. by B. B. Rogers, London 1927, p. 42 ff.):

ὦ εἴα.	Hermes: Yo ho! pull away.
εἴα μάλα.	Chorus: Pull away a little stronger.
ὦ εἴα.	Hermes: Yo ho! pull away.
εἴα ἔτι μάλα.	Chorus: Keep it up a little longer.
ὦ εἴα, ὦ εἴα...	Hermes: Pull, pull, pull, pull...
εἴα μάλα.	Trygaeus: Keep it up a little longer.
ὦ εἴα.	Hermes: Yo ho! pull away.
εἴα νῆ Δία...	Trygaeus: Yes, by Zeus! a little stronger

It is not hard to guess what הייא implied on the lips of workmen. In the vernacular הייא was an ordinary adverb meaning "quick".²³ In several languages הייא, also, serves as an exclamation to incite to action or greater effort: *on! up!*²⁴ In either case, the adverb and the interjection tend, in special urgency or impatience, to be repeated:²⁵ *heyā-ā-heyā!* Thus the twain brothers were born.

As in our day, but much oftener in antiquity, exclamations were known to be addressed to divinities. In some instances, the shout with which a god was invoked became his very name.²⁶ The cry *heyya* or "quick" seemed particularly appropriate for the "quick" or deft *Heyyin*, the alternate name for Khousōr or *Kṭr* in the Ugarit religious texts. Seafaring men being mostly god-

ὦ εἴα νῦν, ὦ εἴα πᾶς,	Chorus: Pull again, every man, all he can,
ὦ εἴα, εἴα, εἴα, εἴα, εἴα,	Pull, pull, pull, pull, pull,
ὦ εἴα, εἴα, εἴα, εἴα, εἴα, πᾶς.	Pull, pull, pull, pull, all together.

The shouts become a song, cf. Apollinaris Sidonius, *Epistulae* II, 10: "chorus helciariorum / responsantibus alleluia ripis."

²³ Gittin 34a, Raba dispatching a letter of divorce: ! הייא אשור הבו לה, or Sab. 119a end, the blind R. Sheshet devising how to speed his students to the Sabbath meal: רב ששה בקיטא מוהיב להו לרבנן היכא דמטיא שמשא, בסיחא מוהיב הייא להו לרבנן היכא דמטיא שמשא, כי היכי דליקומי הייא.

²⁴ See A. J. Maclean, *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, Oxford 1891, p. 75: *hīyū, hēyū, hayū, hayō* "come!" Comp. Arab. *هيا* and Greek *εἴα* in the dictionaries. The Latin *heja*, "come on!", in gentle persuasion or impatient exhortation, e.g. Virgil, *The Aeneid* IV, 569: *heic age, rumpe moras!* "Up ho! break off delay!", or *ibid.* IX.38. Horace, *Satires* II.6.23 f., illustrating the annoyances of living in the metropolis where at the most inopportune of hours one may be whisked to court:

... Romae sponsorem me rapis: "heia,
ne prior officio quisquam respondeat, urge."

The dictionaries list in this sense also דאחן כבא דעבדת ליה שושבחתא, Yer. Ab. Z. III 1,42c, also Yer. Pea I 1,15d, however the passage is still puzzling, see Gen. R. 59.4 and the note of Theodor p. 633, and Louis Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies* II, New York 1929, p. 335.

²⁵ R. Abba expediting preparations for Sabbath: אשור הייא אשור הייא *hie thee, quick!*, Sab. 119a and Rashi *ad loc.* Comp. the repeated *εἴα εἴα* or *ὦ ὦ* or *τοῦ τοῦ*.

²⁶ The god invoked with the cry *ἰή, ἰήϊος*, also *ἥϊος*, epithet of Apollo. *Eὔσιος* or *Euhios*, name of Bacchus, from the cry *εὐαῖ, εὐσι*.

fearing men,²⁷ it is quite possible that their **הי"א הי"א** was indeed a minced form of Heyyin or a way to invoke him, and that at least on certain occasions, it was felt or intended to be a plea for aid from the god of shipping and shipmen.²⁸

In brief, Heyya and Aheyya in the midrash of the rabbis seem no other but Heyyin, i. e. Khusōr and his brother in the account of Phoenician antiquities by Sanchuniathon. The inventor of the raft is made to be also an expert in speech and spells, for only such power of the word as could command and compel disciplined and united action was believed by the ancients to have made navigation possible.²⁹

But who was Khusōr's brother, and what was his name? In the Ugarit records we read of *Ktr-w-Iss*,³⁰ and the assumption seems reasonable that the hyphenation preserves the memory of what was formerly a pair of gods: *Ktr* or "cunning" had a brother named *Iss* or "clever".³¹ It is more difficult to explain how popular fancy (perchance by relating it to *hss* or a kindred root³²) read into the name the suggestion of stonework, and thus made *Iss* the hero eponymous of the masons.

