

**THE PESHITTA OF JOB - AN EXAMINATION OF
THE TRANSLATOR'S TECHNIQUE WITH
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE BOOK OF
JOB 3/1-10/22**

F.A. Gosling

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of MPhil
at the
University of St Andrews



1994

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13767>

This item is protected by original copyright

The Peshitta of Job

An Examination of the Translator's Technique

with particular reference to the book of Job 3/1-10/22

by

F. A. Gosling.

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree of Master
of Philosophy of the University of St. Andrews.

1993



ProQuest Number: 10166494

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166494

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

TR B422

I should like to express my thanks to Dr Robin B. Salters for the help and guidance he gave in determining the main thrust of this Thesis and for the many insights I received from him.

I am especially indebted to Miss Sylvia Adams, for her painstaking efforts in the typing of this manuscript.

(a) I certify that Frank Gosling has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution of the University Court, 1981, No 2, and is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the Degree of Master of Philosophy.

Signature of supervisor

(b) I was admitted as a research student under Ordinance 350 (General No. 12) on 1st October 1992 and as a candidate for the degree of M.Phil. under Resolution of the University Court, 1981, No 2. on 1st October 1992 .

The following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, is my own composition, and has not previously been presented for a higher degree. The research was carried out in the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of Dr Robin B. Salters.

Signature of candidate.

In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

ABSTRACT

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.

CONTENTS

Preface.

Abbreviations.

Bibliography.

Chapter One	---- Introduction	p 1.
Chapter Two	---- Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 3.1-4.21	p 41.
Chapter Three	---- Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 5.1-6.30	p 85.
Chapter Four	---- Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 7.1-8.22	p 132
Chapter Five	---- Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 9.1-10.22	p 166
Chapter Six	---- Conclusions	p 201
Indexes.		p 206

PREFACE

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:

T. Noldeke: Compendious Syriac Grammar (2nd edition) 1904.

T. H. Robinson: Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar
(4th edition) 1962

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

T. Muraoka: Classical Syriac for Hebraists (1st edition) 1987.

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.

ABBREVIATIONS

ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
BDB	Brown-Driver-Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon
BHK	Biblia Hebraica, 3rd edition
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
Bibl	Biblica
G	The Septuagint
GKC	Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar
HEB	Hebraica
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JB	Jerusalem Bible
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature

JSS Journal of Semitic Studies

KB Koehler-Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros

KB3 Koehler-Baumgartner, Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon
 zum Alten Testament, 3rd edition

KJV King James Version

MT Masoretic text

NEB New English Bible

NIV New International Version

NJPS New Jewish Publication Society Version

NRSV New Revised Standard Version

REB Revised English Bible

RSV Revised Standard Version

RV Revised Version

Symm Symmachus

Syr	Syriac Peshitta
Targ	Targum--various editions
TCOT	Tyndale Commentary of the Old Testament
Theod	Theodotion
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTS	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
Vulg	Vulgate
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andersen, F. I. Job TCOT Leicester 1976
- Barr, J. Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament.
Oxford 1968
- Bauer, H. &
Leander, P. Grammatik des Biblisch Aramäischen
Halle 1927.
- ibid Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testament. Vol 1.
Halle 1922
- Baumann, E. "Die Verwendbarkeit der Pesita zum Buche Hiob für die Textkritik"
1898-1900 ZAW vol 18 pp 305-338; Vol 19 pp 15-95, 288-309; Vol 20 pp 177-201, 264-307.
- Bergstrasser, G. Hebräische Grammatik
Vols 1 & 2. Leipzig 1918
- ibid Introduction to the Semitic Languages
First English edition Winona Lake 1983.

- Beyer, K. Althebräische Grammatik
Berlin 1969.
- Blake, F. R. A Resurvey of the Hebrew Tenses
Rome 1951
- Blau, J. Grammar of Biblical Hebrew
Wiesbaden 1976.
- Brockelmann, C. Hebräische Syntax
Neukirchen 1956.
- ibid Lexicon Syriacum
Halle 1928.
- ibid Syrische Grammatik
Leipzig 1899.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Hebrew & English Lexicon of the Old Testament
& Briggs, C. A. Oxford 1951.
- Ceriani, A. M. Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti
ex Codice Ambrosiano
Milan 1876-1883.

- Clines, D. J. A. Job 1-20 WBC Vol 17
 Dallas 1990.
- Dalman, G. Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen
Aramäisch
 Leipzig 1897.
- Davidson, A. B. Commentary on Job
 Vol 1 Edinburgh 1862.
- ibid Hebrew Syntax
 third edition Edinburgh 1896.
- Delitzsch, F. Commentary on the Old Testament
Job Edinburgh 1866.
- Delitzsch, Fried. Das Buch Hiob
 Leipzig 1902.
- Dhorme, E. Commentary on the book of Job.
 English Translation Nashville 1967.
- Driver, G. R. 'Problems in the Hebrew text of Job'
 1955 VTS 3 pp 72-93.

- Gesenius, W. Hebrew Grammar
 second English edition edited by A. E. Cowley
 Oxford 1910.
- Gibson, J. C. L. Syrian Semitic Inscriptions
 Vol 2: Aramaic Oxford 1975.
- Gordis, R. The Book of Job
 New York 1978.
- Gosling, F. A. The Syntax of Hebrew Poetry--An Examination
of the use of Tense in Poetry with particular
reference to the Book of Job 3.1-42.6
 Unpublished Ph.D. University of St Andrews
 1992
- Grabbe, L. L. Comparative Philology and the text of Job.
 Montana 1977.
- Guillaume, A. 'Arabic Background of the Book of Job'
 1963--in--Promise and Fulfilment essays
presented to S.H.Hook pp 106-127.
- ibid Studies in the Book of Job
 Leiden 1968.

- Harris, Z. G. Grammar of the Phoenician Language
New Haven 1936.
- Hartley, J. E. The Book of Job
Grand Rapids 1988.
- Hoftijzer, J. The Function and Use of the Imperfect Forms
with Nun Paragogicum in Classical Hebrew
Assen 1985.
- Holladay, W. L. Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old
Testament Leiden 1971.
- Jastrow, M. Talmud Dictionary
Vols 1-2 London 1903.
- Jennings, W. A Lexicon to the Syriac New Testament
Oxford 1927.
- Johns, A. F. Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic
Michigan 1982.
- Jouön; P. Grammaire de L'Hebreu Biblique
Rome 1923.
- Kutscher, E. Y. History of the Hebrew Language
Jerusalem 1982.

- Lambdin, T. O. Introduction to Biblical Hebrew
New York 1971.
- Lamsa, G. M. The Holy Bible translated from Ancient
Texts
San Francisco 1933.
- Lee, S Vetus Testamentum Syriace
London 1823
- Liddell, H. G. &
Scott, R. Greek-English Lexicon
ninth edition Oxford 1982.
- Lisowosky, G. Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament
Stuttgart 1958.
- Mandl, A. Die Peschita zu Hiob
Leipzig 1892.
- Mangan, C. The Targum of Job
The Aramaic Bible Vol 15 Edinburgh 1991.
- Meyer, R. Hebräische Grammatik Vols 1-4
Berlin 1959-1972.

- Moscatti, S. Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of
the Semitic Languages
Wiesbaden 1980.
- Müller, A. Outlines of Hebrew Syntax
Glasgow 1888.
- Muraoka, T. Classical Syriac for Hebraists
Wiesbaden 1987.
- Niccacci, A. Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose
Sheffield 1990.
- Nöldeke, T. Compendious Syriac Grammar
second edition London 1904.
- Payne-Smith, J. Syriac English Dictionary
Oxford 1903.
- Payne-Smith, R. Thesaurus Syriacus
Vols 1-2 & Supplement.
Oxford 1927.
- Polzin, R. Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose
Montana 1976.

- Pope, M. H. Job--Anchor Bible
New York 1982.
- Ralphs, A. Septuaginta
Vols 1 & 2
Stuttgart 1935.
- Rignell, L. G. The Old Testament in Syriac
Part 2, fascicle 1a.
Leiden 1982
- ibid "Notes on the Peshitta of the Book of Job"
1973 ASTI vol 9 pp 98-106.
- Roberts, B. H. The Old Testament Text and Versions
Cardiff 1951
- Robinson, T. H. Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar
Oxford 1962.
- Rosenthal, F. Grammar of Biblical Aramaic
Wiesbaden 1974.
- Rowley, H. H. The Book of Job.
London 1980.

- Sawyer, J. F. A. Modern Introduction to Biblical Hebrew
Stocksfield 1976.
- Segert, S. Grammar of Phoenician and Punic
Munich 1976.
- Smith Lewis, A. A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary
London 1897.
- Sokoloff, M. The Targum to Job
Ramat Gan 1974.
- ibid Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic
Ramat Gan 1990.
- Stenij, E. De Syriaca Libri Job interpretatione quae
Peschita vocatur Helsingfors 1887.
- Stevenson, W. B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic
Oxford 1924.
- Strahan, J. The Book of Job.
Edinburgh 1913.
- Szpek, H. M. Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job
Atlanta 1992.

- Tur-Sinai, N. H. The Book of Job
Jerusalem 1967.
- Voste, J. M. "Les deux versions syriaques de la Bible
d'apres Mar Ishodad de Merw (c850)"
1952 BIBL vol 33 pp 235-236.
- Waltke/O' Connor Biblical Hebrew Syntax
Winona Lake 1990.
- Weingreen, J. Hebrew Grammar
second edition Oxford 1959.
- Williams, R. J. Hebrew Syntax
second edition Toronto 1976.
- Wright, W. Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the
Semitic Languages
London 1890.
- ibid Short History of Syriac Literature
London 1894.
- Wurthwein, E. The Text of the Old Testament
Oxford 1957.

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 consequential 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 Würthwein:

"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 Würthwein 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 ׁ'-, while in Aramaic it is ׁ'-, 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*, ׁ'ׁ; whereas in the eastern dialects--at least in Syriac--it is *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 'ן , pl. 'ן' --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 ך

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 ך. (8). In Hebrew, however, the case is somewhat different as the forms connected with the demonstrative element (ן, ך) 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 ׀ is also rare, the usual form being ׀ or, more frequently, ׀א. Returning once again to Hebrew the usual form is ׀א, while the shorter form ׀ 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 ׀) the most ancient inscriptions show a relative pronoun ׀ which later became ׀ and, in Syriac, ׀. (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 consonantal element ׀. 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 Aramean 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 ׀א 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 ׀. 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 ׀ 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 ׀ is more developed than that of ׀ in standard Biblical Hebrew since it is also used as a conjunction, as are ׀ in later Biblical Hebrew and ׀ 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.

(B) 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 ׀ = mother. The feminine gender is most commonly denoted by the ending

הַ in the absolute state and הֶ 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: יָדַי 'both hands'; אָזְנוֹתַי 'both ears'; שִׁנָּי 'teeth' (of both rows); but it also found in such words as נְלוֹמֵי 'a pair of sandals'. (13). The regular plural termination for the masculine gender is יָ, while that of the feminine gender is generally indicated by the termination יוֹ. 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 effect 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 χ _ in the absolute state, while the termination η _ 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

and participles used as predicates; (b) nouns in distributive phrases; (c) nouns after ܕܐ; (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 χ , vocalized by pthaha.
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 ܠܝܦܫ = to do, as their paradigm verb. The names thus given are a direct result of the form which ܠܝܦܫ assumed in each respective conjugation. The names are

therefore as follows:

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

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 $\text{N}\lambda$ 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 voweling 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 $\text{ʔ}\lambda$, '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 nx prefix to each of the conjugational themes. Of these three themes, Ethpe'el, 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'el 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 Haph'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 η later became χ . (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 $\eta\eta'$ 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,

used in the protasis of conditional sentences after the particle ܝܘ (S265); it is used in statements which have a modal colouring; it is also the proper form for a wish, request, summons or command (S266); it is also the tense of dependent, subordinate clauses which point to the future (S267); the imperfect is used with the perfect ܘܠܝܢ in conditional clauses to denote an action frequently repeated (S268). (35).

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. (36). 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 waw consecutive; (b) the symmetrical arrangement of the conjugations, each of which has its own reflexive which is recognised by the prefix ܐܘܟ; (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 be 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; 17.16; 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, 25; 13.2; 15.26; 17.9, 15; 19.16; 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; 27.5, 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:

בָּרַךְ יְהוָה כְּנוֹנֵי בֶקֶר וַיִּרְעוּ כָּל בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים

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:

ברא אנהרא כונבי שפרא וכלהון בני מלאכא 'בנו

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 בָּרָא "when the morning stars sang--", the Peshitta has בָּרָא "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 בָּרָא and so followed the text of G, which has ὅτε εὑενθησαν "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 בָּרָא '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:

הַרְפְּאִים יְחַלְלֵן מִתַּחַת מֵיִם וְשֹׁכְנֵיהֶם

and is translated by the RSV as:

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

In this text the Peshitta has:

הָא גְבוּרָא נַחְסְלָנָן רַמָּן מֵיָא נְשָׁלוּן

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.

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:

איפשר דנבריא דמתמוזמין יתבריין ואינן מלוצ למיא ומשיר'תהון

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 וַפְּאִיִּם 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 ה as an interrogative particle. The verb חולל 'tremble', which is the Polal from the root חול 'writhe', has been understood by the Targumist to be from the root חלל, 'sweeten, soften'. This latter root has, in the Ethpalpal 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 חולל has to be understood as a relative clause qualifying the mighty men: namely, they are decaying. In this circumstance the Aramaic verb חורר, 'restore', has to be understood from the context. The Syriac translator has followed the Targumist here and has understood חולל 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:

וַיֹּאֲלֵ אֱלֹהִים וַיִּדְכֹּאֲנִי יָתֵר יָדוֹ וַיִּבְצֹעַנִי

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:

וְנִחְסַפִּים אֱלֹהִים וְנִדְכִינִי וְנִפְרוֹס אִיָּהּ וְנִשְׁמְלִינִי

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 לֹא־יִּ, 'agree to', which has been correctly interpreted by the Syriac translator who used the verb ܕܘܥܒܘܢܢ, 'consent'. This latter verb is in fact the Ethpe'el, which is used instead of the Ettaph'al of ܕܘܥܒ. 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 ܕܘܥܒܘܢܢ, 'crush', with the Aramaic verb ܕܘܥܒ, which means to '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 ܕܘܥܒ, 'appoint', for the MT's ܕܘܥܒ, 'loose', may be justified since the latter form is the only occurrence of the Hiphil conjugation of ܕܘܥܒ 1 in the Hebrew Bible, and as a result its meaning is somewhat uncertain. The final verbal form in the MT is ܕܘܥܒܘܢܢ, 'cut off', for which the Syriac translator has used ܕܘܥܒܘܢܢ, '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 ܕܘܥܒ in its secondary sense of '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:

יִגְאֲלֵהוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת חֹשֶׁךְ עָלָיו עֲנֹנָה יִבְעֲתֶהּוּ כַּמְרִירִי יוֹם

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:

נִכְסִיּוֹהִי חֹשׁוֹךְ וְטַלְלֵי מוֹתָא חֲרָכְנָן עֲלוּהִי עֲוֹנָא נִבְעֲתוֹנָה מְרִירִי יוֹמָא

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."

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: חֲשַׁנָּן עָלָיו עֲנֹנָה, which is translated as: "let clouds dwell upon it". The Peshitta has rendered this as: חֲרַנְנָן עֲלֵיהּ עֲנֹנָא, 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 חֲשַׁנָּן, 'dwell', whereas the Peshitta has used a different root, 'decline', hence 'overshadow'. In this verse the Targum has used the verb חָרַן, '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 חֲרַנָּן, '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 חֲרַנָּן '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).

