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The Thesis seeks to investigate the methodology of the Syriac translator of the book of Job. It pays attention to his dependence on the ancient versions, in particular the Septuagint. Thus it seeks to show how the Syriac translator has interpreted the Hebrew text and to explain the divergences between the texts, where such occur.

The introductory chapter reviews critically the exegetical value of the ancient versions, as well as connoting the fundamental differences between the Hebrew and Syriac languages. It also notes the various characteristics of the Peshitta of Job, which are then illustrated by examples drawn from the entire corpus of the book of Job.

The second chapter begins by defending the principle that this kind of research is best conducted by writing a continuous commentary on the book of Job. Thus this work has restricted itself to Job 3-10 because of the spatial requirements imposed upon it. The remainder of the this chapter contains the commentary on Job 3.1-4.21.

The third chapter contains the commentary on Job 5.1-6.30.

The fourth chapter contains the commentary on Job 7.1-8.22.
The fifth chapter contains the commentary on 9.1-10.22.

The sixth chapter provides a summary and conclusion.
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It has often been expressed that the value of the ancient versions is to be found in the exegetical tradition which they represent. This work seeks to investigate the exegetical method and tradition of the Syriac translator.

At the beginning of chapter two the method which I have employed was noted, namely, that the work will consist of a continuous commentary on part of the book of Job (Ch 3.1-10.22). These chapters have been selected not only because they contain part of the first cycle of speeches, but also because it was decided that the best way of conducting this study was to attempt a continuous commentary upon a selected portion of the book of Job. The aim of the said commentary is to study the translator's technique through the above noted chapters. The work proceeds on the basic assumption that the Vorlage from which the Peshitta was translated was the Hebrew text; however, influence from the Aramaic Targumim and from the Greek versions, in particular that of the Septuagint, has to be taken into account as well. It should not be thought, however, that it is the intention to comment on every verse; instead commenting will be restricted to those verses which best show the technique that the translator used. Every verse upon which comment is to be made is begun by the appropriate portion of the Hebrew text which is taken from BHS. The translation of the Hebrew text is taken from the RSV which has been
chosen because of its theological orientation to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The translation of the RSV is then followed by the text of the Peshitta, which in turn is followed by its translation. In this context it should be noted that I have used the Aramaic square script to represent the text of the Peshitta, a decision rendered necessary by the limitations of the word-processor which I used. As far as the translations from the Peshitta are concerned these are in fact my own, although reference has been made to the translation by Lamsa where such was thought to be appropriate. In the comments which follow the translation, reliance has been made upon a wide selection of commentators and scholars and these are noted in the main body of the text with fuller references in the notes which accompany each chapter. In this context it should be noted that where reference is made to the ICC on Job by Driver and Gray, that unless otherwise stated the page numbers refer to the philological part of the commentary. Among the commentators Clines, Dhorme and Gordis were found to be the most helpful from a philological and exegetical point of view. As far as the the exegetical tradition of the Peshitta is concerned, Dhorme among the commentators was found to be the most helpful. His work may now be supplemented by that of J.E. Hartley, The Book of Job (1st edition) 1988, who alone among the newer commentators makes reference to the Peshitta.

Of the older scholars who have considered the value of the Peshitta as an aid to the exegesis of the book of Job (some of whose work is more than 100 years old), this work has drawn its inspiration from the
earlier and more exhaustive study of:

E. Baumann: "Die Verwendbarkeit der Pesita zum Buche Hiob für die Textkritik".
ZAW 1898-1900. (see bibliography for full references)

In addition to Baumann's work which has proved so helpful in the compilation of this study, reference has also been made to the standard grammatical works:


as well as to the latest work on Syriac Grammar and Syntax:


My method with all of the above works has been (as a precursor to this study), to read them through completely and to note every remark they have made with respect to the Peshitta of Job. Such notes have then been incorporated into the body of this work where such was felt to be beneficial to the aim of this study.

The respective journals have also been researched over a period of 40
years (1950-to date), but the search has revealed few articles upon
the use of the Peshitta as an aid to exegesis and consequently only a
few references are to be found to such articles in the body of the
work.

The most recent work to study the Peshitta of Job is that by Heidi M.
Szpek:

_translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job_ (1992); it should be
noted, however, that this work arrived too late for it to be
incorporated into the main body of the work, but reference has been
made to it in the concluding chapter.

For bibliographical references in the main body of the work, I have
used an exhaustive system of notes which alludes by number to the
author, his work and the date of publication in the case of books.
For periodical articles the same noting system refers to the author,
periodical, name of article, and page number. For authors with
multiple articles I also add volume number and date of publication to
avoid confusion. Thus by reference to the noting system which
follows every chapter the full bibliographical location of each
reference will be obtained. This extensive notation system has been
adhered to to avoid confusion. A list of abbreviations and full
bibliography is given before the main body of the work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASTI</td>
<td>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDB</td>
<td>Brown-Driver-Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHK</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica, 3rd edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibl</td>
<td>Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>The Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKC</td>
<td>Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEB</td>
<td>Hebraica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Jerusalem Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>Journal of Semitic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Koehler-Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</td>
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<td>King James Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB</td>
<td>New English Bible</td>
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Chapter One

Introduction
The object of this work is to provide an examination of the Peshitta of Job and the technique of the ancient translator of the Hebrew text of the book of Job. In so doing it seeks to build upon my former work which was concerned with the syntax of Hebrew poetry, especially that of tense; whereas the interest here, however, is not primarily syntactical but exegetical. (1).

It is a commonly accepted judgement that the use of the ancient versions is that of textual criticism and the consequent emendation of the MT; although it ought to be stressed that, since the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls, scholars tend to be more cautious in their evaluation of them than in former years. This use of the ancient versions is commented on by Driver:

"The special value of the Ancient Versions consists in the fact that they represent MSS very much earlier than any Hebrew MSS at present extant, and belonging in some cases to different recensions.--- These versions were made from MSS older by many centuries than those which formed the basis of the Massoretic text; and when we consult them in crucial passages, where the Massoretic text has the appearance of being in error, we constantly find that the readings which they presuppose are intrinsically superior to those exhibited by the Massoretic text, and have evidently been made from a MS (or MSS) free from the corruption attaching to the latter." (2).

But it should be noted that this is not their only use, for they also make their own distinctive contribution to the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible and its theology. In the case of the Peshitta it is necessary to note that it, in common with the other ancient versions, is not merely a translation, but provides its own exegesis of the text it sought to make intelligible to its own audience, namely, the Syrian
Church. Such a valuation of the versions was also made by Wurthwein:

"The Septuagint belongs more to the history of Old Testament exegesis than to that of the Old Testament text. It can only be used as a witness to the text if its own understanding of the Old Testament text is made clear." (3).

Now the evaluation which Wurthwein has made of the Septuagint is surely also applicable to the Peshitta; namely, that an appreciation of its text must first be made before it can be used for text-critical purposes. The evaluation that is called for is that of historical exegesis, which places its understanding of the Old Testament text in the light of the religious conditions which prevailed at the time when the translation was first made. This understanding of the ancient versions is also echoed by McKane in the introduction to his commentary on the book of Jeremiah:

"The interest in the Ancient Versions which is characteristic of this commentary is not only or principally related to their importance for textual criticism. The assumption that the versions are of prime exegetical significance is so fundamental that it would be impossible to separate the treatment which has been given to them from the body of the work——. The ancient versions which are used (Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate, Peshitta, Targum) are regarded as indispensable, early witnesses to the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible." (4).

This study, then, will adopt Mc Kane's definition of the Peshitta as an early witness to the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible and will attempt to demonstrate how the translator went about his task. At the very outset it is necessary to note that, although the Syriac translator
was translating from Hebrew into another north-west Semitic language he was doing so to a different family in the north-west group of Semitic languages. Hebrew belongs to the Canaanite division of the group along with Phoenician and Moabite, while Syriac belongs to the Aramaic branch of that selfsame group.

That differences exist between these two 'families' in the north-west group of Semitic languages is a remark that almost does not require to be made. A simple difference to which attention may be drawn is that of the masculine plural noun. In Hebrew this is indicated by $p$-, while in Aramaic it is $j$-, although the latter is also to be found in isolated texts in the Hebrew Bible which is no doubt due to Aramaic influence. (5). It goes without saying however, that the differences are in fact much more profound than this. Wright comments as follows on the differences in the Aramean dialects:

"All these Aramean dialects may be divided into two classes, which are readily distinguishable by the form of the 3rd person singular of the Imperfect. In the western dialects--Biblical Aramaic, the Targums, the Samaritan, the Egyptian Aramaic, the Nabatean, the Palmyrene, and the Christian dialect of Palestine--the prefix of this person is yodh, $yodh$; whereas in the eastern dialects--at least in Syriac--it is nun, $nun$. " (6).

Now what Wright is drawing our attention to is a difference in morphology which is used to distinguish the dialects of Aramaic. That differences in Morphology should exist should not surprise the scholar. They may have also existed in the dialects of Biblical Hebrew and here one may draw attention to the suffixes which are to be
found in the Books of Kings: 2nd f. s. suff 'י', pl. 'י' --and are interpreted by Burney as possibly belonging to a supposed dialect of North Palestine. (7).

But the differences between the two families in the north-west Semitic languages are not only morphological and they may be best defined as belonging to three distinct categories:

(A) The use of the Relative Pronoun.

(B) The State of the Noun and omission of the definite article.

(C) The Syriac verbal system in comparison with the Hebrew system.

It should not be thought that the above are the only differences, but they are referred to since it is accepted that these are the elements to which attention is best drawn.

(A) The use of the Relative Pronoun 7

In his study on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Moscati has observed that, in the majority of those languages, the relative pronouns are connected with the demonstrative ones, and more particularly with the consonantal element 7. (8). In Hebrew, however, the case is somewhat different as the forms connected with the demonstrative element (י, י) are rare and are usually only to
be found in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible cf. Ex 15.13. It is worth noting that a similar pattern is to be observed in Phoenician where the use of י is also rare, the usual form being ו or, more frequently, וx. Returning once again to Hebrew the usual form is וx, while the shorter form ו is also to be found regularly in the poetic portions of the Hebrew Bible. Moscati has further observed that in the Aramaic area (in accordance with the phonetic development of the consonant י) the most ancient inscriptions show a relative pronoun י which later became י and, in Syriac, י. (9). Thus far the differences noted above depend on whether the relative is connected with the demonstrative element, or whether, as is the case in Hebrew and Phoenician, the usual forms are connected with the consonant element י. It has to be stressed, however, that this is not the only discernible difference; there is also a difference in the way that such relatives are used and it is this aspect of comparative Semitic grammar which will now be explored.

One of the main differences in the way that the relatives are used is to be found in the fact that in the Aramaic languages they may be used as conjunctions; whereas in the Hebrew/Phoenician languages they are rarely used as such, except in late Biblical Hebrew, a fact noted by Waltke/O'Connor in their study of Hebrew syntax. (10). Polzin has drawn attention to the fact that וx is used as a conjunction 'that', subordinating an entire sentence to a verb of knowing, remembering etc., only in the later literature of the Old Testament—such as Qoheleth, Chronicles, Esther and Nehemiah and that in such
literature it occurs some 30 times as opposed to 12 times in the other books of the Hebrew Bible. (11). He has further stressed that its use here appears to have become like that of the Aramaic 'ṝ. In his study of the Habakkuk Commentary, Brownlee observed that one of the developments that one finds in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls is that of the use of ḫ as a conjunction. (12). From this review of the evidence one can conclude that in Syriac, which is in reality Eastern Aramaic, the use of the relative ḫ is more developed than that of ḫ in standard Biblical Hebrew since it is also used as a conjunction, as are ḫ in later Biblical Hebrew and ḫ in the Aramean languages. This is one of the main differences between the Aramean branch and the Hebrew/Phoenician branch and is therefore one of the main differences between Hebrew and Syriac.

(3) The State of the Noun and the Omission of the Definite Article

It may be said that it is in the construction of the noun that one of the main differences appears between the Aramean family of languages and that of Hebrew/Phoenician. In Hebrew the noun may be said to possess gender, number and state. As far as gender is concerned, in common with all the Semitic languages, there are but two genders: masculine and feminine. The masculine is regarded as being the more common and important gender and as a consequence has no special indication. Feminine nouns are also without an indication of gender when the meaning of the word naturally denotes femininity, as in ḫ = mother. The feminine gender is most commonly denoted by the ending
n_ in the absolute state and n_ in the construct state. In the case of number, there are, to be strictly correct, three numbers which can be denoted by Hebrew nouns and these are: singular, dual and plural. The use of the singular noun calls for no comment at this point. The use of the dual in Hebrew is somewhat broken down, unlike Arabic, but is preserved in words which denote those objects which naturally occur in pairs. Thus, words in which the dual may be found are: הַיִּדְיָה 'both hands'; הַאֵילָה 'both ears'; הַשְּׁנָה 'teeth' (of both rows); but it also found in such words as הַשְּׁנָה 'a pair of sandals'. (13). The regular plural termination for the masculine gender is מ_ while that of the feminine gender is generally indicated by the termination מ_ . In Hebrew the nouns have only two states, namely, absolute and construct. Gesenius has noted that the use of the construct state in part exists to compensate for the loss of case endings in Biblical Hebrew which for the most part have all but disappeared. (14). The genitive case is mostly indicated by a close connection between two nouns. This close combination exists between the governing noun and the noun that is being governed. The effect of this combination causes the tone to be forced upon the governed noun, with the result that the weakened tone of the former word then usually involves further changes in it. The changes thus described affect the consonants to some extent, but more especially the vocalisation, since the vowels which had been lengthened by their position in or before the tone syllable necessarily become shortened, or reduced to shewa. (15).
As might be expected the situation in the Aramean languages is somewhat different. Since this work is concerned with the translation of a Hebrew text into Syriac, it is the position of the noun in that example of the Aramean languages which will be considered in the remarks below. Like the Hebrew noun, the Syriac noun possesses only two genders, masculine and feminine. As with the Hebrew masculine singular noun there is no special termination, but the feminine singular is indicated by $x_-$ in the absolute state, while the termination $n_-$ is used in the construct state. As far as number is concerned, the Syriac noun, unlike Hebrew and Western Aramaic, has only two numbers, namely, singular and plural, although it should be noted that fragments of a supposed dual are also to be found. (16). The main difference to be noted as far as the noun is concerned is that in the Aramean languages it possesses three states, whereas in Hebrew it possesses only two. In Syriac the three states are: the absolute, the emphatic or definite, and the construct.

It was noted above that in Biblical Hebrew the construct state in part exists to compensate for the case endings which have all but disappeared, and the same is also true of the Syriac language. As there are no cases in Syriac, their work has in part been taken over by prepositions and in part by the states. In Biblical Aramaic the three states of the noun are used with proportional regularity. However, by the time of the Syriac language, the use of these states has broken down somewhat. Thus the absolute state which is the simple form of the noun, is found only sparingly. Its use is accordingly limited to: (a) adjectives
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and participles used as predicates; (b) nouns in distributive phrases; (c) nouns after .pyplot; (d) sometimes in nouns after numerals. (17). Since Syriac, unlike Hebrew and Arabic, has no definite article the emphatic state originally took the place of the article. Its use, however, is most considerably extended and it is the state that is commonly employed. The construct state is used only when one noun depends on another directly, without the mediation of a preposition. It should be noted, however, that the construct state is far from being the equivalent of the genitive case. When two words stand in the relation which is expressed by the genitive, it is one member of the pair that is inflected; in Syriac it is the other noun which is inflected, since it is used in the construct state. This brief survey of the noun in Syriac has shown that the use of the states in Syriac, with the compensating omission of the definite article, is one of the main differences that exist between it and the Hebrew/Phoenician languages.

(C) The Syriac Verbal System in comparison with the Hebrew System

When the Hebrew verbal system is compared with the Aramean verbal system, the most significant difference is that of the omission of the 'waw consecutive' in the latter, a fact which has been noted by Driver. (18). However, it ought to be noted, that Segert has drawn attention to its possible existence in Aramaic in the inscription of the king of Zakir. (19). The evidence which Segert has drawn attention to has been examined by Gibson, who considers
that these forms are better understood as simple imperfects which are here denoting a past meaning, a use which may be paralleled in Biblical Aramaic. (20). Perhaps another way of understanding these forms is to consider them as examples of the ancient preterite, which also may be said to exist in such forms in archaic Hebrew poetry. No matter which way we understand such forms the evidence is, to say the least, doubtful and the conclusion that the *waw consecutive* existed in early Aramaic is of uncertain value.

There are, however, other differences between the two verbal systems and it is to these that attention must now be drawn. In the Semitic languages the number of conjugations varies. In Arabic there are no less than fifteen, in Hebrew seven, but in Syriac six are generally employed, although in the case of a few verbs other forms are found. In his grammar, Robinson has noted that the six conjugations are as follows:

"1. The simple form of the verb, without any modification.
2. The passive of the simple form.
3. The intensive form, produced by internal modification.
4. The passive of the intensive form.
5. The extensive form produced by attaching the letter X, vocalized by phah.
6. The passive of the extensive form." (21).

The names of the conjugations have been allocated by the older grammarians on the basis of their use of the verb יָּהַל = to do, as their paradigm verb. The names thus given are a direct result of the form which יָּהַל assumed in each respective conjugation. The names are
therefore as follows:

1. Pe'al.
2. Ethpe'el.
3. Pa'el.
4. Ethpa'el.
5. Aph'el.
6. Ettaph'el.

When the Syriac's conjugational system is examined against that existing in Hebrew, the impression is gained of a much neater and more symmetrical system than that which is found in the Hebrew language. The reason for this is not hard to find: it is that each of the three non-prefixed patterns has a corresponding prefixed, to create a reflexive pattern. Thus the Ethpe'el replaces the Niphal of the Hebrew conjugational system, while the internal passive, Pual and Hophal of Hebrew, has only been preserved in the passive participles of Pa'el and Aph'el. Yet it has to be noted that the Syriac conjugational is not only simpler because of its symmetry, but also because of the vowelling which it employs throughout its forms. What is being indicated here is that the vowel sequence in each of its conjugations is unchanged and constant, unlike the Hebrew vowel sequence which varies according to each respective form. This may be illustrated by a simple comparison of the verb הֵעָל, 'clothe', in the Syriac Aph'el theme and in the Hebrew Hiphil theme. While the vowels of the former are constant in the forms of its perfect,
imperfect, imperative and participle, the vowels of the latter change in the corresponding Hebrew forms. (22). As far as the student is concerned the unchanged aspect of the vowels of the Syriac verbal system is a godsend.

A further word must now be added on the value and interpretation of the regular reflexive pattern in Syriac, namely, on the Eth prefix to each of the conjugational themes. Of these three themes, Ethpe'al, Ethpa'al & Ettaph'al, it is the last which is the rarest, and, as Noldeke has noted in his work, its place is usually taken either by the Ethpe'al or Ethpa'al. (23). These reflexive themes may be said to carry the nuance not only of reflexive action, but also of passive action. In this context it should be noted that Biblical Aramaic has an extra passive conjugation which is modelled on the form of the Pe'al passive participle, to which finite endings have been added, and thus produces the form Pe'il. (24). This conjugation, however, is not complete and only survives in a few forms of the regular verb in Biblical Aramaic. The forms which do survive are: 3rd., pers masc sing; 3rd., pers fem sing; 2nd., pers masc sing & 3rd pers masc pl. Stevenson has noted that this conjugation is unique to what he terms 'Old Testament Aramaic' and is therefore not to be found in Syriac. (25).

While the conjugations of Syriac are being commented upon, a word of explanation must be provided for the dual causative theme Hap'el & Aph'el. In his study of the grammar of Biblical Aramaic, Johns has
noted that both the *Haph'el* and *Aph'el* are to be found in Biblical Aramaic, although he offers no reason as to why this should be. (26). The explanation would appear to belong to the history of the language rather than to syntax, and this is the way that Moscati has understood the phenomenon. In his work on comparative Semitic grammar he suggests that both forms go back to one original theme whose prefix later became θ. (27). As Syriac may be considered to be a later development of Aramaic, there are no examples of a *Haph'el* to be found within it; the only exception being that of יָדָנ which is considered by Wright to be a loan-word from Hebrew. (28).

The tense system of the Aramaic languages will now be considered. That the use of the Hebrew system presents a great complexity as far as interpretation is concerned needs little comment here. The problem of the consecutive tenses alone is one that has occupied many scholars without any consensus appearing as to their origin and interpretation. The 'perfect' and 'imperfect' both seem to refer to the past, present and future in a wide variety of contexts, so that McFall has appropriately entitled his study 'The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System'. (29). While it is correct to say that a certain regularity obtains in prose, the position in poetry is more complicated; although even there a regular system of the use of tense may be discerned. (30).

In Syriac, however, a more regular pattern may be said to obtain. As with all the Semitic languages, Syriac possesses but two tenses,
the so-called 'perfect' and 'imperfect'. The use of the tenses in Syriac has been defined by Noldeke, who notes that the perfect is used as the regular tense of narration. (31). The use of the perfect as a narrative tense in Syriac is to be compared with the use of the Participle as a narrative tense in Biblical Aramaic, cf Rosenthal §177. The latter use is not to be found in Syriac except in the case of לְאָלָה, which is very common. This use of the participle as a narrative tense is to be seen in the common N.T. formula: יְלָדֵי נִהל, cf Noldeke §274. This grammarian has noted that the perfect in Syriac is thus used to denote: narration (§255); the completed result (the pure perfect) (§256); the pluperfect (§257); the future in conditional sentences after יְלָדֵי (§258); hypothetical sentences (§259). The perfect יְלָדֵי often denotes a wish, advice, or a command (§260); the perfect יְלָדֵי with a participle following often denotes the subjunctive (§261); the perfect is used in dependent clauses (§262); the perfect is often strengthened by the enclitic יְלָדֵי, which enables it to be rendered as a true subjunctive (§263). (32).

The use of the imperfect stands in complete contrast to that of the perfect and denotes the future (§264); although Muraoka has noted that this is a rare use of the imperfect. (33). The most common 'tense' for denoting the future is the active participle, although there are some contexts in which the participle exchanges this role with the imperfect. (34). Noldeke has observed that the use of the imperfect in Syriac is thus to denote the future (§264); it is
used in the protasis of conditional sentences after the particle 'x (§265); it is used in statements which have a modal colouring; it is also the proper form for a wish, request, summons or command (§266); it is also the tense of dependent, subordinate clauses which point to the future (§267); the imperfect is used with the perfect \[ x \] in conditional clauses to denote an action frequently repeated (§268).

The picture of 'tense' is completed by the use of the active participle to denote the present, and Nöldeke has noted that such is its chief use. (35). Thus, in comparison with the Hebrew verbal system the Syriac use of 'tense' shows great regularity and this may be said to be one of the main differences between it and the Hebrew tongue. This conclusion is confirmed by Roberts:

"Of the main peculiarities of the language of the Peshitta Syriac, it may be noted that this alone of the Semitic languages possesses 'tenses' in the sense applied to verbal forms generally." (37).

The above remarks are sufficient to show that while there are, undoubtedly, many similarities between the verbal systems of Syriac and Hebrew, there are also many differences. The differences in Syriac may be defined as follows: (a) the absence of the \( \text{waw} \) consecutive; (b) the symmetrical arrangement of the conjugations, each of which has its own reflexive which is recognised by the prefix \( \text{nx} \); (c) the simplicity of the vowel system; and (d) the great regularity of the tense system compared with the Hebrew system.
The purpose of the above analysis has been to show the main differences which exist between the source language (Hebrew) and that of the receptor language (Syriac). This task has been necessary so that one may establish the difficulties with which the Syriac translator was faced in his attempt to render the Hebrew text into Syriac. In addition to the above one of the main difficulties he faced was that of style, or the construction of the two languages. Hebrew has a certain terseness to it, while Syriac may be said to have an easy style. Thus it would possible for the translator to produce a text that would be faithful to the original Hebrew, but which at the same time would be very poor Syriac. Such were the difficulties of the Syriac translator.

It is now necessary to consider the character of the translation that the Peshitta of Job is. An evaluation of it has been provided by Roberts:

"The book of Job, although a servile translation, is in parts unintelligible, due partly to textual corruption and partly to the influence of other translations." (38).

Thus, according to Roberts, the Peshitta of the book of Job is one which is dependent upon the Hebrew text; although it should be noted that its usefulness in solving some of the complicated textual problems of the book of Job is somewhat limited due to: (a) the fact that the MSS have suffered textual corruption; & (b) the Syriac rendering has been influenced to a lesser or greater degree by
the ancient versions, notably the LXX, Targum and Vulgate. It is the results of these two factors in the Peshitta of Job which now call for investigation.

Among the commentators, Dhorme alone has carefully investigated each of the versions and has valued them objectively as to their usefulness for the exegesis of the book of Job. In the evaluation of the Peshitta he has relied upon the earlier work of Eberhard Baumann, although it should be noted that the statistics he uses are based upon his own research. These may be divided into two categories:

(a) The Influence of the Versions and their respective Languages.

(b) The Stylistic Characteristics of the Translation.