If this guess be right, the name of Heyyin's brother was not borrowed, but freely invented by the rabbis. Heyya and Aheyya,

²⁷ Mishna Kid. IV 14 (82a): הספין רובן חסידים.

²⁸ In driving oxen one will use the exclamation: *gee!* But on the lips of the driver *Gee!* may also be an abbreviation of Jesus.

²⁹ See above § 2. *The Lay of Aqhat* n. 5. One may perhaps recall in this connection also the last item in the argument of the *δυσκολόγος* before Hadrian: אין טוב מן הרבור בעולם . . . אלוה הרבור לא היו הספינות פורשות בים. Yalk. Numbers 738 and Proverbs 946.

³⁰ E. g. II Aq 5:18 f. and 23 f.

³¹ See H. Bauer, *OLZ* 1934, p. 245, and *ZAW* 53, 1935, 57: Acc. *ḥassu* "astute, discerning"; cf. Maisler, *Tarbiz* 5, 1934, 378 f. Perhaps the third name *Hy* betokens an original triad of gods: *Cunning*, *Cleaver*, and *Quick* a trace of which seems to survive in Rabbinic and Mohammedan legend. See n. 43, and n. 12.

³² **הַצֵּץ** stones or gravel, Pr 20:17, Thr 3:16; **הוֹצֵץ** to break up (Rabb. Hebrew: to partition), perhaps also to array (Pr 30:27 Sept. *εὐτάκτος*). Cf. Baba Bathra 2a כדתנא מחיצת הכים שנפרצה אומר לו נדור. Comp. מאי מחיצה? נודא כדתנא מחיצת הכים שנפרצה אומר לו נדור. Targ. Ps 62:4 נודא רעיעתה. An angel *Gadreel* is mentioned in 1 En 69:6, but his is the business of deadly weapons, not stonework.

or the variants,³³ are a pair of pendant names like Eldad and Medad,^{33a} Hillek and Billek,³⁴ or Jannes and Jambres.³⁵ The Arabs particularly seem to enjoy putting together such assonant names, and both Muhammad and the post-*Qur'ānic* tradition indulged in this fancy: *Yāḡūḡ* and *Māḡūḡ* for Gog and Magog,³⁶ *Hārūn* and *Qārūn* for Aaron and Korah,³⁷ *Hābīl* and *Qābīl* for Abel and Cain,³⁸ or *Ullūt* and *Millūt* for the first dwellers of hell.³⁹

In the same class belong the two angels in *Bābīl*, *Hārūt* and *Mārūt* who teach people "how to cause division between man and wife" (*Sūra* 2, 96). The Moslem tales, cited in the commentaries to this passage,⁴⁰ echo rabbinic legends⁴¹ about the fallen angels. Having spoken contemptuously of the sins of men, the angels receive permission to send two of their number to earth,

³³ B. Niddah 61a: כיהן וענו בני אחיה בר שמואי הו. cf. b. Moed Katan 20b: ר' חייא לחוד רבי אחיה לחוד. The gutturals ה and ח are easily interchangeable: hence חייא וחיה (Raym. Martini *Pugio Fidei*, p. 938) or חייא וחיה (Jellinek VI, p. XXIV, n. 1). Yalk. Gen 44 = Jellinek IV, 127: הווא וחיה. If authentic, perhaps related to the midrashim on יהוי (Jos. 9:7): שעשו בעשה חיי; cunning as a serpent, Yer. Kid. IV, 65c; cf. b. Sab. 85a on Gen 36:2 (and 21), and on העוים Dt 2:23 in Gen. R. 26.7, ed. Theodor, p. 254; also the various derivations of the name חוה Gen 3:20 (Gen. R. 20.11 cf. Wellhausen, *Die Comp. des Hexateuchs*, Berlin 1899, p. 305, and Ginzberg, *Leg.* 5, p. 91 and 134). "Charmer," "seducer," even "skilled in words" (verb חוה) would not be an inappropriate name. However, *waw* may be a scribal error for *yod*. *Midr. Ber. Rabbati*, ed. Albek p. 31 reads חיהא וחיהא, cf. however *ib.* p. 30.