(B) 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:

לחלק יביר רעים ועיני בניו תכלנה

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:

ונתרו רב רחמא עלי רחמה ועינא דבניהון נחשכנן

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 רַעִים יְנִיד, 'he who informs against his friends', by using the 3rd. masc sing Ethpaua of לָרַ, 'to behave arrogantly against, behave insolently towards', and has not rendered the לַלֵּק 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 לַלֵּק 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:

אֲשֶׁר קָצְרוּ רֹעַב יֹאכַל וְאֵל מְצֹנִים יִקְחֶהוּ וְשֹׂאף צְמִים חִילֵם

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:

דַּחֲצַל כְּפֹאָ נֹאכְרֵי וְלִצְהִיא נַחְסִנְכוּן וְנִגְרֵס צְהִיא קְנִינְהוּן

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 ܘܥܢܐ has been translated above as a noun, but if it were a noun should we not have expected ܘܥܢܐܗ, 'whose harvest' = 'his harvest'? For this reason it seems better to take ܘܥܢܐ as relative pronoun ܘ + 3rd. masc sing perfect Pe'al of ܥܢܐ '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 ܥܢܐܗ, 'from thorns', as a noun ܥܢܐ, 'thirsty', perhaps by metathesis of consonants, or by the influence of the third hemistich where the noun ܥܢܐ does of course occur. The preposition ܠܐ, 'to', is represented in Syriac by the inseparable preposition ܠ. The translator has taken the verbal form ܠܥܢܐܗ, 'take', as being from the root ܥܢܐ, 'gather, collect', which in Mishnaic and Talmudic Hebrew is used in the Hiphil conjugation to denote the collecting of water. He has understood ܠܥܢܐܗ to be a masc pl form of the verb ܥܢܐ, 'collect water', and so he has rendered it with the Syriac form

וַחֲסִינֶנּוּ, 'to be poured out', which may be parsed as being 3rd masc pl imperfect Ethpe'el of the root חָסַן. 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:

וַאֲמַר עִם קִנִּי אֲגִיד וְכֹחֹל אֲרֹבָה יָמַי

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:

וַאֲמַרְח לְעַמָּא מְסַכְנָא אַפְרוֹק וְאִיךְ קִנְיָא אַשְׁלַם
וְאִיךְ חֵלָא דִּימַמָּא אַסְגָּא יוֹמֵי

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, אֲנִי אֶעֱלֶה כְּסִבְיָהּ, have in fact been translated twice. (53). The first interpretation has read אֲנִי אֶעֱלֶה כְּסִבְיָהּ as אֲנִי אֶעֱלֶה כְּסִבְיָהּ, 'I shall deliver the poor people'; whereas the second has taken אֲנִי, 'my nest', as אֲנִי, '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:

מִי פָּלַג לְשֹׁסֶף חֲעֵלָה וּדְרָךְ לַחֲזִיז קְלוֹת

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:

וְהוּא חוּרָא וְקֵלָא

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 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 𐤒𐤒, 'way', as a verb, 'tread', which he has loosely translated by the Syriac verb ܕܠܢ, 'was'. He has taken the noun ܐܘܪܝܢܐ, 'strong wind', as the noun ܕܘܪܝܢܐ, 'vision, appearance'. Finally he has added the conjunction ܘ before the noun ܩܘܠܐ, 'thunder', which he has taken as a singular 'voice'. ܩܘܠܐ 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.

NOTES

- | | | | | |
|------|------------------|---|----------|---------|
| (1) | Gosling, F. A. | <u>The Syntax of Hebrew Poetry</u> | 1992. | |
| (2) | Driver, S. R. | <u>Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel</u> | | pxxiv |
| (3) | Wüsthwein, E. | <u>The Text of the Old Testament</u> | | p 50. |
| (4) | McKane, W. | <u>ICC--Jeremiah</u> Vol 1 | | p xv. |
| (5) | Gosling | ibid | | p 73f. |
| (6) | Wright, W. | <u>Comparative Grammar</u> | | p 19. |
| (7) | Burney, C. F. | <u>Notes on the Hebrew Text of Kings</u> | | p 208. |
| (8) | Moscatti, S. | <u>Comparative Grammar</u> | | p 113f. |
| (9) | Moscatti | ibid | | p 114. |
| (10) | Waltke/O'Connor | <u>Hebrew Syntax</u> | | p 330. |
| (11) | Polzin, R. | <u>Typology of Hebrew Prose</u> | | p 128. |
| (12) | Brownlee, W. H. | <u>Pesher of Habakkuk</u> | | p 27. |
| (13) | Gesenius, W. | <u>Hebrew Grammar</u> | § 88 a-g | p 246. |
| (14) | " | ibid | § 89 a | p 247. |
| (15) | " | ibid | § 89 a | p 247. |
| (16) | Nöldeke, T. | <u>Syriac Grammar</u> | § 70 | p 48. |
| (17) | Robinson, T. H. | <u>Syriac Grammar</u> | | p 21. |
| (18) | Weingreen, J. | 'Note by G. R. Driver' | | p 252f. |
| (19) | Segert, S. | <u>Grammar of Phoenician</u> | | p 194. |
| (20) | Gibson, J. C. L. | <u>Syrian Semitic Inscriptions</u> | Vol 2 | p 7, 8. |
| (21) | Robinson | ibid | § 14 | p 52. |
| (22) | Muraoka, T. | <u>Classical Syriac</u> | § 39 | p 29. |
| (23) | Nöldeke | ibid | § 159 | p 103. |

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 special 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.

אחרי כן פתח איוב את פיהו ויקלל את יומיו

"After this Job opened his mouth and cursed the day of his birth."

וּמִן בְּחַרְכָּן פִּתַח אִיּוֹב פּוֹמֵא וְלֵט יוֹמָא דְאִתְּלִיל בֵּה

"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 יוֹמִן, '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

וַיֹּאמֶר אִיּוֹב וַיֵּץ

"And Job said."

וַיֹּאמֶר אִיּוֹב וַיֵּץ

"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 λεγὼν, while both Peshitta and Targum have provided a full translation of the Hebrew text. The Peshitta has done so by using the perfects ܘܢܘܟܘܢ -- ܘܢܘܟܘܢ 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

יְאֹדָה יוֹם אֲוֹלָד בְּנֵי וְהַלַּיְלָה אֲמַר הָרָה וּבֹרַךְ

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

נאכר יומא דאחילדת בה ולליא דאחאמר בה דאחבסן גורא

"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 נאנך, 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 אשך has to be understood, since in common with the practice generally it has been elided, whereas the Syriac has provided its relative ה. The Hebrew the verbal form אולך, which is a Niphal imperfect from the root ל"א, '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 בה, defined exactly what the verbal form of the Hebrew text אשך 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 G 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 σὺξ, ἐν ἡ εἰπᾶν, it may be that the Syriac translator has simply followed the reading of G in his rendering of this verse.

Verse 5

יִגְאֻלְהוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת חֹשֶׁךְ עָלָיו עֲנַנֵּה יִבְעֲתוּהוּ כַמְרִירֵי יוֹם

"Let gloom and deep darkness claim it.

Let clouds dwell upon it;

let the blackness of the day terrify it."

נִכְסֵי־הַיּוֹם חֹשֶׁךְ וְצִלְמוֹת חֹשֶׁךְ עָלָיו עֲנַנֵּה יִבְעֲתוּהוּ מְרִירֵי יוֹמָא

"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 יִגְאֻלְהוּ, 'claim it', since

the root $\lambda\chi\lambda$, '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 $\lambda'\chi\lambda$, '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: $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\iota$, 'seize it', while Symmachus has: $\alpha\nu\tau\iota\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, 'lay claim to', but the most enterprising reading is to be found in Theodotion, which has: $\alpha\gamma\chi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\omega$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, 'to be next of kin to'. This latter reading is clearly dependent upon the use of $\lambda\chi\lambda$ 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 $\lambda\lambda\beta$, 'soften, moisten', while Aquila has the reading: $\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota$, 'defile'; both of these versions derive their meaning of $\lambda\chi\lambda$ from the late $\lambda\chi\lambda$ 2, 'defile, pollute'. According to Driver/Gray the Syriac translator, like the Latin Vulgate, is simply paraphrasing the text here by using the verbal form: ܩܘܪܝܢܐܢܐ , '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: ܩܘܪܝܢܐܢܐ , 'redeem', from which comes the noun ܩܘܪܝܢܐܢܐ , 'redemption'; ܩܘܪܝܢܐܢܐ , 'seize'; or ܩܘܪܝܢܐܢܐ , 'perform the duty of a

kinsman'. The root לגל occurs some 103 times in the Hebrew Bible. Of these, 33 (including the Ruth passages) are translated in Syriac by the verb: לען , 'perform the duty of a kinsman, effect blood vengeance', while the remainder are translated by the verb קרי , 'redeem'. The only exception to this latter statement is the example in Job 3.5 which is translated by the root: כסא , 'cover'; now why should this be?

The only possible answer to this question is to assume, as Dhorme does, that the Syriac translator read לגל 2 , 'defile, corrupt' here and not לגל 1 , 'redeem, lay claim to'. (5). In support of this view one may cite the fact that when he translates לגל 1 , he always uses either קרי or לען and never כסא . Thus what he has provided is a rather loose translation of לגל 2 , in conformity with the Latin Vulgate's obscurent eum, Aquila's $\mu\lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$, and Targum's ןןןןן . 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 ןןןןן 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 ן , or he simply ignored it. Dhorme has noted that the versions have for the most part interpreted ןןןןן as connected with the root קרי . (7). Thus the Targum connects the word with the root קרי and gives the rendering: "like the bitter

things of the day"; the same derivation is also followed by Aquila in his text: και ἐκθαμβησασαν αὐτην ὡς πικραμμοι ἡμερας. 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 ג. The text of G has been examined by Lester Grabbe in his study, and he is of the opinion that the reading: καταραθειη η ἡμερα 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 נמרי יום, 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

הלילה ההוא יקחהו אפל אל יחד בימי שנה במספר ירחים אל לבא

"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."

לליא הו נכס'יהי צמסנא יומא הו לא נתחשב במנינא ד'ומתא דשנתא
ובמנינא ד'רחא לא נעולי

"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 יקחהו; (b) his translation of יחך; (c) the addition of הו יומא. It seems appropriate to deal with these in order.

(a) His Translation of יקחהו.

As can be seen from a consultation of the above Peshitta text, the Syriac translator has rendered יקחהו by the verbal form נכס'יהי, 'cover'. His use of the root נכס here is interesting because this is the second occurrence of נכס'יהי 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 נָחַל (cf p 46 above). As far as the Syriac vocabulary is concerned he could have used either נָחַל, or more probably נָחַל; although it should be noted that the Targum uses the root נָחַל, '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 'ןן'טןן to produce a certain parallelism between the two verses.

(b) His translation of ךן'.

In his commentary Clines has noted that there are two possible etymologies of ךן': either from ךןן, 'rejoice', which is common in Aramaic but rare in Hebrew, or from ךן', 'be joined, added to', which involves its revocalization as ךן'. (10). With the exception of the text of G, which has εἶη and would appear to have read 'η' instead of ךן', most of the versions have followed the latter proposal in their interpretation of the MT. Thus, Targum has ךן'ן', 'be joined to'; the Vulgate has computetur; while Symmachus has συναφθεῖη. The Peshitta has used the root ךןן, '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 Niphal of ךן' is paralleled with ךןן in Gen 49.6. One must, therefore, conclude by stating that the Syriac translator has understood the Hebrew text here perfectly.

(c) The addition of הו יומא

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 הו יומא, and considers that the reason for this is the נ'י' 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-Sinai wants to re-locate v 6a to the beginning of v 9. (12).

Verse 7

הנה הלילה ההוא יהי גלמוד אל תבא רננה בו

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

לליא הו נהוא מגזי ולא תעולי בה תשובותא

"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 ܢܢܢ; (b) the insertion of ܝ before ܘܟ of the second hemistich; (c) his definition of ܢܢܢܢ. As in the last example it seems best to deal with these in order.

(a) The omission of ܢܢܢ

This particle, which is rendered by the text of G as ἀλλὰ, and by the Targum as ܘܢ, 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 ܢܢܢ; it is more likely that he has followed the Vulgate for stylistic reasons.

(b) The insertion of ܝ before ܘܟ in the second hemistich

It would seem that the Syriac translator has inserted the conjunction ܝ to mark the beginning of the second hemistich. In this action he may be following the text of G, which has καὶ 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 ܝ to mark the second hemistich of v 4,

which is also before the negative לא. This insertion has no basis in the MT, although it is confirmed once again by the text of G, which has אלו.

(c) His definition of הנה

In the translation of the Peshitta noted above it can be seen that the rendering adopted by the Syriac translator is one which interpreted הנה, 'joyful cry' of the MT, as תשבחות, '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 תיעול רננא דחרנגול ברא למקלסא בה

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 חַשְׁבוֹתָא, 'hymn of Praise', alludes to such an exegesis, although he does not fully indicate it as such.

Verse 9

יחשכו כוכבי נשפו יקו לאור ואין ואל יראה בעצמפי שחר

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

נחשכון כוכבי שפרא נסכון לנוהרא ולא נהוא לה ולא נחזא בזליקי
שפרא

"Let the stars of its dawn be dark;
let it wait for light, but let it have none,
let it not see the rays of the dawn."

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 יקו; (b) his interpretation of ואין; (c) his rendering of שחר בעצמפי.

(a) His rendering of יקו

In Biblical Hebrew the verb קוה 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, ܠܩܘܠ 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 ܠܩܘܠ 'hope'.

(b) His interpretation of ܠܩܘܠ

In the text of the Hebrew Bible the negative consequence is expressed by the particle ܠܩܘܠ. While the Syriac translator could have used the negative particle ܠܩܘܠ, '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 ܠܩܘܠ, 'be', which would appear to be used with a 'jussive' nuance.

(c) His rendering of ܠܩܘܠ ܠܩܘܠ

In his work Clines has noted that the Hebrew form ܠܩܘܠ 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, ܠܩܘܠ ܠܩܘܠ, 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 עפעפ'ים with his ארעק' ק'ל'ל, '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

למה לא מרחם אמות מבטן יצאתי ואנוע

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

למנא לא מיחח מן מרובעא ומן בטנא למנא נפקח ספח דין

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

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 ܕܢܘܠ 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 ܘܠܠܘܢ, 'expire', with ܕܢܘܠ ܢܦܘܫܐ, 'be consumed with judgement'. He has altered the sense of the verse by omitting the negative ܕܠ, which also has to be understood in the second hemistich--as has the interrogative ܢܘܠ. It is also noteworthy that he has given full force to the preposition ܕ, which in the MT is prefixed to its respective nouns. In the first hemistich he has rendered the imperfect Qal ܡܘܬܐ, 'die', by the perfect Pe'al ܡܘܬܐ, 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 ܕܢܘܠ, 'womb' by the Syriac cognate ܕܢܘܠܐ, which means conception. The main deviation is to be seen in his rendering of ܘܠܠܘܢ by ܕܢܘܠ ܢܦܘܫܐ. The purpose of the construction ܕܢܘܠ ܢܦܘܫܐ 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 ܕܢܘܠ 'judgement' is the translator's interpretation of the malady which befell Job.

Verse 12

מדוע קדמוני ברנים ומה שדים נ' אינק

"Why did the knees receive me?

Or why the Breasts that I should suck?"

למנא רביני בורכא ומן תדיא למנא ינקח

"Why did the knees rear me?