It now seems appropriate to consider these in order:

(A) The Influence of the Versions and their respective Languages

1. Dhorme first of all notes that there are a number of cases where the Peshitta is in agreement with the Septuagint and these may be explained by the direct influence of the Greek on the Syriac version: 5.3; 6.4, 19, 21; 7.15; 9.19, 33; 10.20; 12.14; 13.18, 28; 14.5; 16.5, 9; 17.15; 18.3; 19.23; 22.3, 17; 23.2; 24.20; 27.15, 18, 19; 29.12; 31.23; 34.36, 37; 37.19, 24; 38.7. (39).
2. He now comments on the relationship that exists between the Peshitta and Targum and suggests that this is due to nothing less than the resemblance which is to be found between the Aramaic and Syriac languages: 6.12, 22; 26.5, 9, 10; 28.16; 29.16, 17; 33.27; 34.6, 17; 38.3, 31; 40.7; 41.17; 42.10. (40).

3. While handling the relationship that exists between the Targum and the Peshitta, he further notes that sometimes the translation is based on the meaning of the Aramaic root: 6.2, 9; 8.17; 9.27, 29; 20.27; 23.2, 10; 24.10; 29.4, 19; 32.6; 35.14; 36.32; 38.22. (41).

4. Also noted by him are a number of occasions where the Latin version and the Syriac version are in accord and which may be explained by a common tradition: 3.5, 7; 6.16, 25; 7.2; 8.18; 13.13; 14.15; 15.2, 24; 16.12; 17.4, 10; 18.3, 8; 20.3, 10, 23, 28; 21.23; 22.12, 30; 23.9, 14; 24.9, 20; 28.4; 30.11, 24, 28; 31.18; 33.14, 17, 32; 40.15. (42).

Having considered the influence of the versions it now seems best to catalogue Dhorme's classification of the stylistic characteristics of the Peshitta of Job.

(B) The Stylistic Characteristics of the Translation

1. Under this head Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translation is
not distinguished for its faithfulness to the Hebrew. What he is noting here is that some anomalies exist in the division between clauses, and between verse and verse, so that he has drawn attention to the following: 9.5; 13.13; 15.16; 16.10; 17.5; 19.24, 26-7; 20.15; 21.17; 22.3-4, 15-16, 21; 23.11-12; 24.11-12, 15, 22, 23; 27.20-1; 28.4, 5-6, 17-18; 30.5-6, 7-8, 17-18, 25; 31.26-7; 32.15-16; 34.5, 25-6, 31-2; 35.12-13; 36.18-19, 24-5; 38.8-9, 17-19, 28-9; 39.27-8; 41.5-7, 15-16, 25-6. (43).

2. He further notes that incorrect readings and defective vocalisations are fairly frequent and, accordingly the following may be noted: 5.5; 6.7, 13, 17, 19; 7.5; 9.27, 35; 11.3, 6, 11, 12, 15; 12.4, 12; 15.4, 27; 16.3, 7; 18.13, 19; 19.13; 20.5, 7, 9, 22, 23, 25; 21.10; 22.2, 11; 23.16; 24.1, 13, 21, 22; 26.7; 27.11; 28.13, 26; 29.7, 22; 30.2, 15, 23; 31.8, 10, 11, 20, 28 30, 34; 32.4, 9, 12, 18, 19, 22; 34.5-6, 24; 35.15; 36.5, 27, 28; 37.14; 38.8, 20; 39.20, 22, 29; 40.2, 24, 26, 31; 41.1, 12, 20, 24. (44).

3. Also noted by him are a certain number of passages in which there occur repetitions and double translations: 2.10; 4.21; 11.3; 12.16, 26; 13.2; 15.26; 17.9, 15; 19.15; 20.12; 24.6, 11, 24; 29.18; 31.23, 24; 33.9, 15, 20, 21, 26; 34.5, 18; 36.13, 20. In this section he also notes a further selection of passages in which slight additions occur: 1.12, 13; 2.6, 11; 3.6; 4.16, 20; 6.22; 9.33; 15.6; 19.16; 21.15; 23.6; 24.20; 27.19; 31.14, 34; 33.5.
9; 34.10. Additionally, implicit quotations are to be observed in: 9.18; 28.19; as well as theological adaptations in: 1.6; 37.7. (45).

4. His concluding review of the Peshitta of Job is concerned with transpositions, omissions and compressions. The transpositions are to be found in: 2.5; 10.11; 12.19; 16.22; 31.35; 32.3; 38.36; he has also noted omissions in the text in: 1.13, 15, 21; 3.7; 6.2, 15; 7.13; 8.16; 10.6; 11.15, 20; 12.11; 13.10, 15; 14.6; 15.28; 21.8; 22.26; 23.3; 24.2, 5, 14; 27.6, 17; 29.6, 25; 30.3-4, 12, 16; 34.20; 37.4, 23; 38.25; 40.8, 18, 20; 41.21, 22, 23, 24; while compressions are to be found in: 6.14; 23.13; 27.3; 29.5; 33.18; 35.5; 37.6-7; 39.3-4; 40.11-12, 16. (46).

Having thus arrived at a suitable tabulation of the features of the Peshitta of Job, it now seems appropriate to illustrate each of these features by a consideration of one example from the above noted characteristics.

(A) 1. Cases where the Peshitta is in agreement with the Septuagint.

Under this head it seems appropriate to consider the example in 38.7, where the Hebrew text reads:

GetValue
This text is translated by the RSV thus:

"when the morning stars sang together,  
and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

By way of comparison the text of the Peshitta reads:

בְּרָא אֶתְהָרָא כּוֹכָבִים שֶפֶרֶם וְכָל הָאָרֶץ כָּלֶה מִיָּדָם פָּנֵיהּ

which may be translated as:

"when he created the twilight stars together,  
and all the sons of the angels gave a joyful shout?"

When the two texts are compared it can be seen that the main difference between them is that whereas the Hebrew text has יְהִי "when the morning stars sang—", the Peshitta has בְּרָא "when he created the twilight stars—". It would appear, therefore, that the Syriac translator did not know what to do with the Hebrew temporal construction יְהִי and so followed the text of G, which has "וַיַּכְוַע וַיִּגְנִּיף וַיַּכְוַע "when they were created". However, it should be stressed that there are also differences between Peshitta's text and G's text because the latter is a passive construction, whereas the former is active. Dhorme has noted the possibility that the Syriac translator may have read a Hebrew text which had יְהִי 'create'; but this proposal has been rejected by Driver/Gray, who consider that such an emendation of the
text has the result of destroying the poetry and parallelism of the Hebrew Bible. (47).

(A) 2. Cases where the Peshitta is in agreement with the Targum

In this section it seems best to consider the example in 26.5 whose Hebrew text reads:

הבראש המנה מהים ושם הנפשות

and is translated by the RSV as:

"the shades below tremble, the waters and their inhabitants."

In this text the Peshitta has:

מצות נפשות ומנה מהים ושם הנפשות

which may be translated as:

"behold the mighty men shall be slain, and they shall lie down quieter than still waters."

Even a cursory reading of the text is sufficient to show that great differences exist between the MT and the text of the Peshitta of Job.
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In the previous example it was demonstrated that the Syriac translator had either read a different Hebrew text from the one which we now possess, or he had simply followed the text of G in his attempt to translate the text of Job. The same thesis, however, cannot be followed here, since, as Dhorme has noted, the vv 5-11 did not exist in G and have only been supplied by Theodotion. (48). In this case the Syriac translator has followed an entirely different exegetical tradition which appears to be that of the Targum. The Targum has interpreted Job 26.5 as follows:

\[אִשֵּׁרְתָּא לְבֹרֵי אֶשְׁמְמוֹדֵי יַבְרְיָאֵי אֱלֹהֵי מָלֻשׁ לְאֵלַי יַשֹּׁרֶהוֹךְ\]

and is appropriately translated thus:

"Is it possible that the mighty who are decayed will recover, when they are below the waters and their camps?" (Aramaic Bible).

As the MT is read, it is simply making a statement about the response of the underworld to the power of God as it is revealed in creation. However, the Targum's exegesis of this verse is to change the simple statement into a question which suggests that the response of Sheol to the power of God in creation is that the mighty men whose bodies are decayed in the underworld may recover. The Targumist has arrived at this interpretation of the Hebrew text by understanding the דִּמְעַל of the MT not as 'shades of death', but as giants or mighty men which is, of course, its secondary meaning. Having thus arrived at his
exegetical decision that the Hebrew text is not speaking of the shades of death but of the mighty men of the past who are now in a decayed state in the underworld (which also reveals the Targumist's interest in eschatology), he transforms the statement of the MT into a question by understanding the definite article נ as an interrogative particle. The verb יֶלְלֹה יִירָשְׁתֶל 'tremble', which is the Polal from the root יָלָּה 'writhe', has been understood by the Targumist to be from the root יָלָה, 'sweeten, soften'. This latter root has, in the Ethpalepale conjugation of Syriac, the meaning of 'to be dissolved' and is used of the body wasting away and growing old. Thus the Targumist has understood the MT to be asking the question relative to the decaying bodies of the mighty men in Sheol, in which case the verb יֶלְלֹה יִירָשְׁתֶל has to be understood as a relative clause qualifying the mighty men: namely, they are decaying. In this circumstance the Aramaic verb יַרְדִּיל, 'restore', has to be understood from the context. The Syriac translator has followed the Targumist here and has understood יֶלְלֹה יִירָשְׁתֶל in a similar way so that he produces the translation:

"Behold the mighty men shall be slain".

The example in 26.5 is a clear case where the Syriac translator has followed the Targumist in his understanding of the Hebrew text of Job. The Syriac translator has rendered the second hemistich as a statement which qualifies the lot of the mighty men in their state of death. As such it must be considered to be a unique contribution of the
Syriac translator.

(A) 3. Cases where the translation is based upon the meaning of the Aramaic root

In this division it seems appropriate to consider the example in 6.9, where the Hebrew text has:

רָיָּא אָדוֹת יִדְבָּכֵל יִתְרָה יִדְבָּכֵל

and is translated by the RSV thus:

"that it would please God to crush me, that he would loose his hand and cut me off!".

In this verse the text of the Peshitta has:

לְהַעֲלָה אֶלֶּחָא לְנְדוֹלָא לֵבָרָה אֶלֶּחָא לְנְדוֹלָא

which is best translated as:

"that God would consent to purify me, that he would appoint his hand to perfect me."

When the above two texts are examined, it can be seen that the Peshitta has understood the MT in an entirely different way to that
found in the best of our English translations. Dhorme has asserted that the reason for this is that the translation is based on the meaning of the root in Aramaic. (49). In the MT the first verbal form is 'agree to', which has been correctly interpreted by the Syriac translator who used the verb 'consent'. This latter verb is in fact the Ethpe'el, which is used instead of the Ettaph'al of the MT. Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has in fact achieved a very good understanding of the Hebrew text here. (50). When, however, he dealt with the second verbal form it is an altogether different matter. Here he has connected 'crush', with the Aramaic verb 'cleanse, purify' and so arrived at an altogether different understanding of the text. For instead of the MT's "that it would please God to crush me", he has produced a text which yields an entirely different sense: "that God would consent to purify me". When we come to the second hemistich, his use of the Syriac root 'appoint', for the MT's 'loose', may be justified since the latter form is the only occurrence of the Hiphil conjugation of 'loose' in the Hebrew Bible, and as a result its meaning is somewhat uncertain. The final verbal form in the MT is 'cut off', for which the Syriac translator has used 'perfect'. As with the second verbal form of the first hemistich, he has used a verb the meaning of which may be assumed to be the exact opposite of the MT. The probable reason for this is that he would appear to have taken the root 'cut off life' = 'finish, complete' and so has produced a rendering which is quite different from any of the other
versions.

(A) 4. Cases where the Peshitta is in agreement with the Latin Vulgate

Under this head it seems best to consider the example in 3.5, where the Hebrew text reads:

[Scripture text in Hebrew]

and which is translated by the RSV thus:

"Let gloom and deep darkness claim it.
Let clouds dwell upon it;
let the blackness of the day terrify it."

This is rendered by the Peshitta as follows:

[Scripture text in Peshitta]

which may be appropriately translated:

"Let the darkness and the shadows of death cover it.
Let the clouds overshadow it;
let those whose days are bitter be terrified by it."
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Since it is proposed to comment upon the first and third hemistich in the main body of the work, attention is restricted at this stage to the second hemistich. In the MT the text is: דַּעַת יִסְדָּר צַלְעַת, which is translated as: "let clouds dwell upon it". The Peshitta has rendered this as: הַלַּעַת יִשְׁדָּר צַלְעַת, which may be translated as: "let the clouds overshadow it." While both texts may mean more or less the same thing, the wording is actually different. The difference is to be found in the verb that is used by each text. In the case of the MT it is the root דַעַת, 'dwell', whereas the Peshitta has used a different root, 'decline', hence 'overshadow'. In this verse the Targum has used the verb מַעַת, 'rest, dwell' to give an almost literal rendering of the Hebrew text. The Peshitta, however, has used a verb with an altogether different meaning, namely מַעַת, 'bend, turn down', which may by implication be rendered 'overshadow'. Dhorme has noted that the Peshitta is here in agreement with the Vulgate, whose text has: Obscurent eum tenebrae et umbra mortis; Occupet eum caligo, Et involvatur amaritudine. (51). In this latter text the verbal form occupet, 'fall, attack', may be parsed as being 3rd. pers sing present subjunctive and be said to carry the same meaning as the Syriac מַעַת 'bend, turn down'; and as such may be said to be an obvious example where the Peshitta and Vulgate are in agreement. Dhorme has noted that the only possible explanation for this phenomenon is that both versions are drawing on a common tradition. (52).
1. Cases where the Peshitta does not correctly distinguish the division between clauses and verses

In this division it seems best to consider the example in 17.5, where the Hebrew text reads:

ルןס יבמה עתמה ותינני ונני יכננה

and which is translated by the RSV as:

"He who informs against his friends to get a share of their property, the eyes of his children will fail."

The Peshitta renders 17.5 thus:

יתנורודר רעמה עליה רועמה ותינני ודננה וכננה

which may be translated as follows:

"when a friend behaves insolently against his friend, even the eyes of their children shall be dimmed."

When the two texts are compared, it can be seen that the first hemistich of each is completely different. The reason for this is that the Syriac translator has provided an interpretation of the first
hemistich, rather than an accurate rendering of the Hebrew text. He has interpreted מֵעָה יַרְאֵה, 'he who informs against his friends', by using the 3rd. masc sing Ethpaual of מְלָא, 'to behave arrogantly against, behave insolently towards', and has not rendered the מְלָא of the Hebrew text at all. The above is therefore a good example of an instance where the Peshitta has not paid sufficient attention to the clauses which exist in the MT. In this example the purpose clause represented by מְלָא has been ignored by the Syriac translator.

(B) 2. Cases where the Peshitta is dependent upon Incorrect Readings and Defective Vocalisations

Under this head it seems appropriate to examine the example in 5.5, where the Hebrew text reads:

ד'חר ד'חט ד'חט ד'חט י'חט ד'חט ד'חט

and which is translated by the RSV thus:

"His harvest the hungry eat,
   and he takes it even out of thorns;
   and the thirsty pant after his wealth."

By contrast the Peshitta text reads:

זָעַר כָּבָשָׁן אֲכֵלָה, יָחָשֵׁי חַלֶּשׁ, לַעֲשָׂר בָּהָלָם וַעֲשָׂר בָּהָלָם.
which may be translated as:

"whose harvest the hungry eat,
and water shall be poured out to the thirsty;
and the thirsty shall devour their substance."

At first sight the opening hemistich of both texts appears to be identical, but a closer examination of the Peshitta text reveals that this is not necessarily the case. The opening construction of the Peshitta has been translated above as a noun, but if it were a noun should we not have expected "his harvest" = 'whose harvest'? For this reason it seems better to take as relative pronoun 3rd. masc sing perfect Pe'al of 'reap, harvest'. Thus, the translation of the Peshitta's first hemistich is more accurately rendered as: "what he has reaped, the hungry will eat."

The commentators are generally agreed that the second hemistich is virtually unintelligible. The Syriac translator has taken the noun 'from thorns', as a noun 'thirsty', perhaps by metathesis of consonants, or by the influence of the third hemistich where the noun does of course occur. The preposition 'to', is represented in Syriac by the inseparable preposition . The translator has taken the verbal form 'take', as being from the root 'gather, collect', which in Mishnaic and Talmudic Hebrew is used in the Hiphil conjugation to denote the collecting of water. He has understood to be a masc pl form of the verb 'collect water', and so he has rendered it with the Syriac form
'to be poured out', which may be parsed as being 3rd masc pl imperfect Ethpe'el of the root קד. The example here in 5.5 is, therefore, a clear instance of how the Syriac translator, in his attempt to understand the Hebrew text of Job has misread the verbal form of the MT.

(B) 3. Cases where the Peshitta contains Repetitions and Double Translations

In this subsection it seems appropriate to consider the example in 29.18, where the Hebrew text reads:

דָּעַם אֶפְרַיִם בֶּן אֶפְרָיִים אֵל שֵׁם אֶל שֵׁם

and which is translated by the RSV:

"Then I thought, 'I shall die in my nest,
and I shall multiply my days as the sand."

The Peshitta text of 29.18 has:

דָּעַם אֶפְרַיִם בֶּן אֶפְרָיִים אֵל שֵׁם אֶל שֵׁם

which is appropriately translated as:
"and I thought, 'I shall deliver the poor people,
and I shall end as the reed,
and I shall multiply my days as the sand of the seas."

Even a cursory reading of the two texts shows that, whereas the MT is composed of two hemistichs, the Peshitta in fact has three. In this context Dhorme has noted that the reason for this is that the words of Job's initial thought, יִשְׂפָּר, have in fact been translated twice. (53). The first interpretation has read יִשְׂפָּר as יְשִׁפָּר, 'I shall deliver the poor people'; whereas the second has taken יִשְׂפָּר as יֵשָׁפָר, 'my nest', as יֵשָׁפָר, 'reed'. Rignell has suggested the following reason for the double translation:

"Double translations are exceedingly common in the book of Job. Sometimes they are coordinated, sometimes mingled with each other. In most cases it can be stated with certainty that no other translation as, for instance, LXX, lies behind the alternative reading. Instead there can be no doubt that we are dealing with alternative translations into Syriac from the Hebrew text. Often it is, however, still more complicated, as a correct translation may be mixed-up with an erroneous rendering due, for example, to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. The final P-text has not been compared with the Hebrew." (54).

In the case referred to above, neither rendering is correct, although the second is perhaps nearer to the original than the first.
(B) 4. Cases where the Peshitta contains Transpositions.

Omissions or Compressions

Under this final head it seems best to consider the example in 38.25, where the Hebrew text reads:

\[ \text{מ"פ לְעַלָּה רָדָה לְעַלָּה} \]

and which is translated by the RSV thus:

"Who has cleft a channel for the torrents of rain, and a way for the thunderbolt."

In this example the text of Peshitta reads:

\[ \text{לָעַלָּה רָדָה לְעַלָּה} \]

which is best translated as:

"so that there was a form and a voice."

From a comparison of these two texts it can be seen that the former is composed of two hemistichs, whereas the latter is composed of only one. The example in 38.25, therefore, is a clear instance of the Syriac translator having totally omitted the first hemistich. In passing it should also be noted that this verse is incorrectly translated.
translated by Lamsa, who retains both hemistichs in his rendering, since he would appear to be following the AV here. A further comment is necessary, however, on the Syriac’s interpretation of the second hemistich, which is totally different from a plain understanding of the MT. In the first instance he has taken the noun קֵת, 'way', as a verb, 'tread', which he has loosely translated by the Syriac verb אֵל, 'was'. He has taken the noun קֵת, 'strong wind', as the noun הָעַל, 'vision, appearance'. Finally he has added the conjunction כּ before the noun וה, 'thunder', which he has taken as a singular 'voice'. וה in its singular form does of course mean 'voice', but in its plural form it may also mean 'thunder'. It would appear that the Syriac translator has not done this randomly, but has had a specific purpose in view. His particular interpretation of the MT is to make the second hemistich of v25 (the only one rendered by him) into a purpose clause following on from the second hemistich of v 24. Thus the second hemistich of v 24 in the Peshitta may be rendered as:

"and in what way does the wind proceed over the earth";

v 25 is now added to this statement:

"so that there was a form and a voice".

His intention in so doing was to show that not only is God the Lord of all natural forces, but that He also uses such natural forces to
effect a revelation of Himself. Thus, what has been provided is not a translation of the Hebrew Bible, but an interpretation of it.

The above remarks are sufficient to show that the question as to which sources the Syriac translator used is a complex one: at times he has taken the readings of G, when he could not understand the plain sense of the Hebrew text; at other times he has used the Targum to effect an interpretation of the text; while at still other times he has freely drawn on a tradition which was common both to the Peshitta and the Latin Vulgate. The nature of his translation is also a complex matter. As noted above there are a number of cases where he does not respect the division in the MT between different clauses and verses. There are other instances where his rendering is based upon a defective vocalisation or incorrect reading of the Hebrew text. There are yet other examples where he has supplied a double translation of parts of the Hebrew text; the effect of this is to make verses which are composed of two hemistichs into verses which have three. There are still other occasions where he totally omits parts of verses and reconstructs that which remains into a different sense altogether. All of these features require deeper investigation and it is intended, in the remainder of this work, to subject part of the book of Job to such an investigation.
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Chapter Two

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 3.1-4.21
It is first of all necessary to devote a brief paragraph to the method by which this study will proceed. It is the custom in such studies to set about on a course of examining a limited number of selected texts, which are of necessity spread throughout the entire book which is being studied. That procedure will not be followed here; instead it has been decided to study the translator's technique through a given number of chapters, namely Ch's 3-10 which comprise of course part of the first cycle of speeches of which the book of Job is composed. This decision to attempt a continuous commentary on Ch's 3-10 has been arrived at, not only as the best way of conducting this study, but also because of the spacial requirements of this work. Thus, while the broad results of the translator's technique have been tabulated in Ch 1, it is possible to consult the commentary to find an observation on the translation process which is effected in the Peshitta at that point.

Chapter Three

Verse 1

In all verses which require comment, it will be the procedure of this work first of all to print the text of the Hebrew Bible and the RSV translation of it, which will then be immediately followed by the text of the Peshitta and its translation.
"After this Job opened his mouth and cursed the day of his birth."

וַיִּהְבָּחֵן בֵּיתוֹ אֵיִוְרֵב פָּנָיו הֲזָמָה יֵאֵזִי•לֹּהַיְלָה

"And afterward Job opened his mouth and cursed the day in which he was born."

In the first instance it should be noted that the RSV has not provided an absolutely literal translation of the Hebrew text, but rather an interpretation of it. The Hebrew word לֹּהַיְלָה, 'his day', of course means the day of his birth, as can be seen from v 3, but a literal rendering of the text would be 'his day'. Among the versions both G and Targum have rendered this phrase literally, while the Syriac is unique in having given an interpretation of the Hebrew text. The interpretation which the translator has provided is one that is fully in accord with the sense of the MT.

Verse 2

יֵעַּֽל אֵיִוְרֵב יֵאֵזִי•לֹּֽהַיְלָה

"And Job said."

לֹּֽהַיְלָה יֵאֵזִי•לֹּֽהַיְלָה

"Job answered and said."
In this verse the RSV has produced an economical rendering of this well attested Semitic construction by ignoring the first verbal form as being almost equal to inverted commas. This is in conformity with its policy, which it uses in the translation of the NT phrase: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν: "Jesus answered". Of the versions, G alone has produced a similar rendering by the word λέγειν, while both Peshitta and Targum have provided a full translation of the Hebrew text. The Peshitta has done so by using the perfects ἔλεγεν — εἴπερ to replace the waw consecutive forms, as was noted in Ch 1. (for further remarks on the use of the perfect as the regular narrative form, see above p 15.). While the use of the perfect to denote narrative is absolutely what one might expect, it does, however, have the disadvantage that it does not have entirely the same nuance as the Hebrew waw consecutive. What is indicated by this remark is the loss of consecution through the absence of the conjunction.

Verse 3

"Let the day perish wherein I was born,
and the night which said,'a man-child is conceived.'"
"let the day perish in which I was born,
and the night in which it was said,
'a male child is conceived.'"

As this verse is more or less a literal translation from the Hebrew text it requires little comment. It should, however, be noted that the verbal form יָרָצָא, which is of course 3rd. masc sing imperfect Pe'al, 'perish', is here being used with a jussive connotation, since Syriac has lost modal forms such as the 'jussive' and 'cohortative', although traces of them are still to be detected.