^{33a} Nu 11:26 f.

³⁴ Sanh. 98b; Hullin 19a.

³⁵ 2 Timothy 3:8; Tg Y. Ex 1:15 and 7:11; Men 85a. Ginzberg, *Unh. Sekte*, p. 240, n. 3 and *Legends* vol. 5, p. 425, points out that the older form of the legend knew only of Jannes.

³⁶ *Kur'ān* S. 21,96 (and 18,93).

³⁷ S. 28.76.

³⁸ S. 530. The names of the "two sons of Adam" are not mentioned in the *Kur'ān*, "perhaps long antedating it," so Charles C. Torrey, *The Jewish Foundation of Islam*, New York 1933, p. 50.

³⁹ See J. Bergmann, *MGWJ* 46, 1902, 531 ff. Contrast Josef Horowitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen*, Berlin and Leipzig 1926, p. 148, n. 1.

⁴⁰ Esp. Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr* ad loc., translated and discussed by E. Littmann, "Hārūt and Mārūt," in: *Festschrift Friedr. C. Andreas*, Leipzig 1916, pp. 70-87.

⁴¹ Abraham Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?*, Leipzig 1902 p. 104-106.

and they very soon prove that angels on earth would not do any better than men.⁴² *Hārūt* and *Mārūt*, the two⁴³ disgraced angels, were condemned to be suspended by the feet in a rocky pit at Babylon, where they teach men magic. The name of the pair has been variously explained, but neither the derivation from 1. En. 6:7,⁴⁴ nor from 2 En. 33:11,⁴⁵ and least of all, from the Avestan *Haurvatāt* and *Ameratāt*⁴⁶ seems well founded.

It would appear that as in the case of Heyya and Aheyya, only one of the names was actually borrowed from earlier tradition, and that the other name grew from Arabic fondness for assonance. Goliath and Saul may serve as an illustration of the freedom and playfulness with which new names were invented. The Jews were often heard to speak of their *gālūt*, sometimes, also,

⁴² Littmann, *l. c.* p. 87 praises as a particularly fine feature of the saga, "wie sie uns im islamischen Gewande vorliegt, dass die Engel, die sich sündenfrei fühlen und pharisäisch auf die schwache Menschheit hinabsehen, für ihren Hochmut bestraft werden dadurch dass sie, mit menschlicher Schwäche behaftet, dieser auch nicht widerstehen können." "Dieser ethische Zug" is precisely the burden of Yalk. Gen 44, or *Gemar Eref* (Sassoon, *II*, p. 626b. cf. *ibid.* p. 627b) = מסכתה בלה = ed. Michael Higger, p. 231.

⁴³ Some versions speak of three angels who were sent to earth (Littmann, *l. c.*, p. 81), their names, according to Tha'labī, being *Azza*, *Azabiya*, and *Azriyail* (Heller, *REJ* 60, 1910, 209). Comp. *Seder Eliahu Zuta* c. 25 ed. M. Friedmann, p. 49: עזה ועזי ועזאל, and 1 En 69:5 *Asbeël* = עזביאל. See above n. 12 and n. 31, and Ginzberg, *Legends*, vol. 5, p. 170.

⁴⁴ *Armaros* is taken to go back to *har marot* = *Mārūt*, so Jos. Halévy, *Journ. Asiatique* 19, 1902, 148 ff.

⁴⁵ In the Slavonic Book of Enoch, the angels Orioch and Marioch are commanded to guard the revelations of Enoch. To this pair W. Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 560, would trace *Hārūt* and *Mārūt*. Similarly Jos. Horowitz, "Jewish Proper Names and Derivatives in the Koran," *HUCA* II, 1925, p. 154 f., and his *Koran. Untersuchungen*, p. 147 f. See however Ginzberg, *Legends l. c.* p. 160.