And why did I suck from the breasts?"

The commentators are divided as to whether קדמוני ברנים 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 Pa'el ינקח, which here represents the Piel קדמוני 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 רַבִּי.

Verse 13

כִּי עָתָה שָׁנַבְתִּי וְאַשְׁקֹט וְאִם יָנוּחַ לִי

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

כִּנְרָה דִּין הָשָׂא שָׁנִיב הָוִית וְשָׁלָא וְדַמִּיךְ הָוִית וְנִיחַ

"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, כִּנְרָה, 'perhaps, it may be', which the Hebrew text does not have. The temporal element is introduced into the translation by the particle הָשָׂא, 'now', which is (of course) a contraction of הָשָׂא הָאָה, '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 הָוִית together with a series of passive participles, a use which is in

itself reminiscent of NT Greek.

Verse 16

אן כנפל סמוך לא אהיה כעללים לא ראן אור

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

אן איך יחסא סמירא אינו לא הויח ואיך עולא דלא חזו נוהרא

"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 למה , which is thought by most commentators to be elided from the beginning of the verse, but has simply reproduced the conjunction אן of the MT. It is, further, worthy of note that in his translation he has produced an exact rendering of נפל סמוך (that which falls in secret=untimely birth) with the Syriac's יחסא סמירא . 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 כִּי, which is to be found in a similar statement in the text of Obadiah 16: כִּי הָיוּ, "as 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 אִיִּן, "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

שם רשעים חדלו רגז ושם ינוחו יגיעי נח

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

דחמן עולא שליו מן דלמרגורו ותמן מחתניחין אילין דלאין בחייהון

"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 נח י'נ'ע' in the second hemistich. Dhorme has noted that the word י'נ'ע', in the sense of 'wearied, exhausted', recurs only in Sir 37.12. He has also drawn attention to the salient fact that the complement נח 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 נח י'נ'ע', 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: ^γ ^δ ερει ανεπαυστα κατακοποι τω σωματι.

Verse 22

השמחים אלי ויל ישישו כי ימצאו קבר

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

דחדין ומתכונשין ודיצין פד משכחין קברא

"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 ל'ג' אל' in the first hemistich. Among the commentators Clines has noted the difficulty occasioned by this phrase, which also occurs in

Hos 9.1 with שמחתי, 'rejoice', as here and literally means 'to the point of exultation'. (18). The usual solution proposed by commentators is to emend גיל to גל, 'heap', and so provide a parallel to קבר, 'grave', of the second hemistich. In his work Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator may have followed this course in his interpretation of גיל אלי by ומחננושין, '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 שׁלח 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

לגבר אשר דרכו נסתרה ויטך אלוה בעדו

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

לגברא דאורחה מסתרא ומגן אלהא עלוהי

"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 לָלוּ and that לָלוּ אֵלֶיךָ לְמַעַן has to be understood from verse 20. (21). 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 וְיִטֵּן, which is represented in the Peshitta by לָלוּ. This latter form may be parsed as being m. s. Aph'el participle of the root לָלוּ, 'protect', a root which is only used in the Aph'el conjugation. The Peshitta is unique in its interpretation of וְיִטֵּן here, since the versions attest the meaning usually attributed to it, namely, 'hemmed in, hedged in'. The form of וְיִטֵּן 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 לָלוּ to convey the sense of 'cover [protectively]'. Such an understanding could have caused him to use the Aph'el participle לָלוּ, which is best translated by the English word 'protect', as in the above translation.

Chapter Four

Verse 2

הנסה דבר אליך תלאה ועצר במלין מי יונל

"If one ventures a word with you, will you be offended?

Yet who can keep from speaking"?

אן אקף למחללו עמך תלאא ולמנלא מלין מנך מנר משכח

"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: הַנְּסֶה. This form is usually parsed as הַ 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 הַנְּסֶה, in which case it may be parsed as הַ interrogative + 1st 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 $\eta\kappa\lambda$, 'begin, proceed', which may be parsed either as: (a) 3rd masc sing perf Aph'el of $\eta\kappa\lambda$, '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 $\eta\kappa$, '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 $\eta\kappa\lambda$ 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

הלא יראתך נטלתך תקותך וחס דרביך

"Is not your fear of God your confidence,
and the integrity of your ways your hope"?

הא דחלתך הי הי עדליך וסברך ותמימות אורחך

"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 $\eta\lambda\theta\upsilon$ 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 $\lambda\theta\upsilon$ 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 $\eta\lambda\theta\upsilon$, contained in the MT. The text of G has: ποτερον ουχ ο φοβος σου εστιν εν αφροσυνη και η ελπις σου και η ακακια της οδου 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 $\eta\lambda\theta\upsilon$ 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 G'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

זכר נא מי הוא נקי אבר ואיפה ישרים נחדרו

"Think now, who that was innocent ever perished?

Or where were the upright cut off"?

אחרכר נא מנו זכיא דאבר ואיכו תריצא דבהת

"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 נחדרו, 'cut off', and the Peshitta's interpretation of it. The root נחך 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 נהת. In Syriac the root נהת means to 'be ashamed, confused' and it is this root which the Syriac translator has used to represent the MT's נחדרו. 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: אַחַחְחָר. 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 נַלְמַן instead of נַחַח; or (b), the Peshitta is simply interpreting the form נַחַח 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 נַלְמַן instead of נַחַח. The benefit of this proposal is that the root נַל, 'be ashamed, confounded', which is only attested in the Niphal conjugation, often appears in poetic texts with such a meaning, usually in parallelism with verbs of a similar meaning such as נָסַב, '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 נַחַח with the case of Job uppermost in the mind of the translator. This is the more likely reason for the Syriac's rendering of נַחַח by נַל, for the reason stated above, namely, his tendency to paraphrase in his interpretation of the MT.

Verse 8

כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי חֲרָשִׁי אֲוֶן וְרוּעִי עֲמַל יִקְצֹרְהוּ

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

אִךְ מֵא דְחִזִּית דְרַרְרִין בַּחֲסָא וְזִרְעִין עֲמֵלָא נִחְצְדוֹנָה

"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 יִרְרִין, 'live'. On examination of the text it seems odd that the translator has rendered an identical form to the MT's זָרַע, 'sow', but has produced what may be described as a metaphorical sense for the MT's יִרְרִין, 'plough' with the participle יִרְרִין, 'proceed, live'. In Syriac the root רָרַר means to 'proceed, continue', but with the noun חֲסָא 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 רָרַר, 'proceed', is often confused with the verb רָרַר, 'scatter, winnow'. (26). Accordingly it seems best, in the interests of sense, to emend the text of the Peshitta to יִרְרִין 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 יִרְרִין & יִרְרִין, which is to be noted in the text of the Hebrew Bible.

Verse 12

וְאֵלַי דְּבַר יְנוּב וְחָסֵם אֲזוּנַי שְׁמַעַן מְנוּהוּ

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

וְעַלִּי פָתוּמָא אַתְּוִיב וְקִבְלַת אֲדוּנַי אֵיךְ זְעוּר מְנוּה

"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 אַתְּוִיב, 'be answered'. This verbal form may be parsed as 3rd masc sing perf Ettaph'al of the root וָו, 'answer', which only occurs in the Aph'el and Ettaph'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 וָוּוּוּ, '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 שִׁמְחַ מְוֵהוּ, 'a whisper of it', has been rendered in Syriac by וְעוֹר מְוֵהוּ, 'a little of it'. In their commentary Driver/Gray have noted that שִׁמְחַ, '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

יַעֲמַד וְלֹא אֶכִּיר מַדְאֵהוּ אֲמוֹנָה לְנוֹד עֵינַי דִּמְמָה וְקוֹל אֲשַׁמַּע

"It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance.

A form was before my eyes;

there was silence, then I heard a voice:"

וְקָמָה וְלֹא אֲשַׁחֲדָעָהּ וְלֵיתָ חוֹתָהּ לְקוֹבְלֵי עֵינַי וְנִנְעַמְחָה וְקוֹלָהּ שִׁמְעָה דְאִמְרָה

"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 ܐܢܫܘܟ, 'I stood up', instead of the MT's ܐܢܫܘܝܢ. This reading is supported by G, whose text has: ἀνεστήν, καὶ οὐχ ἐπέγνω, 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 ἑστην 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 ܐܢܫܘܟ instead of ܐܢܫܘܝܢ; 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 ܐܢܫܘܟ, 'recognize', is rendered in Syriac by the Eshtaph'el of the root ܥܦܝ, 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: ܐܢܝ ܐܘܪܘܝܢ ܘܡܘܬܘܢ ܘܡܘܬܘܢ--"I looked and there was no form before my eyes". (29). The only difference between the text of G, which has: εἶδον, καὶ οὐχ ἦν μορφή προ

οφθαλμων μου, and the text of Peshitta is that the Syriac text does not represent מַרְאֵהוּ; the only apparent reason for this is that the translator may have considered מַרְאֵהוּ a doublet for מַמְוֹנָה. Among the commentators Tur-Sinai 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 ך at the end of מַרְאֵהוּ and reapportioning it to מַמְוֹנָה; his text would then simply read: מַמְוֹנָה וְהַמְוֹנָה וְלֹא אֶנְיֹן מַרְאֵה וְהַמְוֹנָה, 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 דְּאִמְרָה at the very end of his text, the Syriac translator has correctly interpreted the דְּמַמָּה וְקוֹל of the MT. Dhorme has noted that most commentators have considered דְּמַמָּה וְקוֹל 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

הוּן בְּעַבְדִּי לֹא יֵאמֵר וְנִמְלֵא אֲנִי יְשִׁים אֶהְיֶה

"Even in his servants he puts no trust,
and his angels he charges with error;"

הָא בְּעִבְרֹהּ לֹא מִהֵימָן וְנִמְלָכָהּ נְסִים אֲמָהָא

"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 אָהָלָה by the Syriac translator. The word אָהָלָה 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 אָהָלָה 3, '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 σκολιον, 'crookedness'; while the Targum is in no doubt about the matter, it uses the word אֲיִלָּה, 'iniquity'. The rendering of the Peshitta by the word אָהָלָה, 'amazement', is perhaps from a different etymology namely from the root אָהָלָה 2, 'praise, be praised'. When we consider the Syriac noun אָהָלָה, 'amazement', we find that its root, אָהָלָה, means to 'regard with awe, reverence'; so that the conclusion is inescapable that its etymology is surely אָהָלָה 2, and not אָהָלָה 3, which is the root from which most of the other versions have derived their understanding of the Hebrew noun.

Verse 19

אף שכנוי בחי חמר אשר בעפר יסודם ידכאום לפני עש

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

אף אילין דשרין בבחא דטינא דבעפרא משכללין נחמכנון קדם ערפלא

"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 ידכאום, 'crush' of the Hebrew Bible he has used the Syriac Pa'el of the root מנך, 'humiliate', which may be described as a correct exegesis of the MT. He has literally rendered the prepositional form לפני, '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 ܩܩܐ. (32). With the noun ܡܝܢ, 'moth', however, it is an altogether different matter. It is difficult to see how the Syriac translator could have derived ܩܩܐ from ܡܝܢ. One possibility, however, is to consider that he may have read ܡܝܢ 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 ܡܝܢ 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

מִבֹּקֶר לְעָרֶב יִכָּחַר מִבַּלַּיִם מְשִׁיִּים לְנֹצֵחַ יָאֲבֹדוּן

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

מִן צָפְרָא לְרִמְשָׁא נְחַמְכִּנוּן הִלָּא נְחַתְסִימוּן עֲמוּרִין לְעֵלָם וְנֹאבְדוּן

"They shall be humiliated from morning to evening,
the inhabitants shall not dwell in it forever;
moreover, they shall perish".

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 יָנַחַר by Peshitta's נַחַחְנַנְנִין; (b) the Peshitta's interpretation of מַלִּי מַשִּׁים and connection of מַלִּי with מַשִּׁים; (c) the repetitious nature of וְנִנְחַחְנַחַר made into a third hemistich. These will now be considered in order:

(a) The interpretation of יָנַחַר by Peshitta's נַחַחְנַנְנִין

The Syriac translator has rendered the Hophal יָנַחַר, 'be beaten, hammered', by the Pa'el of the root נַחַח, which he has also used in the previous verse to translate the verbal form נַחַחְנַחַר, '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 מַלִּי מַשִּׁים

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 מַשִּׁים as a Hiphil

participle of the root ק"ו , 'set, place', to which one must understand an elided complement לב , 'heart, mind'. The difficulty with such an understanding is that the Hiphil of the root ק"ו 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 לעלם , 'for ever', which properly belongs to לעלם , with his interpretation of ק"ו . 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 לעלם

Having achieved the above reconstruction of the text so as to make it intelligible, he was left with the verbal form לעלם , 'perish', which he has also reconstructed into a third hemistich by the addition of a ל prior to the verbal form. His construction of this third hemistich has had the effect of making the verbal form לעלם highly repetitious in nature, so that his rendering could be considered a gloss in the text.

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

הלא נסע יתרם במ ימותו ולא בהנמה

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

הא שקל יורתנהון מנהון ושוכנהון בהון נמותון ולא בהנמתא

"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 יתרם, 'tent peg'. In his exegesis the Syriac translator has noted

that this word is capable of two interpretations in Syriac: either (a) ארמא, 'remainder; or (b) ארמא, '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 אלה, 'surely', by אה, 'behold', which he has then followed by his verb לקח, '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 ארמא, 'possession', to make better sense. For the second hemistich he read ארמא, 'remainder', for which he has provided a synonym ארמא, 'their remainder'. By such an exegesis of the Hebrew text he has not only provided an alternative meaning for the word ארמא, but has also provided an alternative subject for the second hemistich, of which he has otherwise provided an exact translation.

NOTES

- | | | | | |
|------|------------------|---------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| (1) | Muraoka, T. | <u>Classical Syriac for Hebraists</u> | 1987 | p 29. |
| (2) | Gosling, F. A. | <u>Syntax of Hebrew Poetry</u> | 1992 | p 281f |
| (3) | Jastrow, M. | <u>Talmud Dictionary</u> Vol 1 | 1903 | p 202. |
| (4) | Driver/Gray | <u>ICC--Job</u> | 1921 | p 17. |
| (5) | Dhorme, E. | <u>Book of Job.</u> | 1967 | p 26. |
| (6) | " | ibid | | p 26. |
| (7) | " | ibid | | p 27. |
| (8) | " | ibid | | p 27. |
| (9) | Grabbe, L. L. | <u>Comparative Philology and Job</u> | 1977 | p 29. |
| (10) | Clines, D. J. A. | <u>WBC--Job 1-20</u> | 1989 | p 70. |
| (11) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 27. |
| (12) | Tur-Sinai, N. H. | <u>Book of Job</u> | 1967 | p 54. |
| (13) | Mangan, C. | <u>Targum of Job</u> | 1991 | p 29. |
| (14) | Clines, D. J. A. | ibid | | p 71. |
| (15) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 28. |
| (16) | Stade, B. | <u>ZAW</u> 6/1886 | | p 143-
156. |
| (17) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 36. |
| (18) | Clines, D. J. A. | ibid | | p 74. |
| (19) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 38. |
| (20) | Grabbe, L. L. | ibid | | p 38. |
| (21) | Clines, D. J. A. | ibid | | p 75. |
| (22) | " " | ibid | | p 108. |
| (23) | Noldeke, T. | <u>Compendious Syriac Grammar</u> | 1904 | p 307. |

- | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------|------------|
| (24) | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p 23. |
| (25) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 44. |
| (26) | Payne-Smith, J. | <u>Syriac English Dictionary</u> | 1903 | p 530. |
| (27) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 49. |
| (28) | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p 24. |
| (29) | " " | ibid | | p 25. |
| (30) | Tur-Sinai | ibid | | p 83. |
| (31) | Dhorme, E. | ibid | | p 51. |
| (32) | " | ibid | | p 54. |
| (33) | " | ibid | | p 55. |
| (34) | " | ibid | | p ccxviii. |

Chapter Three

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 5.1-6.30

Chapter Five

Verse 2

פִּי לֹא יִלֵּל יְהוָה כִּפְשׁוֹ וּפְחָה אַמִּית קִנְאָה

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

חַסֵּל דִּלְסַנְלָא קַסְלָא וְלִסְנַלָּא קַסְלָא קִנְאָחָא

"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 'נִי 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 'נִי with its usual meaning of 'for, since', which in Syriac is represented by the compound particle ܢܝܠܢ. (1). Blommerde has also understood the ܝ which is prefixed to ܢܝܠܢ as an emphatic particle; but it is more natural to treat the ܝ 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 7 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 נָהַר and the Hiphil of נָהַר, both of which may be used to express the concept of slaying or killing; whereas the Peshitta uses ܩܬܠ in both hemistichs. In a similar fashion, it should be noted, that whereas the Hebrew text uses two distinct nouns for fool, אָוִיל and פֶּתֵה, the Peshitta only uses the noun ܫܢܠܐ.