(1). In the Hebrew text of the first hemistich the relative יָבוּץ has to be understood, since in common with the practice generally it has been elided, whereas the Syriac has provided its relative י. The Hebrew the verbal form יָרָצָא, which is a Niphal imperfect from the root יָרָץ, 'be born', has been noted to be an example of the ancient preterite, and is used to connote narration, a use quite common in Hebrew poetry. (2). The Syriac text, by contrast, has used the perfect of the Ethpe'el conjugation which indicates exactly the nuance conveyed by the Hebrew Niphal form. In the final hemistich the Syriac translator has, by means of the preposition יָתוּס, defined exactly what the verbal form of the Hebrew text יָרָצָא is referring to. As the MT stands, it can either be translated as: "the night in which it was said", which is how the text of Q and Targum have understood it; or, as: "the night which said", which is how the
RSV has translated it. Thus the Syriac translator has made his text more exact and more easily understood than the existent Hebrew text. Since the Greek translator has done the same with his text, which reads: καὶ ἡ νυκτὶ, ἐν ἡ οἰκον, it may be that the Syriac translator has simply followed the reading of G in his rendering of this verse.

Verse 5

"Let gloom and deep darkness claim it.
Let clouds dwell upon it;
let the blackness of the day terrify it."

"Let the darkness and the shadows of death cover it,
let the clouds descend upon it,
let those whose days are bitter be terrified by it."

As the second hemistich of this verse has already been dealt with (when the relationship between the Vulgate and the Peshitta was explored [cf Ch 1, pp 28, 29]), the discussion here will be limited to the first and third hemistichs. In the first hemistich, the difficulty is located in the verbal form נצלעה, 'claim it', since
the root הָּנָּה, 'redeem, claim' is unique to Hebrew. The root does not occur in Arabic, Ugaritic, Syriac or Phoenician, although Jastrow has located a use of it in Targumic Aramaic. (3). It should be noted, however, that the forms which are to be found in the Targums are mainly the Pe'al active participle הָּנָּה, 'redeemer', which may be said to be a loan word from Biblical Hebrew. Thus, from the review of this evidence, it can be plainly seen that the Syriac translator was faced with a verbal form for which he had no direct equivalent in his own language. Unfortunately he could obtain no help from the versions, since no consensus on its interpretation and meaning had emerged. The text of G has: αἰλοθέω, 'seize it', while Symmachus has: αὐτήν ἀναζητῶ, 'lay claim to', but the most enterprising reading is to be found in Theodotion, which has: κατασκύλισα αὐτήν, 'to be next of kin to'. This latter reading is clearly dependent upon the use of הָּנָּה which is to be found in the book of Ruth, in which it is used to express the claim of redemption which could be exercised by the next of kin. The Targum has used the root הָּה, 'soften, moisten', while Aquila has the reading: μολύσσω, 'defile'; both of these versions derive their meaning of הָּנָּה from the late הָּא, 'defile, pollute'. According to Driver/Gray the Syriac translator, like the Latin Vulgate, is simply paraphrasing the text here by using the verbal form: הָּהָלֲל, 'cover it'. (4). Yet the question must be asked: what alternatives did he have? It seems that there were in fact 3 possible verbs which the Syriac translator could have used, which are: הָּה, 'redeem', from which comes the noun הָּה, 'redemption'; הָּה, 'seize'; or הָּה, 'perform the duty of a
kinsman’. The root הָיָה occurs some 103 times in the Hebrew Bible. Of these, 33 (including the Ruth passages) are translated in Syriac by the verb: יָתַת, ‘perform the duty of a kinsman, effect blood vengeance’, while the remainder are translated by the verb יָתַת, ‘redeem’. The only exception to this latter statement is the example in Job 3.5 which is translated by the root: הָיָה, ‘cover’; now why should this be?

The only possible answer to this question is to assume, as Dhorme does, that the Syriac translator read הָיָה, ‘defile, corrupt’ here and not הָיָה, ‘redeem, lay claim to’. (5). In support of this view one may cite the fact that when he translates הָיָה, he always uses either יָתַת or יָתַת and never הָיָה. Thus what he has provided is a rather loose translation of הָיָה, in conformity with the Latin Vulgate’s obscurent eum, Aquila’s μολυναί, and Targum’s יָתַת. Since such is the case we must follow Dhorme, who, in his translation of the MT, argues that we should translate ‘pollute’ and not ‘claim’. (6).

It is now time to examine the hapax legomenon הָיָה of the third hemistich. From an examination of the text of the Peshitta it is clear that the Syriac translator either read a text which did not have the prefixed preposition י, or he simply ignored it. Dhorme has noted that the versions have for the most part interpreted יָתַת as connected with the root יָתַת. (7). Thus the Targum connects the word with the root יָתַת and gives the rendering: "like the bitter
things of the day"; the same derivation is also followed by Aquila in
his text: καὶ ἔχωμαβσειαν αὐτὴν ὡς προφαμοι ἡμέρας. Dhorme
is of the opinion that the latter's text has influenced the work of
Jerome, who rendered: et conturbent eam quasi amaritudine diei.
(8). The Vulgate simply renders: amaritudine and totally neglects
the i. The text of G has been examined by Lester Grabbe in his
study, and he is of the opinion that the reading: καταραθειη η
ἡμέρα has been connected to the beginning of v 6 so as to produce:
"may that day and night be accursed"; which in turn means that the
text of G is corrupt at this point. (9). Having therefore
reviewed the versional evidence it seems clear that, if the Syriac
translator was in any doubt as to how he should render קרורידא ירבד, the
overwhelming testimony of the versions would point him in the
direction which he has taken, and it seems that his rendering of the
third hemistich of 3.5 is yet another example of where he may have
been influenced by the Targum and Latin Vulgate.

Verse 6

הconfidence את הימים אל גלпи, אש נפשך ירוה אל יבש

"That night--let thick darkness seize it!
let it not rejoice among the days of the year,
let it not come into the number of months."
"That night—let the thick darkness cover it!
that day—let it not be reckoned in the number of the days of the
year,
let it not come into the number of months."

In this verse the Syriac translator has provided an almost literal
rendering of the text, with the exception of the following: (a) his
translation of ינ"ס; (b) his translation of ינ"ס; (c) the
addition of ינ"ס. It seems appropriate to deal with these in
order.

(a) His Translation of ינ"ס.

As can be seen from a consultation of the above Peshitta text, the
Syriac translator has rendered ינ"ס by the verbal form ינסנ, 'cover'. His use of the root ינ here is interesting because this is
the second occurrence of ינ in vv 5-6. It will be remembered
that he had already used this verbal form in v 5 where he used it to
render the Hebrew verb ינ (cf p 46 above). As far as the Syriac
vocabulary is concerned he could have used either ינ, or more
probably ינ; although it should be noted that the Targum uses the
root ינ, 'take, carry away' in its text. Since none of the other
versions has used a root which means 'cover', the rendering of the
Peshitta must be judged as unique and which has been employed, perhaps, for stylistic reasons. The sentiments of v 5 may be considered to be paralleled in v6, the only difference being that, whereas v5 refers to 'that day', v 6 refers, of course, to 'that night'. Thus the Syriac translator may have simply employed the form 'HI'033 to produce a certain parallelism between the two verses.

(b) His translation of גנ'.

In his commentary Clines has noted that there are two possible etymologies of גנ': either from גנ', 'rejoice', which is common in Aramaic but rare in Hebrew, or from גנ', 'be joined, added to', which involves its revocalization as גנ'. (10). With the exception of the text of G, which has גנ and would appear to have read ג instead of גנ, most of the versions have followed the latter proposal in their interpretation of the MT. Thus, Targum has גנ', 'be joined to'; the Vulgate has computetur; while Symmachus has סננפכקגונ. The Peshitta has used the root גנ', 'be reckoned', which not only agrees with the interpretation of the majority of the versions, but also has in its favour the fact that the נphalt of גנ' is paralleled with קצ' in Gen 49.6. One must, therefore, conclude by stating that the Syriac translator has understood the Hebrew text here perfectly.
In his evaluation of the manner in which the versions have rendered this verse, Dhorme has noted that the Peshitta alone has inserted an additional subject for the second hemistich in the form of "נין", and considers that the reason for this is the "ט" of the MT. (11).

The Syriac translator has assumed that the night cannot be part of the day, and as such cannot be added to the days of the year, as the MT of the second hemistich specifies. Because of this assumption he has supplied what he feels is the appropriate subject for the second hemistich, namely, "that day".

It is because of this apparent confusion of subjects between the first hemistich and the second and third hemistichs, as noted by the Syriac translator, that Tur-Sinaé wants to re-locate v 6a to the beginning of v 9. (12).

Verse 7

"Yea, let that night be barren;
let no joyful cry be heard in it."

הנה הלילה הזהי ית"ם להולך אל הכמה להנה ובו

לךisure והנהה מבזון ית"ם עלילא והשהרוותא
"That night, let it be barren, 
let no hymn of praise enter into it."

Once again, the Syriac translator has provided an almost literal rendering of the verse, with the exception of the following: (a) the omission of יָהַנְנָא; (b) the insertion of וּ before יָא of the second hemistich; (c) his definition of בֵּית יָהָה. As in the last example it seems best to deal with these in order.

(a) The omission of יָהַנְנָא

This particle, which is rendered by the text of G as αλλα, and by the Targum as χν, has been omitted both by the Peshitta and by the Vulgate. It is doubtful that the Syriac translator read a Hebrew text which did not have יָהַנְנָא; it is more likely that he has followed the Vulgate for stylistic reasons.

(b) The insertion of וּ before יָא in the second hemistich

It would seem that the Syriac translator has inserted the conjunction וּ to mark the beginning of the second hemistich. In this action he may be following the text of G, which has χατ at this point in its text, or more likely he may simply be carrying out an exercise in regularity with the intention of making the text more precise, as his of course is. It is interesting to note that he has made a similar insertion of the conjunction וּ to mark the second hemistich of v 4,
which is also before the negative $\#x$. This insertion has no basis in the MT, although it is confirmed once again by the text of G, which has $\#x$.

(c) His definition of הָרָקַם

In the translation of the Peshitta noted above it can be seen that the rendering adopted by the Syriac translator is one which interpreted הָרָקַם, 'joyful cry' of the MT, as חַגּוּרַבִּים, 'hymn of praise'. When the Targum's exegesis of this verse is compared, it would seem that there is a definite allusion to the Targumist's understanding of the phrase. In the second hemistich the Targum has:

לא ייעוף הָרָקַם והלעגהל בֶּן לָשָׁלֹשׁ בָּה

which may be translated as:

"may the cry of the wild cock not be heard praising in it."

(Aramaic Bible).

In his edition of the Targum of the book of Job, Mangan has noted that, in Targum to Ps 50.11, the wild cock is there identified with Ziz, the heavenly singer. (13). In this verse, therefore, the Targumist, by mentioning the wild cock, implies that the voice of praise, which can only be uttered by Ziz the heavenly singer, is not to be heard in this day of disaster. The Syriac translator, by
using the word מזמור, 'hymn of Praise', alludes to such an exegesis, although he does not fully indicate it as such.

Verse 9

"Let the stars of its dawn be dark; let it hope for light, and have none, nor see the eyelids of the morning,"

While the Syriac translator has supplied an accurate rendering of the Hebrew text, there are, nevertheless, a number of matters which require comment: (a) his rendering of מָאָס; (b) his interpretation of לָכֵן; (c) his rendering of לָכֵן.

(a) **His rendering of מָאָס**

In Biblical Hebrew the verb מָאָס means either to 'wait', or to 'hope'.
In his rendering of the Hebrew text the Syriac translator has adopted the former meaning; whereas the MT is capable of both meanings, as is confirmed by the texts of NEB and RSV. The Syriac text can only be translated by the English 'wait', since the verb underlying that translation, מְסַלָּל, means either to 'wait, or to expect' and does not carry the nuance of 'hope'. Had the Syriac translator intended to reproduce the concept of hope in his translation, he would have to have used some such verb as מְסַלָּל ‘hope’.

(b) His interpretation of מְסַלָּל

In the text of the Hebrew Bible the negative consequence is expressed by the particle מְסַלָּל. While the Syriac translator could have used the negative particle מְסַלָּל, 'there is not', to render the negative consequence; he has chosen to do so in a fuller way than is necessary, by his use of the imperfect מְסַלָּל, 'be', which would appear to be used with a 'jussive' nuance.

(c) His rendering of מְסַלָּל

In his work Clines has noted that the Hebrew form מְסַלָּל may either be translated as 'eyelids' or as 'eyelashes'. (14). The former rendering is attested by BDB, while the latter is the interpretation of KB & KB 3. Since Hebrew already has a special construction for 'eyelashes', namely, מְסַלָּל מְסַלָּל, the former rendering of the MT would seem to be the more likely. In his rendering of the Hebrew
text the Syriac translator has given an exact interpretation of \( \text{כָּנַל} \) with his \( \text{רֶשֶׁת} \), 'rays of the dawn', since, according to the commentators, this is precisely what the Hebrew construction means. Dhorme has drawn attention in his work, to an observation by Schultens, namely, that the Arabs in ancient times regarded the rays of the sun as its eyelids. (15). It may be that the Syriac translator was aware of this idiom and, accordingly, has given its exact interpretation in his translation.

Verse 11

"Why did I not die at birth, come forth from the womb and expire?"

"Why did I not die (at my procession) from the womb, and why did I come forth at conception to be consumed with judgment."

A cursory comparison of the above two texts reveals that they are quite different and consequently some comments must be made. In this context it is illuminating to note that Lamsa, in his translation of the Peshitta of 3.11, has omitted the final two words of the Peshitta.
text; either because he regards them as corrupt, or because he is attempting to make his translation conform as nearly as possible to the AV, a tendency which has been noted earlier in this work. In assessing the work of the Syriac translator in his rendering of this verse it should be noted that he has not only extended it, but that he has also altered its sense. He has extended the verse by his repetition of $x^\nu$ in the second hemistich, which has been elided in the MT as is usually the practice in Hebrew poetic syntax and structure; and by his interpretation of the waw conjunctive form $y^\nu$ $\nu$, 'expire', with $x^\nu$ $\nu$, 'be consumed with judgement'. He has altered the sense of the verse by omitting the negative $\nu$, which also has to be understood in the second hemistich—as has the interrogative $\nu$. It is also noteworthy that he has given full force to the preposition $\nu$, which in the MT is prefixed to its respective nouns. In the first hemistich he has rendered the imperfect Qal $\nu$, 'die', by the perfect Pe'al $\nu$, which has exactly the connotation indicated by the poetic use of the imperfect as an aorist. (For further remarks on this use see above p 45). In the second hemistich he has rendered the MT’s $\nu$, 'womb' by the Syriac cognate $\nu$, which means conception. The main deviation is to be seen in his rendering of $\nu$ by $\nu$. The purpose of the construction $\nu$ is to show that the sole intention behind the birth of Job is that he might be brought into the world to have the judgement of God pronounced upon him. It is interesting to note that the word $\nu$ 'judgement' is the translator’s interpretation of the malady which befell Job.
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Verse 12

"Why did the knees receive me?
Or why the Breasts that I should suck?"

"Why did the knees rear me?
And why did I suck from the breasts?"

The commentators are divided as to whether אַפִּים, בְּרֵשֵׁים is a reference to the Father's knees or the Mother's. Without entering into the debate unnecessarily, it is useful to note that a different position is defended by Stade, who reported a custom prevalent among Bedouin women of being seated upon the knees of a midwife while giving birth; this may be the precise significance of Gen 30:3, where Bilhah is to give birth upon the knees of Jacob, using his knees as a kind of birthing chair. In this case, being received by the midwife's knees would be a moment intermediate between being born and being put to the breast. (16). The Syriac translator is in no doubt about the issue; for him the matter is simply that of the child being reared upon his mother's knees, which is the usual position for the child as it sucks his/her mother's breasts. This action is denoted by the פָּאֵל, which here represents the פּוֹלָל of the Hebrew.
Bible. It is necessary to note, however, that the text of the Peshitta does not denote the mother as such but implies this interpretation by its use of לֹ֥א.

Verse 13

וכָֽלַֽהְךָ֪ נְכַלְּכֵֽהְּנִיְֽהִיִּֽהָנִיַּֽהָנִי

"For then I should have lain down and been quiet; I should have slept; then I should have been at rest,"

וכָֽלַֽהְךָ֪ נְכַלְּכֵֽהְּנִיְֽהִיִּֽהָנִי

"For perhaps now I should be dead and silent; and I should be asleep and at rest,"

Only minimal comment is required on this verse since the sense of the MT has been preserved in the Peshitta's rendering of the Hebrew text. It is interesting to note that the Syriac text possesses a particle of doubt, 'perhaps, it may be', which the Hebrew text does not have. The temporal element is introduced into the translation by the particle הֵן, 'now', which is (of course) a contraction of הָיְֽהָנִי הֵן, 'this very hour'. The Syriac translator has rendered the hypothetical state of Job, which in the MT is indicated by the alternation of perfect and imperfect, by means of the verb הֵן together with a series of passive participles, a use which is in
itself reminiscent of NT Greek.

**Verse 16**

"Or why was I not as a hidden untimely birth, as infants that never see the light."

"Or like a hidden untimely birth as though I had not been, or like infants which have never seen the light."

Once again minimal comment is required on this verse since the Peshitta has accurately preserved the sense of the MT. It is interesting to note that the Syriac translator, in his version of this verse, has not introduced the interrogative particle چکیک (k'3), which is thought by most commentators to be elided from the beginning of the verse, but has simply reproduced the conjunction چکیک (k'3) of the MT. It is, further, worthy of note that in his translation he has produced an exact rendering of چکیک (k'3) (that which falls in secret=untimely birth) with the Syriac's چکیک (k'3). However, it has to be stressed that, while there may be some likenesses between the two texts, there are also significant differences. In the MT the whole of the first hemistich is in fact an interrogative clause; while in
the Peshitta the first hemistich is a comparative statement, the
verbal element of which has been transformed into a concessive clause.
While it is possible that the MT can be translated in the way that the
Syriac translator has rendered it, it is, however, unlikely, since
we should have expected a concessive particle as ִיַּלְלַג, which is to be
found in a similar statement in the text of Obadiah 16: ידֵי הַיָּלֵל
gas though they had not been”. So that there may be no doubt about
how the Peshitta is to be translated, the Syriac translator has
provided such a particle in the form of ִיַּלְלַג, “as if”. Thus he has
introduced into the first hemistich of this verse a concessive
statement which gives voice to Job’s desire: “that he had not been”.

Verse 17

שֶׁרְשֵׁיוֹן שֶׁל הָאֵד הַשָּׁמָּאִיל שֶׁלָּהֵיל יִבְּנֵי

“There the wicked cease from troubling,
and there the weary are at rest”.


“There the wicked have ceased from wrath,
and there those who were weary with their lives are at rest”.

This verse requires minimal comment, since the sense is basically the
same; the only basic difference is to be found in the translator’s
rendering of נגוע in the second hemistich. Dhorme has noted that the word נגוע, in the sense of 'wearied, exhausted', recurs only in Sir 37.12. He has also drawn attention to the salient fact that the complement נגוע has been added to confirm that it is a question of physical exhaustion. (17). In this verse, the Syriac translator has supplied not a literal translation of נגוע, but an interpretation of it. He has rendered it as "those who were weary with their lives" and his interpretation of it may be dependant upon the text of G, which has: εσει ανεμαυσατο καταρχοι τω σωματι.

Verse 22

בשמים אלל יהל ישראל כ ימיער בכל

"who rejoice exceedingly,
and are glad, when they find the grave"?

ולאלו שמחונים ודעים כל משהים יראם

"who rejoice and gather themselves together,
and exult when they find the grave."

Once again, the version which has been provided by the Syriac translator needs little comment, except for his interpretation of נגוע in the first hemistich. Among the commentators Clines has noted the difficulty occasioned by this phrase, which also occurs in
Hos 9.1 with בֵּיתׁ, 'rejoice', as here and literally means 'to the point of exultation'. (18). The usual solution proposed by commentators is to emend בֵּית to בֶּית, 'heap', and so provide a parallel to בֹּות, 'grave', of the second hemistich. In his work Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator may have followed this course in his interpretation of בֵּית by בֹּות, 'and gather themselves together'; although, if such is the case, he would appear to have made the text of Job more obscure than it really needs to be at this point. (19). Grabbe is of the opinion that the Syriac translator simply paraphrases the text here, although he also notes that the verb בֵּית can also mean 'to die', in the sense of being gathered to one's fathers. (20). If such a sense can be adopted here, then the text simply implies an expression of joy at the moment of death, which in reality is the fulfilment of Job's desire that he should die: a desire which he has continually given voice to in the book.

Verse 23

לֹאָב שָׁמַךְ אֹצָר הָדוֹרָה נְסַחְתֶּה יָנָּהָר בּוּדָר

"Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,
whom God has hedged in"?
"Why is light given to a man whose way is concealed, whom God has protected."

In his commentary Clines has noted that the MT only has יִוָּלַי and that בַּלְתִי בַּלְתִי has to be understood from verse 20. This is not only true of the MT, but is also true of the Peshitta's text. That said, the major deviation between the texts is to be noted in the second hemistich, where the Hebrew Bible has בַּלְתִי, which is represented in the Peshitta by בַּלְתִי. This latter form may be parsed as being m.s. Aph'el participle of the root בַּלְתִי, 'protect', a root which is only used in the Aph'el conjugation. The Peshitta is unique in its interpretation of בַּלְתִי here, since the versions attest the meaning usually attributed to it, namely, 'hemmed in, hedged in'.

The form of בַּלְתִי in the MT is that of the Hiphil; it may be that the Syriac translator has read this as a Qal, in which case he could have understood the root בַּלְתִי to convey the sense of 'cover [protectively]'. Such an understanding could have caused him to use the Aph'el participle בַּלְתִי, which is best translated by the English word 'protect', as in the above translation.
Chapter Four

Verse 2

"If one ventures a word with you, will you be offended?
Yet who can keep from speaking"?

"If I begin to speak with you, will you grow weary?
But who is able to restrain himself from speaking with you"?

As can be seen by a comparison of the two translations the sense of both texts is basically the same, although the same ambiguity which is to be found in the MT is also to be found in the Peshitta: a circumstance which is due to the nature of the translation which has been provided by the Syriac scribe. The ambiguity in the MT referred to: נושה. This form is usually parsed as נ interrogative + 3rd fem sing perf Piel, 'attempt, venture', which is the way that the RSV has understood it; but Clines has noted that it may also be taken as an orthographic variant for נ呼和, in which case it may be parsed as נ interrogative + lst pers pl imperf Qal, 'lift up, take up', and can have as object either 'proverb' or 'psalm'. (22).
In the Peshitta also a similar ambiguity is to be found in the form נְּגַז, 'begin, proceed', which may be parsed either as: (a) 3rd masc sing perf *Aph'el* of נְּגַז, 'follow, adhere to'; or as: (b) 1st pers sing imperf *Aph'el* of the same root. In his Grammar Nöldeke has noted that in conditional sentences in which the condition is set forth as possible, the conditional particle is יִּזָּה, 'if'. This particle usually has as its verb the active participle (§271); the imperfect occurs less frequently (§265). (23). Since the perfect only occurs in such sentences when the past is being referred to, we may assume that the form which occurs in the Peshitta is in fact, the imperfect. Therefore, the Syriac translator has taken the form יִּזָּה as 1st pers pl imperfect, but he has rendered it as a 1st pers sing to be in conformity with the 1st pers sing form of address which is also to be found in vv 8, 12, & 16. This interpretation of the Peshitta is also confirmed by Driver/Gray in their commentary. (24).

Verse 6

"Is not your fear of God your confidence, and the integrity of your ways your hope"?
"Behold it is your fear that is your blame,
and your trust in the perfection of your way".

When the above two translations are compared it can be seen that their sense is somewhat different. This difference in sense is due to the way that the various versions have interpreted the word יִהְיוּ in the first hemistich of the verse. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that this word is capable of two meanings: either (1) 'foolishness', or (2) 'hope'. (25). BDB has noted that the root יִהְיוּ occurs with the former meaning, 'to be or become stupid', (occurring only once in the Hebrew Bible in Jer 10.18). As might be expected the Targum on this verse has given a rendering which follows exactly the good sense of יִהְיוּ, contained in the MT. The text of G has: ποτερέων σοι ὁ φόβος σου ἐστιν ἐν αἵρεσιν καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς σου καὶ ἡ ἁπαξία τῆς ὁδοῦ σου; which is best translated as:

"Is not your hope based on foolishness, as is your hope and the innocence of your way"? From this text it can clearly be seen that G has interpreted יִהְיוּ in its bad sense of 'foolishness', and this interpretation of the word has considerably altered the meaning of the verse. As the text stands in the MT it is a reminder to Job that what should be his hope and confidence are his fear of God and the integrity of his ways; whereas the interpretation of G suggests that his fear of God is based on folly, as are his hope and his defence of the innocence of his ways. From what has been said on O's interpretation of this verse, it can easily be seen that the Syriac translator has been influenced by such an interpretation, and that it
is this that is represented in his translation of the text.

Verse 7

Verse 7

"Think now, who that was innocent ever perished?
Or where were the upright cut off"?

"Remember now, whoever perished being innocent?
and where were the upright put to shame"?