⁴⁶ So Paul de Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Leipzig 1866, p. 15, and Fr. C. Andreas, see Littmann *l. c.* p. 84. These beneficent genii are female, their names mean "Perfection" and "Deathlessness," and they represent the reward promised to the blessed after death, all very unlike *Hārūt* and *Mārūt*. Furthermore, the hypothesis would make Muhammad acquainted with the Old Iranian or Avestan form of the names, instead of the Middle Persian or Pahlavi, *Khurdāt* and *Amurdāt*, see Horowitz, *HUCA* II, p. 164, and *Kor. Unters.*, p. 147.

as a crumb of comfort, of their *rēš gālūtā*, until the Philistine chief became *Ġālūt*,⁴⁷ whereupon his opponent, and paronomastic counterpart, was dubbed *Ṭālūt*, the "tall" king (from the verb *ṭāla*).⁴⁸ It has been similarly suggested that the one name which can be traced to pre-Moslem tradition is *Mārūt*, a "quite common Syriac word for power, it possibly contains a remembrance of 'עזאל', while its parallel was formed by Muḥammad simply altering the first consonant of the other name.⁴⁹

Here again the Ugarit texts may contain a useful clue. Heyyin is said to be a *hrš*, a *craftsman* or master artificer.⁵⁰ But *hrš*, also, means *magician*,⁵¹ and it may well be that this twofold meaning of *hrš* gave rise to the cycle of legends about the discoverers of tools and skills who also revealed to men the black arts.⁵² Once *Hārūt* was born, or rather adopted, his companion sprang from a rhyme and reminiscence about *rebellious* angels who *subjugated* the heavenly bodies by means of witchcraft and defied God's *lordship* of the world.⁵³ Some of these tales or terms

⁴⁷ Horowitz, *HUCA* II, p. 163, and *Kor. Unters.*, p. 106.

⁴⁸ Geiger, *l. c.* p. 179.

⁴⁹ A. J. Wensinck, *Enc. of Islam* II, p. 272 f.

⁵⁰ E. g. II Aq 5:18 f.

⁵¹ So probably Is 3:3 חכם חרשים, as the parallel לחש נבון would suggest. Cf. Targ. and Syr. Ex 22:17 חתי חרש לא חתי.

⁵² 1 Er 7:1, 8:3, 65:6. See the following note, and *Additional Note 1*, n. 25.

⁵³ Tanh. Bereshit: 12, as emended by Ginzberg, *Legends* vol. 5, p. 152: 'אנשי השם' (Gen 6:4) מלמד שהיו מורדין חמה ולבנה ועושין כשפים. עליהם הוא שאמר (Job 24:13) חמה היו במורדי אור' חמה הנכורים (cf. Gen 6:4) שהיו קשין ומורדין ומכשפין, וואסרו לאל סור ממנו ודעה דרכיך לא חפצנו מה (Job 21:14 f.) שדי כי נעבדנו'. Cf. Midrash Hag-Gadol Gen., ed. Schechter, p. 131: אשר ר' אליעזר: שהיו מורדין חמה ולבנה ועושין בהם כשפים ש', חמה היו: 131: במורדיאור' אל תקרא במורדי אור אלא במורדי יאור עזה ועזי ועזאל שירדו לארץ וחסרו ננות האדם והחטיאו: 49: אותם ולמדו אותם כשפים שמורדין בהם חמה ולבנה מעשה ידי ומסרו להם עזאל ועזאל היו מלמדן: 172 f.: חמה ולבנה כוכבים ומזלות לעמד לפניו מימינו ומשאלם לשם בהם כדרך שהיו משמשין לפני הקב"ה ש', וכל צבא השמים עומר עליו מימינו ומשאלו' המורדים שמרדו במקום: 22: Comp. Pirke R. Eliezer c. 22: (1 Re 22:19). אנשי השם' שהיו קשים ומורדים בהקב"ה: 6:4: ה' (cf. also the idioms Ber. 48a מרות or Ber. R. 55.7 מרות דע לם which Job 21:14, used in these midrashim, is defying).