Verse 3

אָוִיל רָאִיתִי אָוִיל מִשְׂרִישׁ וְאֶקְוֶה נֹהֵר פֶּתֵה

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

אֲנִי חֹזֵית רִשְׁיָעָא דְמַצְלַח וְאַבְדָּא דִּירֵה מִן שְׁלִי

"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 ܠܝܘܠܐ, 'fool', as the impious man which is denoted by ܘܥܝܘܒܐ 'impious'. It should not be thought, however, that the Syrian scribe read a text which contained the word ܘܘܪܝܐ, '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 ܠܝܘܠܐ, '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 ܘܘܪܝܐ, 'taking root', by the Aph'el participle ܡܠܝܢܐ, '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 ܘܘܩܠܝܢܐ, 'and I cursed', by ܘܘܩܠܝܢܐ, 'perishing', that now merits our attention. In his rendering of the second hemistich he has interpreted ܡܠܝܢܐ, '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 ܘܘܩܠܝܢܐ, 'he cursed', instead of the MT's ܘܘܩܠܝܢܐ, 'I cursed'. In this he may simply be following the text of G which has: ἄλλ' εὐθεὸς ἐβρωθη αὐτῶν ἡ διαίτα. There is an apparent difficulty in reading ܘܘܩܠܝܢܐ, '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 ויִקָּן, 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

יִרְחֲקוּ בְנָיו מִיָּשָׁע וַיִּדְכְּאוּ בַשַּׁעַר וְאֵין מַצִּיל

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

נִתְרַחֲקוּן בְּנוֹהֵי מִן פְּרוּקָנָא וְנִתְמַכְכוּן בַּתְּרַעָא וְלֵית דְּפָרֵק לְהוּן

"His sons are far away from deliverance,
and they are humiliated in the gate,
and they do not have a deliverer."

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 מנך, 'humiliate', to render the Niphal of the root דנך, '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 מנך elsewhere in the Peshitta to effect an interpretation of the MT. (for further remarks on the use of מנך to render דנך and נחח, see above pp 77f & 78ff respectively).

Verse 5

אשר קצירו רעב יאכל ואל מצוים יקחהו ושאר צמים חילם

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

דחצד כפנא נאנול ולצהיא נחנסנון ונורט צהיא קנינהון

"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 אֲשֶׁר קָצַיְתָּ , 'whose harvest', by the phrase דחצד . Although it should be noted that the Peshitta's text is also capable of being interpreted as a verb, דחצד , 3rd masc sing perfect Pe'al, 'to harvest', to which has been prefixed the relative ה ; 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 ה 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 ܩܢܝܢܐ, 'from the thorns', as some sort of derivative of ܩܢܝܢܐ. He may have made this emendation either: by considering that the word ܩܢܝܢܐ 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: ܩܢܝܢܐ = ܩܢܝܢܐ = ܩܢܝܢܐ. 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 ܩܢܝܢܐ, 'take', as being from the root ܩܢ, '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 ܩܢܝܢܐ 1, 'pant, gasp', he appears to have read ܩܢܝܢܐ 2, 'crush, pulverize', which caused him to use the verb ܩܢܝܢܐ, 'crush, devour'. That understood, he has otherwise rendered the verse accurately, while retaining the difficult 3rd m pl

suffix of ח"לם.

Verse 6

פ' לא יצא מעפר און ומאדמה לא יצמח עמל

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

חסל דלא נפק מן עפרא שוקרא אפלא מן אדמתא צמח עולא

"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 שוקרא, 'falsehood', for the MT's און, 'wickedness'; and עולא, 'injustice', for the MT's עמל, 'trouble'. According to Dhorme, the point of the text is to show connection between און, 'evil', and עמל, 'trouble'; the author of the first is likewise the author of the second. (6). In this case the text of G simply has κοπος, 'labour', and πονος, '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 שקר, '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

פִּי אָדָם לְעֵמֶל יוֹלֵד רִבְנֵי רֶשֶׁף יִגְבִּיְהוּ עֶרֶף

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

מִסַּל דִּבְרֵי נֶשֶׁא לְעֵמֶל הוּא אֶתְיֵלֵד רִבְנֵי עוֹפֵא נְרִימוֹן גּוֹפֵא

"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 phrase רִבְנֵי רֶשֶׁף, 'sparks', is defined by BDB as being derived from the noun רֶשֶׁף, '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 $\eta\psi\gamma$ 'נן as $\eta\psi\gamma$ 'נן , '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 $\eta\psi\gamma$ 'נן as the name of a bird, so that the text of G has: νεσσοι δε γυπτος, Aquila: $\nu\iota\sigma\iota$ $\pi\tau\eta\nu\sigma\upsilon$, and Symmachus: $\tau\alpha$ $\tau\epsilon\chi\nu\alpha$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\nu$. 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: $\epsilon\psi\gamma$ 'נן , 'wild Birds'. According to Dhorme his exegesis here may be not so far from the mark, as may be proved by the translation of $\eta\psi\gamma$ by $\eta\psi\gamma$ in the Targum of Onqelos (Dt 32.34). (9). Thus his interpretation of $\eta\psi\gamma$ 'נן may be deemed to be another example of the Syriac translator's dependence on the Septuagint.

Verse 11

לשום שפלים לתרום וקרים שגבו ישע

"he sets on high those who are lowly,
and those who mourn are lifted to safety".

למסם שפלא ברומא ומכינא נחצונון בפרוקנא

"to set the lowly on high,
and the humiliated are strengthened with salvation".

Unusually, the first hemistich in the MT begins with the preposition ל + infinitive absolute שׂוּ, 'to set', of the root שׂוּ. 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 G has the participle ποιοῦντα, 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 שׂוּל bears witness to the correctness of the MT. In the second hemistich he has once again used the verb הִנָּךְ, 'to be humble', to render the Qal participle שׂוּרֵי, 'mourners'. In this instance he has used the masc sing Pe'al passive participle מְנִינָא to give a particular interpretation to the שׂוּרֵי of the Hebrew Bible. In Hebrew the verb נָנַךְ means 'to be dark, wear mourning attire'; whereas the verb the Syriac translator has used, הִנָּךְ, 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 שׂוּרֵי denotes those who have soiled their faces and heads in great sorrow; whereas in the Peshitta the passive participle מְנִינָא denotes those who have humbled themselves in an act of repentance with sackcloth and ashes. Dhorme has noted that the meaning of the phrase שׂוּרֵי מְנִינָא is that of being lifted to safety;

whereas in the Peshitta the meaning of **בפּוּרְקָנָא בְּנַתְעֻשְׁנֻן** 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

מִפֶּר מַחְשְׁבוֹת עֲרוּמִים וְלֹא תַעֲשִׂינָה יְדֵיהֶם אֲרֻשִׁיה

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

מִבְּסַל מַחְשְׁבוֹתָ דְּחַכְמַיָּא דִּלְא נַעֲבֹרֵן אִידִיהוֹן לְחַנְמַא

"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 **א** to form a negative consequence clause. In the Peshitta, this clause has been formed, as we might expect, by the

relative ך, which has been annexed to the negative particle ךל. The reason for the divergence of the texts is the final word of the second hemistich ך'ך'ך, 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 ך'ך'ך by the word ך'ך'ך, 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 ך'ך'ך, '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

לכד חכמים בערמם ועצת נפחלים נמהרה

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

אחד חכמא בחכמתהון ותועיתא דצנוועתנא מוטל

"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 וְנִמְהָרָה, 'brought to a quick end', by the Syriac translator's use of the Pa'el participle חֲנֻטֵל, 'abolish'. The Syrian scribe had already used the participle חֲנֻטֵל in the first hemistich of the previous verse to render the Hiphil participle נִפְרָץ, 'frustrate'; whereas on this occasion he has used it to render the Niphal participle וְנִמְהָרָה, '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 εἰςσθησεν, the Vulgate has dissipat, and the Syriac has חֲנֻטֵל. (15). But it is also correct to note that the Syriac root חֲנֻטֵל, 'abolish', is not an exact equivalent of the Hebrew root נִמְהָרָה, 'bring to a quick end'. In Hebrew the root נִמְהָרָה means to 'do something quickly, in a hurry', and it is this temporal element which is missing from the Syriac root used.

Verse 14

וְרָמָם יִפְגְּשׁוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְכִלְיָהּ יִמְשְׁשׁוּ בַצֹּהֲרַיִם

"They meet with darkness in the daytime,
and grope at noonday as in the night".

באימא נגשׁוּן אײך דבּוּשׁוּכא וּאײך דבּללײא נמוּשׁוּן בּטוּרָא

"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 ׁוּשׁוּׁ, 'encounter, meet', which only occurs in the Piel conjugation in this text. In the Peshitta the imperfect Palpel of the root ׁוּשׁוּ, 'grobe, 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 ׁ, 'as', has been omitted from the text before the noun ׁוּשׁוּ, 'darkness', and so he has supplied the missing preposition in the form of ׁׁ. His reconstruction has had the effect of creating a text which has the same prepositions in both stichs; 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 ׁׁׁׁׁ in order to make it intelligible.

Verse 15

וְיִשָּׁע מִחֶרֶב מִפִּיהֶם וּמִיַּד חֹזֵק אֲבִיּוֹן

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

פָּרַק מִן חֶרֶב אֶת מִן פּוֹמְהוֹן וּמִן אִירָא דַעֲשִׂינָא לַמְסַנָּנָא

"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 אֲבִיּוֹן, 'needy', in the second hemistich, they suggest (following Budde) the word אָתָּן, 'fatherless', should be used, and consider that its three consonants have fallen out of the text, and that אָתָּן 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: ἀπολοιντο δε εν πολεμω, αδυνατος δε εξελθοι εκ χειρος δυναστου, 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 ׀ה'פּוּ and has read ׀ן׀ן׀ instead of ׀פּ׀ן׀; for this reason the text of G was unavailable to the Syriac translator. The Targum has supplied a new object for the verbal form ׀פּ׀ן׀ in the form of ׀ה'פּוּ, '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: ׀ן׀ן׀ן׀ן׀ ׀ן׀ ׀ן׀ן׀ן׀ ׀ן׀ ׀ן׀ן׀, which, by ignoring the second ׀ן׀, 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 ׀ן׀. (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 ׀ן׀ן׀ 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.

Verse 21

בְּשׁוֹט לְשׁוֹן אֲחַבָּא וְלֹא תִירָא מִשָּׁד פִּי יְבוּא

"You shall be hid from the scourge of the tongue,
and shall not fear destruction when it comes".

מִן שְׂבַטָא דִּלְשׁוֹנָא אֲסַתְתֵּר וְלֹא אֲדַחַל מִן אֲבִירָא פִּד נֶאֱחָא

"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 ב , 'in, with, by'; yet it has to be noted that the Peshitta has not used this, but the preposition מִן , 'from, of'. BHS has recorded in its textual apparatus that there is a alternative Hebrew text בְּשׁוֹטָא , 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 emend the text to read בְּשׁוֹטָא , following Driver/Gray. (19). In reality, however, there is no need to do this, since, as Hartley has pointed out, the preposition ב has here the meaning of מִן , 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 עִם אֲבֹנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּרִיתְךָ וְחַיִּים הַשָּׂדֶה הַשְּׁלָמָה 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".

מִסַּל דַּעַם כְּאַפָּא דְדַבְרָא קִימְךָ וְחַיּוֹתָא דְבַרְא אֲשַׁתְּלַמַּח 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: *כִּי עִם אֲבֹנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּרִיתְךָ*, 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:

קימך חטל דנפא דברג קימך, 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 הוּשַׁלְמָה, 'be at peace', which occurs only here in this conjugation. The Peshitta has used the perfect Ethpa'al of the same root: אַשְׁחַלְמָה, '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

וידעת נבי שלום אהלך ופקדת נוך ולא חחטא

"You shall know that your tent is safe,
and you shall inspect your fold and miss nothing".

וחדע דשלם הו משכנך ותהפוך לדירך ולא חחטא

"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 ידע, 'to know', which is here used with a stative nuance; whereas the same concept is expressed in the Peshitta by means of the Pe'al 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 אהלך, 'your tent', is expressed by the noun משכנך, 'your tabernacle', which appears to have more theological overtones than the neutral noun אהל, 'tent'. It may be that the noun משכנך, 'your tabernacle', may be an allusion to the Targum's exegesis of this verse, which has rendered אהלך, 'your tent', as בית אולפנך, 'house of your study' (for another such allusion, see above p 54). In the second hemistich, the Syriac translator has rendered MT's ופקדו, 'inspect', by the

imperfect Pe'al וּתְחַזְרֶנָּה, '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 וְלֹא תִחַטְּא, 'and you shall not sin'. In his commentary Clines has noted that the theological verb חָטָא, '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 חָטָא by the passive verbal construction תִּינָוֵי, 'injure', rather than by taking the primary meaning of 'to miss' of the MT's תִּחַטְּא.

Verse 26

חֲבוּא בְנִלְחָא אֲלֵי קִבְרָא פְעִלְוּתָא גְדִישָׁא בְעִתָּו

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

וּתְחַזְרֶנָּה וְיִחַטְּא לְקִבְרָא אֵיךְ חֲבוּא בְנִלְחָא בְעִתָּו

"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: בְּלֵב , which the RSV has translated: "in ripe old age". In his study Grabbe has noted that the root בל occurs only in Job 5.26 and 30.2 in the entire Old Testament; its precise meaning is, however, unknown. (23). 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 בל . Thus the text of G has: $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\eta$
 $\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\alpha\phi\psi$ $\psi\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\psi\rho\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, 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 בְּלֵב and has therefore avoided the problem altogether. The Targum has:
 $\text{ח' צול בשלימות שנייך בנונא לקבורתא}$,
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 בל from בל , 'completion', as has the Greek translator in his rendering

of נלנ in 30.2 by the word συντελεια. The Syriac translator in his rendering of נלנ in 30.2, has used the word צוּוּנָא, 'vigour', but his translation may be due to the fact (as Dhorme has noted), that he read there: לל נל '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 נלנ in 5.26, which he has translated as an adverb of manner: נ'א'א'א, 'gently, peacefully'.