A cursory reading of these two texts shows that the sense of both is basically the same, so that only minimal comment is required. It is, in fact, only in the second hemistich that any divergence is to be noted, so that comment will be limited to the verbal form יָרָד, 'cut off', and the Peshitta's interpretation of it. The root יָרָד means to 'be hidden, be destroyed', but it is only attested in the Niphal, Piel, and Hiphil conjugations, since there is no evidence for the Qal conjugation. In the MT it is the Niphal conjugation which is represented, whereas in the Peshitta the form is that of the Pe' al יָרָד. In Syriac the root יָרָד means to 'be ashamed, confused' and it is this root which the Syriac translator has used to represent the MT's יָרָד. With the exception of the
Peshitta, the versions are unanimous in their support of the MT's 'cut off'; and it should be noted that the Targum even uses the same root: _rectangle. Since this is the case, it is well worth asking why the Peshitta has differed here. There are only two possible answers to this question: either (a), the Peshitta's translator read a Hebrew text which had _rectangle instead of _rectangle; or (b), the Peshitta is simply interpreting the form _rectangle with the case of Job uppermost in the mind of the translator. The proposals will be considered in order: (a) that the Peshitta's translator read a Hebrew text which had _rectangle instead of _rectangle. The benefit of this proposal is that the root _rectangle, 'be ashamed, confounded', which is only attested in the Miphal conjugation, often appears in poetic texts with such a meaning, usually in parallelism with verbs of a similar meaning such as _rectangle, 'be turned back', in Ps 40.15 (Heb). While this proposal may be attractive, it must be rejected as being improbable, since there is no other versional evidence for it and the Peshitta cannot be accepted as a sole witness for such a reading, due to its tendency to paraphrase. (b) that the Peshitta is simply interpreting the form _rectangle with the case of Job uppermost in the mind of the translator. This is the more likely reason for the Syriac's rendering of _rectangle by _rectangle, for the reason stated above, namely, his tendency to paraphrase in his interpretation of the MT.

Verse 8
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"As I have seen, those who plough iniquity
and sow trouble reap the same."

虮ך אֶת יְהוָּה וּלְרַעֲבֹת וְלֹא אָכְלֵנִי מָלֵא הַנָּחֲלָה

"Just as I have seen, those who live in sin
and sow trouble shall reap the same."

At first sight it would seem that the sense of both texts is the same;
the only exception to this being the verbal form of the Peshitta יִלֵּל, 'live'. On examination of the text it seems odd that the translator
has rendered an identical form to the MT's יָשָׁם, 'sow', but has
produced what may be described as a metaphorical sense for the MT's
יָשָׁם, 'plough' with the participle יָלַל, 'proceed, live'. In Syriac
the root יָלַל means to 'proceed, continue', but with the noun יָלַל it
has the sense of 'live'. Payne-Smith has given a solution to this
phenomenon in his lexicon, where he has noted that the verb יָלַל,
'proceed', is often confused with the verb יָשָׁם, 'scatter, winnow'.
(26). Accordingly it seems best, in the interests of sense, to
amend the text of the Peshitta to יָלַל and translate the first
hemistich of the verse thus: "Just as I have seen, those who
cultivate sin". This proposal has the added benefit of preserving
the metaphorical use of the participles יָשָׁם & יָלַל, which is to be
noted in the text of the Hebrew Bible.
Verse 12

"Now a word was brought to me stealthily,
my ear received the whisper of it".

"Now a word answered me,
and my ear received as it were a little of it".

When the above two translations are compared, it can be seen that the Peshitta's rendering of this verse is somewhat different from that of the MT; indeed, the first hemistich of the Peshitta's translation is virtually unintelligible, although a semi-literal one has been provided which does not convey a great deal of sense as far as an English rendering is concerned. The element in the first hemistich which has caused the unintelligibility is the verbal form ו"ה, 'be answered'. This verbal form may be parsed as 3rd masc sing perf Etaph'al of the root ב"ח, 'answer', which only occurs in the Aph'el and Etaph'al conjugations. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the text of the Peshitta is possibly corrupt at this point and, accordingly, the form should be ב"ח, 'to do anything by stealth'; the first hemistich may then be translated: "Now a word was brought to me stealthily" which of course conforms to the
translation of the MT offered above. (27). In the second hemistich the phrase in the Hebrew Bible יָנָע, 'a whisper of it', has been rendered in Syriac by הער, 'a little of it'. In their commentary Driver/Gray have noted that יָנָע, 'whisper', in later Hebrew acquired the sense of 'a little'; and this no doubt underlies the rendering given by the Syriac translator. (28).

Verse 16

"It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance. A form was before my eyes; there was silence, then I heard a voice:"

"then I stood up, but I could not recognize it; there was no appearance before my eyes, but I heard a gentle voice which said:"

A comparison of the two texts show that substantial differences exist between them. It is simplest to record that there are differences in each of the hemistichs of this verse and to treat them in order. The first hemistich: the opening verbal form is translated by the Peshitta as if it were the personal response of Eliphaz to the spirit
passing his face; it is that he in 1st personal terms has stood up; so that the Syriac translator would appear to have read a text which had יָשָׂם, 'I stood up', instead of the MT's יִשָּׂם. This reading is supported by G, whose text has: οὖν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἐπεξεργάζοντάς, which is appropriately translated as: "I stood up, but I did not recognise it". It is also worth noting that Aquila, whose rendering is usually excessively literal, has εἰς τὸν in the same context. With such an array of versional evidence in support of the Peshitta's reading, it would seem logical to argue in favour of the adoption of יָשָׂם instead of יִשָּׂם; but the opinion of nearly all the commentators is against such a proposal. In assessing their judgements, one has to take into account the verifiable fact that in many cases the Syriac translator simply follows G when he considers his text to be more acceptable for dogmatic or other reasons. Because of this factor it seems best to follow the text of the Hebrew Bible at this juncture.

The verbal form יָשָׂם, 'recognize', is rendered in Syriac by the Eshtaph'el of the root שָׂם, which produces an exact equivalence of meaning between the two texts.

The second hemistich: it is in the second hemistich that the greatest deviation between the texts is to be observed, since they actually mean the opposite of each other in English translation. Driver/Gray note that the Syriac translator would appear to have followed the text of G here and read: דִּבְרֵי חִנָּם מְאֻוֹת--"I looked and there was no form before my eyes". (29). The only difference between the text of G, which has: εἶδον, καὶ οὐκ ἦν μορφή προ
οφθαλμών μου, and the text of Peshitta is that the Syriac text does not represent רזידת המג; the only apparent reason for this is that the translator may have considered רזידת המג a doublet for נוֹזֶבָה. Among the commentators Tur-Sinaí alone wants to achieve the same kind of interpretation of the second hemistich as that formulated by both G and the Peshitta, by simply deleting the ה at the end of רזידת המג and reapporportioning it to נוֹזֶבָה; his text would then simply read:

essional יסרוּתֵךְ אֵלָיו, which would produce the translation: "it stood still, but I could not discern a sight or image before my eyes". (30). The only caveat that one can offer against such a reconstruction of the Hebrew text is that it destroys the parallelism that exists between the first and second hemistichs. Thus, the text which the Peshitta has rendered may be judged to be another of those occasions on which the translator has simply followed the text of G, for dogmatic or linguistic reasons.

The third hemistich: with the exception of the additional יסרוּתֵךְ at the very end of his text, the Syriac translator has correctly interpreted the יסרוּתֵךְ of the MT. Dhorme has noted that most commentators have considered יסרוּתֵךְ to be a hendiadys, 'murmur and a voice', to express 'murmuring voice', and that this is the way the Peshitta has understood the MT. (31).

Verse 18

וה נבבדה לא אים עבון ובסותני ישים חכית
"Even in his servants he puts no trust, 
and his angels he charges with error;"

"Behold, in his servants he has had no trust, 
and his angels he has struck with amazement;"

Since the sense of both of the first hemistichs is identical, comment will be reserved for the interpretation of the hapax legomenon בֵּיתוֹ by the Syriac translator. The word בֵּיתוֹ only occurs with this meaning in the present passage, which most of the English versions translate as 'fault, error'; the root which is associated with such an etymology is that of בָּעַז, 'be deceived, fool'. This is also the root that the versions have assumed was at the basis of this word, so that the text of G translates it by the word σκόλιον, 'crookedness'; while the Targum is in no doubt about the matter, it uses the word הִנְיָה, 'iniquity'. The rendering of the Peshitta by the word הַצָּרָה, 'amazement', is perhaps from a different etymology namely from the root הָעַז, 'praise, be praised'. When we consider the Syriac noun מָטָר, 'amazement', we find that its root, מָטָר, means to 'regard with awe, reverence'; so that the conclusion is inescapable that its etymology is surely הָעַז, and not בָּעַז, which is the root from which most of the other versions have derived their understanding of the Hebrew noun.
Verse 19

"how much more those who dwell in houses of clay,  
whose foundation is in the dust,  
who are crushed before the moth."

"Even those who dwell in houses of clay,  
which are built in the dust,  
shall be humiliated before the thick darkness."

As with the last example, the major deviation between the texts is to be observed in the final hemistich of the verse. The commentators are generally agreed that the third hemistich is very difficult, and is considered to be a gloss by some scholars (eg., Holscher, Fohrer). In his translation the Syrian scribe has not relied on any of the other versions, as is his usual practice (eg., G, Targum, Vulgate). For the Piel verbal form בָּלַע, 'crush' of the Hebrew Bible he has used the Syriac Pa'el of the root כֹּל, 'humiliate', which may be described as a correct exegesis of the MT. He has literally rendered the prepositional form בָּשָׁם, 'before', which some scholars such as Dhorme would want to translate by 'like', in line with the texts of G and
Vulgate cf. 3.24, with the Syriac preposition ܡܡܐ (32). With the noun ܡܡܐ, 'moth', however, it is an altogether different matter. It is difficult to see how the Syriac translator could have derived ܟܐܠܐ from ܡܡܐ. One possibility, however, is to consider that he may have read ܡܡܐ 2, (constellation of) Leo, and construed that, since the constellations are to be seen in the darkest heaven, the poet was trying to convey a concept of thick darkness in which the wicked would be destroyed. That said, we have to take into consideration the fact that the other versions, including the text of G, render ܡܡܐ 1, 'moth', literally. One has, therefore, to conclude that the Syriac translator has simply produced a paraphrase of the text in this instance.

Verse 20

"Between morning and evening they are destroyed; they perish for ever without any regarding it".

"They shall be humiliated from morning to evening, the inhabitants shall not dwell in it forever; moreover, they shall perish".
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Even a cursory reading of the two texts shows that there are considerable differences between them. The differences may be defined thus: (a) the interpretation of הָלַכְךָ by Peshitta’s הָלַכְךָ; (b) the Peshitta’s interpretation of מָהִמֵּךְ הָלַכְךָ and connection of מָהִי with מָהִי; (c) the repetitious nature of מָהִי ה́ ה́ made into a third hemistich. These will now be considered in order:

(a) **The interpretation of הָלַכְךָ by Peshitta’s הָלַכְךָ**

The Syriac translator has rendered the Hophal הָלַכְךָ, 'be beaten, hammered', by the Pa'al of the root הָלַכְךָ, which he has also used in the previous verse to translate the verbal form מָהִי, 'crush'. On that occasion it was remarked that the translator had supplied a fitting exegesis of the Hebrew text; and it would seem that such is the case in this verse also.

(b) **The Peshitta’s interpretation of מָהִי ה́ ה́**

All the commentators have noted how difficult this phrase is, so that it is to be expected that the versions would supply an alternative to it; their interpretation at this point, which differs from the MT, does not readily suggest, however, that they read a substantially different Hebrew text from the one we ourselves possess. It is more likely that they had the same text that we have, but were unable to make an intelligible rendering of it. The normally accepted way of understanding the MT is to take מָהִי as a Hiphil.
participle of the root פ, 'set, place', to which one must understand an elided complement ה, 'heart, mind'. The difficulty with such an understanding is that the Hiphil of the root פ is otherwise unattested; in addition, Dhorme considers that the ellipsis is too violent. (33). From the translation which has been offered by the Syrian scribe, it is clear that he did not know what to make of this text, so he reconstructed it assuming that the subject of v19 was also being considered in the present verse. This led him to construct a clause which would give a reason for their present humiliation from morning to evening; since the 'dwellers in houses of clay' are being considered, it is that they would no longer dwell in their habitations forever. To achieve this construction he has also had to connect מְלָא כָּל, 'for ever', which properly belongs to לֻלֶּךְ, with his interpretation of פ. It also should be noted that his reconstruction of the text is not dependent on any of the other versions, such as G or the Targum.

(c) The Repetitious nature of לֻלֶּך

Having achieved the above reconstruction of the text so as to make it intelligible, he was left with the verbal form לֻלֶּך, 'perish', which he has also reconstructed into a third hemistich by the addition of מ before the verbal form. His construction of this third hemistich has had the effect of making the verbal form לֻלֶּך highly repetitious in nature, so that his rendering could be considered a gloss in the text.
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From a consideration of his treatment of the text, it must be concluded that, as his reconstruction was not dependent upon any of the other versions, his exegesis of the text (if indeed it can be called that), was wholly speculative in character.

Verse 21

"If their tent cord is plucked up within them, do they not die, and that without wisdom"?

"Behold their possessions have been taken away from them, and their remnant shall die and that without wisdom".

From a comparison of the two texts it can be seen that the major difference between them is in the first hemistich, although it also has to be stressed that, on the basis of that exegesis, a subject has been supplied for the second hemistich which is somewhat different from the MT. Dhorme has noted that the text of 4.21, as rendered by the Syriac translator, is one of those occasions where he has supplied a double translation of the MT. (34). The word of the Hebrew text which has caused the translator to do this is בִּשָּׂרַת, 'tent peg'. In his exegesis the Syriac translator has noted
that this word is capable of two interpretations in Syriac: either (a) ḫām', 'remainder'; or (b) ḫām', 'inheritor'. In the translation of the Hebrew text that he has provided he has used both of these meanings. In the first hemistich he has rendered ḫām, 'surely', by ḫām, 'behold', which he has then followed by his verb ḥāw, 'take away'. Since it would not make sense for the text to speak of the inheritor being taken away, he has inverted the consonants and provided the noun ʾīlmāmî, 'possession', to make better sense. For the second hemistich he read ḫām', 'remainder', for which he has provided a synonym ʾīlmāmî, 'their remainder'. By such an exegesis of the Hebrew text he has not only provided an alternative meaning for the word ḫām', but has also provided an alternative subject for the second hemistich, of which he has otherwise provided an exact translation.
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Chapter Three

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 5.1-6.30
Chapter Five

Verse 2

"Surely vexation kills the fool,
and jealousy slays the simple".

"Since anger has slain the fool,
and indignation has slain the one who lacks understanding".

From a cursory reading of the texts it can be seen that the sense is very similar in both, so that only minimal comment is required. A merely visual comparison of both texts reveals that the Syriac translator has followed the word order of the Hebrew Bible exactly. The particle 'a is understood by Gordis to be an emphatic particle and such an understanding is also presented in the RSV; the Syriac translator, however, has rendered 'a with its usual meaning of 'for, since', which in Syriac is represented by the compound particle 7 סב. (1). Blommerde has also understood the 7 which is prefixed to ירי in an emphatic particle; but it is more natural to treat the 7 as the sign of the direct object, which may be construed as an Aramaism, and is (of course) similarly employed by the Syriac
translator. (2). The Syriac translator has also supplied a to the direct object of the second hemistich. He may have done so on the basis of Hebrew poetic syntax, which would normally elide those particles of which the force extends from the first hemistich to the second. The only matter left for comment is that of the translator's style. The Hebrew text has, in fact, used two different verbs, namely, the Qal of and the Hiphil of , both of which may be used to express the concept of slaying or killing; whereas the Peshitta uses in both hemistichs. In a similar fashion, it should be noted, that whereas the Hebrew text uses two distinct nouns for fool, , and , the Peshitta only uses the noun .

Verse 3

"I have seen the fool taking root,
but suddenly I cursed his dwelling".

"I have seen the impious prospering;
but suddenly his dwelling perished".

As with the previous example, the Syriac translator has preserved the
exact word order of the Hebrew Bible. When, however, the sense of both verses is compared it can be seen that there are differences between them. In the first hemistich it should be noted that the Syriac translator has interpreted ʾiṣāx, 'fool', as the impious man which is denoted by ḫaṣṣāʾ š̄impīṣ 'impious'. It should not be thought, however, that the Syrian scribe read a text which contained the word ḫaṣā, 'wicked', since what he has provided is an interpretation of the text and not a literal translation of it. Dhorme has noted that the word ʾiṣāx, 'fool', in v 2 has drawn the attention of Eliphaz back to his general thesis, which is that the fool, who is the same as the impious man, cannot be happy on the earth (4.8-11). (3).

The same kind of comment may be applied to his rendering of the Hiphil participle ʾyāṣir, 'taking root', by the Aph'el participle ḫāṣā, 'prospering'. The idea of prosperity is expressed in the Hebrew Bible by the analogy of the tree which roots itself in the earth. Thus what the Syriac translator has provided in the first hemistich is an interpretation of the text, rather than a literal translation of it. In the second hemistich it is his translation of ḥaṣā, 'and I cursed', by ḫaṣā, 'perishing', that now merits our attention. In his rendering of the second hemistich he has interpreted ḫaṣā, 'suddenly', as an adverb of time and has not sought to repoint the text so as to read 'fool', as Gordis suggests that we should. (4).

It is clear that the Syriac translator has read ḥaṣā, 'he cursed', instead of the MT's ḥaṣā, 'I cursed'. In this he may simply be following the text of G which has: ἀλλὰ ἠθέως σφραγῆ αὐτῶν ἡ διάκυκλον με. There is an apparent difficulty in reading ḥaṣā, 'and I
cursed', since this makes the effectiveness of the curse depend on the personal involvement of Eliphaz. From the renderings of G and the Peshitta it is clear that this difficulty in the text was met long ago and that G has simply postulated a correction with מֶלֹךְ, which has been followed by the Syriac translator. Thus one may conclude this comment on v 3 by noting that this is yet another occasion on which the Peshitta is in agreement with the Septuagint.

Verse 4

"His sons are far from safety,
they are crushed in the gate,
and there is no one to deliver them."

Since the sense of both texts is similar, comment will be reserved for the second hemistich of the verse. Dhorme has noted that the fondness of Eliphaz for the personal tone encourages us to recognise in v 4 the malediction announced in v 3. (5). In his translation of
the Hebrew text he has rendered the imperfects as jussives. While such a possibility exists in theory for the text of the Peshitta, one cannot with certainty render the imperfects with a modal colouring, since, with the exception of a few fragments, Syriac has lost its distinctive jussive forms. (for further remarks on this aspect of the imperfect in Syriac see above p 45). In the second hemistich the Syriac translator has once again given an interpretation of the text rather than a literal rendering of it. This is to be observed in his use the Pa'el of the root יִמָּה, 'humiliate', to render the Niphal of the root נִמָּה, 'crush'. From a consideration of the Hebrew text there is no doubt that the rendering which the Syrian scribe has given is precisely what the text means: namely, that the sons of the impious man will be humiliated in a public place as a result of the malediction which has been pronounced upon him. It should be noted that the Syriac translator has used the root יִמָּה elsewhere in the Peshitta to effect an interpretation of the MT. (for further remarks on the use of יִמָּה to render נִמָּה and נְמָה, see above pp 77f & 78ff respectively).

Verse 6

 THREAD דבְּבַךְ אֵלֶּהֶם יָשָּׁר קָעֵד *

"His harvest the hungry eat,
and he takes it even out of thorns;
and the thirsty pant after his wealth".
"His harvest the hungry eat,
and water is poured out to the thirsty,
and the thirsty devour their possessions".

A comparison of the two texts reveals that there are substantial
differences between them. By common consent of the commentators this
is a difficult verse; and, as with other examples, this difficulty
was also encountered by the translators of the ancient versions. It
seems appropriate to deal with this verse in the order of its
hemistichs. In the first hemistich the Syriac translator has
produced a fairly literal rendering of the MT, which supports the
reading לְרַעְשָׁם, 'whose harvest', by the phrase לַעֲדֵנִי. Although
it should be noted that the Peshitta's text is also capable of being
interpreted as a verb, לְעַדְנָי, 3rd masc sing perfect Pe'al, 'to
harvest', to which has been prefixed the relative ל; this would then
yield the more accurate rendering: 'what he has reaped, the hungry
will eat' (for further remarks on this understanding of the Syriac
text, see above p 31ff). It is best to understand the relative ל as
referring back to the fool of v 3. All the commentators note how
difficult the second hemistich is and although they consider it to be
corrupt, they note that it is not possible to indicate what the
original may have been. However, the concern of this work is not to
attempt to restore the original text, but to offer an explanation of
the Syriac translator's understanding of the text and of his resultant
rendering. (For further information on conjectural emendations of the text, see commentators). From a consideration of the Syriac Translator's rendering of the second hemistich, it is clear that he has understood the noun ' from the thorns', as some sort of derivative of ' ' . He may have made this emendation either: by considering that the word ' was unintelligible and so simply replaced it by understanding the same subject as in the third hemistich; or, he may have arrived at his reading by a metathesis and deletion of consonants thus: . Whatever the method, he made the deduction that the subject of the second hemistich was the same as that of the third, namely, the thirsty. Thus understood, the text seemed to imply that something was brought or carried to the thirsty; since the text is speaking of hunger and thirst the consequent deduction was that it was water which was brought (a not unnatural deduction!). Thus, he paraphrased that conclusion using the form that water was being poured out to the thirsty (see above p. 31ff regarding the possibility that the Syriac translator mistook the verbal form , 'take', as being from the root , 'gather, collect', which in Talmudic and Mishnaic Hebrew is used in the Hiphil conjugation to denote the collecting of water.) In the third hemistich the Syriac translator has provided a more or less literal rendering of the text. The only difference that is to be noted is that instead of reading , 'pant, gasp', he appears to have read , 'crush, pulverize', which caused him to use the verb , 'crush, devour'. That understood, he has otherwise rendered the verse accurately, while retaining the difficult 3rd m pl
Verse 6

"For affliction does not come from the dust,
nor does trouble sprout from the ground";

"For falsehood has not proceeded from the dust,
nor has injustice sprung forth from the ground".

A brief reading of these two texts shows that the sense is virtually identical in both, so that only minimal comment will be required.

The only marked difference is substitution by the Syriac translator of פָּרוֹק, 'falsehood', for the MT's רֵעֵשׁ, 'wickedness'; and קֶדֶשׁ, 'injustice', for the MT's רֻעֵשׁ, 'trouble'. According to Dhorme, the point of the text is to show connection between רֵעֵשׁ, 'evil', and רֻעֵשׁ, 'trouble'; the author of the first is likewise the author of the second. (6). In this case the text of G simply has חֵול, 'labour', and דָּלֶת, 'suffering', which may be nearer to the intentions of the MT than the Peshitta. It should be noted, however, that the Targum in the first hemistich uses the noun רֵעֵשׁ, 'falsehood', which has been followed by the Syriac translator,
and he may have used an equally loaded theological word in the second hemistich simply to preserve the supposed parallelism between the stichs.

Verse 7

"but man is born to trouble
as the sparks fly upwards".

"For man is born for trouble
as the wild birds soar in flight".

As can be seen by an examination of the texts of the Hebrew Bible and the Peshitta, the main differences are located in the second hemistich, so that comment will be restricted to that part of the verse. As in previous examples, the Syriac translator has provided a translation which reflects exactly the word order of the MT. In the MT the phrasebery ה"ץ, 'sparks', is defined by BDB as being derived from the noun ayr, 'flame', and may literally be rendered as: 'offspring of the flames', hence 'sparks'. (7). It should be noted that, as this phrase is unique in the Hebrew Bible, it has been variously interpreted in the ancient versions.
Dhorme has noted that the Targum's exegesis at this point is to interpret the phrase יְנֵי עֲלֵיָה as יִנְיֵי עֲלֵיָה, 'sons of the demons', while the second Targum has: 'the sparks which shoot from coals of fire'. (8) It would seem that the Targumist has seen in this phrase an allusion to animate beings, so that he has produced the version 'sons of the demons'. The other versions have interpreted יְנֵי עֲלֵיָה as the name of a bird, so that the text of G has: νειοι δε γυναisis, Aquila: νειοι πτηνου, and Symmachus: τα τεκνα των πετειων. As in other examples, the Syriac translator would appear to have followed the text of G in this instance, which would have caused him to render: סַנִּיגי 'יְנֵי, 'wild Birds'. According to Dhorme his exegesis here may be not so far from the mark, as may be proved by the translation of יְנֵי by יַעֲג in the Targum of Onqelos (Dt 32.34). (9). Thus his interpretation of יְנֵי 'יְנֵי may be deemed to be another example of the Syriac translator's dependence on the Septuagint.

Verse 11

לֶשׁוֹם אֱפִלוֹת כָּלָהוֹן וְלָלְדֵי יִנְיֵי יָם

"he sets on high those who are lowly,
and those who mourn are lifted to safety".
"to set the lowly on high,
and the humiliated are strengthened with salvation".