Less perceptible are the echoes about the descent in the generation of

myths.⁶⁰ In another passage of his Phoenician antiquities, Sanchuniathon calls the first intelligent beings *Zophesemin* or seers of heaven.⁶¹ May not a similar signification be concealed in Shemhazai, chief of the archangels (1 En. 6:3, 9:7 and 69:2) who sat the first in the kingdom of heaven and hence saw the king's face?⁶²

However, it is quite possible that the angelic names in our records are no longer transmitted in their original form. Rabbinic doctrine demanded that the name of God be combined with every angel⁶³ to indicate beyond a shadow of doubt that all powers, either in the depth or in the height above, are subject and subservient to the sovereign will of God. By making the names of angels theophorous, the Jewish homilists not only dis-

Perhaps the spelling עזא aims at differentiation from מצרים של עזא? Jellinek I, p. 39.

⁶⁰ I find Ewald, *l. c.* p. 48, first call attention to Targ. Y. Gen. 6:4, although he fully endorsed J. Scaliger's identification of Usoos with Esau. Discussing the names שמוזאי ועזאאל, Ewald wonders: "sollte man vermuten, noch in diesem entfernten Gebiete sei ein Andenken an jene . . . phönaischen *Semrum* (sic!) und *Usoos* gekommen, und diese beiden Namen seien . . . nur wenig umgebildet."

⁶¹ Eusebius, I 10, 33d: ζῶα νοερά, καὶ ἐκλήθη Σωφασημίν (rectius Ζωφασαμίν) τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐρανοῦ κατόπται.

⁶² Esth 1:14; 2 Re 25:19=Jer 52:25. Cf. Gen 32:31 and 33:10; Ex 24:10 and 33:20; Ju 6:22 and 13:22; Is 6:5. The verb חזה Ex 24:11; Nu 24:4; Ps 17:15; Job 19:26. See also 2 Chr 26:5 בראות האלהים, weakened to ראה in Sept., Syr. and Targ., also Yer. Soṭa IX 13 f. 24b. Comp. 1 En 39:12 f. and esp. 71:7 on the angels who "guard the throne of His glory", and 40:2 ff. on the four presences or מלאכי הפנים (Is 63:9). See *Seder Eliahu Rabba*, ed. Friedmann p. 163: אין מלאכי השרת רואין אותו, שאפילו חיות נושאות כסא: אין מלאכי הכבוד, מסתכל ביו השנייה והאחרת, Comp. what powers accrued to the angels, 3 Enoch ed. Jellinek, *l. c.* vol. 5, p. 172. Is צפה למרכבה (b. Meg. 24b) such a quest to be as the angels? Cf. Tanh. Buber I p. 141: ראה את הקב"ה ואת הדרי: רואין שכינה מבפנים . . . הנכנסין. המרכבה, comp. also *Seder Eliahu Rabba* p. 161: הנכנסין . . . בכסא כבוד שלו. See Gershom G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, Jerusalem 1941, p. 45 ff. and p. 355. Or the spelling of the name Semjâzâ or Samiâzâz (Σεμιαζᾶ and Σεμιαζᾶς) see Charles, *The Book of Enoch* p. 17. *Yalkuṭ* ed. princ. reads שמוזאי; b. Nidda 61a שמוזאי; R. Martini, *Pugio Fidei* p. 938 שמוזאי and שמוזאי; Bahya b. Asher, ביאור על התורה, Fano 1507 (end of the 15th c.) has שמוזאל.

⁶³ See Ginzberg, *Legends*, vol. 5, p. 152, n. 56.

guised many a foreign importation, but also retrieved them from oblivion. Our *midrash* may serve as an example. For this faded fragment of a myth about a pair of Canaanitish divinities, patrons and protectors of mariners and masons, would have hardly reached our day, were it not for the skill with which the *Rabbanan d'Aggadta*, or the teachers of the Haggadah, had adapted it to the biblical setting, and converted it to support the Jewish ritual.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Cf. Yoma 67b: תנא רבי ר' ישמעאל עזאל מכפר על מעשה עזא ועזאל: and Yalk. Gen. 44: שאלו תלמידיו את רב יוסף מה עזאל. א"ל . . . ולכך היו ישראל מקריבין קרבנות ביום הכפורים איל [צ"ל שעיר] אחד לה' שיכפר על ישראל ואיל [שעיר] אחד לעזאל שיסבול עונותיהם של ישראל והוא עזאל שבתורה. The mention of the Palestinian school of R. Ishmael about the middle of the second century C.E., and of Rab Joseph bar Hiyya (d. 333), successor of Rabba b. Nahmani in the Babylonian school of Pumbeditha, may help to indicate the times and the places in which these traditions were current among the Jews.