Verse 27

הנה ואת חקרנוה כן היא שמענוה ואתה דע לך

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

הדא נצין והננא הר שמענוה ואתה דע לך

"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 הנה, '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 ἰδου and the Targum which has קה. It would seem more likely that he has omitted קנה 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 קמנו, 'hear it'. This form has been read as a perfect tense by the Greek translator, whose rendering is: ἀκηκοαμεν, '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: קמנו, '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

לן שקולן פקל פקל ויהי במאזנים פקלן וכן

"O that my vexation were weighed,
and all my calamity laid in the balances"!

לִּי דֵּיּן מִחֲתָקֵל לְוַדִּי וְמִדָּם דִּהוּנִי בְּמִסְאָחָא אַחְדָּא

"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 וְהִיָּה to be a form of the verb הָיָה , 'to be'. In the text of 6.2b, we have to take note of the *kethib* וְהִיָּה , 'my misfortune', which, as Dhorme has noted, has the same meaning as the *qere* וְהָוָה , and is derived from the verb הָוָה , 'to fall'. (25). Thus the word וְהִיָּה may be said to be the parallel word to נַעַץ , 'vexation'. But it should be noted that this is not how the Syriac translator has understood it. He has connected וְהִיָּה with the verb הָיָה , 'to be', and has assumed that the יָה ending is a form of the 1st pers sing suff. He has used the common noun מִדָּם , 'something', together with the relative דֵּיּן to produce: 'that which'; he has then qualified this phrase by the verb לְוַדִּי , '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 וְהִיָּה , 'my misfortune'. He has, moreover, totally omitted the verbal form: וְהָוָה , '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

כִּי עַתָּה מִחֹול יָמַיִם יִכָּבֵד עַל פֶּן דִּבְרֵי לַעַו

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

מִסּוּל דִּהֶשֶׂא מִן חֹלָא דִּימַמָּא עֲשֵׁן מַסְל הֵנָּה פְּחֻגְמִי כִלִּין

"For then it would be heavier than the sand of the seas;
for this reason my words are restrained".

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 מִסּוּל, 'for', which of course represents the Hebrew כִּי. (26). The element of the Hebrew text which has brought forth comment is the translation of לַעַו, 'rave, speak rashly', by the Peshitta's כִּלִּין, 'restrained'. In his commentary Clines has noted that the KJV has derived לַעַו from לָוַע 1, 'to swallow, swallow down'; whereas most modern scholars derive the verbal form from לָעַע 2, '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 לעצ 2), they derived their understanding of לעו from לוץ 1, since the Targum has אשחלה'ן, 'abandoned, exhausted'; so that the Syriac translator followed that understanding of the Hebrew text, causing him to render: נל'ן, 'restrained'.

Verse 4

בִּי חַצֵּי שְׂדֵי עַמְדֵי אֲשֶׁר חָמַתָּם שָׂתָה רוּחִי בְּעוֹתֵי אֱלֹהִים עֲרֹכְוֹנִי

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

מִסַּל דְּגִאֲרוּהִי דְחַסִּינָא בְּבִסְרִי וְחַמְתְּהוֹן שְׂחִיא לְרוּחִי
וּבְעַתְתָּה דְּאֵלֵהָא סְרַדְחִנִי

"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 עִמָּדִי, '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 τῷ σαματι μου εστιν, he has rendered 'רנני, '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, נחמם, '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 וְאֵל, 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 'רני, 'my spirit', is the object of נחמם, 'drinks', since it is indicated by the nota accusativa ܘ. 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 'ערנני, 'arrayed against me'; whereas the Peshitta has used the perfect Pa'el 'עללני, 'made afraid, terrified'. Dhorme has explained this apparent discrepancy as a corruption of the text, which should in fact be 'עללני, '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

מאנה לנגוע בפשי המה כדוי לחמי

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

מאנח נפשי במכחשה או מילל איך וויא קרובי

"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 מאנה, 'refuse', which may be parsed as 3rd fem sing perf Qal of the root: אנח, 'to refuse'. The first verbal form is then succeeded by a second: לנגוע, 'to touch', which is of course the preposition ל + inf cons of the verb נגע, 'to touch'. The second verbal form is followed by the subject of the first: פשי, 'my appetite'. Hartley has noted that the noun פשי 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 נאנן , 'is weary', which may be parsed as 3rd fem sing perf Pe'al of the root נאנ , 'be irksome, grow weary'. The Syriac translator has in this construction used the cognate root נאנ , which in Hebrew means 'refuse' but in Syriac means 'to be weary'. It would appear that he has understood the next verbal construction: נאננן , 'to touch', as the object of the verb נאנן , 'refuse'. He has taken the preposition ל as the nota accusativa ל , 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 נאננן , 'touch', as the noun נאנן , 'plague', which he has rendered by the Syriac noun ܩܘܡܩܘܡܐ , 'troubles'. He has read the noun נאנן in its normal sense of 'my soul', and has also taken the trouble to reposition it next to the verb נאנן 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 הם , 'they', which the Syriac translator has assumed to be a verbal form, הם , 'to make an uproar', and so has rendered ללן , which may be parsed as masc sing Aph'el participle of the root לל , 'to wail'. He has accurately represented the inseparable preposition כ , by the Syriac ܟܝܟ , 'like'. He has read the noun כח , 'indisposition', as the noun כח , 'drunkard'; and, finally, he has taken the noun לחם , 'my bread', from the root לח , 'to fight',

which has caused him to render 'קרבני, '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

וַיֹּאֲלֵ אֱלֹהִים וַיִּדְכְּאֹנִי יְתֵר יָדוֹ וַיִּבְצַעֲנִי

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

וְנַחֲסֵפִים אֱלֹהִים וְנִדְכִינִי וְנִפְרוֹס אִידָהּ וְנִשְׁמְלִינִי

"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 וַיֹּאֲלֵ, 'to resolve, intend', which, as Dhorme has noted is the Hiphil of the root אָל 2, 'resolve, intend', with ו before the dependent verb. (31). This verbal form is represented in the Peshitta by the Ethpe'el of the root פִּיֵס, 'acquiesce'; this must be judged as being a fairly accurate rendering of the Hebrew text. In the MT the dependent verb is introduced by ו, to which has been attached the

form: '1XJ7', 'crush'. It is fairly certain that the Syriac translator has connected the form '1XJ7' with the Aramaic root XJ7 (XJ1), '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 7H", 'loose', which may be parsed as 3rd masc sing jussive Hiphil of the root 7H1. In the Peshitta this is represented by the imperfect Pe'al 11711, '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 '11711, 'cut off'; in the Peshitta, however, the root 1171 is represented by the form '11711, 'perfect'. This latter form '11711, may be parsed as the 3rd masc sing imperfect Shaph'el of the root 1171, 'perfect, finish'; yet one has to concede that it is difficult to trace the translator's technique in the rendering of the root 1171. 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 1171, 'crush', and the noun 1171, 'gain'. It is, however, more likely that the Syriac translator had to choose the verbal root 1171 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

רַחֵם עוֹד נַחֲמָתִי וְאַסְלֵדָה בְּחֵילָהּ לֹא יִחַמְּלֵנִי

כִּי לֹא נִחְדַּשְׁתִּי אִמְרֵי קְדוֹשׁ

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

וְנִהְיָ אֲנִי חֲזָק וְאַשְׁתַּמְלֵא חֲזָק בְּחֵילָהּ לֹא חוֹסֵן

מִסַּל דֵּלָא דְגַלְתִּי בְּמַאֲמְרֵהּ דְּקְדִישָׁא

"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 עוֹד, 'still, again' of the first hemistich of the MT, which he has represented by חֲזָק, 'again'. The interpretation of the imperfect conjunctive וְאַסְלֵדָה, '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 G, which has ἠλλομην, 'leapt', and by the Targum, which has וְרָצַח, '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 הַלִּינָה, 'birthpangs, pain', from the more common noun לִינָה, '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 הִלְלִינָה, and as a result was free to make of it what he would. In his rendering of the imperfect conjunctive הִלְלִינָה, he has once again used the root חָלַל, which here occurs in the Eshtaph'al conjugation with the meaning 'be perfected'. He has however, given a fairly accurate rendering of the locution לִינָה לֹא, 'it does not spare', in his nominal translation: לִינָה לֹא, 'without measure'.

Verse 16

הַקָּרִים מִנִּי קָרָח עֲלֵימוּ יִחְצֵלֵם שֶׁלֵג

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

הַדְּלֵחִין הַזֶּה מִן גִּלְדָּא עֲלֵיהוֹן סִי מֵלֵגָא

"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 הַקָּרִים of the MT refers to the נַחֲלִים of v 15. (35). But it is not only in their interpretation of הַקָּרִים 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

נתערקלון שבילא דאררחהון ונסקון בתושא ונאכדון

"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 לַפְתּוּן, 'turn aside', which is masc pl imperfect Niphal of the root לָפַח, and in that conjugation only occurs here in the Hebrew Bible. In the Peshitta לַפְתּוּן is represented by the imperfect Ethpar'al נַתְעַרְקְלוּן, '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 דַרְכֵיהֶם the complement of אַרְחוֹת; it should further be noted that he has confused the noun אַרְחוֹת, 'caravan', for the noun אַרְחַת, '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

הַבִּיטוּ אֲרוֹתֵי תֵמָה הֲלֵיכֵת שְׁבָא קוֹר לְמֹר

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

דְּחִינּוּ לְאַרְוֵתָא דְתֵמָה וּלְשְׁבִילַא דְשְׁבָא סְנִינּוּ לְהוֹן

"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 הַבִּיטוּ, 'look', by the perfect of the root הָרָךְ, 'look at', but has either rendered the initial ה as the relative ד, or he has supplied one. He has then construed אֲרוֹתֵי תֵמָה as the object of the verb הַבִּיטוּ, and has indicated this in his text by the nota accusativa ל. In the second hemistich of the verse he has taken הֲלֵיכֵת as a parallel term to אֲרוֹתֵי, which he took to be 'paths' and has accordingly rendered as שְׁבִילַא, 'paths'; this procedure may be justified, if it is remembered that הֲלֵיכֵת may mean 'ways' in Habb 3.6. As with the first hemistich he has made the construction דְשְׁבָא שְׁבִילַא the object of the verb סְנִינּוּ, 'waited for'.

Verse 26

הלהרבה מלים אחשבו ולרוח אמרי נאש

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

הא למכונו מלין אחשבוון ועל רוחי מלתי אחבי'וון

"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 אָשַׁב, 'despairing'; it is best to take this as masc sing Niphal participle of the root אָשַׁב, 'to despair'. Rignell has drawn attention to the fact that Brockelmann has stated incorrectly in his lexicon that אָשַׁב is a rendering of the Hebrew אָשַׁב. 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 reprinted אמרי as a noun: 'my word'. Thus his rendering of the second hemistich is based on his

tendency to paraphrase.

Verse 27

אף על יחוס אפילו ותכרו על ריעכם

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

הא על יחמא מתרוורבין אנתון ומכרין אנתון לרחמנן

"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 אפילו, 'cast', which, as Dhorme has noted, has no complement. (39). In these circumstances it is best to adopt the complement גוול, 'lots', as in 1 Sam 14.42, a decision that is confirmed by the presence of the preposition על 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 Palpel participle of the root 'גן, 'magnify yourselves', which qualifies the action of the subject against the fatherless.

A different procedure is adopted in the second hemistich. Dhorme has noted that, the Syriac translator has there interpreted the verbal form תננו as deriving from the Aramaic root ננא, 'be sad', which has caused him to use the Aph'el participle תננין 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

שבו נא אל אלהי עוללה ושבתי עורד צדקי בה

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

Turn now, my vindication is at stake".

תשובו נא השא ולא תהווון איך עוללה חובנו הכיל וזכור

"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 יהי, 'let it be'; whereas the Syriac translator would appear to have read a true imperfect יהיו, '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 'רָשָׁע, 'you return', but it is clear that the Syriac translator has followed the text of G and the Targum and read the Qere רָשָׁע, '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 'קִיָּאִי, 'my vindication', as a verb רָשָׁע, 'be innocent, justified'. In Lamsa's translation of this verse, he has translated both occurrences of רָשָׁע 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

הִישׁ בְּלִשׁוֹנִי עוֹלָה אִם חֲכִי לֹא יִבִּין הָרוּחַ

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

דְּלִמָּא אִית בְּלִשׁוֹנִי עוֹלָא אִו פּוֹמִי לֹא מַמְלֵל קוֹשְׁתָא

"Is there wickedness on my tongue,
or does not my mouth speak truth"?

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 'פִּי, 'my mouth', has correctly understood the meaning of the Hebrew 'טַעַם, 'taste, palate'. He has rendered 'יִבִּין, 'discerns', by the Pa'el participle 'לִלְמַן, 'speak', which may be described as a paraphrase of the Hebrew text. Finally he has rendered 'אִוִּי, 'calamity', by the Syriac noun 'אִוִּי, '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 'אִוִּי, and so was guided in his choice of 'אִוִּי by the assertions of v 28. Thus, once again, what he has produced is a paraphrase of the text.

NOTES

- | | | | | |
|------|------------------|--|------|------------|
| (1) | Gordis, R. | <u>Book of Job</u> | 1978 | p 52. |
| (2) | Blommerde, A. | <u>Northwest Semitic Grammar & Job</u> | | p 43. |
| (3) | Dhorme, E. | <u>Book of Job</u> | 1967 | p 58. |
| (4) | Gordis | ibid | | p 53. |
| (5) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 57. |
| (6) | " | ibid | | p 61. |
| (7) | BDB | <u>Hebrew & English Lexicon</u> | 1906 | p 958. |
| (8) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 61. |
| (9) | " | ibid | | p 62. |
| (10) | Gosling, F. A. | <u>Syntax of Hebrew Poetry</u> | 1992 | p 309, 10. |
| (11) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 64. |
| (12) | Driver/Gray | <u>ICC--Job</u> | 1921 | p 30f. |
| (13) | BDB | ibid | | p 444. |
| | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p 31f. |
| (14) | Clines, D. J. A. | <u>WBC--Job 1-20</u> | 1989 | p 117. |
| (15) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 65. |
| (16) | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p 32. |
| (17) | Rignell, L. G. | <u>Vetus Testamentum Syriace</u> 92:1a | | p 7. |
| (18) | Lamsa, G. | <u>Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Texts</u> | | p 561. |
| (19) | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p 32. |
| (20) | Hartley, J. E. | <u>Book of Job</u> | 1988 | p 123. |
| (21) | Gosling | ibid | | p 445f. |
| (22) | Clines | ibid | | p 118 |

- (23) Grabbe, L. L. Comparative Philology and Job 1977 p 43.
- (24) Dhorme ibid p 73.
- (25) " ibid p 75.
- (26) Payne-Smith Syriac-English Dictionary 1903 p 267.
- (27) Clines ibid p 158.
- (28) Dhorme ibid p 76.
- (29) " ibid p 76.
Rignell, L. G. 'Peshitta of Job' 1973 p 104.
- (30) Hartley ibid p 131.
- (31) Dhorme ibid p 81.
- (32) Grabbe ibid p 46f.
- (33) Dhorme ibid p 81.
- (34) Grabbe ibid p 48.
- (35) Dhorme ibid p 86.
- (36) " ibid p 86.
- (37) Payne-Smith ibid p 425.
- (38) Rignell, L. G. 'Peshitta of Job' p 104.
- (39) Dhorme ibid p 93.
- (40) " ibid p 93.