Unusually, the first hemistich in the MT begins with the preposition י + infinitive absolute וֹלַי, 'to set', of the root לָי. It should be stressed that v 11 is part of a hymn of praise, in which the acts of God are more or less all denoted by the participle, so that one may refer to this usage as the 'divine' use of the participle. (10). It should be noted, however, that the text of Q has the participle פֹּלְעָנוּ, perhaps because the Greek translator wanted to make his text conform to this use of the participle in vv 9-10 & 12; but this text has not been followed by the Syriac translator, whose rendering פָּלְעָנוּ bears witness to the correctness of the MT. In the second hemistich he has once again used the verb יַפְרֹה, 'to be humble', to render the Qal participle יִפְרֹה, 'mourners'. In this instance he has used the masc sing Pe'el passive participle יִפְרֹה to give a particular interpretation to the יִפְרֹה of the Hebrew Bible. In Hebrew the verb יִפְרֹה means 'to be dark, wear mourning attire'; whereas the verb the Syriac translator has used, פֹּלָע, means to 'humble oneself, humble oneself in sackcloth and ashes', so that the Syriac translation is not an exact rendering of the MT. In the Hebrew Bible the participle יִפְרֹה denotes those who have soiled their faces and heads in great sorrow; whereas in the Peshitta the passive participle יִפְרֹה denotes those who have humbled themselves in an act of repentance with sackcloth and ashes. Dhorme has noted that the meaning of the phrase וֹלַי וֹלַי is that of being lifted to safety;
whereas in the Peshitta the meaning of לְהוּנֵי לְהוּנָם is that of being girded with salvation. (11). From the above comparison of the texts it can be seen that while the Syriac translator has produced a rendering which is peculiar to him and is not dependent on any extant version, it may simply be regarded as a paraphrase of the text, which is a favourite practice of his.

Verse 12

"He frustrates the devices of the crafty,
so that their hands achieve no success".

"He brings to an end the devices of the crafty,
so that their hands cannot achieve their purpose with intrigue".

An examination of the texts shows that while they may be judged to be similar in the first hemistich, in the second they are quite different; and for that reason comment will be restricted to the latter part of the verse. In the MT, the second hemistich begins with the conjunction ו, which has been combined with the negative ב to form a negative consequence clause. In the Peshitta, this clause has been formed, as we might expect, by the
relative ֵי, which has been annexed to the negative particle ַּא. The
reason for the divergence of the texts is the final word of the second
hemistich ַּאֶשָּׁה, which, as has been noted by Driver/Gray, is of
uncertain etymology and meaning. (12). The word has been defined by
BDB as meaning 'abiding success', while Driver/Gray consider that its
meaning is nearer to 'effective counsel'. (13). The Syriac
translator has rendered ַּאֶשָּׁה by the word ַּא, which in its emphatic
state may mean something like 'cunning skill', a meaning which has
been employed in the above translation of the Peshitta. In his
commentary Clines has noted that some scholars, including H. Bauer,
have argued for a meaning nearer to ַּאֶשָּׁה, 'plots', which has the
effect of allowing a similar concept to be represented in both
hemistichs, as well as corroborating the work of the Syriac
translator. (14).

Verse 13

"He takes the wise in their craftiness;
and the schemes of the wily are brought to a quick end".

"He has apprehended the wise in their craftiness;
and the beliefs of the crafty are abolished".
Even a cursory examination of the texts reveals that they are broadly the same as far as sense is concerned, so that only minimal comment is required. The only matter worthy of note is the interpretation of the Niphal participle יָבֵל, 'brought to a quick end', by the Syriac translator's use of the Pa'el participle ḫūb, 'abolish'. The Syrian scribe had already used the participle ḫūb in the first hemistich of the previous verse to render the Hiphil participle יָבֵל, 'frustrate'; whereas on this occasion he has used it to render the Niphal participle יָבֵל, 'bring to a quick end'. Dhorme has noted that apart from the Targum, the other versions, in a spirit of harmony, have replaced the passive with an active: thus G has יָבֵל, the Vulgate has dissipât, and the Syriac has ḫūb. (15). But it is also correct to note that the Syriac root ḫūb, 'abolish', is not an exact equivalent of the Hebrew root יָבֵל, 'bring to a quick end'. In Hebrew the root יָבֵל means to 'do something quickly, in a hurry', and it is this temporal element which is missing from the Syriac root used.

Verse 14

ינָמָם יָבֵל תְחִלֹת וְכַלִּית יִפְגֹּשׁוּב בְּצֵרוֹת

"They meet with darkness in the daytime, and grope at noonday as in the night".
"They feel for their way in the daytime as in darkness,
and they grope at noonday as in the night".

From the above tabulation of the texts it can be seen that the sense of both is the same, so that comment has been restricted to the first hemistich. In the first hemistich of the Hebrew text the concept of encountering darkness is expressed by the imperfect Piel מִפגָר, 'encounter, meet', which only occurs in the Piel conjugation in this text. In the Peshitta the imperfect Palpel of the root רָפָל, 'grope, handle' has been used to denote the idea of the crafty feeling their way in the daytime, as though it were darkness. However that is not quite the idea envisaged by the MT, since the Hebrew text indicates that God has blinded the crafty so that they are moving about in darkness, and actually encounter it in the daytime. The Syriac translator considered that the inseparable preposition מֵ, 'as', has been omitted from the text before the noun מִפגָר, 'darkness', and so he has supplied the missing preposition in the form of מֵמֶ. His reconstruction has had the effect of creating a text which has the same prepositions in both stiches; but while it has to be recorded that his text is more regular in its construction, it nevertheless does not improve the sense, since it actually makes the first hemistich more difficult to translate, as the translator then has to supply a supposed object for the verbal form מִפגָר in order to make it intelligible.
Verse 15

"But he saves the fatherless from their mouth,
and the needy from the hand of the mighty".

"He has saved their mouth from the sword,
and the impoverished from the hand of the mighty".

When the texts are first compared it seems that the sense of the first hemistich is somewhat different in each. However, a closer investigation reveals that this is not the case. As far as the Hebrew text is concerned, Driver/Gray note that the two clauses are so unevenly balanced that there must be an error somewhere. (16).

In an attempt to supply a synonym for לוייח, 'needy', in the second hemistich, they suggest (following Budde) the word פס, 'fatherless', should be used, and consider that its three consonants have fallen out of the text, and that פס has been supplied for the missing word in the wrong place. It is this suggestion that lies behind the translation of the RSV. In cases of difficulty such as this, it is the normal practice of the Syrian scribe to rely on the text of G for his interpretation of the MT. (for a list of examples see above p 18). On this occasion, however,
that possibility was not available to him, since the text of G at this point is either corrupt, or an entirely different Hebrew text to the one extant in the MT has been read. The text of G is: απολοίντως ἐν πολέμῳ, ἀθυνοῦς ἐξ ἐξελθών ἐκ χειρὸς δυναστοῦ, which is appropriately translated as: "and let them perish in war, and let the weak escape from the hand of the mighty". When this latter text is examined it would seem, as Dhorme has observed, that G's translator has omitted Ὄστῳ and has read Ὄσῳ instead of Ὄσῳ: for this reason the text of G was unavailable to the Syriac translator. The Targum has supplied a new object for the verbal form Ὄσῳ in the form of Ὄσῳ, 'his people', in its attempt to interpret the reference to the exodus from Egypt. In these circumstances the Syriac translator has simply repeated the text of the MT with his rendering: ἔστη Ἰαχὼν καὶ ἐξέλθη ἐκ τῆς ἐννόμων, which, by ignoring the second Ἰαχὼν, may be translated as: "He has saved their mouths from the sword". It should be noted that this translation of the Peshitta may be justified by the fact that, according to Rignell, there are extant manuscripts which omit the second Ἰαχὼν. (17). It should further be noted that Lamsa, in his translation of the Peshitta, translates the first hemistich as: "He saves their lives from the sword"; although there is no justification for translating Ὁμι as 'life'. (18). Thus one may conclude the comment on this verse by noting that, although the Syrian scribe has rendered the first hemistich of the MT literally, he has not provided an exegesis that would have made it more easily understood.
"You shall be hid from the scourge of the tongue, 
and shall not fear destruction when it comes".

"You shall be concealed from the scourge of the tongue, 
and you shall not be afraid of ruin when it comes".

A superficial inspection of these texts would tend to suggest that they are identical. The matter for comment does not lie in the superficial appearance of the texts, but in the preposition which the Hebrew Bible has used in its very first word. According to the MT this is the preposition א, 'in, with, by'; yet it has to be noted that the Peshitta has not used this, but the preposition מ, 'from, of'. BHS has recorded in its textual apparatus that there is an alternative Hebrew text ספת, which has not only been read by the Peshitta, but also by the text of G and the Vulgate. Since such is the case, it would seem that all we have to do is to amend the text to read ספת, following Driver/Gray. (19). In reality, however, there is no need to do this, since, as Hartley has pointed out, the preposition א has here the meaning of מ, which in itself is an element of the Syntax of Hebrew.
poetry. (20). In conclusion, one may simply note that this is another occasion where the Syriac translator has followed the text of G in his attempt to regularise the text.

Verse 23

כִּי עַל אֲבָנֵי הַגֶּדֶד בָּרָיְתָהּ וּחַיָּהּ חֹשֵׁשָּׁהּ לְךָ

"For you shall be in league with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with you".

מָסַל עֵמֶן אֵאָבָן בָּרָיְתָה שְׁמִמָּהּ לְךָ אֲשַׁמָּלוֹם לְךָ

"For your pact is with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field have surrendered to you".

When the texts of the MT and the Peshitta are compared it can be seen that there is very little difference between them. In the first hemistich of the Hebrew Bible the concept of being in league with the stones of the field is in English translation expressed by the verb 'to be'; although it should be noted that the verb is absent from the Hebrew text, which expresses this concept by a nominal construction: לְךָ אָבָנֵי הַגֶּדֶד, and is literally translated as: "your agreement is with the stones of the field". In this case, the Syriac translator has followed the practice of the MT, and has furnished the concept by means of a nominal expression:
which is best translated as: "For your pact is with the stones of the field". The reason that the expression has been commented upon is that in some cases where the MT has a nominal expression, the Syriac translator has supplied the verb 'to be', which he has considered to be understood in the Hebrew text (for an example of this practice see Peshitta's rendering of 3.19). In this verse, however, he has supplied a rendering which mirrors the MT exactly. In the second hemistich of the MT the idea that the beasts of the field are at peace with the Blessed man is expressed by the perfect Hophal הַלַּעַל, 'be at peace', which occurs only here in this conjugation. The Peshitta has used the perfect Ethpa'al of the same root: מָלַלְכָּא, 'be brought into a state of peace'. In the Hebrew Bible the perfect Hophal is not used to describe the temporal aspect of when such an action should take place, but rather the state of the person who is thus blessed, namely, a state of peace. (21). In the Syriac language, however, it is not the state of the man that is being denoted, but rather the temporal aspect of when the action happens to such a man; and it is this nuance that is reflected in the above translation. (for further remarks on this topic see above pp 10ff).

Verse 24

р<sup>ו</sup>ר<sup>ו</sup>צ<sup>נ</sup> כְּ שָלָה אַשָּלָה, וְיִשְׁרָאֵל לֹא לֵךְ לִמְדוֹתָן
"You shall know that your tent is safe,  
and you shall inspect your fold and miss nothing".

וְהָדוּעַ צֵלאֹ חַר מְסַכָּה וְהָתוֹפָרָה לְרִיִּילֶה לְאָלָה

"and you shall know that your tabernacle is at peace,  
and you shall return to your habitation and shall not sin".

When a comparison is made between the above texts it can be seen that substantial differences exist between them. In the first hemistich of the Hebrew text the idea of the knowledge of complete security is expressed by the perfect Qal of the verb יָדַע, 'to know', which is here used with a stative nuance; whereas the same concept is expressed in the Peshitta by means of the Pe'el imperfect of the same root; and in the Syriac language the emphasis is not on the state of knowing, but on the temporal aspect of such knowledge. As was noted when dealing with the previous example, this remains one of the fundamental differences between the Hebrew and Syriac languages (cf p 10f above). In the Peshitta the noun יִדַע, 'your tent', is expressed by the noun יִדַע, 'your tabernacle', which appears to have more theological overtones than the neutral noun יִדַע, 'tent'. It may be that the noun יִדַע, 'your tabernacle', may be an allusion to the Targum's exegesis of this verse, which has rendered יִדַע, 'your tent', as יִדָעֲלֵא יִדָע, 'house of your study' (for another such allusion, see above p 54). In the second hemistich, the Syriac translator has rendered MT's נַצַּק, 'inspect', by the
imperfect Pa'al הֹלֶל, 'return', which may be judged as being nothing more than his normal tendency to paraphrase the text of the Hebrew Bible. He has, however, produced an accurate rendering of the final verbal form in the MT by בָאָה יִתֵּן, 'and you shall not sin'. In his commentary Clines has noted that the theological verb בָאָה, 'sin', in secular contexts means 'miss', and that the example here in 5.24 is one such context. He further notes that the correct translation of the text is therefore: 'find nothing missing'. (22).

The question to be considered now is in what sense did the Syriac translator understand this verb. In the translation offered above, the rendering is that of 'sin', which appears to be justified by the allusion to the Targum's exegesis in the first hemistich of the verse. In support of this it should be noted that the Targumist has rendered בָאָה by the passive verbal construction פָּלַכְתָּה, 'injure', rather than by taking the primary meaning of 'to miss' of the MT's בָאָה.

Verse 26

"You shall come to your grave in ripe old age, as a shock of grain comes up to the threshing floor in its season".
"You shall enter into the grave gently,
as the gathering in of a shock of grain in its season".

At first sight the differences between the texts seems to be substantial, but in reality this is only a superficial judgement. The element of the Hebrew text which has caused the difficulty is the enigmatic expression: תְּפָנָה, which the RSV has translated: "in ripe old age". In his study Grabbe has noted that the root תְּפָנָה occurs only in Job 5.26 and 30.2 in the entire Old Testament; its precise meaning is, however, unknown. He has further noted that in both cases the context limits the meaning to something in the range of 'old age' or 'strength, vigour'. BDB has noted that the possible meaning is that of 'firm or rugged strength' and also gives the meaning 'vigour' for the example in 30.2. With such an uncertain etymology it is no surprise that the versions express a great disparity in their rendering of תְּפָנָה. Thus the text of G has: ελευθερία δὲ εν ταπεινω καιρω ψευδος καιρον θερεζωμενον, which is appropriately translated as: "and you will come to the grave as ripe grain reaped in its season". In this rendering of the Hebrew text it is clear that the Greek translator has totally omitted תְּפָנָה and has therefore avoided the problem altogether. The Targum has:

which is best translated as: "you will enter into the sepulchral chamber, to the burial place, in the fullness of your years" (Aramaic Bible). The Targumist has derived his understanding of תְּפָנָה from תְּפָנָה, 'completion', as has the Greek translator in his rendering
of נב in 30.2 by the word συντελεῖα. The Syriac translator in his rendering of נב in 30.2, has used the word ξηρα, 'vigour', but his translation may be due to the fact (as Dhorme has noted), that he read there: ינ הנ 'all strength'. (24). Since the Syriac translator could derive no help from the versions, one may conclude with the observation that, on the basis of such evidence, it is clear that he was only guessing at the meaning of נב in 5.26, which he has translated as an adverb of manner: מ'ח'ג', 'gently, peacefully'.

Verse 27

 lawful התי תרכיה יכ ינ המנה וא הלא

"Lo, this we have searched out; it is true,
Hear, and know it for your good".

יתוק הצער לכם והש mooie ומית הלא

"This we have searched out, and it is true;
we have heard it, but know it for yourself".

A comparison of the above two texts reveals that, as far as sense is concerned, they are very similar. In the first hemistich the Syriac translator would seem to have totally omitted the beginning נב, 'Behold'; there is, however, no suggestion that
he read a text not containing it, since it is witnessed by both the
text of G as ἤδει and the Targum which has קְנֵי. It would seem more
likely that he has omitted קְנֵי for stylistic reasons (for another
example of this practice see above p 53). The only other matter
worthy of comment in this verse is the interpretation which the Syriac
translator has given to the MT's בְּיָא, 'hear it'. This form has
been read as a perfect tense by the Greek translator, whose rendering
is: ἔχεικαμεν, 'we have heard'; whereas the form in the Hebrew
Bible is that of an imperative. In his understanding of the Hebrew
text the Syriac translator has followed the Text of G and has likewise
rendered it with a perfect: בְּיָא, 'we have heard it'. Since the
Peshitta has a pronounced tendency to follow the text of G where the
translator has judged it desirable, it is best to consider the
example in 5.27 as another instance of this practice.

Chapter Six

Verse 2

"O that my vexation were weighed,
and all my calamity laid in the balances!"
"O that my anger was weighed in the balances,
and that which has happened to me may be in the scales along with it"

A cursory examination of the above texts reveals that the major differences are to be found in the second hemistich. From his exegesis of the Hebrew text, it is clear that the Syriac translator has understood 'נִמְנָה to be a form of the verb נָה, 'to be'. In the text of 6.2b, we have to take note of the kethib 'נִמְנָה, 'my misfortune', which, as Dhorme has noted, has the same meaning as the qere 'נִמְנָה, and is derived from the verb נָה, 'to fall'. (25). Thus the word 'נִמְנָה may be said to be the parallel word to עַבָּד, 'vexation'. But it should be noted that this is not how the Syriac translator has understood it. He has connected 'נִמְנָה with the verb נָה, 'to be', and has assumed that the 'n ending is a form of the 1st pers sing suff. He has used the common noun סָרָה, 'something', together with the relative כ to produce: 'that which'; he has then qualified this phrase by the verb יָמַן, 'to be', to which has been added the 1st pers sing suff so as to give the translation: "and that which has happened to me". Although the Syriac translator has arrived at an altogether different text, he has not achieved a different sense from that contained in the Hebrew Bible, since "and that which has happened to me" may be said to equal the nominal form 'נִמְנָה, 'my misfortune'. He has, moreover, totally omitted the verbal form יָסָד, 'place'; since, had he included it, his second
hemistich would have become overburdened with two verbal forms; the sense of the verse demands that it should be understood.

Verse 3

"For then it would be heavier than the sand of the sea; therefore my words have been rash".

As with the previous example the matters for comment are located in the second hemistich; but before proceeding to these, it is appropriate to note the unusual spelling of the particle לְפָנֵי, 'for', which of course represents the Hebrew לְפָנִי. (26). The element of the Hebrew text which has brought forth comment is the translation of לְפָנֵי, 'rave, speak rashly', by the Peshitta's לְפָנִי, 'restrained'. In his commentary Clines has noted that the KJV has derived לְפָנֵי from לְפָנֵי, 'to swallow, swallow down'; whereas most modern scholars derive the verbal form from לְפָנֵי, 'talk wildly', and it is this etymology that is to be denoted in the RSV's translation as given above. (27). From a study of the versions, however, it would seem
that, with the exception of the text of G which has ϕαυλα, 'evil, wrong' (from ϕάυλος), they derived their understanding of ἴλιον from ἴλιον 1, since the Targum has ἴλιον, 'abandoned, exhausted'; so that the Syriac translator followed that understanding of the Hebrew text, causing him to render: ך"ןב, 'restrained'.

Verse 4

כִּי צִרֵי שֵׁיָּם, אַשְׁרָה חַםְתָה יְהֹוָה רוֹחִי, עַדֶּשֶׁהוּ אֵלֹהִים אֲרוֹכֶם.

"For the arrows of the Almighty are in me;
my spirit drinks their poison;
the terrors of God are arrayed against me".

מַסֵּל מְאָרוֹרָת, הַסִּכָּנָה בְּרֶשֶׁת, יְהוֹוָה שְׁחַי אַלֹהִים.

"For the arrows of the Almighty are in my flesh;
their venom drinks up my spirit;
and the terrors of God have terrified me".

A comparison of the texts reveals that there are matters for comment in all three hemistichs of this verse. In the first hemistich the Hebrew Bible has used the particle רָגוּם, 'with me', to indicate that the arrows of the Almighty are not only with Job, but in him. The Syriac translator would appear to have had difficulty with this
particle, since following the text of G, which has εν τω σώματι
μου ἐστιν, he has rendered 'ισόμι, 'in my flesh'. It may be, of
course, that the Syriac translator has produced this rendering of the
Hebrew text because he simply preferred the text of G to that of the
Hebrew Bible for stylistic reasons. When the translations of the
second hemistich are compared it can be seen that the Peshitta has
inverted the order of the MT. That is, that the object of the
participle in the MT, ἐνανίον, 'their poison', has been taken by the
Peshitta as the subject of the same participle. The Peshitta is not
alone in this, for Dhorme has noted that all the versions have done
this, with the exception of the Targum. (28). The reason for this
in the case of the Peshitta is not hard to find: it is that it has
either read a Hebrew text which did not have the relative της, or it
has chosen to ignore it altogether. Thus the rendering of the
Peshitta at this point reads: "their venom drinks up my spirit"; in
the Syriac text there is no doubt that 'νις, 'my spirit', is the
object of νις, 'drinks', since it is indicated by the nota
accusativa. In the third hemistich the differences are to be noted
in the final verbal word which each text uses. In the MT this is
imperfect Qal 'הָיוֹלַי', 'arrayed against me'; whereas the Peshitta
has used the perfect Pa'el 'יִמַּלכְכ, 'made afraid, terrified'. Dhorme
has explained this apparent discrepancy as a corruption of the text,
which should in fact be 'נָלַח, 'set in order'. (29). Thus
understood, the Peshitta has in fact produced a text which, in its
third hemistich, is virtually identical to that of the MT.
Verse 7

"My appetite refuses to touch them;
they are as food that is loathsome to me".

"My soul is weary of its troubles;
moreover my affliction wails like a drunkard".

When the texts are compared it can be seen that they differ widely,
at least in sense. By common consent of the commentators this is a
difficult verse; moreover, they are divided as to its exact meaning.
Our concern here, however, is to attempt to reconstruct the method
by which the Syriac translator interpreted the Hebrew text. The
first hemistich of the MT begins with the verbal form אֲנִית, 'refuse',
which may be parsed as 3rd fem sing perf Qal of the root: אֶת, 'to
refuse'. The first verbal form is then succeeded by a second:
אֲנִית, 'to touch', which is of course the preposition על + inf cons
of the verb אֵן, 'to touch'. The second verbal form is followed by
the subject of the first: אֲנֵית, 'my appetite'. Hartley has noted
that the noun אֲנֵית means literally 'the throat', and so by extension
also can be taken to mean 'the appetite'. (30). In the text of the
Peshitta the first hemistich
likewise begins with the verbal form הָנָה, 'is weary', which may be parsed as 3rd fem sing perf Pe'el of the root וָה, 'be irksome, grow weary'. The Syriac translator has in this construction used the cognate root אוֹ, which in Hebrew means 'refuse' but in Syriac means 'to be weary'. It would appear that he has understood the next verbal construction: שְׁלַל, 'to touch', as the object of the verb אוֹ, 'refuse'. He has taken the preposition י as the nota accusativa י, which is common in Aramaic but rare in Hebrew (although the book of Job may be said to abound with examples of it). He has further understood the inf cons שִלָל, 'touch', as the noun שִלָל, 'plague', which he has rendered by the Syriac noun מִלָל, 'troubles'. He has read the noun 'מִל in its normal sense of 'my soul', and has also taken the trouble to reposition it next to the verb אוֹ and thus made the text regular in its order and syntax.

The above reconstruction shows how the Syriac translator arrived at his rendering: "My soul is weary of its troubles". When it comes to the second hemistich a similar reconstruction is necessary in order to understand the method of the translator. In the MT the second hemistich begins with the pronoun נָה, 'they', which the Syriac translator has assumed to be a verbal form, נָה, 'to make an uproar', and so has rendered נָה, which may be parsed as masc sing Ap'el participle of the root נָה, 'to wail'. He has accurately represented the inseparable preposition י, by the Syriac יְ, 'like'. He has read the noun 'יָ, 'indisposition', as the noun יָ, 'drunkard'; and, finally, he has taken the noun 'יָ, 'my bread', from the root יָ, 'to fight',
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which has caused him to render 'my affliction, combat'. The above reconstruction has shown the steps by which the Syriac translator has arrived at a rendering somewhat different from the MT, and which is totally independent of the versions.

Verse 9

לְאֵל אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יַרְדְּכָנֵנִי

"that it would please God to crush me,
that he would let loose his hand and cut me off'.

וַאֲמִ֫יקָנוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יֵשָׁחֵךְ אָנְשֵׁנִי

"so that God would acquiesce and cleanse me,
so that he would stretch out his hand and perfect me".

An examination of the texts reveals that, as far as the sense is concerned, they are somewhat different. In the first hemistich of the MT, the first verbal form that is encountered is that of יֵשַּׁחַךְ, 'to resolve, intend', which, as Dhorme has noted is the Hiphil of the root יֵשַּׁחָל 2, 'resolve, intend', with י before the dependent verb (31). This verbal form is represented in the Peshitta by the Ethpe`el of the root יֵשַּׁחַךְ, 'acquiesce'; this must be judged as being a fairly accurate rendering of the Hebrew text. In the MT the dependent verb is introduced by י, to which has been attached the
for 'crush'. It is fairly certain that the Syriac translator has connected the form ʿḻḵḻḻ with the Aramaic root ʿḻḻ (ḻḻ), 'to clean, be cleansed from sin', and so has produced a rendering which is totally different from its meaning in the MT.