Chapter Four

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 7.1-8.22

Chapter Seven

Verse 1

הלא צבא לאנוש על ארץ ונמי שניר ימיו

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

הא זבוא הו לאנשא על ארעא ואיך יומי אגירא אנוך יומהי

"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 הלא, 'is not'; he has rendered it with the particle הא, 'behold'. In his commentary Gordis has suggested a reason why this should be. He has noted that, in Rabbinic Hebrew, the particle לא, without the interrogative ה, 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 אלה by אה? (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 אצ, 'army', by the Syriac noun אצ, 'time'. Dhorme has argued that the noun אצ, '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 אצ in the book of Job. In fact the noun אצ 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: אצ, 'hosts'; whereas in 14.14 the RSV has used the term 'my service', while the Peshitta has rendered: אצ, 'youth'. From this evidence, and from the example of 10.17 in particular, it seems clear that the Syriac translator knew the meaning of אצ, and so what he has provided in 7.1 is a paraphrase of the text, from which the complement has been omitted.

Verse 2

נעבד אשאף צל ונשכיר יקוה נעלו

"Like a slave who longs for the shadow,
and like a hireling who looks for his wages,"

וּאִיךְ עֹבֵד דְּמַסְכָּא לְסַלְלָא וְאִיךְ אַגְיָדָא דְּמַסְכָּא לְמַשְׁלֵמוֹ פְּעִלָּה

"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: וַעֲלֹן, '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 מְשָׁלֵמוֹ. It is only the Syriac translator who has construed the noun וַעֲלֹן to convey the sense 'work'; and to achieve such a sense he has had to add the Pa'el infinitive מְשַׁלְּמוֹן, 'to complete'. Finally it should be noted that the Syriac translator has used the Pa'el participle מְשַׁלְּמוֹן to render the imperfect יִשְׁאַף, 'pant, long for', as well as the imperfect יִקְוֶה, 'wait, expect'. Thus, once again, we may conclude that the Syriac translator has provided a paraphrase of the text.

Verse 3

כִּן הִנְחַלְתִּי לִי יְרוּחִי שׁוֹא וְלִילִיָּוָה עֲמַל מִנּוֹ לִי

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

הַנּוֹא יָרַח לִי יָרַח סְרִיקָא וְלִילוּחָא דְעַמְלָא לֹא אַחְמוּרִי לִי

"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 ׀׀ as a Pual; and (b) the insertion of the negative ׀. These will now be considered in order.

(a) The interpretation of ׀׀ as a Pual

It is clear from a casual reading of the Peshitta that the translator has read ׀׀ as a Pual, 'apportioned', since he has rendered it by the Ethpe'el of the cognate root ׀׀, '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 ׀

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 dittography; i.e. he has mistakenly repeated the last two letters of the form $\alpha\lambda\alpha$, 'weariness', which have in turn produced the negative $\alpha\lambda$.

Verse 4

אם שכבת ואמרת מתי אקום ומדד ערב ושבעתי ודד'ים ער' נשף

"When I lie down I say, 'When shall I arise'?"

But the night is long,

and I am full of tossing till the dawn".

אן שכבת ואמרת אמתי אקום ומשח אנה לרמשא

ושכב אנה ונאד אנה לשפרא

"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: $\gamma\delta\eta$, which in the MT is pointed as

a perfect Piel. As Dhorme has noted in his commentary, this form has yielded a great number of explanations by commentators. (3). BDB attributes to this form the meaning of 'extend, continue', and notes that its subject is the ערב, 'evening'. The difficulty with this is twofold: (a) the normal meaning of מדה is 'measure'; (b) the meaning of לילה has to be attributed to ערב. These difficulties may be overcome, when it is remembered that (a) The Hithpoel of מדה occurs in 1 Kings 17.21 with the meaning of 'stretched out'; (b) ערב occurs with the meaning of לילה in Prov 7.9. As far as the Syriac translator is concerned, he has clearly understood מדה in the sense of 'stretched out', since he has rendered מדה by the participle מדה, which normally means 'anoint', but also has a secondary meaning of 'extend, stretch out'. He has not, however, understood ערב as the subject of this verb, but the object, which he has indicated by the nota accusativa ל. He has assumed that the subject of מדה is the same as the subject of the first hemistich, namely, Job, which he has indicated in his text by the pronoun אגא. In the third hemistich the translator does not appear to have understood the meaning of מלא, 'full of', since he has replaced the verb with the participle נשן, 'lie down'. The verb מלא 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

לבש בשרי רמה וגיש עפר עורי רגע וימאס

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

לבש בשרי רמא וגושמי עפרא משכי קפור ואתמסי

"My flesh is clothed with worms and my body with dust;
my skin shrinks, and decays".

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

- (1) the interpretation of גיש by גושמי;
- (2) the interpretation of רגע by קפור;
- (3) the interpretation of וימאס by ואתמסי;

it seems appropriate to consider these in order.

- (1) The Interpretation of גיש by גושמי

As Dhorme has noted in his commentary, the meaning of דָּבַח , Qere דָּבַח , is that of 'clod, glebe', which has been attached to the word עָפָר , 'dust', and is necessary to specify the clod of earth, for in Mishnaic Hebrew דָּבַח 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 בָּשָׂר , since he has rendered it by the word גִּבְרִיתִי , '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 דָּבַח). 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 שָׁבַר by שָׁבַר

Clines has noted in his commentary that the verb שָׁבַר is of uncertain derivation. (6). BDB has taken it to be cognate with Ethiopic *raga'a*, 'congeal', and proposes the meaning: 'hardens'. (7). Dhorme, however, has noted the connection between שָׁבַר and שָׁבַר in 26.12, and as a result he has translated שָׁבַר as 'break, shatter', and שָׁבַר as 'splits'. (8). The former understanding of שָׁבַר 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 ܘܫܝܩ, '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 ܘܫܝܩ 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 ܘܫܝܩ instead of ܘܫܝܩ, causing him to render ξυωv; while the Targum has used ܘܫܝܩ, 'trembled', to render ܘܫܝܩ. Thus it is best to conclude that the Syriac translator has simply guessed at the meaning of ܘܫܝܩ and with the understanding that the text was saying something about Job's festering skin condition, provided a paraphrase with the form ܘܫܝܩ.

(3) The Interpretation of ܘܫܝܩ by ܘܫܝܩ

In his commentary Gordis has noted that the form ܘܫܝܩ, whose root is ܘܫܝܩ, is a metaplastic form of ܘܫܝܩ, 'melt'. (11). The Syriac translator has correctly made this connection, although his deduction may be based on the text of G, which has ܘܫܝܩ. He has translated ܘܫܝܩ, 'flow', with the imperfect Ethpe'el ܘܫܝܩ, 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.

Verse 7

זכר פי רוח חיי לא חשוב עיני לראות טוב

"Remember that my life is a breath;
my eye will never again see good".

אתדבר דרוחא חיא הי ותהפוך עיני למחוא טובא

"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 חַי, 'living', instead of חַיִּי, '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 Syrian scribe has omitted the negative אַל, 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 8

לֹא תִשׁוּרְנֵי עֵינַי רְאֵי עֵינַיְךָ בִּי וְאֵינֶנִּי

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

לֹא תִחְדַּא לִי עֵינָא דְחַוְיָא לִי וְעֵינַיְךָ בִּי וְלֵיחִי

"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) רָאָה, 'gaze, look at', and (b) רָאָה, '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, רָאָה, 'gaze, look at', for the verb שָׂרַח, 'sing, rejoice', and it is this mistake which has caused him to use the Syriac verb חָדַח, 'rejoice'. Otherwise he has produced a fairly accurate translation of the MT.

Verse 10

לא ישוב עוד לביתו ולא יכירנו עוד מקמו

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

ולא הפך ארוב לביתה ולא משחודע ארוב לאתרה

"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 מקמו as the object of the verb יכירנו, whereas in the MT it is, of course, the subject. This is confirmed by the presence of the suffix נו, attached to the end of the verb. The Syriac translator has construed that the suffix נו, of the noun מקמו, has indicated that it is the object of יכירנו, and he has made this clear in his text by the nota accusativa ܠ. 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 יכירנו by the Eshtaph'el participle משחודע, which achieves an exact correspondence of sense between the texts.

Verse 13

כִּי אָמַרְתִּי אֲנַחֲמֵנִי עַרְשִׁי יִשָּׂא בְשִׁיחִי מִשְׁכְּנִי

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

מִסֵּל דְאָמַרְתָּ דַתְּבִיאֲנִי וְאֲחַלְכֵב מִן סוּרְפָא דְמִשְׁכְּנִי

"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 עַרְשִׁי;
- (2) the interpretation of יִשָּׂא by אֲחַלְכֵב;
- (3) the provision of מִן;
- (4) the interpretation of בְּשִׁיחִי by סוּרְפָא;
- (5) the grammatical nature of מִשְׁכְּנִי;

and will now be considered in order.

(1) The Omission of 'פָּרַח

In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has omitted the noun 'פָּרַח, 'my bed', which in the MT is the subject of the verb 'נִנְחַם, '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 'פָּרַח. The omission has caused the translator to render 'נִנְחַם 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 'פָּרַח' by 'נִנְחַם

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 'פָּרַח' in the MT, which is of course 'נִנְחַם, 'my couch'. The Greek translator has read 'פָּרַח' as 'פָּרַח, and this is represented in his text by the verb ¹αποισω. The Syriac translator has followed this interpretation of the MT, and as a result has used the Ethpa'al 'נִנְחַם, 'be consoled, comforted'; which in itself means that the subject is no longer 'נִנְחַם, 'my couch', but Job himself.

(3) The Provision of ׀ן

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

(4) The Interpretation of ׀ן'שׁ by אשׁן

In his rendering of the second hemistich the Syriac translator has considered ׀ן'שׁ to be a construct plural, and to translate it he has used the noun אשׁן, '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 ׀ןשׁן

It is, finally, necessary to re-iterate that ׀ןשׁן has been taken by

the Syriac translator, not as the subject of שׁוֹחַ , but as the object in construct with שׁוֹחַ .

Verse 15

וּבַחַר מִחֹנֶק נַפְשִׁי מִתּוֹת מַצְמֹתִי

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

וּבַחַרְתָּ נַפְשִׁי מִן אֲבִדָנָא וְגוּמִי מִן מוֹתָא

"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 וּבַחַר may be understood as waw consecutive + 3rd fem sing imperfect Qal, whose subject is the feminine noun נֶפֶשׁ , 'soul, life'. Blommerde in his work puts forward a convincing argument that it is best to translate נֶפֶשׁ as 'throat, neck', since it accords better with the noun מִחֹנֶק , 'strangulation'. (16). The Syriac translator, who here follows the text of G, has understood וּבַחַר , not as 3rd fem sing as in the MT, but as 2nd masc sing: 'you have separated', whose object is נַפְשִׁי , 'my life'. To regularise the text he has inverted the order of מִחֹנֶק & נַפְשִׁי : he has understood the former noun

מחוק in the sense of מן+נחק, which is represented in his text as מן אבדנא, 'from destruction'. It is more than likely that he did not know the meaning of מחוק, which has caused the paraphrase thus offered. In Syriac the root בחר 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 מַעְצָמוֹת, 'my bones' as the subject of the verb בחר, presumably because he has construed it to be in parallelism with נַפְשִׁי; 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 מן מותא. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syriac text מן מותא is in agreement with the text of G (b). (17).

Verse 16

מאסתי לא לעלם אחיה חדל מנני פי הבל ימי

"I loathe my life; I would not live for ever.

Let me alone, for my days are as a breath".

קטעת לי ולא הוא לעלם חי אנא פרוק מני מטל דהבלא אנון יומי

"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 ׳נֹאֲמָה , since, if it carries its usual meaning of 'despise, reject', it requires some such complement as ׳׳נ , '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 ׳נֹאֲמָה may be a metaplastic form of ׳נָמָה , '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 ܢܘܡܝܐ , 'give up, be weary, be low spirited', which, as Payne-Smith has noted, may be used in an impersonal way. (19). The root נָמַךְ thus used gives an excellent rendering of the MT, since it brings out the nuance which is intended by ׳נֹאֲמָה . It may be that the Syriac translator was influenced in his exegetical decision by the rendering of the Targum, which has used the Pa'el ܩܝܢܐ , 'to abominate, loathe'; but it should further be noted that the Targum has used the Pa'el ܩܝܢܐ to render the Hebrew root נָאֵם in Jer 2.37.

Verse 17

מה אנוש נִי תגדלנו וכִי חשית אליו לבך

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

מנו אנשא דתובדיוהי ותסים עלוהי לבך

"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 לָגַן, 'make so much of, make great'; whereas the Peshitta has used the imperfect Aph'el of the root אָבַד, '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 לגלגל or לגלגל . (20). There is, however, no extant Hebrew text which witnesses to such a reading, so that Dhorme postulates that this may be a corruption of a derivative form of אָבַד, a verb to which the Syro-hexapalar version has recourse in order to translate the text of G: εμεγαλυνας = MT לגלגל . (21). The conjugation to which Dhorme is

referring would appear to be the Palpel, whose 2nd masc sing imperfect + 3rd masc sing suff is: מַוַּרְבִּיּוֹהִי. From a comparison of the two forms it can be seen that, although they are fairly similar, major surgery is needed to make מַוַּרְבִּיּוֹהִי into מַוַּבְרִיּוֹהִי. The corruption to which Dhorme doubtless refers may be reconstructed as follows: (1) the first ו has been omitted, perhaps by scribal error; (2) the letters ו + ו have been inverted, and the ו has been mis-read as a ו (a possible conjecture in Syriac, since both letters are the same apart from the . above the ו). 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

חַסְאֲחִי מַה אִפְעַל לְךָ נֹצֵר הָאָדָם לְמַה שְׂמַחְנִי לְמַפּוֹעַ לְךָ
וְאֵהִיָּה עָלַי לְמַשָּׂא

"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?"

אן חסית מנא אעבד לך עבודה דאנשא למנא סמתני דאפוע בך
והוית עלי טענא

"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: εἰ ἐγὼ ἠμαρτον, and has provided the particle ἂν, 'if'. The particle אַן 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 אַן. (22). In his comments on the interpretation of the versions, Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator connected ַןַן, 'watcher', with the root ַןַ, 'to form, create', and has thus rendered ַןַן אַןַן, 'maker of men'. (23). In the second hemistich he has provided an almost literal rendering of the Hebrew text, with the exception of ַןַ אַןַן. Dhorme has noted that the *hapax legomenon* אַןַן conveys the idea of what is encountered, what one hits or strikes, i.e. 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 אַןַן, '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 הוֹיָה must be understood to be the 2nd masc sing of the root הוּא, '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 עָלַי, as one of the eighteen *tiqqune sopherim* 'corrections of the scribes', and accordingly rendered ἐπι σοι. Therefore, since he has retained עָלַי, 'to me', the only other possibility is to take הוֹיָה, as 1st per sing, and to translate: "I have become a burden to myself". Since the form הוֹיָה 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

רַמָּה לֹא חָשָׂא פִשְׁעִי וְחַטְבִּיר אֵת עוֹנִי
 כִּי עָתָה לְעַפְרָא אֲשַׁכַּב וְשָׁחַרְחַנִּי וְאֵינִי

"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".

וְעַד כַּמָּא לֹא חֲשַׁבְוֹק לְחֻבֵי וְתַעֲבֹד חֲסֵה י
דְהִשָּׂא עַל עַפְרָא אֲשַׁכַּב וְחַבְעֵינִי וְלִית אֲנָא

"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 מָה, 'why', has been rendered by a compound preposition עַד כַּמָּא, '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 פְּשָׁעִי, 'my transgression', by the Syriac equivalent חַוְוִי, 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 מֵא of the first hemistich, but has instead prefixed the Syriac equivalent ܠ to the previous noun חַוְוִי. In the second hemistich the only matter deserving comment is the negation אֲנָא לִית, 'but I shall be no more': Nöldeke has noted in his grammar that the negation לִית, when followed by the independent personal pronoun, as in 7.21, is a somewhat rare construction.

(25).

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

ה'יגאה גמא בלא בצה 'שונה אחר בלי מים

"Can Papyrus grow where there is no marsh?

Can reeds flourish where there is no water"?

דלמא סוג אגמא באחרא צה'א או 'עא ארבונא איכא דליה מנא

"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 אגמא, 'marsh'. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syrian scribe has confused אגמא, 'papyrus', with אגמא, 'reedy pool, muddy pool', and so has rendered ה'יגאה בלא בצה by באחר צה'א, '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 = קנה & (2) a reedy pool = מַיָּם; whereas according to Payne-Smith, the Syriac language uses one word to cover both, namely, אַגְמָא, 'pool, standing water; reed, especially Egyptian papyrus'. (27). It is this factor which has caused the Syriac translator to understand אַגְמָא, 'papyrus', as אַגְמָא, 'marsh', and to render: "can a marsh increase in a thirsty place"; he would then appear to have understood the noun בַּצֵּה as the preposition ב + צֵה, and consequently rendered אַצְהֵי בַצֵּה.

Verse 16

רַטְבּ הוּא לְפָנַי שֶׁמֶשׁ וְעַל גִּזְחוֹ יִנְקָחוּ חִצָּא

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

אֵיךְ רַטְבָּא הוּא קִדְמַי שֶׁמֶשׁ

"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* ַסָּ, '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 ַסָּ occurs in Aramaic, Arabic & Akkadian, it is only used twice in the Hebrew Bible: in 24.8 the imperfect Qal ַסָּ, 'be wet', is to be found, while in the passage under immediate discussion the adjective ַסָּ, 'full of sap', is used. In the Peshitta, the Syriac translator has used the form ܟܣܝܢܐ, 'moisture, green vegetation', which is qualified by the particle ܟܝܢܐ, 'like'. The preposition ܕܩܝܡܐ, 'before', has been correctly identified by the Syrian scribe, who has used ܕܩܝܡܐ here. Gordis has noted that the phrase ܕܩܝܡܐ ܕܩܝܡܐ 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 Lamsa, 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

על גל שרשי'ו יסבכו ביה אבנים יחיה

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

ועל גללין שרשוהי' וסמכוך וביהא דכאפא נחיא

"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 גל, 'heap of stones', as the plural גללין, 'waves'. (31). The only alternative to this is to follow Lamsa in his translation of גללין by the word גללא, '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 גללין, 'entwined', by the form גללא, '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 18

אם יבלענו ממקומו וכחד בו לא ראייתך

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

אן נעקריוה' מן אחרה ונדגל בה ונאמר לה דלא חזיתך

"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 'בלענו' by 'נעקריוה';
- (2) the addition of 'נאמר לה';

these will now be considered in turn.

(1) The Interpretation of ירלעו by ועקר'יה'

Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator has interpreted the root
נלע, 'swallow, destroy', by the Syriac עקר, '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
סלעם, which is the Safel of לעם, but which carries the same meaning
as נלע, 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 לה ונאמר

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

הן הוא משוש דרכו ומעפר אחר 'צמחו

"Behold, this is the joy of his way;
and out of the earth others will spring".

הא הרי'ר בצא כלה'ין אורחתה ומן עפרא אחרנא נצמח

"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 חשח, '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 חשח 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

עד ימלה שחוק פיך ושפת'ך תרוצה

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

צדמא דנתמלא פומך גוחכא וספיותך אשבוחתא

"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 עַד as 'until', (not as $\text{עַדְּ$, 'yet') and he has made this clear in his text by the Syriac preposition $\text{עַדְּ$. Dhorme has noted that the translator has understood the active form מִלֵּא as an imperfect Niphal, since he has rendered it by the imperfect Ethpe'el מִלֵּא , '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.

NOTES

- | | | | | |
|------|------------------|---|------|---------|
| (1) | Gordis, R. | <u>The Book of Job</u> | 1978 | p 78. |
| (2) | Dhorme, E. | <u>The Book of Job</u> | 1967 | p 97. |
| (3) | " | ibid | | p 99. |
| (4) | Payne-Smith | <u>Syriac-English Dictionary</u> | 1903 | p 330. |
| (5) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 100. |
| (6) | Clines, D. J. A. | <u>WBC--Job</u> | 1989 | p 163. |
| (7) | BDB | <u>Hebrew-English Lexicon</u> | 1906 | p 921b. |
| (8) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 100. |
| (9) | Payne-Smith | ibid | | p 512b. |
| (10) | Nöldeke, T. | <u>Compendious Syriac Grammar</u>
§ 160. | 1904 | p 106. |
| (11) | Gordis | ibid | | p 80. |
| (12) | Rignell, L. G. | 'The Peshitta of Job' | 1973 | p 100. |
| (13) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 103. |
| (14) | " | ibid | | p 105. |
| (15) | " | ibid | | p 105. |
| (16) | Blommerde, A. | <u>Northwest Semitic Grammar & Job</u> | | p 49. |
| (17) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 106. |
| (18) | Clines | ibid | | p 166. |
| (19) | Payne-Smith | ibid | | p 501b. |
| (20) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 108. |
| (21) | " | ibid | | p 108. |
| (22) | Clines | ibid | | p 193f. |

Chapter Five

Commentary on the Peshitta of Job 9.1-10.22

Chapter Nine

Verse 2

אָמַנְתָּ יְדַעְתִּי כִּי כֵן וְהִנֵּה יִצְדָּק אֲנוֹשׁ עִם אֵל

"Truly I know that it is so:

But how can a man be just before God"?

שְׂרַיָא יִדַע אֲנָא דְהַכִּנָּא הוּ וְלֹא זָכָא לְאֵלֵהָא אֲנוּשָׂא

"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 הֲ in the sense of the negative לֹא; how can this apparent difficulty be resolved? The answer is to be found in the use of הֲ in Arabic, where הֲ 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 הֲ 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 הֲ

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

הַמְעִיף הַרִים וְלֹא יָדְעוּ אֲשֶׁר הִפְכֵם בְּאַפּוֹ

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

הוּ דְמַשְׁנֵא חוּרִין לֹא יָדַע וְהִפֵּךְ לְהוֹן בְּרוּגְזָא

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

As the difference in sense is limited to the construction: וְלֹא יָדְעוּ, comment will be restricted to that. Once again Dhorme has noted in his commentary that the Syriac translator has the Hebrew construction יָדְעוּ as ו + יָדַע, 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.

(4). It should be noted, however, that the Peshitta's interpretation of the MT is unique and is otherwise without any versional support.

Verse 12

הן יחטף מי ישיבנו מי אמר אליו מה תעשה

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

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

הא אן חבר מנו נפקוד באידה ומנו נאמר לה מנא עבר אנת

"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: חטף, which BDB defines as: 'seize, snatch away'. The Syriac translator has rendered חטף, 'snatch away', by the verb

מִן, 'break, shatter'. It is highly unlikely that the Syriac translator did not understand the root פִּתַּח, 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 מִן is based on his exact understanding of the root פִּתַּח. He would appear to have taken the form מִן, 'hinder', in the sense of 'answer back', and it is surely this understanding which led him to render it with מִן מִן, 'entreat with his hands'. Grabbe has taken the construction מִן מִן in the sense of 'require it from his hands', but it is better to take the preposition מִן, 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

אלה לא ישיב אפרו אחורו שחורו צורו רהב

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

אלה לא מהפך רוגזה ותחורוהו ותמכנון מעתה סגיא

"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 שָׁחָהוּ, 'bowed down', with the Syriac root חֲנַךְ, 'humiliate'; it should be stressed that in this instance the use of the root חֲנַךְ is an accurate one. It has been noted elsewhere in this work that the Syriac translator has used the root חֲנַךְ, 'humiliate', on a number of occasions to render such roots as: חָנַךְ & חָנַח, and that such usage is usually his interpretation of the text. (for further remarks on this topic, see above p 90). In his commentary Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator did not realise that the form חָנַח is a name, and has merely supplied an abstract term for it (חֲנִיח). (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

אִיךָ כִּי אֶעֱנֶה אֲבַחֲרָה דְבָרֵי עַמִּי

"How then can I answer him,
choosing my words with him".

אִיךָ אֲנִי דִּי אֶעֱנִי וְהִי וְאֶסְדֹּר מִלִּי קְדֻמָּה

"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 וְ 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 וְ positively rather than interrogatively as in the MT.

Verse 15

אֲשֶׁר אִם צִדְקָתִי לֹא אָעִנָּה לְמַשְׁפָּטֵי אַחֲחֹנָן

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

אֲלֹא צוֹדֵדְקָה לֹא אֲחַעֲנֶנָּה וְלִדְיִנִּי אֲתַנְשֶׁף

"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 אָעַן, '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 אָעַן not as a Qal, but as a Niphal. In his commentary Dhorme has noted that such a reading is also presupposed in G's εἰσακουσεται μου, and in Theodotian's ἀποκριθησεται μου, 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

אָר בשַׁעֲרָה יִשׁוּפְנִי וְהִרְבֵּה פִצְעֵי חַוְנִי

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

דְּבַכְל מִנְחָא דְרִשִׁי בְחֻקְפָּא מַחְנֵי וְאִסְגִי צוֹלְפָתִי מִן

"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 בְּשׂוּעָה ;
- (b) the interpretation of "וְנִינִי";
- (c) the interpretation of 'פְּצֵי'.

These are dealt with as follows:

- (a) The Interpretation of בְּשׂוּעָה

In its translation of this text the RSV has taken בְּשׂוּעָה as 'tempest', which seems odd, since, as Dhorme has noted in his commentary, its normal spelling in the book of Job is בְּשׂוּעָה . (9). The spelling with w 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 ܫܘܥܐ , 'hair, fur'. Moreover, he has sought to interpret the entire phrase so as to mean 'for a trifle', ie 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 ׀׀׀, '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 '׀׀׀׀'

In his commentary Rowley has noted that the verb used here is the same as that used in Gen 3.15, namely ׀׀׀, 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 ܟܢܢ, 'strike, beat, wound', which he has provided with the instrumental construction ܟܢܢ ܕܥܝܢܐ, 'with violence'. Dhorme has noted that the Syriac translator's rendering here is less literal than that provided by G, which has: με ̇ε̇τριψη, 'let him crush me'. (12).

(c) The Interpretation of '׀׀׀'

In his rendering of the Hebrew text the Syriac translator has

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

Verse 18

לא יחנני השב רוחי פי ישפוני ממררים

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

ולא שוקני דחתניח רוחי מטל דאסבצוני מררא ואררני גררא

"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 השב;
- (b) the addition of גררא ואררני.

These will be dealt with in order.

(a) The Interpretation of 177

In the MT the form 177 may be parsed as being 3rd masc sing perfect Hiphil of the root 177, 'return, come back', but which, in the Hiphil conjugation when used with the noun 111, 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 111, 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 8773 '1'1771

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

אם לנח אמיץ הנה ואם למשפט מי יוצידני

"If it is a contest of strength, behold him!

If it is a matter of justice, who can summon him"?

אן בחילא מקיף הו ואן לדינא מנו נארעיוהי

"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 הוה, '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 הוהוה. The Syriac translator, however, would appear to have taken הוה as the pronoun הוה, '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 וי, which, as Clines has noted, may be one of the tiqqun 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: נארעיוהי, 'who will encounter him'. The Translator has used the Syriac root ארע, 'encounter', to render the Hebrew root יעך, 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

אם שוט ימית פחאם לחסח נקים ילעג

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

אן שבסה מן שלי קסל ועל שטיות זכייין ממיק

"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 שוט, rather than a translation of it. In his commentary Clines has noted that the word שוט, '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 שוטן, '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, מַטָּה, of the second hemistich is derived from the root מָטַט, 'melt', and that this etymology yields the rendering 'calamity'. (19). The same etymology has been assumed by the Targum which renders מַטָּה מַטָּה, 'dismayed', but not by the Peshitta, whose translator may have only arrived at his rendering by inspired guesswork.

Verse 24

אֲרֵץ נִתְּנָה בְּיַד רָשָׁע פְּנֵי שֹׁפְטֵיהָ יִכָּסֶה אִם לֹא אֲפֹאֵר מִי הוּא

"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"?

אֲרֵץ יִהְיֶה בְּאִידָהּ דְּרִשְׁיָעָא וְאֲפִיִּהוֹן דְּרִינָא מִחֲפִין
אֵלָא לְרִגְוָה מִנּוּ מְסִיבֵר

"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 אָהָר + אָפֶא, 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 אָ לֹ אָ of the MT is represented by his combined particle אָלָא, 'but, if not'. Instead of reading אָפֶא as in the MT, he has read אָפֶא, 'his anger', and this is represented in his text by the Syriac noun אָפֶא. He has rendered the ה' of the MT as אָפֶא, 'who'; he has presumably taken the pronoun אָפֶא as some form of the verb 'to be', from which he has taken the sense of 'endure', and consequently has rendered by the Pai'el participle אָפֶא. 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

חֲלָפוּ עִם אוֹרוֹחַ אָבִהּ כְּנֹשֶׁר יִטּוֹשׁ עַל־י אֲנִל

"They go by like skiffs of reed,
like an eagle sweeping on its prey".

עֲבָרוּ עִם אֲלִפָּא סְגִיאתָא דְבַעַלְדַּבְבָּא אִיךְ נִשְׂרָא דְסַאֲסַ עַל מְנוּלַחָה

"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: אַנְיֹת אֹנֶה, 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 אַנְיֹת, 'ships', but did not know that when it is used in connection with the following noun אֹנֶה, 'reed', it has the meaning of skiffs. All the commentators note the difficulty that has been caused by אֹנֶה, 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 אֹנֶה may be interpreted as 'reed'. (22). The Syriac translator, however, would appear to have given two interpretations to the word אֹנֶה. The first has been noted by Driver/Gray, who observe that he has connected it with the word אֲנִיָּה, 'enmity', and that this connection caused him to provide the rendering אַנְיֹת אֲנִיָּה, 'enemies'. (23). The second is the connection noted by Szpek with the word אֲנִיָּה, whose root is אֲנִי, 'to be many'. (24). It is difficult to see how such a connection can be justified, since the proposed misreading as אֲנִיָּה

has no coherency whatsoever. It is more probable that the word אַא'טו has been inferred from the plural form of אַנִיִּוֹת, 'ships'. In concluding it should be noted that the Syriac translator would have received no help from the versions, since they all misunderstood אָבָה.

Verse 27

אם אמרי אשכחה שיחי אצובה פני ואבל'גה

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

עם מררי טעית שועי'ת' אן אשבוך רנני אר מלי מתחציק אונא

"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 אם, not in the sense of 'if', but in the sense of 'with'. Dhorme has noted in his commentary that the translator has connected אמרי, 'I say', with the root מרר, 'to be bitter'; it may be that he was influenced in this decision by the rarity of the

infinitive after ׀א, a feature to which Clines has drawn attention. (25). It is clear that he has taken 'ח'ש, 'my complaint', in the sense of 'ח'ש'ע'י, 'my discourse'. He has then supplied the particle ׀א, 'if', which he may have felt necessary from the context. In the second hemistich he would appear to have replaced 'פ'נ, 'my countenance', with 'ר'נ, 'my reflection', and supplied an additional noun, 'ל'נ, 'my words'. Dhorme is of the opinion that the additional noun has been supplied because the translator read אגל'ג, 'be of good cheer', twice. (26). It is probably better, with Szpek, to regard the additional noun 'ל'נ, 'my words', as a double translation of the Hebrew פ'נ. (27). The translator has taken the final verbal form אגל'ג, 'be of good cheer', in the sense of אגל'ג'ע'י, 'be grieved', which is the exact opposite of the meaning of the text in the Hebrew Bible. Since the text of G has used the form στεναξω, 'groan', and the Vulgate has dolore torqueor, 'I am tormented with sorrow', it is more than likely that he was influenced by their renderings when he made his choice of אגל'ג'ע'י. It should once again be noted that Szpek has not taken sufficient account of the versions in her analysis of the motivation of the translator.