Thus, according to the Syrian scribe, the meaning of the prayer is not that Job should die, which is a fairly frequent request of his in Ch's 3-20, but that he should be restored to life. This interpretation is also to be detected in his rendering of the second hemistich. In the MT the second hemistich begins with the verbal form ʿḻḻ, 'loose', which may be parsed as 3rd masc sing jussive Hiphil of the root ʿḻḻ. In the Peshitta this is represented by the imperfect Peʿal ʿḻḻ, 'stretch out', which may be judged as being a fairly accurate translation of the Hebrew text. In the MT the final verbal form is that of ʿḻḻ, 'cut off'; in the Peshitta, however, the root ʿḻḻ is represented by the form ʿḻḻ, 'perfect'. This latter form ʿḻḻ may be parsed as the 3rd masc sing imperfect Shaph'el of the root ʿḻḻ, 'perfect, finish'; yet one has to concede that it is difficult to trace the translator's technique in the rendering of the root ʿḻḻ. One possibility, however, is to note that the Targum's exegesis here, 'may he free his hand and enrich me', is based on a play of words between the root ʿḻḻ, 'crush', and the noun ʿḻḻ, 'gain'. It is, however, more likely that the Syriac translator had to choose the verbal root ʿḻḻ in order to conform to the positive aspect that he had given to the prayer in his rendering of the first hemistich. If such is the case, it provides a logical explanation of his positive rendering of what is
in the MT a negative prayer.

Verse 10

This would be my consolation;
I would even exult in pain unsparing;
for I have not denied the words of the Holy One".

And it would again be my consolation;
and I would be perfected again in strength without measure;
because I have not been unfaithful to the discourses of the Holy One".

Since the main differences, at least as far as sense is concerned,
are to be observed in the second hemistich, comment will be reserved
for that part of the verse. The Syriac translator, in his attempt
to construct a regular text, has repeated the ייוי, 'still, again' of
the first hemistich of the MT, which he has represented by ייוי,
'again'. The interpretation of the imperfect conjunctive ייוי, 'and I will exult', posed a problem as much to the ancient
versions as it does to scholars to-day. Grabbe has noted that the usual procedure for its elucidation is to compare it with the identical word found in Mishnaic Hebrew. (32). Dhorme considers that this meaning (exult) is corroborated by the text of Q, which has ἡλλομην, 'leapt', and by the Targum, which has מָרַמ, 'rejoice'. (33). Grabbe considers that this versional attestation is still an open question; the rendering which the Syriac translator has provided is one which causes equal perplexity. (34). In the first instance it is necessary to note that he has taken the nomen unitatis ἀγαθ, 'birthpangs, pain', from the more common noun ἡπτ, 'force, strength'. It may be that he was influenced in this decision by the fact that he had interpreted this prayer more positively than its actual meaning in the MT. If such be the case, then he was also inclined to couch the second hemistich in more positive terms than in the Hebrew Bible. It is equally possible that he did not know the meaning of the imperfect conjunctive מָרַמ, and as a result was free to make of it what he would. In his rendering of the imperfect conjunctive מָרַמ, he has once again used the root מ, which here occurs in the Eshtaph'al conjugation with the meaning 'be perfected'. He has however, given a fairly accurate rendering of the locution מָרַמ מ, 'it does not spare', in his nominal translation: מַלְו מ, 'without measure'.
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Verse 16

"which are dark with ice, and where the snow hides itself",

"those who were afraid of the ice, upon them snow increases".

A cursory examination of the texts reveals that they are totally different in sense. In fact, of the texts studied thus far in this work, the greatest divergence between the versions and the MT is to be observed in this verse. The reason for this deviation is not hard to find; for, among the commentators, Dhorme has noted that the versions have failed to understand that the opening שלמה of the MT refers to the שלמה of v 15. (35). But it is not only in their interpretation of שלמה that the versions have misconstrued this verse, for, as Dhorme has once again noted, the Targum, Peshitta and Vulgate have all understood it as a kind of proverb; in this case it is somewhat difficult to fit it into the context. (36). The verse is best taken as a further amplification of v 15, in which Job's brethren are considered to be false, like a wadi stream. In the MT the first
hemistic begins with the Qal participle נָאָרָה, 'darken', which is represented in the Peshitta by יִדוּעַ יִרְשְׁוּה, 'those who were afraid'. It would appear that the Syriac translator has followed the text of G, which has understood נָאָרָה, in the sense of 'to fear', with its δισυλαξεῖντο. This sense is also to be observed in the Vulgate, which has timent, and it may be that such dependence may be explained by a common exegetical tradition, which has emanated from the Septuagint. The Peshitta's construction יִדוּעַ יִרְשְׁוּה is a good example of the verb נָאָרָה being combined with the participle in order to create a continuous past tense (cf. Noëdeke § 277). In the second hemistic the versions have mostly construed כְּהַנָּה, 'was hidden', with the Aramaic root כָּהַנ, 'be strong'. In his rendering of the Hebrew text the Syriac translator has supplied the form כָּהַנ, which may be taken either as a noun (Dhorme, Lamsa), or as a verb (Grabbe). Since the translation that the Syrian scribe has produced is fairly literal, in that he usually translates a verb by a Syriac verb, it is best to take כָּהַנ as a verb, as in the above translation.

Verse 18

"The caravans turn aside from their course; they go up into the waste and perish".
"The paths of their routes are entangled; they go up into the trackless waste and perish".

When the texts are compared it can be seen that the major differences are to be noted in the first hemistich, and comment will therefore be limited to that part of the verse. In the MT, the verse begins with the verbal form נשלל, 'turn aside', which is masc pl imperfect Niphal of the root נשל ל, and in that conjugation only occurs here in the Hebrew Bible. In the Peshitta נשלל is represented by the imperfect Ethpar‘al נשללנמל, 'be entangled', which may be judged to bring an altogether different nuance into the text of the book of Job. It should also be noted that the first hemistich in its entirety is translated in Payne-Smith's dictionary as: "let the paths of their ways be perplexed". (37). Following the Vulgate the Syriac translator has made מנסל the complement of משלל; it should further be noted that he has confused the noun מנסל, 'caravan', for the noun מנסול, 'way', which has brought into his translation an entirely different sense to that found in the MT. In the MT the first hemistich may be interpreted as a statement that the caravans have turned aside from their course; whereas in the Peshitta it is a statement about the nature of the paths, namely, that they are twisted or entangled.
Verse 19

"The caravans of Tema look,
the travellers of Sheba hope",

"who have looked to the routes of the south,
and waited for the paths of Sheba".

Only minor differences can be detected in this verse, so that only minimal comment is required. Unlike the texts of G and the Vulgate, the Syriac translator has correctly rendered לְמֹרֶת, 'look', by the perfect of the root הָרָת, 'look at', but has either rendered the initial ה as the relative ה, or he has supplied one. He has then construed מְלֹך הָרָת as the object of the verb לְמֹרֶת, and has indicated this in his text by the nota accusativa ᴷ. In the second hemistich of the verse he has taken מְלֹך הָרָת as a parallel term to מֹשֶה, which he took to be 'paths' and has accordingly rendered as מֶשֶׁת, 'paths'; this procedure may be justified, if it is remembered that מֶשֶׁת may mean 'ways' in Habb 3.6. As with the first hemistich he has made the construction מְלֹך מֶשֶׁת the object of the verb לְמֹרֶת, 'waited for'.
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Verse 26

"Do you think that you can reprove with words,
when the speech of a despairing man is wind".

"Behold you think you can reprove with words,
and you meditate against the spirit of my word."

From a comparison of the texts it can be seen that the major
differences of sense occur in the second hemistich, and comment will
therefore be limited to that part of the verse. The element on which
comment is desirable is the form פֶּקֶל, 'despairing'; it is best to
take this as masc sing Niphal participle of the root פָּקָל, 'to
despair'. Rignell has drawn attention to the fact that Brockelmann
has stated incorrectly in his lexicon that פָּקָל is a rendering of
the Hebrew פֶּקֶל. Rignell has further noted, correctly, that the
Syriac translator very likely did not understand the word, translated
it freely and rendered it without noting the Hebrew form "you are
penetrating" as a parallel to the earlier "you are thinking of".

(38). It is clear that the Syrian scribe has also repointed נָאָם as
a noun: 'my word'. Thus his rendering of the second hemistich is
based on his
tendency to paraphrase.

Verse 27

"You would even cast lots over the fatherless, and bargain over your friend".

"Behold you magnify yourselves against the fatherless, and make sad your friend".

A cursory examination of the texts reveals that in both hemistichs it is the verbal forms which have been rendered differently from those which they have in the Hebrew Bible. In the first hemistich of the MT, the verbal form is the Hiphil imperfect יִשָּׂרָא, 'cast', which, as Dhorme has noted, has no complement. (39). In these circumstances it is best to adopt the complement נִלְכָּל, 'lots', as in 1 Sam 14.42, a decision that is confirmed by the presence of the preposition בַּיָּה before the object. It is this lack of a complement in the first hemistich which has caused the Syriac translator to offer a paraphrase of the MT; in the first hemistich the Peshitta has a masc pl Palpal participle of the root וְלָל, 'magnify yourselves', which qualifies the action of the subject against the fatherless.
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A different procedure is adopted in the second hemistich. Dhorme has noted that, the Syriac translator has there interpreted the verbal form יִרְלָה as deriving from the Aramaic root יִרְלָה, 'be sad', which has caused him to use the Aph'el participle יִרְלָה in his rendering. (40).

It should be noted that, while there are different factors operating in the methodology of the Syriac translator in both parts of the verse, the resultant translation is a paraphrase.

Verse 29

סַבֶּךְ לָא אֶל-חַיֶּת, זְרֵה, יַעֲרֹתָה, בֹּה

"Turn, I pray, let no wrong be done.

Turn now, my vindication is at stake".

תַּנְבֵּךְ נְאַע חַיִּים זְרֵה יַעֲרֹתָה לְאָּל חַיִּים יַעֲרֹתָה בֹּה

"Turn now, I pray, and do not be as the wicked,

turn therefore, and be innocent".

As the differences between the texts are minor, only minimal comment will be required. In the first hemistich of the verse, the MT uses the jussive יְּרָא, 'let it be'; whereas the Syriac translator would appear to have read a true imperfect יְּרָא, 'you shall be'. The difference caused by such a reading is minimal, since the MT makes an
appeal to Job's friends to practise no wrong; whereas the text of the 
Peshitta urges them not to become like wicked men. In the MT the 
second hemistich begins with the form מֵרֵי, 'you return', but it is 
clear that the Syriac translator has followed the text of G and the 
Targum and read the Qere מֵרֵי, 'return'. The final comment that may 
be passed on the Peshitta's rendering of this verse is that it has 
treated the nominal form of the MT יָרְדָן, 'my vindication', as a verb יָרְדָן, 'be innocent, justified'. In Lamsa's translation of this 
verse, he has translated both occurrences of יָרְדָן as repent, which is 
possible but unlikely; in rendering the Hebrew text of Job, the 
translator was surely attempting to render it into one whose meaning 
was as near as possible to the Hebrew Bible, and not one which was 
overloaded with theological meaning, which must be considered to be 
absent from the text of Job.

Verse 30

"Is there any wrong on my tongue? 
Cannot my taste discern calamity"?

"Is there wickedness on my tongue,  
or does not my mouth speak truth"?
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An examination of the texts reveals that the major differences of sense are to be detected in the second hemistich; for that reason comment will be limited to that part of the verse. The Syriac translator, in his use of the noun ʿנְאָר, 'my mouth', has correctly understood the meaning of the Hebrew ʿנֶפֶשׁ, 'taste, palate'. He has rendered ʿנֶפֶשׁ, 'discerns', by the Pa'el participle ʿנֶפֶשׁ, 'speak', which may be described as a paraphrase of the Hebrew text. Finally he has rendered מָלָא, 'calamity', by the Syriac noun ʿנְוֶלֶח, 'truth', a decision made necessary by his rendering of v 28b: "I will speak in your presence, I will not lie". The probability is that the Syriac translator did not know the meaning of מָלָא, and so was guided in his choice of ʿנְוֶלֶח by the assertions of v 28. Thus, once again, what he has produced is a paraphrase of the text.
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Chapter Four

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 7.1-8.22
Chapter Seven

Verse 1

"Has not man a hard service upon the earth,
and are not his days like the days of a hireling"?

"Behold there is a time for man upon the earth,
and his days are like the days of a hireling".

The differences between the two texts are to be found mainly in the first hemistich, and for that reason comment will be limited to that part of the verse. One of the basic differences between the two translations is that the rendering of the MT is couched in interrogative language; whereas the Peshitta has taken the first hemistich, not as an interrogative, but as an assertion of a fact. This is due to the way the Syriac translator has rendered the particle $\chi\gamma$, 'is not'; he has rendered it with the particle $\chi\eta$, 'behold'. In his commentary Gordis has suggested a reason why this should be. He has noted that, in Rabbinic Hebrew, the particle $\chi\gamma$, without the interrogative $\eta$, becomes an emphatic 'indeed', and may often be omitted in translation. (1). Gordis goes on to argue that such a use should be permitted in Biblical Hebrew. While such
may be the case, could it not be that the Syrian scribe was aware of the nuance, and that it was this that caused him to render ∏י by ∏י? (for other examples of this characteristic of the Peshitta, cf translations of 4.6, 21.). It should further be noted that the Syriac translator has rendered the noun ∏י, 'army', by the Syriac noun ∏י, 'time'. Dhorme has argued that the noun ∏י, 'time', should have been followed by a complement: a term of military service. (2). Before coming to any conclusions however, it is best to consider the Syriac translator's renderings of the other examples of the noun ∏י in the book of Job. In fact the noun ∏י only occurs in two other places in the book of Job: 10.17 & 14.14. In 10.17 the RSV has translated this noun by the term 'hosts', and this is rendered by the Syriac translator as: ∏י, 'hosts'; whereas in 14.14 the RSV has used the term 'my service', while the Peshitta has rendered: ∏י, 'youth'. From this evidence, and from the example of 10.17 in particular, it seems clear that the Syriac translator knew the meaning of ∏י, and so what he has provided in 7.1 is a paraphrase of the text, from which the complement has been omitted.

Verse 2

"Like a slave who longs for the shadow, and like a hireling who looks for his wages,"
"and like a servant who waits for the shadow,
and like a hireling who expects to complete his labour",

In this verse the differences are to be detected in the second hemistich, and so it seems appropriate to restrict comment to that part of the verse. The word in the MT, which has caused the deviation between it and the Peshitta is: יְלִיָּה, 'wages'. In Hebrew this word may mean the actual deed of work, or, as in Job 7.2, the reward for doing the work, namely, wages. It should be noted that it also has this meaning in Jer 22.13. The text of G has understood it in this latter sense, as has the Targum, which has used the word שלוח. It is only the Syriac translator who has construed the noun lavor to convey the sense 'work'; and to achieve such a sense he has had to add the Pa'el infinitive תמך, 'to complete'. Finally it should be noted that the Syriac translator has used the Pa'el participle צרי to render the imperfect עֵמִּי, 'pant, long for', as well as the imperfect עֵמִי, 'wait, expect'. Thus, once again, we may conclude that the Syriac translator has provided a paraphrase of the text.

Verse 3
"so I am allotted months of emptiness, 
and nights of misery are apportioned to me".

"So I have inherited months of emptiness, 
but wearisome nights are not reckoned to me".

A cursory examination reveals that the major differences of sense are to be located in the second hemistich. There are in fact only two matters that require comment: (a) the interpretation of נְפָרְסָא as a Pual; and (b) the insertion of the negative ה. These will now be considered in order.

(a) The interpretation of נְפָרְסָא as a Pual

It is clear from a casual reading of the Peshitta that the translator has read נְפָרְסָא as a Pual, 'apportioned', since he has rendered it by the Ethpe'el of the cognate root נָפֵר, 'reckoned'. This is a possible reading of the MT, since it only requires alteration of the pointing, and no change in the consonants.

(b) The Insertion of the Negative ה

Since there is no manuscript or textual evidence for such an
insertion, the conclusion is inescapable that this is due to an error of the Syrian scribe. His mistake would appear to be due to dittoigraphy; i.e. he has mistakenly repeated the last two letters of the form כַּלֵּנָה, 'weariness', which have in turn produced the negative כֹּל.

Verse 4

"When I lie down I say, 'When shall I arise'? But the night is long, and I am full of tossing till the dawn".

"If I lie down I say, 'When shall I arise'? But I am stretched out until the evening, and I lie tossing until the early dawn".

When the two texts are compared, it can easily be seen that the major differences of sense are located in the second and third hemistichs. For that reason comment will be limited to these parts of the verse. The element that has caused the difficulty in the second hemistich is the form: laughed, which in the MT is pointed as
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a perfect Piel. As Dhorme has noted in his commentary, this form has yielded a great number of explanations by commentators. (3).

BDAG attributes to this form the meaning of 'extend, continue', and notes that its subject is the יל, 'evening'. The difficulty with this is twofold: (a) the normal meaning of יל is 'measure'; (b) the meaning of יל has to be attributed to יל. These difficulties may be overcome, when it is remembered that (a) The Hithpael of יל occurs in 1 Kings 17.21 with the meaning of 'stretched out'; (b) יל occurs with the meaning of יל in Prov 7.9. As far as the Syriac translator is concerned, he has clearly understood יל in the sense of 'stretched out', since he has rendered יל by the participle יפ, which normally means 'anoint', but also has a secondary meaning of 'extend, stretch out'. He has not, however, understood יל as the subject of this verb, but the object, which he has indicated by the nota accusativa י. He has assumed that the subject of יפ is the same as the subject of the first hemistich, namely, Job, which he has indicated in his text by the pronoun ים. In the third hemistich the translator does not appear to have understood the meaning of יפ, 'full of', since he has replaced the verb with the participle יפ, 'lie down'. The verb יפ is normally taken as a 'stative' verb, which can be translated in English by the present tense; the Syriac translator however, has not used a verb, but a participle, to indicate this nuance in Syriac. It is worthy of note that the third hemistich in its entirety is translated by Payne-Smith in his dictionary as: "I lie tossing until the morning". (4).
Verse 5

"My flesh is clothed with worms and dirt;
my skin hardens, then breaks out afresh".

A cursory examination of the two texts reveals some differences, which may be defined as:

(1) the interpretation of פ"ע by פלשה;

(2) the interpretation of ליע by ליעלפ;

(3) the interpretation of א"ע by א"עמא;

it seems appropriate to consider these in order.

(1) The Interpretation of פ"ע by פלשה
As Dhorme has noted in his commentary, the meaning of יד, Qere יד, is that of 'clod, glebe', which has been attached to the word יד, 'dust', and is necessary to specify the clod of earth, for in Mishnaic Hebrew יד means rather 'curd' (of milk). These clods of earth are of course the dirty scabs which, like a garment, cover the body of the sick man. (5). It would appear that the Syriac translator has here read יד, since he has rendered it by the word 'גוזה', 'my body'. As there would appear to be no other versional support for such a reading of the MT, one has to conclude that, as in other cases, the Syrian scribe has merely given a paraphrase of the text (due here to his ignorance of the exact meaning of יד). He may have been assisted in this by his desire to construct a text which would have the elements of good parallelism: "My flesh is clothed with worms and my body with dust". In so doing he has not done justice to the skin condition of Job, which the text seeks to define.

(2) **The Interpretation of יד by יד**

Clines has noted in his commentary that the verb יד is of uncertain derivation. (6). BDB has taken it to be cognate with Ethiopian רגה', 'congeal', and proposes the meaning: 'hardens'. (7). Dhorme, however, has noted the connection between יד and יד in 26.12, and as a result he has translated יד as 'break, shatter', and יד as 'splits'. (8). The former understanding of יד is reflected in the translation of RSV; while the latter is to be noted.
in the translations of NEBmg, NAB, JB, NIV. In his rendering of this verb the Syriac translator has used the form ܢ ﻪ، 'shrinks', which, as Payne-Smith has noted in his dictionary, is an old form of the preterite. (9). In his grammar Noldeke has noted that the form ܢ ﻪ represents the only certain remains of a perfect in o, and that this form is to be found in the Peshitta here, as well as in 30.3; in Lamentations 4.8; in Psalm 119.120. (10). In his elucidation of this form the Syriac translator received no help from the versions: G has read ܢ ﻪ instead of ܢ ﻪ, causing him to render ـــ; while the Targum has used ـــ, 'trembled', to render ܢ ﻪ. Thus it is best to conclude that the Syriac translator has simply guessed at the meaning of ܢ ﻪ and with the understanding that the text was saying something about Job's festering skin condition, provided a paraphrase with the form ܢ ﻪ.

(3) The Interpretation of ܐ ܐ by ܐ ܐ

In his commentary Gordis has noted that the form ܐ ܐ, whose root is ܐ ܐ, is a metaplastic form of ܐ ܐ, 'melt'. (11). The Syriac translator has correctly made this connection, although his deduction may be based on the text of G, which has ܐ ܐ. He has translated ܐ ܐ, 'flow', with the imperfect Ethpe'el ܐ ܐ, which may mean 'rot, decay', and may be judged to be a correct interpretation of the MT. All in all, his rendering of this verse may be judged to be a paraphrase, in line with his usual practice.
"Remember that my life is a breath;  
my eye will never again see good".

"Remember that the Spirit is living,  
and my eye will again see good".

The text has been included in those verses upon which comment will be offered, because, at least in its second hemistich, it in fact means the exact opposite of its meaning in the MT. In the first hemistich the Syriac translator would appear to have read 'ן, 'living', instead of 'ייו, 'my life'; this factor in itself has caused him to restructure the clause, so that instead of making a qualification about Job's life (my life), it makes a qualifying statement about the Spirit, namely, that it is living. It would seem that in this passage the scribe is making a doctrinal assertion about the Spirit, and Rignell has detected Christian influence here.

(12). In the second hemistich the Syriac scribe has omitted the negative ו, so that the clause means the exact opposite of its meaning in the MT. In point of fact the Syriac translator does not have a good record with negatives; for either he inserts them as in
7.3 above (cf p 136), or he omits them as here. Otherwise, he has provided a fairly accurate rendering of the Hebrew Bible.

Verse 6

לָאֶתֵּנָה, עֵינֶי לָהֶם עֵינָי לְךָ אֵלֶּה

"The eye of him who sees me will behold me no more;
while thy eyes are upon me, I shall be gone".

לָאֶתֵּנָה לְךָ עֵינֶי מֵעַלָּה, עֵינֶי לָּהֶם אֵלֶּה.

"The eyes of him who sees me will rejoice no more;
your eyes are upon me, and I am gone".

As the main differences of sense are contained in the first hemistich, comment will be restricted to that part of the verse. In the first hemistich, the MT has used two verbs to denote the action of seeing, these are: (a) רָאָא, 'gaze, look at', and (b) רָעָא, 'see'. They are distinguished in the above translation by the English words 'see', and 'behold'. It would seem that the Syriac translator has mistaken the first of these verbs, רָאָא, 'gaze, look at', for the verb רָעָא, 'sing, rejoice', and it is this mistake which has caused him to use the Syriac verb חַג, 'rejoice'. Otherwise he has produced a fairly accurate translation of the MT.
Verse 10

"he returns no more to his house,
    nor does his place know him any more".

"he does not again return to his house,
    nor does he recognise his place any more".

As the major difference of sense is located in the second hemistich, it seems appropriate to limit the comment to this. Dhorme has noted that the versions have rendered this verse well. (13). The only caveat against that statement is that the Syriac translator has taken יִרְאוֹן as the object of the verb יָרֹא, whereas in the MT it is, of course, the subject. This is confirmed by the presence of the suffix יָרֹא, attached to the end of the verb. The Syriac translator has construed that the suffix יָרֹא, of the noun יִרְאוֹן, has indicated that it is the object of יָרֹא, and he has made this clear in his text by the nota accusativa יָרֹא. In doing so he has altered the sense of the verse. In passing it should be noted that he has chosen to render the imperfect Hiphil יָרֹא by the Eshtaph'el participle יָרֹא, which achieves an exact correspondence of sense between the texts.
Verse 13

"When I say, 'my bed will comfort me,
my couch will ease my complaint'.

"For I said, 'you will comfort me.
and I will be consoled from the vexation of my couch'.

A cursory examination reveals that there are substantial differences of sense in all parts of this verse. These may be tabulated as follows:

(1) the omission of יְשָׁרֵי;

(2) the interpretation of רַשִּׁים by בָּלָהָא;

(3) the provision of הַנַּה;

(4) the interpretation of יִשְׁבַּע by קְלַלָּא;

(5) the grammatical nature of יְשָׁרֵי;
and will now be considered in order.