Verse 28

'גרה' נל עצבתי 'דעתי פי לא תוקני

"I become afraid of all my suffering,
for I know that thou wilt not hold me innocent".

וְאֵן אַחַחְנִיחַ דְּחַל אֲנֵא מִן כָּל אַשְׁוּיָק
מַסֵּל דִּידַע אֲנֵא דְלֵא מְזַכָּא אֲנֵחַ לִי

"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 אַן אַחַחְנִיחַ 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

אֲנִי אֲרֻשַׁע לְמָה זֶה הִבֵּל אֵיבֹעַ

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

הֵא אַן אַחַחְיִב לְמַנָּא אֵיךְ הִבֵּלֵא מְסִיף אֲנֵחַ לִי

"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 אָנָּח with the root אָנָּח, 'expire', and that this understanding is reflected with his Aph'el participle אָנָּחִי. (29). For such an understanding he was no doubt dependent on the text of G, which has ἀπεθανον, '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

אָדַבְרָה וְלֹא אִירָאֶנּוּ פִּי לֹא כֵן אֲנֹכִי צַמְדִּי

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

אֲמַלֵּל וְלֹא אֶדְחַל מִנֹּה דִּלֹּא הוּיִת לְקוּבִלָּה

"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 ןן, 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 אַנְנִי, 'I', with the verb הוּיָהּ, 'I am', and has read עִמָּהּ, 'with him', instead of עִמָּי, '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

הַטּוֹב לְךָ כִּי תַעֲשֶׂה כִּי תִמָּאֵס יוֹיֵעַ כַּפֶּיךָ וְעַל עֲצַח רִשְׁעִים הוֹפֵעָה

"Does it seem good to thee to oppress,
to despise the work of thy hands,
and favour the designs of the wicked"?

לא כדן לך אטלם אונ ומטלא אונ לאותא דאידיך
ועל תרעיתא דרשיצא אדיקח

"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 לך אלא, '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 hemistich very literally: ἢ καλον σοι, "is it good for you", and the Targum has: לך אלא, "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

כִּי תִבְקֹשׁ לְעוֹנֵי וּלְחַטָּאתַי תִּדְרֹשׁ

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

דִּמְעָקֵב אַנְחָה עַל חוֹבֵי וְעַל חַטָּאתַי

"that you seek out my guilt and my sins"

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 חַטָּאתַי as a plural; he has also noted that the Syrian scribe has omitted the final verbal form תִּדְרֹשׁ, and has taken חַטָּאתַי as a second object of תִּבְקֹשׁ, '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

יְדִיךָ עֲצוּבוֹנֵי וַיְעֲשׂוּנֵי יַחַד טוֹבִיב וְתוֹבְלַעֲנֵי

"Thy hands fashioned and made me;
and now thou dost turn about and destroy me".

אֵיךְ לֹא בִּי וְעָבַדְנִי וּמִן בְּתָרְכֶן צָבָא אַחַת לְמַחֲבוֹתַי וּלְמַסְבְּעוֹתַי

"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 *עָבַדְנִי*, 'fashioned me', has been used. BDB has related the root *עָבַד*, 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 *πλασσω*, 'mold', and by the Targum which uses the *Pa'el* conjugation of the root *עָבַד*, 'shape, fashion'. In this instance the Syriac translator has gone his own way and has used the root *עָבַד*, 'labour, toil'. The only reason that one could give for this is that, while the root *עָבַד*, 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 *אַחַר*, 'afterwards', for *יַחַד*, 'together', and to find some form of the verb 'turn about' from the same root as *יָשַׁב*, namely *שָׁבַב*. The Syriac translator, for his part, has certainly taken *יַחַד* in the sense of *אַחַר*, by rendering the word *בְּתָרְכֶן*, and would appear to have

ignored וְיָשׁוּב altogether, or substituted the verb צִוָּה, 'wish', in its place. He has also added the Pa'el infinitive מְחַיְיבֵנִי, '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

חַיִּים וְחֶסֶד עָשִׂיתָ עִמָּדִי וּפְקֻדָּתְךָ שָׁמְרָה לְרוּחִי

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

וְחַיָּא וְשְׁלָמָא עֲבַדְתָּ עִמִּי וּפְקֻדָּנִיךְ נִטְרָה לְרוּחִי

"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 וּפְקֻדָּה, 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

אם רשעא לי אללי לי וצדקא לא אשא ראשי שבנ קלון וראה עניי

"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".

אן חסית וי לי וגן אודוקת לא ארים רישי

מסבנ אנא צערא וחזית מוכנני

"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, שבנ קלון, 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 שָׁוַע, 'sated', a first person singular verb also, thus: אֲנִי שָׁוַעְתִּי. In this act he has simply followed the text of G, which also verbalized this clause: πληρης γαρ ατιμιας ειμι. 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, וְחַזְקָה מִיָּמַי. 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

וַיִּגְאֵה נֶפְשׁוֹל אֲצִוְרֹנִי וְחָשַׁב אֲתַפְלֵא בִי

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

וְאַן אֲתַתְרִים אֵיךְ אֲרִיא אֲצִוְרֹנִי וְהִפֵּךְ אֲנִי מִחֲגֹבְרֵי צִלִּי

"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 וַיִּגְאֶה , 'and he lifts up', and rendered it with the reflexive Ethpe'el form אֶתְהַרְיֵם , '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 וַיִּגְאֶה , 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 אֶתְהַרְיֵם , 'work wonders against', by the denominative (quadriliteral) verb מַתְהַרְיֵם , 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

$\text{אֶתְהַרְיֵם עֲדָיךָ נִגְדֵי וְחֵרֵב פִּעֲשֶׁךָ עֲמָדֵי חֵל פְּרוֹת וְצִבָּא עֲמָדֵי}$

"Thou dost renew thy witnesses against me,
and increase thy vexation toward me;
thou dost bring fresh hosts against me".

ומחרא אנת זינך לוקבלי ומסגא אנת רוגוך לותי
 וחילוך מחלף אנת לי

"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 עָדִיךְ, as being cognate with the Arabic *adiya*, 'was hostile', and has understood the noun in terms of military hostility and so has provided the noun אָרְמִי, '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: και ανακαλιζεις σεαυτω αντιχειμενον 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 Aph'el participle מַחְרָא, 'to make ready to fight'. In the second hemistich he has interpreted the Hebrew חִלְיוֹת, 'change, relief', by using the cognate verb חָלַף, 'renew', which in this case is rendered as the Pa'el participle.

Verse 20

הלא מצט ימי יחדל ישית ממני ואבליגה מעט

"Are not the days of my life few?

Let me alone, that I may find a little comfort".

זעורין אנון יומתא דחיי פרוק מני ואשלא ואחתניח קליל

"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 hemistich the translator has taken the phrase יחדל ימי as ימי חלדי, '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 ὁ βίος τοῦ χρόνου μου. In the second hemistich the scribe would appear to have read the Qere תיפוי, as well as supplying the reflexive pronoun 'yourself', so as to obtain the translation as above. For the final verbal form ואבליגה, 'I will be bright', he would appear to have supplied a doublet in the form of the roots אלא and אלו. According to BDB the root אלו 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

ושׁוֹי עַל־יַי וְאַנּוּחַ זַעִיר 'let me at ease and I will rest a little'.

Verse 22

אֶרֶץ עִינְפֹתָהּ כְּמֹר אֶפֶל צְלֻמוֹת וְלֹא סִדְרִים וְהַפֶּעַע כְּמֹר אֶפֶל

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

דֶּשֶׁהִיא אֵיךְ חֲבֵרָא וְסַלְלֵי מְרֻחָא וְלִית בֵּה סִדְרִין דְּדִרְיִן
וְהַשְׁלֵהִיא אֵיךְ חֲבֵרָא

"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 עִינְפֹתָהּ, 'deep darkness', by the Syriac noun דֶּשֶׁהִיא, 'lonely'. The word עִינְפֹתָהּ comes from the root עִיף/עִיף 1, 'to be dark'; whereas the Syriac translator assumed that it came from the root עִיף 2, 'be faint, weary', and therefore furnished the noun דֶּשֶׁהִיא, 'lonely'. The phrase וְלֹא סִדְרִים has been expanded by him to וְלִית בֵּה סִדְרִין דְּדִרְיִן, '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 וַיִּשָׁאֵר , which is from the root שׂאֵר , 'shine forth', to be from שׂוֹאֵר 2, 'be faint, weary', and so has provided the form וַיִּשְׁלַח , 'desolate'. From this apparent confusion he has ended up with a text, which although similar to the MT, is nevertheless different to it.

NOTES

- | | | | | |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------------|------|---------|
| (1) | BDB | <u>Hebrew-English Lexicon</u> | 1906 | p 553. |
| (2) | Dhorme, E. | <u>The Book of Job</u> | 1967 | p 126. |
| (3) | " | ibid | | p 128. |
| (4) | Clines, D. | <u>WBC--Job</u> | 1989 | p 216. |
| (5) | Grabbe, L. L. | <u>Comparative Philology and Job</u> | 1977 | p 61. |
| (6) | " | ibid | | p 61. |
| (7) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 134. |
| (8) | " | ibid | | p 135. |
| (9) | " | ibid | | p 137. |
| (10) | Szpek, H. | <u>Translation Technique in Job</u> | 1992 | p 30. |
| (11) | Rowley, H. | <u>The Book of Job</u> | 1970 | p 79. |
| (12) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 136. |
| (13) | Payne-Smith | <u>Syriac-English Dictionary</u> | 1903 | p 475b. |
| (14) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 137. |
| (15) | " | ibid | | p 137. |
| (16) | Clines | ibid | | p 218. |
| (17) | " | ibid | | p 218. |
| (18) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 140. |
| (19) | Gordis, R. | <u>The Book of Job</u> | 1978 | p 108. |
| (20) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 140. |
| (21) | Rowley | ibid | | p 81. |

- | | | | | |
|------|-------------|--------------------------|------|--------|
| (22) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 141. |
| (23) | Driver/Gray | <u>ICC---Job</u> | 1921 | p 59. |
| (24) | Szpek | ibid | | p 152. |
| (25) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 142. |
| | Clines | ibid | | p 219. |
| (26) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 142. |
| (27) | Szpek | ibid | | p 252. |
| (28) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 142. |
| (29) | " | ibid | | p 142. |
| (30) | Rowley | ibid | | p 83. |
| (31) | Szpek | ibid | | p 56. |
| (32) | " | ibid | | p 56. |
| (33) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 148. |
| (34) | " | ibid | | p 152. |
| (35) | Clines | ibid | | p 222. |
| (36) | Dhorme | ibid | | p 153. |
| (37) | Grabbe | ibid | | p 63. |
| (38) | Mangan, C. | <u>The Targum of Job</u> | 1991 | p 40. |

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 Pesita 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. Szpek. 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, i.e. 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; i.e. 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 173:

"Versional parallels with the LXX (στενάζω "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 für 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.

NOTES

- (1) Rignell, L. G. 'Notes on the Peshitta of Job'
ASTI 9, 1974 98-106.
- (2) Szpek, H. M. Translation Technique in Job p 2.
1992.
- (3) " ibid p 252.
- (4) McKane, W. ICC--Jeremiah Vol 1 p xxviiif
1986.

INDEXES

Index of Subjects

Aramaic roots,	translation of Peshitta based on	26, 27.
Peshitta of Job,		
	characteristics of translation,	19, 20.
	Christian influence in,	142.
	clauses and verses of, not in agreement with MT,	30, 31.
	containing transpositions, omissions or compressions	35-37.
	nature of,	17, 18.
	translation of, based on incorrect reading,	31, 32.
	translation of, contains repetitions & doublets	33, 34.
Septuagint		
	agreement of, with Peshitta,	62, 63,
	68, 74-75, 88, 94-95, 99, 103-104, 110, 114, 122, 128, 141, 146, 148- 149, 153, 173, 178, 184, 186, 189, 193, 195-196.	
Syriac		
	characteristics of,	4,
	jussive, loss of in Syriac,	45, 90.
	relative pronoun in Syriac,	5-7, 91, 98.
	noun, state of,	7-10, 159.
	use of tense in Syriac,	105-106.
	verbal system in Syriac,	10-16.
Targum		
	agreement of, with Peshitta,	23-25, 49,
	54, 93-94, 106-107, 112-113, 118, 150, 171, 175.	

Versions

as witnesses of early exegesis, 3, 204.
influence of, on Peshitta, 18-19, 204.
use of, for textual criticism, 2, 204.

Vulgate

agreement of, with Peshitta, 28-30, 46-
49, 53, 99, 123, 161, 163, 168, 177, 184.

Index of Authorities

Baumann, E.	18, 202, 203.
BDB	94, 98, 140, 167.
Blommerde, A.	86, 148.
Brownlee, W. H.	7.
Burney, C. F.	5.
Clines, D. J. A.	51, 56, 63, 64, 65, 66, 98, 112, 140, 150, 153, 169, 178, 179, 184, 194.
Dhorme, E.	18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 34, 48, 49, 52, 57, 63, 64, 68, 72, 75, 78, 80, 81, 88, 89, 93, 95, 96, 99, 109, 111, 114, 117, 120, 121, 126, 127, 134, 138, 140, 144, 146, 149, 151, 153, 156, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163, 168, 171, 173, 174, 175, 177, 179, 181, 182, 184, 186, 189, 193, 195.
Driver, S. R.	2.
Driver, S. R. /Gray, G. B.	23, 47, 67, 73, 74, 98, 101, 103, 107, 182.
Gesenius, W.	8.
Gibson, J. C. L.	11.
Gordis, R.	86, 88, 133, 141, 158, 180.
Gosling, F. A.	2, 14, 45, 96, 105.
Grabbe, L. L.	49, 64, 108, 120, 170, 195.
Hartley, J. E.	103, 115.
Jastrow, M.	47.
Johns, A. F.	13, 14.
Lamsa, G.	57, 102, 158, 159.

McFall, L.	14.
McKane, W.	3, 203.
Mangan, C.	54, 161, 198.
Moscatti, S.	5, 14.
Muraoka, T.	13, 15, 45.
^{cc} Noldeke, T.	8, 13, 15, 16, 67, 141, 155.
Payne-Smith, R.	71, 112, 123, 138, 141, 150, 157, 159, 176.
Polzin, R.	6.
Rignell, L. G.	34, 102, 114, 125, 142, 202.
Roberts, B. J.	16, 17.
Robinson, T. H.	9, 11.
Rowley, H. H.	175, 182, 187.
Segert, S.	10.
Stade, B.	59.
Stevenson, W. B.	13.
Szpek, H. M.	175, 182, 184, 188, 202, 203.
Tur-Sinai, N. H.	52, 75.
Waltke, B. / O' Connor, M.	6.
Weingreen, J.	10.
Wright, W.	4, 14.
^{cc} Wurthwein, E.	3.