(1) The Omission of 'יְלָע

In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has omitted the noun 'יְלָע, 'my bed', which in the MT is the subject of the verb 'רָפָא', 'comfort'. (14). This omission has in itself no versional support, but is probably due to the fact that the Syrian scribe did not know the meaning of the word. The reason for this is unlikely to have been that he read an extant Hebrew text which did not have 'יְלָע. The omission has caused the translator to render 'רָפָא as a 2nd masc sing imperfect (with the implied subject being God himself), and not as in the MT, a 3rd fem sing imperfect.

(2) The Interpretation of כַּכּ by לַע

Dhorme has again noted that in his interpretation of the MT, the Syriac translator has followed the text of G. (15). This becomes clear when we consider the subject of the verb כַּכּ in the MT, which is of course 'לַע, 'my couch'. The Greek translator has read כַּכּ as כַּכּ, and this is represented in his text by the verb אָדוֹלָה. The Syriac translator has followed this interpretation of the MT, and as a result has used the Ethpa'el לַע, 'be consoled, comforted'; which in itself means that the subject is no longer 'לַע, 'my couch', but Job himself.
(3) **The Provision of 'In**

The change in subject referred to above has meant that the form of the MT, 'חנ', must no longer be considered to be the only object of the verb חפ, but has been construed by the Syriac translator as a construct plural in conjunction with ח'נ. This effectively means that the construct ח'נ חנ, 'vexation of my couch', is now considered to be the object of the verb חַנ, and to make this clear, the Syriac translator has provided the preposition ח, 'from'.

(4) **The Interpretation of 'חנ' by ח'נ**

In his rendering of the second hemistich the Syriac translator has considered ח'נ to be a construct plural, and to translate it he has used the noun ח'נ, 'vexation, anguish'. This rendering may be said to be without any support from the other versions, and is surely based on guesswork. The idea that is now being presented in the text is that Job's bed is a place of vexation, presumably from lack of sleep. This idea is of course present in v 4 of this chapter, where Job is complaining of insomnia, but is quite the opposite of the Hebrew text, since what he says here is hypothetical in character.

(5) **The Grammatical Nature of ח'נ**

It is, finally, necessary to re-iterate that ח'נ has been taken by
the Syriac translator, not as the subject of מֵא, but as the object in construct with מֵא.

Verse 15

"so that I would choose strangling
and death rather than my bones".

"and you have separated my life from destruction,
and my bones from death".

Once again an inspection of the two texts reveals substantial differences of sense between them. In the MT the form מָנַה may be understood as waw consecutive + 3rd fem sing imperfect גאל, whose subject is the feminine noun מַלְאָל, 'soul, life'. Blommerde in his work puts forward a convincing argument that it is best to translate מַלְאָל, as 'throat, neck', since it accords better with the noun מַלְאָל, 'strangulation'. (16). The Syriac translator, who here follows the text of ג, has understood מָנַה, not as 3rd fem sing as in the MT, but as 2nd masc sing: 'you have separated', whose object is מַלְאָל, 'my life'. To regularise the text he has inverted the order of מַלְאָל & מַלְאָל; he has understood the former noun
in the sense of יָתִי הָא, which is represented in his text as הָא הָא, 'from destruction'. It is more than likely that he did not know the meaning of יָתִי הָא, which has caused the paraphrase thus offered. In Syriac the root יָתִי means 'to test, prove', and only secondarily carries the meaning of 'choose'; the text which he has constructed is thus somewhat difficult to render in English, and the translation offered is with the word 'separate', since separation may also carry the thought of testing, proving, in the process of such separation. In the second hemistich he has taken the noun יָתִי הָא, 'my bones' as the subject of the verb יָתִי, presumably because he has construed it to be in parallelism with יָתִי; he has assumed that the remainder of the text denotes that God is promising Job that his bones will be saved from death, and has indicated this in his text by the construction יָתִי הָא. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syriac text יָתִי הָא is in agreement with the text of G (b).

(17).

**Verse 16**

"I loathe my life; I would not live for ever.
Let me alone, for my days are as a breath".
"I am on the point of giving up; I would not live for ever.
Go away from me, for my days are empty".

From an examination of the two texts it can be seen that the major
differences of sense are to be found in the first hemistich, so that
it is appropriate to restrict comment to it. Nearly all the
commentators have found difficulty with נוּץ, since, if it carries
its usual meaning of 'despise, reject', it requires some such
complement as "יָאָרָה, 'my life', which would produce the rendering: "I
abhor my life". It would seem that this is the interpretation which
has been adopted by the RSV, which translates: "I loathe my life".
Another possibility is noted by Clines, who considers that נוּץ may
be a metaplastic form of מַכְלֶה, 'melt, despair', and is to be detected
in the translation of the NEB: "I am in despair". (18). It would
seem that the Syriac translator understood the verb in this latter
sense, since he has used the form נוֹּלְחָה, 'give up, be weary, be low
spirited', which, as Payne-Smith has noted, may be used in an
impersonal way. (19). The root נוֹלְחָה thus used gives an excellent
rendering of the MT, since it brings out the nuance which is intended
by נוּץ. It may be that the Syriac translator was influenced in his
exegetical decision by the rendering of the Targum, which has used
the Pa'al דַּעַה, 'to abominate, loathe'; but it should further be
noted that the Targum has used the Pa'al דַּעַה to render the Hebrew
root דַּעַה in Jer 2.37.
Verse 17

"What is man, that thou dost make so much of him,
and that thou dost set thy mind upon him",

"What is man, that you destroy him,
and that you set your mind upon him",

The examination of the above two texts reveals that the major differences of sense are located in the first hemistich, so comment will be restricted to that. In the first hemistich the MT has used the imperfect Piel of the root הָיָה, 'make so much of, make great'; whereas the Peshitta has used the imperfect Aphel of the root הָיָה, 'destroy'. It can be seen, therefore, that whereas the MT makes a positive statement about man, the Peshitta makes a negative one. Dhorme has noted, following Beer, that this rendering may be the result of reading יָּשָׁה or יָּשָׁה. (20). There is, however, no extant Hebrew text which witnesses to such a reading, so that Dhorme postulates that this may a corruption of a derivative form of חָל, a verb to which the Syro-hexaplar version has recourse in order to translate the text of G: ἐμπαλαλον = MT יָּשָׁה. (21). The conjugation to which Dhorme is
referring would appear to be the Palpel, whose 2nd masc sing imperfect + 3rd masc sing suff is: יָדַּעְתִּי. From a comparison of the two forms it can be seen that, although they are fairly similar, major surgery is needed to make them into יָדַעְתִּי. The corruption to which Dhorme doubtless refers may be reconstructed as follows: (1) the first י has been omitted, perhaps by scribal error; (2) the letters י + י have been inverted, and the י has been mis-read as a י (a possible conjecture in Syriac, since both letters are the same apart from the above the י). This explanation, although conjectural, would seem to justify Dhorme's assertion that the text which the Syrian scribe read was corrupted, either before the translator read it, or as he read it. Otherwise, the text which the translator has produced is one which accurately renders the text of the Hebrew Bible.

Verse 20

הָאָתָם, מָהּ אָבַעְתִּי לָךְ נָצַּר הַמַּעֲשִׂים חֵם שָׁמְשִׁים לָמוּשׁ לִפְתֹּר עֵלָּיָּה לִמָּשׁ

"If I sin, what do I do to thee, thou watcher of men? Why hast thou made me thy mark? Why have I become a burden to thee"?
"If I have sinned, what am I doing to you, you maker of men? Why have you appointed me that I might encounter you? You have become a burden to me".

A close examination of these two texts reveals that there are substantial differences of sense between them. In the first hemistich the Syriac translator has once again followed the text of G, which has: אָֽיִּן אֶ֧לֶּה הַמֲּוֹרָ֖ם, and has provided the particle 'if'. The particle 'if' is of course absent from the MT; but there is a good case for supplying it, since, as Clines has noted, there is an almost identical line in the mouth of Elihu, which is introduced by 'if'. (22). In his comments on the interpretation of the versions, Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator connected ילֵי, 'watcher', with the root יָסָר, 'to form, create', and has thus rendered יֵלַע וְּרַ֥וָן, 'maker of men'. (23). In the second hemistich he has provided an almost literal rendering of the Hebrew text, with the exception of יִֽדְיָשׁ. Dhorme has noted that the hapax legomenon יִֽדְיָשׁ conveys the idea of what is encountered, what one hits or strikes, ie. the target. (24). The Syriac translator has retained this idea (which may be said to be latent in the MT), by using the same verb יִֽדְיָשׁ, 'I should encounter'. The idea thus described in his text is almost the same as that in the MT, the only difference being that the MT uses a nominal construction, whereas the
Peshitta has a verbal one. In the final hemistich the Syrian scribe would appear to have constructed a text which says the opposite of the MT. As the Peshitta has been translated above, the form מִנִּי must be understood to be the 2nd masc sing of the root הָנֵן, 'to be'; the only translation possible with such an understanding is: "you have become a burden to me". It should be noted that he has not followed the text of G, which correctly understood וַיִּלְךָ, as one of the eighteen tiqqune sopherim 'corrections of the scribes', and accordingly rendered מִנִּי. Therefore, since he has retained וַיִּלְךָ, 'to me', the only other possibility is to take מִנִּי, as 1st pers sing, and to translate: "I have become a burden to myself". Since the form מִנִּי is ambiguous, it is impossible to tell which reading the scribe intended; however, if we consider the literal nature of the translation which the scribe has provided, it may be that the latter reading is the one he meant to convey.

Verse 21

"Why dost thou not pardon my transgression and take away my iniquity? For now I shall lie in the earth; thou wilt seek me, but I shall not be".
"How long will you not forgive my wrongs
and take away my sins?
For now I shall lie upon the earth;
you will seek me, but I shall be no more".

As the Syriac translator has produced a rendering which very accurately mirrors the MT, only a few comments are necessary. In the first hemistich the interrogative pronoun יָּנָּא, 'why', has been rendered by a compound preposition אֶתָּלְתָּנַח, 'how long'. This seems to imply that the translator considered that the meaning of the text was that God was delaying his forgiveness and mercy to Job. He has rendered the noun יָּשֶׁפֶל, 'my transgression', by the Syriac equivalent יִרְבּוּל, which literally means 'my guilt, debt', and is a common way of describing sin in the Targum. It is interesting to note that he has not rendered the nota accusativa יָּנָּא of the first hemistich, but has instead prefixed the Syriac equivalent ח to the previous noun יָּשֶׁפֶל.

In the second hemistich the only matter deserving comment is the negation יִנְיָח יִמְלָי, 'but I shall be no more': Nödeke has noted in his grammar that the negation יִמְלָי, when followed by the independent personal pronoun, as in 7.21, is a somewhat rare construction.
Chapter Eight

In this chapter the Syriac translator has effected an exceptionally literal and accurate rendering, with the result that not many verses need comment. However, the following verses are treated in the usual fashion:

Verse 11

"Can Papyrus grow where there is no marsh?
Can reeds flourish where there is no water"?

"Can a marsh increase in a thirsty place,
or can reeds sprout where there is no water"?

Since the only difference to be detected between the texts is located in the first hemistich, comment will be limited to it. The Syriac translator has misunderstood the meaning of הָאָרֶץ, 'marsh'. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syrian scribe has confused הָאָרֶץ, 'papyrus', with בַּיָּד, 'reedy pool, muddy pool', and so has rendered בַּיָּד נֶפֶשׁ by הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ, 'in a dry or thirsty land'. (26). The answer to the problem would seem to lie in the area of
lexicography, since the Hebrew language has used two different words to describe (1) a papyrus = חן & (2) a reedy pool = דלך; whereas according to Payne-Smith, the Syriac language uses one word to cover both, namely, חנן, 'pool, standing water; reed, especially Egyptian papyrus'. (27). It is this factor which has caused the Syriac translator to understand חנן, 'papyrus', as חנן, 'marsh', and to render: "can a marsh increase in a thirsty place"; he would then appear to have understood the noun חנן as the preposition ב + חנן, and consequently rendered חנן חנן.

**Verse 16**

לכ חנן לעין שמש על המנה יuffed חנן

"He thrives before the sun,
and his shoots spread over his garden".

חנן חנן חנן

"He is like green vegetation before the sun,
----------------------------------------"

From the customary examination of the two texts it can be seen that substantial differences exist between them, even if these differences are due to the text of the Peshitta being incomplete---at least as far as the second hemistich is concerned. In the first hemistich the
MT has used the *hapax legomenon* יב, 'full of sap', the cognate root of which has been preserved not only by the Syriac translator, but also by the Targumist. Although the root יב occurs in Aramaic, Arabic & Akkadian, it is only used twice in the Hebrew Bible: in 24.8 the imperfect *Qal יב יב*, 'be wet', is to be found, while in the passage under immediate discussion the adjective יב, 'full of sap', is used. In the Peshitta, the Syriac translator has used the form יב יב, 'moisture, green vegetation', which is qualified by the particle י י, 'like'. The preposition י י, 'before', has been correctly identified by the Syrian scribe, who has used י here.

Gordis has noted that the phrase י י י י י י י Y means 'even under the hot sun', and that this rendering is corroborated by the text of G and the Peshitta. (28). His translation may be appropriate, but it is not supported by either the text of G, or that of the Peshitta. The second hemistich is represented in the above translation by a series of --------, which indicates, as Dhorme has noted, that the second hemistich has fallen out of the text of Peshitta, and that this omission is due to haplography. (29). It is worth noting that Lamsha, in his translation of the Peshitta, has provided the second hemistich thus: "and his roots shall rest in a ground liable to be washed away"; but this text has been made up from the first hemistich of v17, which in turn means that v 17 in his translation is only composed of one hemistich. (30).
Verse 17

"His roots twine about the stoneheap;
he lives among the rocks".

"His roots shall be supported upon the waves;
he shall see his house of stones".

A cursory examination of the texts reveals that they are somewhat different in sense. Dhorme has noted that, in the first hemistich, the Syriac translator has interpreted ÿî, 'heap of stones', as the plural ÿî, 'waves'. (31). The only alternative to this is to follow Lamse in his translation of ÿî by the word ÿî, 'ground liable to be flooded'. (32). The only difficulty with such a proposal is that, according to Payne-Smith, the only attested plural form of the noun is that of the emphatic state, whose consonantal form is identical to its singular. (33). It is clear that his translation of ÿî, 'entwined', by the form ÿî, 'supported, rest', is only a guess at what the MT meant, since he did not know what it meant, and derived no help from the versions. He has, however, produced a literal rendering of the second hemistich, which is as ambiguous in Syriac as it is in
Hebrew.

Verse 16

"If he is destroyed from his place,
then it will deny him, saying, 'I have never seen you'".

"If he is uprooted from his place,
then it will deny him and say to him, 'I have not seen you'".

When the two texts are compared, it can be seen that there are a few differences of sense between them. These differences may be defined as:

(1) the interpretation of נָעַשֶׂה הָאָדָם by וַיִּשְׁכַּב

(2) the addition of לָהֶם לָא

these will now be considered in turn.
Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has interpreted the root יפל, 'swallow, destroy', by the Syriac ימע, 'uproot'. (34). There would appear to be no rational explanation for this, and in the absence of one, it must be assumed that he was engaged in his usual practice of paraphrasing. In this text the Targum has used the root ייהו, which is the Safel of ייה, but which carries the same meaning as יפל, namely, 'swallow, ruin'. Mangan, in his translation of the Targum of Job, renders the verb by 'uproot', but there appears to be no justification for this. (35).

(2) The Addition of יי היחי

Dhorme has once again noted that the Syriac translator has supplied a formula of introduction to the direct speech, which is of course absent from the MT, although it may be said to be implied. (36). As the Vulgate also has et dicet, this would appear to be one of those occasions in which the Syrian scribe has followed that version.

Verse 19

עַל הַחַיָּה מְשַׁפֶּשׁ רִבְכָּה וּמְעַפֶּר אָדָר יָמָּה
"Behold, this is the joy of his way;
and out of the earth others will spring".

"Behold, it is he who examines all his ways;
and from the dust others will sprout".

The usual examination reveals that the differences of sense are located in the first hemistich, so that comment will be restricted to that part of the verse. Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator would appear to have read a text which had רָאָמ, 'feel through, grope', and so by extension to mean: 'to examine by touching'. (37). The advantage of such a reading is that the imperfect Piel נָרַס already occurs in Job 5.14, and again in Job 12.25. While such an interpretation of the MT certainly remains a possibility, it is rendered doubtful by the fact that it carries no other versional support. Thus we may conclude that the Syriac translator was merely guessing when he produced this rendering.

Verse 21

"He will yet fill your mouth with laughter,
and your lips with shouting".

-162-
"until your mouth is filled with laughter,
and your lips with songs of praise".

A cursory examination reveals that the only differences of sense, are to be located in the first hemistich, so that it is appropriate to restrict comment to that part of the verse. It is clear that the Syriac translator has understood the particle יָד as 'until', (not as יָד, 'yet') and he has made this clear in his text by the Syriac preposition כּ. Dhorme has noted that the translator has understood the active form רֵחַ as an imperfect Niphal, since he has rendered it by the imperfect Ethpə'el רֵחֶנְי, 'to be filled'. (38).

Such an interpretation is confirmed by the Hebrew text of Ps 126.2, which also uses the imperfect Niphal to express a similar concept. This reading has also been adopted by the Vulgate, which has impleatur, and this may be another instance where the Peshitta has been influenced by the Vulgate.
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Chapter Five

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 9.1-10.22
Chapter Nine

Verse 2

"Truly I know that it is so:
But how can a man be just before God"?

"Truly I know that it is so;
but a man cannot be declared innocent before God".

When the two texts are examined it can be seen that there are differences of sense between them, especially in the second hemistich. The difference in sense is that the Syriac translator has taken the interrogative ܗܢ in the sense of the negative ܟ; how can this apparent difficulty be resolved? The answer is to be found in the use of ܗܢ in Arabic, where ܗܢ is used constantly in the sense of not. BDB has noted that the transition from the interrogative to the negative, to which in Hebrew there is an approximation, is in Arabic complete (since that language uses ܗܢ constantly in the sense of not).

(1). It may that the Syrian scribe was aware of such a nuance in pre-Islamic Arabic or in early Arabic poetry. However, Dhorme has noted that the Vulgate also renders ܗܢ

-167-
by a negative, so that the possibility exists that this is one of those occasions, in which the Syriac translator has merely followed the rendering supplied by the Latin scribe. (2).

Verse 5

"he who removes mountains, and they know it not,
when he overturns them in his anger;"

"he who removes mountains without knowing it,
and overturns them in his anger;"

As the difference in sense is limited to the construction: יִשַּׁלֵל, comment will be restricted to that. Once again Dhorme has noted in his commentary that the Syriac translator has the Hebrew construction יִשְׁלָל as יָשַׁל, and that his reading has completely altered the sense of the clause. (3). As the MT is read, the first hemistich contains two subjects, the first of which is God, while the second is perhaps the mountains themselves; and it suggests that they have been caught unawares, a concept that is supported by the text of Jer 50.24. However, the translation of the Peshitta suggests an entirely different understanding, which is that the same
subject (God himself) is understood to apply to both participle and verbal form; so that the text states that God performs such acts of power without any conscious exercise of effort. Clines has noted that such a reading would appear to be precluded by the sense of the second hemistich, and that consequently the MT should be retained.

Verse 12

"Behold, he snatches away; who can hinder him?

Who will say to him, 'What doest thou'"

"Behold, if he shatters, who will entreat with his hands?

Who will say to him, 'What are you doing'"

As the differences of sense between the two texts are only to be found in the first hemistich, comment will be restricted to that part of the verse. The initial difficulty with the MT is the presence of the hapax legomenon: יָבֵע, which BDB defines as: 'seize, snatch away'. The Syriac translator has rendered יָבֵע, 'snatch away', by the verb
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'break, shatter'. It is highly unlikely that the Syriac translator did not understand the root גָּנֹן, since as Grabbe has noted, the form existed in his own language, carrying the basic meaning of 'break, break down'. (5). Since this is the case, one must simply conclude that his use of the verb גָּנֹן is based on his exact understanding of the root גָּנֹן. He would appear to have taken the form הָנֵן, 'hinder', in the sense of 'answer back', and it is surely this understanding which led him to render it with מְנַלָּא הָנֵן, 'entreat with his hands'. Grabbe has taken the construction מְנַלָּא הָנֵן in the sense of 'require it from his hands', but it is better to take the preposition מ, with its normal meaning of 'with', and to translate as above. (6). Thus one may conclude by noting that the Syriac translator has provided, in this instance, an accurate rendering of the Hebrew text.

Verse 13

"God will not turn back his anger;
beneath him bowed the helpers of Rahab".

"God will not turn back his anger;
the mighty helpers shall be humiliated under him"
From an examination of the two texts it can be seen that the main
differences of sense are located in the second hemistich, and for
that reason comment will be limited to that. The Syriac translator
has rendered the Hebrew רוּעַ, 'bowed down', with the Syriac root
עָלָה, 'humble'; it should be stressed that in this instance the
use of the root עָלָה is an accurate one. It has been noted elsewhere
in this work that the Syriac translator has used the root עָלָה,
'humiliate', on a number of occasions to render such roots as: קָם &
צָה, and that such usage is usually his interpretation of the text.
(for further remarks on this topic, see above p 90). In his
commentary Dhorame has noted that the Syriac translator did not realise
that the form רוּעַ is a name, and has merely supplied an abstract term
for it (XX'10). (7). Since the Targum has also supplied such a
term, it may be that this is one of those instances where the Syriac
translator has followed the interpretation provided by the Targum.

Verse 14

אַחַיָּא אֶפְנַיָּא אֶנְכֵּנָא אֶבָּרָהָא דִּבְרָה, אַשֵּׁר

"How then can I answer him,

choosing my words with him".

אַחַיָּא אֶפְנַיָּא אֶנְכֵּנָא אֶבָּרָהָא דִּבְרָה, אַשֵּׁר
"But Moreover I will answer him,  
and I will marshall my words before him."

When the two texts are compared it can be seen that the difference of sense is located in the first hemistich, so that comment is limited to this. In Hebrew the conjunction ןָּחַל can have an interrogative sense: how, has, which it does not have in Syriac. It is this basic difference between the two languages, which has caused the texts to disagree. The Syriac translator, who presumably based his knowledge of languages on Syriac, understandably rendered the conjunction ןָּחַל positively rather than interrogatively as in the MT.

Verse 15

"Though I am innocent, I cannot answer him;  
I must appeal for mercy to my accuser."

"Although I am justified, I am not listened to;  
But I will make supplication to my judge."
From a cursory examination of the two texts it can be seen that the differences between them are insubstantial and are located in the first hemistich, so that comment will be limited to this. The main point of difference is in the way that the Syriac translator has interpreted the MT's נָּעַז, 'I will answer him'. In the MT the form is that of an imperfect Qal; while that in the Peshitta is that of an imperfect Ethpe'el. What this means in practical terms is that the Syrian scribe has read the MT's נָּעַז not as a Qal, but as a Niphal. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that such a reading is also presupposed in G's εἰς ἀπειρον ὑπέρ, and in Theodotian's ἀποξείωσα τοι, so that this may be another instance in which the Syriac translator has merely followed the text of G, in his attempt to render the Hebrew text into Syriac. (8). It should be noted that the reading proposed by the text of G and Peshitta is one that has found accord with many commentators, who have accepted it as fitting in well with the general sense and tenor of the passage.

Verse 17

אָחֶר בְּשַׁעֲרָה, שְׁרוֹן, הִרְבֹּתָה בְּצַעְרָתָא.

"For he crushes me with a tempest, and multiplies my wound without cause;"

בְּכַל מֵעֲזָא מַגוֹסָא בְּלוֹכָשָא מַרוֹסָא, רְבָאָהָוָא, בְּצַעְרָתָא, מַרוֹסָא.
"For all the hair of my head he has struck me with violence, and he has multiplied my bruise without a cause".

A cursory examination of the two texts reveals that there are substantial differences between them, mostly located in the first hemistich. These differences may be defined thus:

(a) the interpretation of הַלְּוֹפָה;

(b) the interpretation of יַשְׁלָק;

(c) the interpretation of יַעֹל.

These are dealt with as follows:

(a) The Interpretation of הַלְּוֹפָה

In its translation of this text the RSV has taken הַלְּוֹפָה as 'tempest', which seems odd, since, as Dhorme has noted in his commentary, its normal spelling in the book of Job is הַלְוָה. (9). The spelling with ה does in fact occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, but only in Nahum 1.3. There is, however, no doubt as to how the Syriac translator understood this word, since he has rendered it by צַעִיד, 'hair, fur'. Moreover, he has sought to interpret the entire phrase so as to mean 'for a trifle', i.e. that God has taken this action against him for no reason at all. This understanding of
the Hebrew text in itself provides a good parallel to the מָאָר, 'without cause', of the second hemistich. Since the Targum has a similar reading here, namely, 'he crushes me for the threads of my hair', it may be one of those occasions in which the Syriac translator has followed Targum's interpretation. One must judge that, in this instance, the rendering of Peshitta is a very accurate one. It should be noted that Szpek in her work has incorrectly interpreted the rendering of the Syriac translator here, since she has not taken sufficient account of the influence of the ancient versions as used by the scribe in his attempt to translate the Hebrew text. (10).

(b) The Interpretation of 'יָד

In his commentary Rowley has noted that the verb used here is the same as that used in Gen 3.15, namely יָד, the meaning of which is 'bruise, crush', as it is also in the former reference. (11). In this example the Syriac translator has used the verb יָד, 'strike, beat, wound', which he has provided with the instrumental construction יָדִּים, 'with violence'. Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator's rendering here is less literal than that provided by G, which has: με ἐξετρίψῃ, 'let him crush me'. (12).

(c) The Interpretation of 'יָד

In his rendering of the Hebrew text the Syriac translator has
chosen to express דצל, 'bruise, wound', with the Syriac noun
'חישל, which strictly means 'fracture'. According to Payne-Smith,
the noun 'חישל is especially used of a contusion to the head. (13).
This particular etymology makes it a good translation of the Hebrew
text.

Verse 18

לך תַּעֲנֵנִי והצָלֵנִי וְשֶׁבעֵנִי מַעֲרֵרִים.

"he will not let me get my breath,
but fills me with bitterness".

לך שבני וְחָשְׂנֵנִי רוח מַסְלַמְּנֵנִי מַרְחָא אַלְרָיִיָה.

"But he will not allow me to refresh my breath,
since he has filled me with bitterness,
and he has caused me to drink bitter sorrow".

From an examination of the two texts it can be seen that there are
substantial differences between the two texts, which may be tabulated
thus:

(a) the interpretation of חישל;

(b) the addition of אַלְרָיִיָה.
These will be dealt with in order.

(a) **The Interpretation of יָדַע**

In the MT the form יָדַע may be parsed as being 3rd masc sing perfect Hiphil of the root יָדַע, 'return, come back', but which, in the Hiphil conjugation when used with the noun יָדַע, carries the meaning of 'draw breath'. The Syriac translator has chosen to render this form by the 3rd fem sing imperfect Ethpe'el of the root יָדַע, which in this conjugation has the meaning of 'refresh'. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Vulgate here has a similar rendering, namely, requiescere, and it may be that this has influenced the Syrian scribe. (14).

(b) **The addition of יָדַע יָדַע יָדַע**

Once again Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has added the above clause, which he translates thus: 'he has made me drink absinth'; and that this addition has been provided on the basis of Lam 3.15. (15). As there is no other versional support for this feature of the Peshitta, it must be judged as being unique.

**Verse 19**

וְאַף לֹּא קִחְמִי הַנָּתָן לָּאָמְרָנָה מִי וּרְאוּיָנָה
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"If it is a contest of strength, behold him!
If it is a matter of justice, who can summon him?"

אֵלָי צַעְרֵךְ נִי אֵל לֵוָי זַעְרֵךְ נִי

"If it is a matter of strength, he is mighty,
and if it is a matter of justice, who could encounter him"

As the differences between the two texts are insubstantial, only
minimal comment will be required. There is an apparent difficulty in
the first hemistich of the MT, which has been caused by the particle
יהיה, 'behold'. It would seem that the RSV has understood this
particle in the sense of 'behold him', a sense which may be achieved
by repointing the particle accordingly, or by emending the text to
read יהיה. The Syriac translator, however, would appear to have
taken יהיה as the pronoun יהיה, 'he', since he has made his text a
statement about one of the attributes of God: 'he is mighty'. In
the second hemistich the MT has preserved the verbal suffix יי, which, as Clines has noted, may be one of the tiqqu m sopherim,
although not included in the standard list. (16). The Syriac
translator, who has presumably followed the reading supplied by G,
has emended this to the 3rd pers sing suff thus: יִנְהֵרַעַי, 'who will
encounter him'. The Translator has used the Syriac root יִנְהֵרַע, 'encounter', to render the Hebrew root יִנְהֵר, which in the Hiphil
conjugation carries the legal meaning of 'summon', in the sense of to
cite before a court of law. The translation that he has supplied may
be considered to be
a paraphrase of the text.

Verse 23

"When disaster brings sudden death,
he mocks at the calamity of the innocent".

"If his rod slays suddenly;
he will mock at the folly of the innocent".

A cursory examination of the texts reveals that there are few differences between them, so that only minimal comment is required. At first sight, it appears that RSV's translation of the first hemistich is somewhat different from that of the Peshitta. The reason for this is not hard to find; it is because the latter has supplied an interpretation for the word הֵיל, rather than a translation of it. In his commentary Clines has noted that the word הֵיל, 'whip, scourge', is a symbol for natural disaster, possibly a plague or a flood. (17). Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has read this word as טָמִי, 'his scourge', which may simply mean that the scribe was attempting to provide the same subject for the first hemistich as is to be found in the second. (18).
Gordis has noted that the hapax legomenon, מַמֵּלֶךְ, of the second hemistich is derived from the root מָמָלַךְ, 'melt', and that this etymology yields the rendering 'calamity'. (19). The same etymology has been assumed by the Targum which renders מִמַּלְאֵךְ, 'dismayed', but not by the Peshitta, whose translator may have only arrived at his rendering by inspired guesswork.

Verse 24

illegal permit new edition becomes now is here is why

"The earth is given into the hands of the wicked;
he covers the faces of its judges---
if it is not he, who then is it"?

illegal permit new edition becomes now is here is why

"The earth is given into the hand of the wicked,
he covers the faces of the judges,
but who could endure his wrath"?

When the two texts are compared it can be seen that the differences which exist between them are located in the third hemistich, so that comment will be limited to it. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that, on the basis of the sebir of the scribes, it is necessary to
transpose XTH + XI9X, so as to make sense of a text which seemed too harsh to the first copyists. (20). From the translation of the RSV it would seem that it also has adopted this procedure. On the other hand, the Syriac translator has chosen to go along an entirely different route. The X7 qX of the MT is represented by his combined particle X7x, 'but, if not'. Instead of reading X11X as in the MT, he has read 11X, 'his anger', and this is represented in his text by the Syriac noun הָרֹעַ. He has rendered the 'ג of the MT as 899, 'who'; he has presumably taken the pronoun X10 as some form of the verb 'to be', from which he has taken the sense of 'endure', and consequently has rendered by the Pā'el participle רֹעַ. In so doing he has produced a text which has yielded an altogether different sense from that contained in the Hebrew Bible; and it may be that his rendering is solely guesswork, since he did not know what the text meant.

Verse 26

"They go by like skiffs of reed,
like an eagle sweeping on its prey".
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"They have passed by like many ships of the enemies, like an eagle which is swooping down on its food."

When the two texts are examined it can be seen that the differences of sense are contained in the first hemistich, so that comment will be restricted to that. The words in the first hemistich that have caused the difficulty are: הַנְּבִיאִים, which the RSV has taken as reed skiffs. Rowley has noted that what is intended by this metaphor is the Nile boat with a wooden keel and papyrus sides, light and very swift. (21). As such it provides an excellent parallel to the eagle, whose flight is known for its swiftness. However, this is not the way that the Syriac translator has understood it. He has correctly identified the first noun as נְבִיאִים, 'ships', but did not know that when it is used in connection with the following noun נְבִים, 'reed', it has the meaning of skiffs. All the commentators note the difficulty that has been caused by נְבִים, which is of uncertain derivation. Dhorme has noted that it is on the basis of the Akkadian abu, 'bed of reeds', and the Arabic aba, 'rush, reed', that the Hebrew נְבִים may be interpreted as 'reed'. (22). The Syriac translator, however, would appear to have given two interpretations to the word נְבִים. The first has been noted by Driver/Gray, who observe that he has connected it with the word נְבִי, 'enmity', and that this connection caused him to provide the rendering נְבִי הָעַמִּי, 'enemies'. (23). The second is the connection noted by Szpek with the word נְבִים, whose root is נָבָל, 'to be many'. (24). It is difficult to see how such a connection can be justified, since the proposed misreading as נְבִים
has no coherency whatsoever. It is more probable that the word מ*איה has been inferred from the plural form of מַעְיֹה, 'ships'. In concluding it should be noted that the Syriac translator would have received no help from the versions, since they all misunderstood מַעְיֹה.

Verse 27

שמא אמר, אֱלֹהִים שָׁמַע אֱלֹהִים פִּנִּי, וְאֵכְלֵי הָאָדָם

"If I say, 'I will forget my complaint,
I will put off my sad countenance,
and be of good cheer",

שָׁמַעְתִּי שָׁמַעְתִּי, וְאֵכְלֵי הָאָדָם פִּנִּי, וְאֵכְלֵי הָאָדָם

"With bitterness I have forgotten my discourses,
if I let alone my reflections and my words,
I am grieved".

A comparison of the two texts reveals that there are substantial differences between them, and that these are located in all parts of the verse. In the first hemistich the Syriac translator has taken the particle מָא, not in the sense of 'if', but in the sense of 'with'. Dhorme has noted in his commentary that the translator has connected מָא, 'I say', with the root מֵרָא, 'to be bitter'; it may be that he was influenced in this decision by the rarity of the
infinite after ַַַָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָּ
"Though I am at rest, I am afraid of every torment, since I know that you will not declare me innocent".

A cursory examination of the two texts shows that there are differences of sense between them, and that these are located in the first hemistich of the verse. The main difference may be said to lie in the addition of מַמְלָכָה מִּמֵּסֶף at the beginning of the first hemistich. As there is no versional support for this addition, one must conclude that the translator has supplied it because he considered it necessary as an exegetical aid, to give a better understanding of the passage.

Verse 29

"I shall be condemned; why then do I labour in vain"?

"Behold, If am declared guilty, why do you consume me in vain"?
As the differences between the texts are insubstantial, only minimal comment will be required on this verse. Dhorme has noted that all the versions, with the exception of the Targum, have regarded the first hemistich as an hypothesis. (28). Since, as has been noted frequently in this work, the Syriac translator is heavily dependent on the text of G, this is doubtless the reason that his text conforms to that of G here. Once again Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has connected the Hebrew עם with the root שלל, 'expire', and that this understanding is reflected with his Апчел participle впм. (29). For such an understanding he was no doubt dependent on the text of G, which has апчепьев, 'die'. He has, however, reconstructed the second hemistich to apply, not to Job, but to God. This feature would appear to be his contribution uniquely, since none of the other versions have it.

Verse 35

"Then I would speak without fear of him, for I am not so in myself".

"I will speak and will not be afraid of him, for I have not been against him".
As there are only insubstantial differences between the texts, only minimal comment will be required. The main difference of sense is located in the second hemistich. It would appear that the Syriac translator has either read a text without the preposition מ, or that he has totally ignored it. As there is no versional support for such a proposal, we must assume that he ignored it. He has rendered the pronoun י' 'I', with the verb מ', 'I am', and has read מ, 'with him', instead of מ, 'with me'. He has consequently ended up with a text, the meaning of which is totally different from that of the MT. Rowley has noted that the second hemistich is somewhat cryptic, but opts for the meaning "since it is not so", which he takes to indicate: "since I cannot come face to face with God on equal terms, I will offer my own defence of myself". (30). By contrast, the text which the scribe has created means that Job has never been against God.

Chapter 10

Verse 3

הבר הל אני הפשוי כ התחדש ב_DEST ו לעץ طويل וברך מהפצע
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"Does it seem good to thee to oppress,
to despise the work of thy hands,
and favour the designs of the wicked"?

(Is it not enough for you that you oppress,
and you despise the labour of your hands,
and you look upon the opinion of the wicked).

Although there are virtually no differences between the two texts, the verse has been included for comment because the Peshitta version of it is regarded by Szpek as having been toned down and made less offensive. (31). Szpek takes the view that the statement as it is found in the MT is ostensibly offensive, in that it could imply that God takes pleasure in oppressing his good creations, while favouring the wicked. She further considers that Peshitta's translation ḫא ר'ח, 'not enough', is the particular element that tones down Job's address to God, since it does not carry the implication that God is taking pleasure in doing this. (32). It would seem that she is correct in this analysis, since the text of G translates the first hemistic very literally: י"ח קולנ סוף, "is it good for you", and the Targum has: רַבָּא יְרַמְּלָה, "is there benefit before you". Thus one may conclude that the translator saw it as part of his task that he should tone down those passages which he
considered to be too offensive.

Verse 6

"that thou dost seek out my iniquity
and search for my sin".

As there are only insubstantial differences between the texts, only minimal comment will be required. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator, following the text of G, has rendered 'אֱלֹהִים as a plural; he has also noted that the Syrian scribe has omitted the final verbal form מָדוֹלָה, and has taken מָדוֹלָה as a second object of מָדוֹלָה, 'seek'. (33). That this has been due to nothing more than scribal error may be regarded as certain, since there is no other versional support for it.

Verse 8

"that you seek out my guilt and my sins"
"Thy hands fashioned and made me;
and now thou dost turn about and destroy me".

אֲרִיָּד לְךָ בַּיָּדְךָ וְשָׂרְכִּי בַּפַּעַם מִזְאָה אֲנִי לְחָיָיִתִי לְמָשְׁבַּתִּי

"Your hands laboured over me and made me,
and afterwards you wish to declare me guilty and swallow me up".

A cursory examination of the two texts reveals that there are substantial differences between them, so that comment will be made on the whole verse. In the first hemistich of the MT, the verbal form 'בפשאו, 'fashioned me', has been used. BDB has related the root נפשא, to the Arabic 'adaba', 'cut off', which gives to the Hebrew root the meaning of fashion. This meaning has been retained by the text of G, which has used the root פָּשָׂא, 'mold', and by the Targum which uses the Pa'tel conjugation of the root פְּשָׂא, 'shape, fashion'. In this instance the Syriac translator has gone his own way and has used the root פָּשָׂא, 'labour, toil'. The only reason that one could give for this is that, while the root פְּשָׂא, does exist in Syriac, it has an altogether different meaning, namely, 'to bind up, repair or restore'. The second hemistich is notoriously difficult in the Hebrew text, so that scholars have resolved to read פָּשָׂא, 'afterwards', for פָּשָׂא, 'together', and to find some form of the verb 'turn about' from the same root as פָּשָׂא, namely פָּשָׂא. The Syriac translator, for his part, has certainly taken פָּשָׂא in the sense of פָּשָׂא, by rendering the word פָּשָׂא, and would appear to have
ignored בְּלִי altogether, or substituted the verb חֶשָׁח, 'wish', in its place. He has also added the Paִel infinitive מַעֲנָת, 'to declare guilty', possibly to fill out the sense. Otherwise he has provided an accurate translation of the Hebrew text, but one which is independent of any other version or tradition.

Verse 12

תִּהְיָה רָפָא אֶלֶף עַמָּל אֲפַשׁ֛הֲלָה שְׁמֹרָה לָהּ.

"Thou hast granted me life and steadfast love;
and thy care has preserved my spirit".

וְתִהְיָה בְּשֵׁלֶם עֲבָדָה עַמָּל וּפַשְׁתוֹנִי נָשְׁרָה לָהּ.

"You have granted me life and peace;
and your commandments have preserved my spirit".

When the two texts are examined it can be seen that only minimal differences exist between them. What is of interest in this text is the way that the Syriac translator has used a cognate term from his own language in the second hemistich. In the MT the term מַעֲנָת carries the meaning of 'vigilant care, service, visitation', whereas the cognate term in Syriac bears the more theological meaning of 'commandment'. In this instance the Syriac translator has simply substituted his own Syriac term for the Hebrew term.
Since no other reason can be found, we must conclude that he has done this for reasons of theological preference.

Verse 15

"If I am wicked, woe to me!
If I am righteous, I cannot lift up my head,
for I am filled with disgrace and look upon my affliction".

"If I sin, woe to me!
If I am righteous, I cannot lift up my head,
for I am full of shame and I see my humiliation".

Although the texts are more or less identical from the point of view of sense, this text has been included among those upon which comment is being offered, since it is a good example of how the Syriac translator takes an ambiguous text and makes the sense of it unmistakably clear. Since the ambiguity occurs in the third hemistich, comment will be reserved to it. The difficulty with the first part of the third hemistich, שֶׁלַל *יִדְוָא*, is that both of these elements are nouns. Its meaning, as Dhorme has noted, must be
'filled with ignominy'. (34). Given this difficulty, and the fact that the thoughts of the first and second hemistichs are expressed by first person singular verbs, the translator has decided to regularize the text by making the noun הָעָלֶה, 'sated', a first person singular verb also, thus: עָלֶה. In this act he has simply followed the text of G, which also verbalized this clause: πληρής γὰρ αὐτίμως εἰμί. On the basis of this change, for which he has found support in G, he has also verbalized the second clause; but this time on the basis of the Targum, since the text of G omits it. His final clause is, therefore, תְּהוֹדִי מָזוּל. He has ended with a text which is not only clearer to read, but is also symmetrical with the rest of the verse.

Verse 16

וְזָהַה הַשָּׁעַל הַגָּדוֹל, וַהֲשָׁבֵה הַמַּחֲסִלָא בָּן

"And if I lift myself up, thou dost hunt me like a lion,
and again work wonders against me".

וַאֲנֵזֶה הַשָּׁעַל הַגָּדוֹל, וַהֲשָׁבֵה הַמַּחֲסִלָא בָּן

"And if I lift myself up, you hunt me like a lion,
and again act valiantly against me".
As the differences between the texts are insubstantial, only minimal comment will be required. Once again the Syriac translator has taken the ambiguous form סירא, 'and he lifts up', and rendered it with the reflexive Ethpe'el form יְּהַפֵּשׁ, 'I lift myself up', so that his translation of the text has been done with the aim of regularizing it and making it more easily comprehensible. The translator has apparently emended the text to read סירא, and Clines has noted that this emendation would appear to have been made by the Targum also.

(35). In the second hemistich the scribe has rendered the form运行, 'work wonders against', by the denominative (quadriliteral) verb运行, which in its Pa'el conjugation means 'to work mighty wonders', but which in its Ethpa'al conjugation means 'to act manfully, valiantly'. By so using the reflexive conjugation he has ended up with a text which has a somewhat different meaning to that of the MT.

Verse 17

"Thou dost renew thy witnesses against me,
and increase thy vexation toward me;
thou dost bring fresh hosts against me".
"You prepare your armour to fight against me,  
and you increase your indignation toward me;  
and you renew hosts against me".

When the two texts are compared it can be seen that the differences of sense which exist between them are located in the first and third hemistichs. It is clear that the Syriac translator did not know what to do with the first hemistich. He has taken the Hebrew יְשֵׁרָה, as being cognate with the Arabic اَدْيَا, 'was hostile', and has understood the noun in terms of military hostility and so has provided the noun יְשֵׁרָה, 'your armour'. Such a proposal has been adopted by Dhorme on the basis of Ehrlich's work. (36). Grabbe has noted that he may have had as his basis the reading provided by Symmachus: καὶ ἀνακανίζεις σεαυτό αὐτικεῖμενον μοι, "and you renew for yourself an adversary against me". (37). Having established that what the text was speaking about was a symbol of hostility, it would seem that the translator supplied an appropriate verb to fit, in this case the ἀπ' ἐλ participle ἔτην, 'to make ready to fight'. In the second hemistich he has interpreted the Hebrew מִשְׂחַת, 'change, relief', by using the cognate verb חֵלֶק, 'renew', which in this case is rendered as the פא'ל participle.
Verse 20

"Are not the days of my life few?
Let me alone, that I may find a little comfort."

"The days of my life are short,
leave me alone, and I will be silent and be rested a little."

A cursory examination of the two texts reveals that only insubstantial differences exist between them, so that only minimal comment will be required. In the first hemistic the translator has taken the phrase בְּ车间 יִשְׁתָּה מַעַן, 'the days of my life', a change which is supported by nearly all modern commentators. The Syriac translator would appear to have done this on the basis of the text of $G$, which has ο ἐν ο η χρόνῳ μου. In the second hemistic the scribe would appear to have read the Qere מִיָּה, as well as supplying the reflexive pronoun 'yourself', so as to obtain the translation as above. For the final verbal form מִיָּה, 'I will be bright', he would appear to have supplied a doublet in the form of the roots כִּים and מָיִ. According to BDG the root כִּים carries the meaning of 'flash, be cheerful'. The translator's exegesis of the final line would appear to be based on that of the Targum, which has...
Verse 22

'let me at ease and I will rest a little'.

"the land of gloom and chaos,
where light is as darkness".

"which is as lonely as darkness and the shadows of death,
and in which there is no order of the generations,
and is as desolate as darkness".

As there are only insignificant differences between the two texts, only minimal comment will be required. In the first hemistich the translator has rendered the Hebrew מָם, 'deep darkness', by the Syriac noun ܐܠaldo, 'lonely'. The word מָם comes from the root מ-ם-ם, 'to be dark'; whereas the Syriac translator assumed that it came from the root מום 2, 'be faint, weary', and therefore furnished the noun מום, 'lonely'. The phrase מום אלהים, 'in which there is no order of the generations', possibly on the basis of the Targum which has: "and there is no order so that human beings might live
there". (38). Finally, in the second hemistich he has understood the *waw* consecutive form גָּלֹה, which is from the root גָּל, 'shine forth', to be from גָּל 2, 'be faint, weary', and so has provided the form גָּלֹה, 'desolate'. From this apparent confusion he has ended up with a text, which although similar to the MT, is nevertheless different to it.
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Chapter Six

Conclusion
It is now nearly 100 years since E. Baumann began to compile his exhaustive study on the Peshitta of Job, which he entitled: 'Die Verwendbarkeit der Peshita zum Buche Hiob für die Textkritik', 1898-1900. During this extensive interval only one article is known to have been published dealing with the nature of the Peshitta of Job; namely, 'Notes on the Peshitta of Job’, which was written by the editor of volume 2.1a of the Leiden edition of the Peshitta. (1). This situation has remained unchanged until the publication in 1992 of Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job, by Heidi M. Szpeki. Strictly speaking, however, even this work does not concern itself completely with the Peshitta of Job; since, as the sub-title reveals, it is a linguistic study in which a model for evaluating a text is developed, which is incidentally illustrated from the Peshitta of Job. The purpose is stated by the author thus:

"Herein lies the object of this dissertation:

(1) to present the first systematic study of translation features in the Peshitta to the book of Job; and in doing so (2) to develop a systematic model that can be used to excavate, ie. evaluate, P-Job and other target texts in order to extract and explain not only unique translation techniques and significant departures from the source text, but also account for the expected equivalences necessitated only by language difference". (2).

Yet when we examine this work we find that this stated intention has been reversed; ie. the model is first of all developed in Chapter 2, and only then applied to the Job Peshitta in the remainder of the work. The author claims that the work is a systematic treatment of
the Job Peshitta, and the only caveat that may be levelled against that claim is that it is systematic from the point of view of the model for translation technique, but not from the treatment of the Job Peshitta. The work also suffers from a serious flaw: that is that no account is taken of the role of the ancient versions in the estimate of the translator's work. This major deficiency comes to light when the author deals with the Job Peshitta of 9.27 and states concerning the translator's rendering of 172:

"Versional parallels with the LXX (ὅσον 'I will groan') and Vulgate (dolore torqueor 'I am tormented with sorrow') also exist, but context more than direct influence should be considered". (3).

Thus what the author is revealing here is her neglect of the role that the ancient versions played in the translator's work. In his work on the Book of Jeremiah, McKane has already demonstrated that the Peshitta of that Book is heavily dependent on the Septuagint and the Vulgate. (4). What this means in practical terms is that we still require a systematic treatment of the Job Peshitta, which is illustrative of its dependence on the Septuagint, Vulgate and to a lesser degree the Targum.

It was noted in the preface that this work is dependent on the earlier study of Baumann, yet, this is seldom referred to. The reason for this is not hard to find: it is that the aim of the two studies is somewhat different. In the case of Baumann, his aim is revealed in the title: 'Die Verwendbarkeit der Pesita zum Buche
Ijob fur die Textkritik', which may be translated as: 'The Applicability of the Peshitta in the Book of Job for Textual Criticism'. In other words the aim of Baumann's work is to study the Peshitta so that a more accurate Hebrew text of the Book of Job may be established. This is detailed by him in his § 5 'Emendations of the Massoretic Text on the grounds of the Peshitta'. The aim of this present work, however, has been somewhat different. It has been to examine the Peshitta of the Book of Job with the aim of learning more about it as a version in its own right, and as a witness of the early exegesis of the Book of Job. It is believed that this aim has been achieved in the chapters (3-10) that have been treated in the above pages. The examination of these chapters has shown that the Syriac translator was faced with similar problems to those which we ourselves face, and that he sought to solve these, first of all by attempting to read the Hebrew text, and then by relying on the Septuagint, the Vulgate and, to a lesser degree, the Targum, to furnish him with an adequate understanding of the text. The examination of these chapters has also shown that, in many instances, the versions were of no help to him; and that in such cases he resorted to paraphrase, which may have been based on little more than inspired guesswork.

Although one may comment on the deficiencies of the Peshitta, it is nevertheless deserving of further study; and it is to be hoped that an evaluation of the entire Job Peshitta may be attempted in the near future.
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